

ILLINOIS STATE TEACHER CERTIFICATION BOARD

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

Friday, February 4, 2005

MINUTES

Call to Order / Roll Call:

Dennis Williams, Secretary, Illinois State Teacher Certification Board, called the Illinois State Teacher Certification Board meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. Dennis Williams proceeded to call the roll. A quorum was present.

Members Present:

Mr. Dennis Williams, Secretary

Muhammad Abdullah	Andrew Brulle	Laura Lipe
Kay Acklin	Roger Chamberlain	Linda Malone
Marsha Allen	Deborah J. Curtis	Jo Ann Owens
Richard Ammentorp	Nina Dorsch	Eugene Zalewski
William Briggs	Elliott Lessen	

Note: Mr. Williams reported Amy Alsop, Teacher Representative for the Illinois Federation of Teachers, resigned as a member of the State Teacher Certification Board. Ms. Alsop accepted a position with the Illinois Federation of Teachers.

Members Absent:

Dr. Randy J. Dunn, Chairman	Ascencion Juarez Dave Marshall	Linda Tafel Denise Williams
--------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------

Others Present:

Bob Bigham	Susan Shea	Sally Vogl
Jonathan Furr	Sara Simonson	Karen Williams
Colleen Herald	Lynn Steffen	Marti Woelfle
Linda Jamali	Brenda Stonecipher	
Phyliss Jones	Kathy Stratton	
Cindy Lawson	Joy Taylor-Ankenbrandt	
Mary O'Brian	Linda Tomlinson	
Lee Patton	Renee Vilatte	

Approval of Minutes:

The meeting summary and minutes of the December 2 and 3, 2004, Illinois State Teacher Certification Board meeting(s) were presented for consideration. Elliott Lessen moved that the December 2 and 3, 2004 meeting summary and minutes be approved with the following correction:

Page 5, Second Paragraph, First Line

At the request of Elliott Lessen, insert the word Edwardsville after Southern Illinois University.

William Briggs seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Public Participation:

None.

Facilitation Committee's Report:

Kay Acklin, Chair of the Facilitation Committee, stated the Facilitation Committee had met earlier and would like to revise the agenda to add the following:

- E. Item(s) for Discussion
 - 2. House Bill (HB) 343

Also, the two items for discussion under Agenda Item F. will be addressed after Renewal of Standard / Master Certificates.

Item(s) for Immediate Action:

New Program Recommendations –

Note: Dennis Williams announced that State Board of Education staff received communication from Southern Illinois University Carbondale asking that the English as a New Language program proposal be withdrawn from the agenda.

Western Illinois University – Reading Specialist

Brenda Stonecipher, Principal Education Consultant, Department of Certification and Professional Development, introduced the following representatives from Western Illinois University: Ms. Linda Tomlinson, Certification Officer and Chairperson, Department of Special Education; and Dr. Sara Simonson, Professor, Department of Curriculum and Instruction and Coordinator, Graduate Reading Program.

Andrew Brulle raised a question regarding the competencies and how these are in essence assessed prior to the candidate's entry. On page 2 of the program proposal, it reads, "Because the candidates are already practicing teachers, those entering the program are expected to have the competencies to meet the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards, the Illinois Language Arts Standards and the Illinois Technology Standards required for all teachers." Dr. Brulle asked about the out-of-state candidates, specifically how does one know that they have met the Illinois standards?

Linda Tomlinson stated that they are doing an approach similar to the subsequent certificate where a focused evaluation is completed. Because they are practicing teachers, they will be required to pass the APT. And, if they do not at that point, they go back and look at their coursework. It will be individually determined whether they understand and can meet all of the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards, Illinois Language Arts Standards and Illinois Technology Standards for all teachers.

Andrew Brulle asked if that is only for the ones that don't pass the APT. Linda Tomlinson further stated that according to the state requirement if you can pass the APT then you can meet the Illinois Professional Teaching, Language Arts, and Technology Standards as a baseline.

Elliott Lessen raised a question that if candidates already hold a K-12 will they still be required to take the APT? Linda Tomlinson stated not if they have already passed it. Ms. Tomlinson indicated this is an issue that has been raised as to what APT ... perhaps the state could answer if there are already practicing teachers at a K-12 level in another field, but have never taken the APT, will they be required to take it. Brenda Stonecipher stated yes, that was her understanding.

Elliott Lessen referred to page(s) 8, 9 and 10 of the program proposal. With regard to the electives listed on page 10, some may be focused on reading, but others are not. Given all of the emphasis in terms of the need to have people well prepared to be reading specialists, one wonders about the choice of electives which appear to be rather broad.

Sara Simonson shared that they will only have one course that they could actually choose from the list. On the other hand, they want it to be broad because they see those areas being related to reading as far as the technology supporting the teachers. Math may stand out; many of the teachers as reading specialists are also Title I reading and Title I math. It is only one course from that entire list.

On page 11, Elliott Lessen asked about the experiences the students will have, specifically how diversity will be provided particularly if a teacher is in a small rural district. Sara Simonson indicated that is stressed from the beginning in 571 and 573. If they still have not met that requirement in the reading practicum, staff will make sure by arranging the supervision. In reading 571 and 573, they make their own contacts for their tutoring of their students for the case studies and the interpretive reports. But, in the practicum the supervisor assigns them.

Elliott Lessen complimented university representatives on page 14 (performance assessments and activities) on the nice array of different experiences that later show up in the matrices. Sara Simonson thanked Dr. Lessen. She shared that university staff spent an entire year working as a team (literacy professors) agreeing on core requirement courses.

Nina Dorsch raised a question in terms of assessments. There is reference to a Capstone Assessment (p. 14, first paragraph). Dr. Dorsch asked what the Capstone Assessment consisted of. Sara Simonson stated it is very general. Candidates are meeting the four objectives of the elementary education program and the reading program overall. It involves can they do research, are they aware of current theory, can they make presentations, can they write well and present their ideas.

Andrew Brulle asked university representatives to clarify the “disposition inventory” that is completed a couple of times during the program. Sara Simonson indicated it follows the undergraduate program which they are expected to do for NCATE. It is a simple checklist of behaviors that are exhibited during classes. If students do not meet those requirements, they are called in to talk with the department chair. Dr. Brulle asked what is in the dispositions themselves, what types of checklists, specific criteria. Dr. Simonson stated it has to do with honesty, behavior in class, cooperative nature, professional demeanor, consideration during the practicum – professional abilities, privacy issues working with children, etc.

Kay Acklin moved that the State Teacher Certification Board recommend to the State Board of Education provisional approval of the Western Illinois University Reading Specialist program, thereby authorizing the educational unit to conduct the program and to recommend candidates for certification by entitlement until the time of the institution’s next scheduled Accreditation Review [Section 25.145

(d) (1)]. Elliott Lessen seconded the motion. The motion passed with two abstentions.

Illinois State University – Director of Special Education

Phylliss Jones, Principal Education Consultant, Department of Certification and Professional Development, introduced the following representatives from Illinois State University: Dr. Cindy Lawson, Assistant Chairperson, Department of Special Education; and Dr. Mary O'Brian, Assistant Professor, Department of Special Education.

Elliott Lessen referred to page 28 of the program proposal which reflects individuals holding a master's degree in one of the following areas yet one doesn't talk about them having to have either a Type 75 or a Type 73 certificate. University representatives stated the Director of Special Education is a Type 75 that stands alone under new regulations. It used to be an endorsement on a Type 75, but it is now a stand alone.

Nina Dorsch raised a question regarding (p. 23) field experiences and clinical practice, and the diversity of learners and families that candidates might experience. Item 3b states, "The specific sites for practicum experiences will be chosen with the criterion of diversity of learners and families as top priority." Dr. Dorsch asked how that will be assured in field experiences.

Mary O'Brian stated they have talked with the directors in the state organization IAASE and talked about mentoring. They will target those directors that work with students that have diverse populations to provide those internship experiences for them. Those are available locally or can move into other areas.

With regard to the reference of having a letter of recommendation (p. 26), Nina Dorsch indicated that at the point of admission and having evidence in the form of a letter of recommendation of an appropriate disposition, are you talking about specifically the dispositions that are listed on page 35 ... is there some directive or descriptor that goes out with the request for a letter so that one knows certain things are addressed.

Mary O'Brian indicated that since this program proposal was submitted in December there has been some development of some additional forms. On the application package, there is a description of the descriptors for the applicant. There is a checklist that includes those dispositions as well as a request for letters so that they are asked to rank each of the dispositions as well as include a letter.

Andrew Brulle referred to the issue of three dispositional concerns (p. 36) as being a threshold for a student. Why three – what about severity ... Dr. Brulle raised concern about allowing three concerns because one may be enough.

Mary O'Brian stated it was not set in stone. There are issues, if it were extreme enough, they would meet with that student and automatically talk about continuing in the program. Cindy Lawson stated they already have this system with the undergraduate program and the master's program. Because they have multiple instructors who may or may not talk about dispositions with students, they have a cut off of three. The entire teacher education unit uses that system. It doesn't mean you must have three before they can act. It means if there are three they will act.

Andrew Brulle asked about (p. 3) the candidates who might meet some of these prerequisites through portfolio artifacts. Dr. Brulle asked university representatives to describe how that is judged, who judges it, what is the criteria for determining if that prerequisite has been met.

Mary O'Brian shared that if the student feels they have met the standards through a portfolio artifact through another course or through their performance in another avenue, they would submit that artifact. They have descriptors of all of the portfolio pieces so there is a description of those projects and scoring guides for each project.

Andrew Brulle asked if there was an appeals process in case a portfolio artifact is not passed. Cindy Lawson answered that the policy calls for one attempt to remediate on your own and then if it is still not adequate you would still need to take the course.

Elliott Lessen stated that he did not see a matrix that talks about the standards and the assessments. Nina Dorsch indicated there is a matrix on page 14 and following of the program proposal that lists the standards in the courses. Dr. Lessen specifically asked for a matrix that lists the standards and what assessments will be used. For example, how will one know that students have met the standards?

Mary O'Brian indicated that is not laid out as clearly as a table. Elliott Lessen stated it would be clearer for Certification Board members and for students if a matrix was provided detailing that information.

Kay Acklin moved that the State Teacher Certification Board recommend to the State Board of Education provisional approval of the Illinois State University Director of Special Education (Type 75) program, thereby authorizing the educational unit to conduct the program and to recommend candidates for certification by entitlement until the time of the institution's next scheduled

Accreditation Review [Section 25.145 (d) (1)]. Elliott Lessen seconded the motion. The motion passed with four abstentions.

Proposals for Activities that Meet Requirements for Standard Certificate Eligibility

Eugene Zalewski moved that the “Proposals for Activities that Meet Requirements for Standard Certificate Eligibility” dated February 4, 2005, be approved. Laura Lipe seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote. (See Attachment)

Renewal of Standard / Master Certificates

William Briggs moved that the list of “Renewal of Standard / Master Certificates” be approved. Richard Ammentorp seconded the motion. Dennis Williams confirmed there are 623 recommendations for approval. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

(Note: Due to the size of the printout, the approved list of recommendations is not attached to these minutes. If an individual would like to obtain a copy of the approved recommendations, please contact Dennis Williams, Secretary, Illinois State Teacher Certification Board.)

Dennis Williams reminded Certification Board members that the approval recommendations for the Standard / Master Certificates will increase considerably. By the end of June 30, there are 30,000 teachers in this particular cycle that have to renew. These approvals are for individuals who have all recommendations from their Local Professional Development Committees (LPDCs), from their Regional Offices of Education, and then go to the State Teacher Certification Board for approval.

Richard Ammentorp asked for clarification with regard to bringing these names forward because it was his understanding that no names were to be brought forward until after April 1.

Dennis Williams clarified there are two separate items. This involves renewal for the professional development. The other is registration and paying the fees for the certificate. The April 1 deadline is for paying the fees and registering the certificate(s).

There is concern if the LPDC or Regional Office of Education does not get this into the Certification Board by the end of June (cut-off date). The Certification

Board may want to consider designating the State Superintendent of Education authority to renew these certificates for that period.

William Briggs asked what the latest date is for individuals to submit their paperwork, either through their LPDC or Regional Office of Education, for the State Teacher Certification Board to act for June 30. Dennis Williams stated that if they are going through their LPDC, by May 1, since they have to make their recommendations to the Regional Office of Education.

Susan Shea, Illinois Education Association, shared that she has received several calls indicating that the Regional Offices of Education are not accepting the assurance form(s) early. They want to have the entire package. It would be helpful if the Regional Offices of Education could start accepting the assurance forms. Dennis Williams stated that he will discuss this with the Regional Offices of Education at their next meeting in Springfield.

Item(s) for Discussion:

Calendar for 2005 and 2006

The following calendar(s) were agreed upon by State Teacher Certification Board members.

Calendar Year 2005 (Confirmed)

March 11
April 1
May 6
June 2 and 3 (two days)
July 8
August 4 and 5 (two days)
September 9
October 7
November 4
December 1 and 2 (two days)

Calendar Year 2006 (Tentative)

January 6
February 3
March 3
April 7
May 5
June 1 and 2 (two days)
July 7
August 3 and 4 (two days)
September 8
October 6
November 3
November 30 and December 1 (two days)

(Break: 10:00 a.m. – 10:15 a.m.)

Item(s) for Immediate Action: (Continuation)

Amendments to Part 475 (Contested Cases and Other Formal Hearings)

Repeal of Part 480 (Hearings Before the State Teacher Certification Board)

Dennis Williams introduced General Counsel Jonathan Furr, Sally Vogl (Rules and Waivers Division) and Renee Vilatte (Legal Division).

Jonathan Furr shared that he and staff will be speaking about the proposed consolidation of Parts 475 and 480 of the rules. This past December Dennis Williams sent to Certification Board members an initial draft of this consolidation. After external review in January, comments were received from a number of constituent groups (e.g. Triple I organizations, Illinois Education Association, Representatives of Chicago Public Schools). This draft reflects the work completed to incorporate as many comments as feasible. These proposed rules will be submitted to the State Board of Education at its February meeting.

The consolidation provides one set of rules that can be used for contested cases (hearings) which makes the burden easier on staff and outside groups. For the State Teacher Certification Board, these rules will apply to all contested hearings before the Certification Board. Suspension and revocation hearings will now be governed by Part 475. This part will not apply to an appeal where a certificate is suspended at the Regional Superintendent level. That is a separate process.

The State Teacher Certification Board will generally be required to have a hearing officer that is appointed. The Certification Board will either appoint the hearing officer itself, or allow the State Superintendent to make that appointment, at the Certification Board's discretion.

Most of the other changes in the rules try to align the processes for Certification Board hearings with the procedures for the other contested cases rules. This fills in a lot of holes that were in the Part 480 rules before. For example, the procedures add in a process for pre-hearing conferences and for consent orders, which are hoped to expedite proceedings. The rules also address areas such as discovery and subpoenas and other formal requirements needed to ensure a full and accurate account of the facts in cases.

If the rules are approved by the State Board in February, they will be going into the first notice period. If there are additional areas in this Part that have not been covered, we encourage comments during the first notice period to accommodate suggestions/comments.

William Briggs asked if the State Board of Education will make a final decision with the State Teacher Certification Board's recommendation. Jonathan Furr stated that staff would like to have the recommendation of the State Teacher

Certification Board to present to the State Board of Education. He confirmed that the State Board of Education has the final word.

Mr. Briggs further asked if these rules diminish the duties/powers of the Certification Board. Jonathan Furr and Renee Vilatte stated that the rules do not change the authority/duties of the State Teacher Certification Board. However, by filling in the holes to the process, it may give additional information in order to make findings, conclusions and decisions in the suspension and revocation cases.

Kay Acklin stated that since these proposed rules are extensive that a page-by-page review or full presentation of the proposed changes would be appreciated. Several Certification Board members noted they had not had a chance to review these rules prior to the meeting.

Renee Vilatte indicated she would distinguish the differences between Part 480 (which currently governs suspension and revocation) and revised Part 475 (intended to put all of the contested hearings together).

Kay Acklin shared her concerns that Certification Board members have not been given an appropriate amount of time needed in order to review the rules.

After an overview of the proposed rules, the following areas were recommended for review and change.

Elliott Lessen asked, under Section 475.30, Subsection (c), if the written notice has to go to the hearing officer designated by the State Teacher Certification Board or the State Superintendent and there is no hearing officer, who receives that information? Jonathan Furr stated he believes it is addressed in Section 475.50, subsection (k), which essentially makes it default to the entity that should have appointed the hearing officer to take all actions related to the hearing if one is not designated. Elliott Lessen then suggested that in Section 475.30, subsection (c) designate it goes to the hearing officer designated by the State Teacher Certification Board, or the State Teacher Certification Board, or the State Superintendent. This will assure there is no conflict with what is written in Section 475.50, subsection (k).

Jonathan Furr indicated a clarification should be made to Section 475.50 (k) regarding the receipt of notices in the event that there is not a hearing officer. To provide for consistency, it was suggested that perhaps in these various areas that it be stated "a designated individual" instead of "designated hearing officer". Elliott Lessen recommended the creation of a new Section 475.15 which will come right after "Authority and Applicability" and before any other technical parts of the discussion where all entities are mentioned.

Nina Dorsch suggested that in Section 475.60, subsection (a), remove “The State Superintendent or” and begin with “An attorney ...” Jonathan Furr recommended that the subsection stay as is since this statement was taken from the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act and it applies not just to Certification Board hearings.

With regard to Section 475.60, Kay Acklin stated that subsection (e)(2) needs clarification. Sally Vogl suggested the following, “A party’s motion shall be supported by affidavits setting forth the alleged grounds for disqualification. A motion by the State Teacher Certification Board shall state the alleged grounds for disqualification.”

Elliott Lessen referred to Section 475.100, Orders, paragraph 3. With regard to Marsha Allen’s comment earlier about issuing an order and signing an order, we have “will become effective immediately upon the execution” and then it states, “the parties shall be immediately notified”. If the final decision is going to be effective immediately upon the execution, that is the signing and not the issuance. The post date would be issuance. Renee Vilatte indicated this will be reviewed for consistency.

Jonathan Furr reported this is one piece of the overall rules streamlining initiative. Staff have been working very hard to incorporate all of the comments during the first review period. Many changes have been given to Certification Board members, and this is due to the fact that staff wanted to provide members a draft containing all of the comments received from outside groups.

So it would be more helpful to Certification Board members, Elliott Lessen recommended that in the future proposed rules be accompanied with a cover memorandum that details all substantive pieces and the rationale/reasoning for the changes.

Kay Acklin asked if more rule consolidations will be coming before the State Teacher Certification Board. Jonathan Furr stated he only foresees changes to the Part 25 Certification rules coming before the Certification Board.

Kay Acklin requested that Certification Board members receive more time to review material. Ms. Acklin attributes some of her reluctance with this document to the fact that she is feeling blindsided by the potential changes in the way the Board operates by the changes in the rules. Her understanding of the new atmosphere at the State Board of Education is that everything is new and everyone is on board with decisions, and there is collaboration, cooperation, etc., and she is not feeling that at this time.

Jonathan Furr apologized for the late timing of the Certification Board members receiving this material. There were changes made at the margins of what was sent in late December, but substantially that was the same document. He also

noted that the timing of when the State Board of Education meets puts members of the Certification Board in a difficult position.

Richard Ammentorp asked if the Certification Board members can review the comments that were received in order to help Certification Board members understand various concerns. Jonathan Furr stated that staff would be happy to provide Certification Board members with all of the external comments.

Kay Acklin raised a question relating to the two appeal processes that the Certification Board has worked on for the last four years. One appeal process would govern decisions by the State Superintendent to suspend a teaching certificate and the other appeal process would govern review of decisions by Regional Superintendents. It is understood that the new Part 475 does not address an appeal of a Regional Superintendent's decision. It applies only to the State Superintendent's decisions to suspend or revoke teaching certificates. When the Certification Board held its retreat (August 2004), Ms. Acklin asked Lou Ann Reichle when the Certification Board was going to proceed with these two appeal processes. Ms. Reichle responded that, "we cannot do anything with these because their case is still pending". Why can we now deal with the State Superintendent's decisions in the new Part 475 if the Hall case is still pending? Sally Vogl clarified that Part 475 is not applicable to any form of appeal. Renee Vilatte stated these are two different things – appeal process and hearings.

Elliott Lessen moved that the State Teacher Certification Board (1) recommend to the State Board of Education the amendments to Part 475 - Contested Cases and Other Formal Hearings contingent upon the changes the State Teacher Certification Board has requested, including making a new Part 475.15; and (2) recommend the repeal of Part 480 - Hearings Before the State Teacher Certification Board. Nina Dorsch seconded the motion. The motion passed with two nay votes.

(Break: 11:55 a.m. – 12:05 p.m.)

Amendments to Rules for Certification (Various)

With regard to the earlier question of someone acquiring the Director of Special Education (Administrative Certificate), that does not require the APT. The tests required are the Content Area test and the Basic Skills test depending upon the factors that apply to the Basic Skills test. The rule on who has to take the APT is in Section 25.720, for teaching certificates only.

Sally Vogl reported that the amendments to the Certification rules have taken effect as of January 4, 2005. Ms. Vogl announced that also in effect as of January 24, 2005 is the limited set of amendments to Part I which restored some

statements about reading at the middle grades and media specialists as well as the provisional vocational certificate.

Eugene Zalewski raised a question regarding Section 25.11(f), “Four years of teaching experience means the equivalent of four years’ full time employment ...” Sally Vogl provided clarification and stated that Section 25.11(f) is being revised with respect to the definition of “four years of teaching experience” so that an individual who is approaching the end of the fourth year and who is expected to complete that year in his or her current position will be able to apply for the standard certificate.

Andrew Brulle asked for clarification with regard to the on-site accreditation review. Sally Vogl stated that Section 25.125(d) discusses the review team that is involved in the on-site accreditation review. As part of the agency’s effort to streamline its procedures and cut down on unnecessary duplication, the requirement for Illinois State Board of Education team members and an Illinois State Board of Education co-chair on visits involving NCATE accreditation is being deleted. At the same time, the role of the State Board of Education consultant is being clarified, i.e., this individual does participate in the visit.

Sally Vogl shared that the slight revision in each of Sections 25.22, 25.32, 25.42 and 25.82 is technical in nature. Since Section 25.725 was repealed and most of its needed content was subsumed in Section 25.720, these reference(s) need to be updated.

Kay Acklin asked Sally Vogl to provide information regarding the changes to the “technology specialist”, specifically what is the impact of the change, what is the relationship with regard to ESEA and highly qualified, how are those teachers in the pipeline for preparation as a technology specialist affected.

There are two credentials in the new structure that have a name related to technology. They are Technology Education and Technology Specialist. The Technology Education is the broader orientation that replaces things like Industrial Technology Education, Construction, Electronics, etc. Technology Specialist is Computer Technology and Instructional Technology. Sally Vogl further shared that the addition of a new subsection (m) to Section 25.100 will create an exception to the general model for adding endorsements in the case of “technology specialist”. Since the adoption of this new rule last year, staff have found it very difficult to determine which coursework should be counted toward a major area of concentration relevant to this endorsement. Terminology in this area varies widely, and it seems the more prudent course of action to require passage of the content-area test based on the applicable standards so as to ensure that candidate are, in fact, prepared to perform the functions encompassed within the technology specialist’s area.

Elliott Lessen moved that the Illinois State Teacher Certification Board recommend to the State Board of Education the amendments to rules for Certification (Part 25). Roger Chamberlain seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Item(s) for Discussion: (Continuation)

House Bill (HB) 343

Elliott Lessen reported that he had received information that Monique Davis had introduced HB 343. Pursuant to that Dr. Lessen had discussions with the public deans, and since then Dr. Lessen has written the following statement that has been sent to his Board of Trustees, Chancellor, President's office, and legislative liaison. It was also sent to all public deans. Dr. Lessen asked that the following statement be included on record:

"HB 343 was introduced by Monique Davis, Chicago, and reads: "Amends the Teacher Certification Article of the School Code. Removes a provision that prohibits a student from enrolling in a teacher preparation program until he or she has passed the basic skills test. Removes a provision prohibiting a preservice education teacher from student teaching until he or she has passed the subject matter test in the discipline in which he or she will student teach."

As public education is in the limelight for any number of issues, among which is not producing highly qualified teachers, the removal of these two tests as gatekeeping assessments runs counter to the notion of producing well prepared, well educated, and highly qualified teachers. The basic skills test, which in Illinois is at the sophomore in college level, makes it necessary, regardless of a student's GPA, that he/she will demonstrate "basic" competence in reading, mathematics, and writing. As these are core areas for any of our citizenry, let alone among the underpinnings of those who will teach in America's schools, it is important that this requirement be kept in statute.

The use of the content test as a criterion for student teaching raised debate among the public deans for two reasons. The first was the unavailability of test dates for students who may have needed to retake the test. This is being ameliorated by ISBE with NES, the contracted testing corporation. The second was having students take the content test in their last semester prior to student teaching when they may still be enrolled in content courses. This issue has not seemed to have had an impact given that very few students (three at Southern Illinois University Edwardsville) were kept from student teaching this spring for not having passed the content test. One area that had both a 6-12 and a K-12 certificate, has had a higher fail rate given most students were in a 6-12 program taking a new K-12 test. Given that this area will now be K-12 only, this fail rate should abate.

In order for the state of Illinois to continue to assure that its teachers are being held to high standards which are being met both through program assessments and through the state tests that are based on the standards, we must continue to use these two assessments as gatekeepers for teacher preparation programs. I have already heard from several of my colleague public deans from large programs who are in agreement with this stance.”

Roger Chamberlain stated that he felt this would be a big step backward. He has been on the State Teacher Certification Board for several years and the State Board of Education and our society have wanted standards to increase and hold everyone more accountable. The professional standards and status of the profession have been raised, and this would be tragedy.

Andrew Brulle has not had formal conversations with deans from private colleges, but with ones Dr. Brulle has spoken with have been very opposed to HB 343.

Nina Dorsch shared that she cannot imagine that parents of school-age children would want anyone student teaching in their child’s classroom who did not have command of basic skills and content that they were going to be teaching during that student teaching period.

Dennis Williams stated that the change would not preclude any institution from still requiring those at certain levels. Elliott Lessen shared that all of our programs are now in compliance, and the only issue was the amount of test dates for those who student teach in the spring. For students who student teach in the fall, they have plenty of time because of the summer test dates to retake a test. But, it seems this would be an incredible step backward especially in terms of producing highly qualified teachers, and in our case highly qualified candidates to go into student teaching or to at least start the program.

Laura Lipe shared she has had a number of student teachers, and she would not want someone who cannot do the work. Dennis Williams again clarified that this does not remove the requirement for those tests for certification, but it removes the date (timeframe) in which they have to take the tests. Elliott Lessen stated it also allows students to go through an entire program and student teach, and not having had to pass the basic skills at any point in their program.

Muhammad Abdullah expressed his concerns regarding some students for whom it may take longer to grasp things. He felt reluctant to say “no” without looking closer to see the coalition between someone having taken the basic skills test. Mr. Abdullah has seen student teachers who have passed the basic skills test and complete all of the paperwork, but when standing in front of the children they cannot deliver the instructions. Mr. Abdullah stated he would like to review HB 343 closer before he takes a stance.

Nina Dorsch commented that she believes we don't want folks assuming the role in a child's education unless we know that they have the basic skills and content, specifically in student teaching where ultimately students are assuming full responsibility for the teaching in the classroom often without the cooperating teacher present for much of the day.

Mr. Briggs shared that if you don't know the basics, how will the basics be addressed to the students. Mr. Briggs shared that he has had students who have graduated with straight A's and want to become teachers, that he knows will not be good teachers because they cannot communicate. Further, everyone is dealing with public relations now. If we said it would be okay to go out and student teach and have some children for an entire semester without knowing basic information, and you cannot pass the basic skills test, then that is an injustice.

Elliott Lessen recommended that HB 343 be placed on the agenda for the March 11, 2005 meeting of the State Teacher Certification Board in order for the Certification Board to make a formal recommendation if they choose to do so.

Kay Acklin asked if State Board staff could provide the State Teacher Certification Board with a legislative update / presentation during the spring legislative session. Dennis Williams indicated that he will inquire about providing a summary of all education related bills to Certification Board members.

Dennis Williams clarified that the State Teacher Certification Board can make a formal recommendation to the State Board of Education regarding HB 343. Nina Dorsch followed up by saying perhaps the State Teacher Certification Board can send a letter to the appropriate individuals stating a recommendation (opposition) regarding this bill.

Secretary's Report:

Dennis Williams shared that the backlog for Certification is gone. Staff are working on current applications received each day.

Mr. Williams reported that the following certificates have been suspended by the Regional Superintendent of Schools:

Bryan W. Carlson

Standard Elementary Certificate No. 1810528

Administrative (General) Certificate No. 1613088

Edward H. Kilday

Standard Secondary Certificate No. 1974261
Administrative (General) Certificate No. 1352898

Kevin T. Kilgallen

Standard Elementary Certificate No. 1926991
Standard Secondary Certificate No. 1926992
Administrative (General) Certificate No. 2007652

Paul A. Pesavento

Standard Secondary Certificate No. 1800092

Gregory T. Sharpe

Standard Secondary Certificate No. 1973430

The following certificates have been revoked by the State Superintendent of Education:

Victor D. Barr

Standard Secondary Certificate No. 1814700

Bryan W. Carlson

Standard Elementary Certificate No. 1810528
Administrative (General) Certificate No. 1613088

Paul A. Pesavento

Standard Secondary Certificate No. 1800092

Gregory T. Sharpe

Standard Secondary Certificate No. 1973430

Mr. Williams shared that State Board of Education staff have been asked by several institutions if they can submit new program proposals via cd to the State Teacher Certification Board. The Certification Board agreed that they prefer to have new program proposals provided to them via hard (paper) copy.

Mr. Williams shared and discussed with Certification Board members the following various certification forms: Assurance Statement for Initial to Standard-Level Teaching Certification; Assurance of Completion of Professional Development for Renewal of Standard/Master Certificates; Appeal of LPDC's Recommendation for Non-Renewal of Standard or Master Certificate; and Appeal to the State Teacher Certification Board. State Teacher Certification Board members raised several questions and voiced their concerns.

Mr. Williams also provided a brief summary of the new modifications made to OTIS with regard to highly qualified.

Adjournment:

With no further business, William Briggs moved that the State Teacher Certification Board adjourn. Linda Malone seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote. The State Teacher Certification Board meeting adjourned at 1:10 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
February 2005

(None)

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

Recommended for Approval
by State Board Staff
February 2005

Dominican University School of Education

ATTACHMENT

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

Recommended for Approval
by State Board Staff
February 2005

Allendale Association – Lake County
Paw Paw CUSD 271 – Lee County
Kings District 144 – Ogle County
Cowden-Herrick CUSD 3A – Shelby County
Edgar CUSD 6 – Edgar County
Eastern Illinois University – CEPS – Special Projects – Coles County
School District 45, DuPage County – DuPage County
*Pecatonica CUSD 321 – Winnebago County
St. Anne CHSD 302 – Kankakee County
Somonauk CUSD – DeKalb County

**Districts that Adopted Approved Programs
February 2005**

(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
February 2005

(None)