

ILLINOIS STATE TEACHER CERTIFICATION BOARD

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

Friday, March 11, 2005

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 9:03 a.m. Dr. Dunn asked Dennis Williams, Secretary, Illinois State Teacher Certification Board, to call the roll. A quorum was present.

Members Present:

Dr. Randy J. Dunn, Chairman
Mr. Dennis Williams, Secretary

Muhammad Abdullah
Kay Acklin
Richard Ammentorp
Andrew Brulle

Roger Chamberlain
Deborah J. Curtis
Nina Dorsch
Linda Malone

Dave Marshall
Linda Tafel
Denise Williams

Members Absent:

Marsha Allen
William Briggs
Ascencion Juarez

Elliott Lessen
Laura Lipe
Jo Ann Owens

Eugene Zalewski

Others Present:

Joe Cipfl
Debra Dew
Peter Dordal
Elizabeth Drame
George Fero
Colleen Herald
Linda Jamali
Phyliss Jones
Thomas Kenemore
Fouad Abd El Khalick
Gail Lieberman

Kimberly Mann
Barbara Nourie
Lee Patton
Janet Pierce-Ritter
Chris Roegge
Susan Shea
Larry Sondler
Lynn Stafford
Lynn Steffen
Jennifer K. Stitt
Brenda Stonecipher

Kathy Stratton
Barbara Swanson
Joy Taylor-Ankenbrandt
Linda Tomlinson
Elizabeth Vera
Sally Vogl
Sandra Westbrooks
Karen Williams
Nicole Wills
Marti Woelfle

Approval of Minutes:

The minutes of the February 4, 2005, Illinois State Teacher Certification Board meeting were presented for consideration. Richard Ammentorp moved that the February 4, 2005 minutes be approved. Denise Williams seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Public Participation:

- *Dr. Barbara Nourie, Associate Dean for Teacher Education, Technology and Field Services, Illinois State University*

Dr. Nourie stated she represents the Illinois Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (IACTE) which represents all of the higher education institutions that prepare teachers. Her message has been prepared in collaboration with the Chicago area deans, private colleges and Illinois public deans.

The IACTE asked the State Teacher Certification Board members to be aware of their interest and work on an effort to reduce the redundancy in the paperwork process of accrediting units and recognizing and accrediting programs at the state level.

Many institutions are National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) accredited. There are others looking at Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC). IACTE has taken a stand that there should be a single accrediting body nationally. IACTE is interested in working with the State Teacher Certification Board and other parts of the State Board of Education to reduce the paperwork burden. They believe when one meets the NCATE Standards, which have been adopted as the state's own standards for units, additional paperwork is probably inefficient and not a good use of time.

State standards for programs have been based in large measure on Specialized Professional Associations' (SPAs) standards and there could be additional reduction of paperwork for individual programs.

At a meeting in June 2004 on the Illinois State University campus, institutions agreed that reduction in paperwork would be good. At the state conference in October, the Assessment Sub-Committee outlined the steps that might be taken in order to reduce the inefficiencies that exist.

Kay Acklin asked Dr. Nourie how this was initiated and why this was a topic of discussion beginning in June 2004.

Dr. Nourie stated that it had been a topic of discussion in several different arenas for quite a while. At the June 2004 meeting, everyone agreed there could be some efficiency if everyone worked together. The private organizations, Chicago area deans, and public deans have also had their own conversations. IACTE is the umbrella organization to which all belong.

Kay Acklin asked if Dr. Nourie could be more specific in terms of individuals who brought this issue up for discussion. Is it IACTE as an entity? Dr. Nourie indicated it is IACTE. At least 56 of the higher education institutions are members of IACTE.

Muhammad Abdullah asked what the reduced paperwork would look like. Dr. Nourie stated IACTE envisions if one is nationally accredited at the unit level there would be very little state paperwork. For example, all institutions were asked to complete an “umbrella” report.

Linda Malone asked who would approve new programs. Dr. Nourie stated that the Illinois State Teacher Certification Board would continue to approve new programs. IACTE is referring to those institutions that are in the continuing accreditation process, not in the initial process or initial approval of programs.

Nina Dorsch shared that she has seen on NCATE’s website that most SPAs are moving toward a paperless electronic submission process as is NCATE itself, which should be useful. Dr. Dorsch indicated that she is unsure how much of IACTE’s recommendation needs to be codified in rules. A paper recommendation from IACTE might be forwarded to an appropriate office within the State Board of Education to examine how rules might be adjusted to allow for greater efficiency on the part of the whole process.

Linda Tafel suggested that since this model is in effect in several other states, some group should bring those models to whatever groups need to be involved in the drafting.

Linda Malone asked for clarification between NCATE and TEAC. Dr. Nourie shared her observations.

Facilitation Committee’s Report:

Kay Acklin, Chair of the Facilitation Committee, shared that the Facilitation Committee met at 8:00 a.m. Ms. Acklin further stated the agenda had been revised. Individuals were asked to take item F1 (New IDEA Legislation /

Definition of Highly Qualified) and move before E3 (Proposals for Activities that Meet Requirements for Standard Certificate Eligibility).

Item(s) for Immediate Action:

Linda Tafel moved the State Teacher Certification Board remove from the table the motion regarding English Language Arts (Secondary English Program – Undergraduate), English Language Arts (Secondary English Program – Graduate) and Visual Arts for DePaul University. Nina Dorsch seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Program Approval Recommendations –

DePaul University (Item Tabled June 2004)

Phylliss Jones, Principal Education Consultant, Department of Certification and Professional Development, disseminated documents to the Certification Board members which indicated DePaul University had provided the appropriate evidence needed to approve the tabled programs mentioned above.

Linda Tafel moved the State Teacher Certification Board recommend to the State Board of Education approval of the following programs at DePaul University:

- English Language Arts (Secondary English Program – Undergraduate)
- English Language Arts (Secondary English Program – Graduate)
- Visual Arts

Linda Malone seconded the motion. The motion passed with two abstentions.

New Program Recommendations –

Chicago State University

Brenda Stonecipher, Principal Education Consultant, Department of Certification and Professional Development, introduced the following representatives from Chicago State University: Dr. Kimberly Mann, Assistant Professor of Social Work; Dr. Thomas Kenemore, Assistant Professor of Social Work; and Mr. Larry Sondler, Director of Teacher Certification and Certification Officer.

Andrew Brulle indicated that he did not notice a broad assessment other than the field experiences assessment. Dr. Brulle asked if there was skills assessment of candidates.

Thomas Kenemore stated that one example of an overall assessment activity is embedded in the Capstone course which all students take the last semester of their program. Assignments in the course reflect their overall understanding of the knowledge and skills that they have acquired throughout the entire program.

Linda Tafel followed up with a question (p.15) regarding the successful completion of the Illinois State Board of Education examination for School Social Work for School Service Personnel (Type 73). Dr. Tafel asked why university representatives decided to place that test at that particular point in time as opposed to prior to the internship experience.

Thomas Kenemore shared that university representatives embedded it in the Capstone course because they did not want it to stand alone and separate from any particular course.

Kimberly Mann added that the students will have completed one field placement (Foundation Field Placement) not their Advanced School Placement. Their core coursework related to the school's concentration will occur in that final year (advanced year), which would be the third year for part-time students or the second year for full-time students.

Linda Tafel asked if university representatives see the test as being a part of the Capstone, and what would they do if people do not do well on the test.

Kimberly Mann stated that it is her understanding that students can retake the exam. They would still have completed their MSW requirements and would receive their MSW degree. Larry Sondler added that many university representatives work for a long time to make sure that students will be able to take the final content- area test while they are still on campus. Kimberly Mann indicated that this last year was the first year where a number of students did begin to take their MSW exams prior to graduation.

Nina Dorsch observed that there seems to be a mix of assessments of student learning outcomes and actual program evaluation indicators. Dr. Dorsch urged university staff to separate those out. The first item on the list is student mastery of knowledge and skill. The troublesome phrase is "represented by course grades." Perhaps a more accurate statement would be "represented by meeting standards reflected in meeting expectations on standards-based assessment."

Linda Tafel referred to the program overview (p. 2) and paragraphs 3 and 4 where there is some description about the relationship between this program and the unit for teacher education at Chicago State University. University representatives were asked to describe the relationship of this program to the unit.

Larry Sondler stated that the Social Work program is housed in the College of Arts and Sciences. At Chicago State University, all of the academic secondary programs, as well as the School Counseling program, are in Arts and Sciences. But, staff have worked collaboratively since the College of Arts and Sciences split off from Education. Several bodies are overseeing both colleges.

Linda Tafel referred to p. 3 of the program proposal where it refers to the submitting institution. That paragraph specifically did not show the connection between the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Education, and this program.

Thomas Kenemore stated that historically many of the students have taken the course that will be required for this certification. Kimberly Mann shared that because they did not have a school's concentration many students who knew they wanted to pursue that option would do it as a post MSW (Type 73). Many students would take the exceptional child course through the Education Department as an elective course for social work.

Thomas Kenemore indicated that a lot of collaboration occurs around research activity. Thomas Kenemore and Kimberly Mann are beginning a process funded by the Research Development office internally to do a project about youth and violence in the schools.

Nina Dorsch raised a question about having an explicit connection between the unit conceptual framework and the program goals and objectives, even in tabular form, so that the connection between this program and the unit might be more easily understood.

Denise Williams commended Chicago State University representatives with regard to the numbers stated on page 4 of the program proposal concerning the need for the school social worker dealing with the African American population to know that there is a need and the need is being addressed. The numbers are staggering.

Kay Acklin moved that the State Teacher Certification Board recommend to the State Board of Education provisional approval of the Chicago State University School Social Work program (School Service Personnel certificate), 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)]. Denise Williams seconded the motion. The motion passed with one abstention.

Loyola University – School Technology Specialist

Brenda Stonecipher, Principal Education Consultant, Department of Certification and Professional Development, introduced the following representatives from Loyola University: Dr. Peter Dordal, Professor of Computer Science; Dr. Janet Pierce-Ritter, Associate Dean of the School of Education and Certification Officer; and Dr. Elizabeth Vera, Associate Dean of Academic Programs.

Nina Dorsch referred to the field experiences description (p. 9). Candidates will be assigned to a school or district for implementation of all their field experiences. Dr. Dorsch raised a question on what basis, might it be a school at which they are already employed, how will diversity be assured in that school setting.

Janet Pierce-Ritter stated university staff carefully look at the site and the population that it serves. Not only will it meet the candidate's need, but also the school district need. It may be the place they work, or it may not be, depending on if it meets typical criteria for field placements.

Nina Dorsch asked if university staff are engaged in partnership relationships with a number of schools in case the candidate's home district doesn't fit the need. Janet Pierce-Ritter shared that Loyola University has partnerships with quite a few schools – in the Chicago, Evanston and Des Plaines areas.

Linda Tafel raised a question with regard to what appears on page 10 of the program proposal and also in the matrices beginning on page 16 of the program proposal. After the program is implemented, if Dr. Tafel were to examine a student portfolio as a candidate portfolio, what might the portfolio contain and what will the faculty be looking for when they assess it?

Peter Dordal stated that for the technology based courses (CSED courses) the faculty would be looking for mastery of skills, specific items – sample assessment on page 64 of the program proposal. Some of those assessments might be carried out in a classroom or a one-on-one examination setting or by examination of the portfolio containing a wide range of documents the candidates would produce.

In addition, Janet Pierce-Ritter shared that for some of the education classes the rubric for the portfolio actually begins on page 71 of the program proposal. The focus would be on instruction, work with the faculty, staff development and helping integrate instruction/technology into the curriculum.

Andrew Brulle continued along those lines – specifically stating that “faculty review” is listed several times. Dr. Brulle asked if university representatives keep any records of the faculty review, and if the interview process could be explained.

Janet Pierce-Ritter spoke on behalf of the initial teacher preparation programs that already exist at Loyola University. Review of candidates is completed twice (each semester). Anyone teaching a clinical course would look at students' dispositions and complete a clinical worksheet. For all programs in the School of Education, a yearly faculty review is required. Students would receive a letter that they are making good progress or that they are not making strong enough progress and need to meet with their advisor.

Andrew Brulle asked if any records are kept for program performance, specifically if there are any recurring items for a number of students. Janet Pierce-Ritter indicated it helps make changes and revise curriculum. In a new program it will be critical – not just to assess the candidates, but to assess how well the university is doing with candidates.

Richard Ammentorp inquired if the design of the school technology is strictly for regular education students. The needs of special education students need to be encompassed as well. In the coursework outline (p. 7) it is wonderful to have a specialist in the building who has a grasp of the technology, but there is also a need for the assistive technology for the special education students. The only area where reference is made to the special education component is on page 42 of the program proposal. There is reference to a School Technology Specialist Practicum (CIEP 585), but there is no course description. Peter Dordal indicated that is a typing error. It should have been 485. Mr. Ammentorp stated that the description of 485 does not address the whole realm of the need for assistive technology to address the needs of the special education student. If this is a school technology specialist, one would hope that diversity would go beyond just regular education students.

Janet Pierce-Ritter shared that they see it as a K-12 program, serving students of all needs within the school system. Dr. Pierce-Ritter stated that Mr. Ammentorp made a good point, and this issue should be reflected more strongly in the program.

Richard Ammentorp referred to page 14 of the program proposal and the reference to format Windows. Mr. Ammentorp asked if the students are also being exposed to some of the other programs – Apple is making a very big push. If you are preparing your students as technology specialists, they would need to be exposed to and have a knowledge base of a variety of platforms. Peter Dordal stated that the Computer Science Department has strong Linux presence. Much of the program was written based on the Windows platform, but students will be exposed to several different platforms.

Deborah Curtis raised a question regarding the follow-up of graduates and the interaction with them once they finish the program. On page 78 of the program proposal there is an Exit Survey of Undergraduate Students. Dr. Curtis asked if this survey would be used as students complete the program. Janet Pierce-

Ritter stated an Exit Survey is given to graduate students. It looks like the Exit Survey of Undergraduate Students.

Deborah Curtis also asked if there was something in place to follow students after they exit from the program. Janet Pierce-Ritter indicated there is an induction program as well as an induction coordinator who works with all graduates. E-Mentoring is also available.

Linda Tafel asked university representatives to address in what courses or experience the candidates might receive general leadership preparation for, for instance, providing staff development and the kind of activities that often a technology specialist is called upon to do. Dr. Tafel further asked where someone would develop competencies in that area. Janet Pierce-Ritter replied that she sees it threaded throughout just about every single class. Peter Dordal stated that the School Technology Practicum and the Program Evaluation Course have the most concrete participation in professional development.

Linda Tafel was not clear that students would have experiences working with teachers to develop their technology skills. Janet Pierce-Ritter indicated this was supposed to be the other way; staff will look at how the program is formulated. University staff saw the technology specialist working with the teachers and the professional staff who would then work with the students. The program is designed for the person to be working with the faculty, and the faculty in turn work with the students.

Linda Malone inquired if candidates are exposed to a diverse population when they are in the schools. Elizabeth Vera shared statistics of some of the schools where students do their field placements. There is wide diversity in terms of not only ethnic and racial composition in the schools, but socioeconomic status, language proficiency, etc.

Linda Malone further raised a question with regard to ensuring diversity in the faculty. Elizabeth Vera stated that within the School of Education about 20 percent of the faculty are people of color. Within the teacher preparation area, the representation is even higher. Loyola is making some excellent strides to enhance the diversity within the school.

Kay Acklin inquired as to what progress has been made with the faculty that needs to be hired (p. 13). Janet Pierce-Ritter and Peter Dordal provided a brief update.

Denise Williams stated that on page 12 of the program proposal, there are three present faculty members with two to be hired (one with technological background, one with educational background). Ms. Williams asked if university representatives are crossing the Education Department with the Technology Department to fill in vacant positions. Janet Pierce-Ritter shared that this is a

joint collaborative program with the Department of Computer Science. The program was designed so that five of the courses are taught by computer science faculty and five will be taught by education faculty.

Linda Malone raised a question if the candidates are exposed to the school population before their practicum. Janet Pierce-Ritter clarified that in both the technology enhancement instruction I and II, candidates are supposed to be working in the schools. Also, in the program evaluation class candidates will be working with the school districts.

Linda Tafel moved the State Teacher Certification Board recommend to the State Board of Education provisional approval of the Loyola University School Technology 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)]. Deborah Curtis seconded the motion. The motion passed with one abstention.

McKendree College – Principal / General Administrative

Dr. Dunn stated that at the December 3, 2004, meeting of the State Teacher Certification Board, the McKendree College Type 75 General Administrative Certification – Principal / General Administrative program proposal was tabled. At that time McKendree College representatives were asked to rework the proposal in light of the concerns and questions raised.

Dr. Dunn also shared that even though a cover memorandum from staff was not attached to the program proposal, notes from the December 2-3, 2004, Audit Committee Review were disseminated to members of the State Teacher Certification Board.

Marti Woelfle, Principal Education Consultant, Department of Certification and Professional Development, introduced the following representatives from McKendree College: Dr. George Fero, Chair, Division of Education, Health and Human Performance; and Dr. Joe Cipfl, Advisor to the McKendree College President. If the program is approved, Dr. Cipfl will be an instructor in the program.

Linda Tafel asked college representatives to share where McKendree College is in relation to hiring new faculty for this new program, as well as how the college intends to staff the new program.

George Fero stated that staff are listed in the proposal. Two positions are listed for fall, and one of the positions has been offered a contract. The other position is in negotiations. Staff have also requested additional positions. Those

positions are pending approval of the program since positions cannot be in place unless the program is in place first.

Joe Cipfl responded that he is currently in the role as Advisor to the President of McKendree College. He was Superintendent of Belleville Schools for 12 years. He also shared that several faculty members being examined for the vacant positions are practicing school administrators or have been within the state of Illinois.

Linda Tafel inquired why the EDL 601 Technology Applications for School Administrators course was added as a separate course as a solution to the Advanced Technology Standards (Nets A).

George Fero stated that was part of the solution, but not the total solution. In consulting with the technology faculty, it was decided that one way to assure candidates have a strong foundation in the standards and technology was by developing a separate course that concentrated on those standards. That course is a low numbered course, and in the sequence it would occur before most of the education issued courses. CAT 1 is a prerequisite to that course to ensure as candidates entering that course have the basics of technology.

Nina Dorsch referred to the matrices (p. 44, 45) and noted that the assessment of a case study reaction dealing with fairness and ethics is appearing for both EDL 640 and EDL 610. Dr. Dorsch asked if that was a repeated or revisited kind of assessment that occurs in both courses, or is there a misprint of some sort. George Fero stated that it is a misprint and it should be with EDL 640.

Nina Dorsch indicated that when looking at Standard 2H (p. 43) regarding adult learning and professional development models the courses in which that is addressed are certainly appropriate, but are they also dealt with in the supervision of instruction course since it would be appropriate as well?

George Fero stated that staff will have to make sure that area is covered since the course description does not cover that in particular. It would be appropriate for a supervision course to be dealing with adults.

Andrew Brulle raised several questions regarding specific technical points. First, application fees are listed as a student outcome. That is not a student outcome or an assessment. It is payment of a \$40 application fee. Second, with regard to admission criteria (p. 13), point number two discusses admission of current undergraduates providing that they show a final transcript that they have graduated. But, point number four indicates that in order to be admitted one has to have a current teaching certificate and evidence of at least two year's experience as a certified teacher. Representatives were asked to explain.

George Fero stated that item two is the general admission statement for all of the graduate programs, not specific to this program. Item four that requires two year's experience would be the additional criteria needed for admission to this particular program. It is possible for a candidate, immediately upon graduation, to enter a graduate program, but not this particular graduate program.

Andrew Brulle recommended that college representatives pull that particular item because it seems to be very confusing and conflicting when read. George Fero indicated that staff wanted to make sure that the general admission policy was included.

Andrew Brulle raised a question with regard to the internship. The program proposal specifies a 120-hour internship, which is basically only three weeks' worth of work. Dr. Brulle asked if that was sufficient for preparation of a school leader, and how staff envision that occurring.

George Fero responded that the internship number (120 hours) is a minimum that is expected. It is anticipated that it will more than likely take more than 120 hours to accomplish what has to be accomplished. The 120 hours is based upon the Carnegie formula used (30 hours of field experience to one credit hour coursework). The four credit course would equate to 120 hours. Dr. Fero stated that he doubts if anyone will be able to complete all of the requirements in the 120 hours; that would be the minimum expectation. As an institution and as a program, McKendree could increase the number of hours, but the outcomes are being looked at rather than the number of hours.

Roger Chamberlain stated that in teacher education programs the candidates are coming in with a tremendous amount of time in the schools which is awesome. But, administrators are not. Goals for analysis of school financing, school building and facilities are very relevant experiences needed by a beginning administrator. Dr. Chamberlain shared that he went through some pretty good programs, but he didn't have good, strong knowledge in those areas. Dr. Chamberlain asked what this will look like and how will it be accomplished.

George Fero stated it is accomplished in the courses themselves. Candidates would be utilizing materials from school districts in the area and working with school administrators. Several part-time instructors are practicing school administrators. During the internship in that school, these areas would be one of the outcomes that would have to be accomplished.

Joe Cipfl responded that within the coursework and again with the particular faculty very specific information relative to those kinds of experiences that an administrator needs will occur within those classrooms. Real live experiences will be combined with school observation/interaction as well as classroom experience. Furthermore, the internship itself will be particularly designed to make certain that those individuals can provide evidence that they are capable of

utilizing and exhibiting those skills. The internship will be a designed experience far exceeding 120 hours.

Andrew Brulle raised several concerns specifically that candidates may indicate that they have completed their 120 hours and are finished. Dr. Brulle indicated that the research class seems extraordinarily ambitious – qualitative, quantitative and statistics in one three-semester-hour class. It is not understood how that can be accomplished in one three-hour class. With *NCLB*'s emphasis on research-based evidence, Dr. Brulle believes this is an area where administrators should have more expertise.

George Fero stated that is one of the reasons why that particular course is combined with the action research module. The action research module is where candidates are applying what they are learning in the content course in developing a prospectus for research. In reality it is a five-hour course. It is not intended to be a definitive course in research that would be at the doctoral level, but more of a survey research course that is modeled after courses that have been taught at other institutions.

Andrew Brulle referred to the statistics aspect of the course. George Fero stated that rather than teaching the actual computations and statistics, the interpretation statistics and application are being reviewed.

Nina Dorsch understood that the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards (Spa 4 Educational Administration) encourages or requires a two-semester internship type of experience. Dr. Dorsch asked for clarification specifically if the internship is four hours within one semester or is it split between two semesters.

George Fero responded that the four hours of credit are one semester, but the internship is not expected to be completed in one semester. Candidates would receive an IP at the end of the first semester until it is completed. The outcomes cannot be accomplished in one semester.

Linda Tafel asked if individuals in the program would be employed full time, and if they would then be doing an internship over a course of two semesters on a part-time basis while they were still teaching. George Fero shared that the models staff looked at had interns completing their work in activities before school, during preparation time, after school, and weekends. Some schools may cooperate in an hourly release time. It depends upon the particular circumstances of the candidate. It is the intention that the candidate would more than likely be a full-time teacher. The program is designed for full-time practicing educators to achieve this credential.

Deborah Curtis raised a question with regard to the numbers of the courses. Most of the courses are at the 600 level in the master's program. Master's

coursework tends to be at the 500 level. Dr. Curtis asked McKendree staff to elaborate on this issue.

George Fero stated staff looked at models at other institutions. It was found that some institutions did use a 500 level; however, staff also wanted to have the opportunity to separate from the true graduate courses those courses that might need to be cross scheduled. For example, there may be some courses that are cross scheduled with 400 levels (senior level courses) and students in the same class (graduate and undergraduate). There would be difference in the work and expectations of the graduate students. If all of the courses were maintained at the 500 level, that separate differentiation could not be made.

Andrew Brulle reviewed Appendix 4 – Final Performance Assessment Rubric and found that the following terms are used over and over: limited, clear, clear and convincing. There should be more of a definition of those terms. It is difficult to differentiate between clear versus clear and convincing.

George Fero stated that those rubrics are drawn from the ETS Pathwise rubrics, and everyone is going to be going through training on those rubrics with ETS. Upon approval of the program, ETS will train the initial cohort of instructors on those rubrics and also at least one or two trainers.

Linda Tafel made reference to the final performance assessment rubrics, which are in Appendix 4, the lengthy set of items and artifacts that will be in the student portfolio, and also the dispositions. Dr. Tafel asked college representatives to explain how they envision putting all of the assessment pieces together and how all of that will fit together at the end of the program.

George Fero explained that there are essentially three large assessments in the program. First, the candidates go through dispositions assessment at each transition point. A set of rubrics is used for the assessments of the dispositions. Besides the transition points, if any instructor has a question about dispositions they may conduct an assessment of dispositions. Second, the portfolio is a separate assessment. The artifacts will be looked at in the portfolio ensuring they at least meet the expectations in the set of rubrics for the portfolio. Finally, the performance assessment is an overall assessment of the candidate and all of the standards. The three major pieces of the process are considered as a whole upon program completion.

Roger Chamberlain asked what population McKendree College intends to serve. George Fero stated that the primary population is educators in the metropolitan East St. Louis area. At this time, McKendree College has entered into collaboration with East St. Louis schools, Cahokia, Brooklyn, Granite City and Collinsville. Staff will be preparing some of their school administrators (at McKendree's expense) in the ETS process. The goal is to have interns matched with administrators who have gone through the training. Dr. Fero also indicated

that McKendree College will be drawing from other areas of southern Illinois, more to the east than to the south.

Dr. Chamberlain asked how McKendree College ensures that candidates have exposure to diverse cultures and communities. Joe Cipfl stated McKendree College is working with East St. Louis School District 189 not only in school administration, but also teacher development.

Linda Tafel asked for the projected number of students that McKendree might be serving upon approval of this program. George Fero stated that the initial cohort would be at least 20 students. The graduate classes are limited (by internal policy) to 20. Once 20 is reached the cohort is filled, and if the demand exceeds the 20 students, another cohort may be created. Based upon feedback and interest, the first cohort would begin (if approved) this summer. There would be 20 in that cohort.

Linda Malone asked how McKendree is getting the word out. George Fero stated college representatives have asked school administrators and teachers in the area what programs they would like to see at McKendree College.

Joe Cipfl stated there is a real need and desire in McKendree's region to provide this experience. Many area teachers come from McKendree's programs. Those school districts have good experiences with their teachers, and they hope to have good experiences with their administrators. But, there is a definite need and request that McKendree College engage in these experiences.

Roger Chamberlain asked what McKendree College's successful candidates will look like when they enter the schools. George Fero reported that the principals will be education leaders, respect culture, have strong beliefs about themselves and about education, believe all students can learn and operate their schools in that manner, value diversity, appreciate and use technology, motivate student learning in their schools by motivating and assisting their teachers/assistant teachers as instructional leaders, have a strong ethical base, be life-long learners by seeking continuous development, be reflective, be important parts of the community, and be good oral and written communicators.

Dr. Dunn stated that Joe Cipfl is representing the President's office even though it was not enumerated in the notes. Dr. Dunn also asked Dr. Cipfl to share with the Certification Board members that the President of McKendree College has pledged to sustain the capacity of this program as the numbers warrant, to ensure the program is fully staffed and to keep the program moving forward.

Joe Cipfl stated there is an extraordinary commitment by the President of McKendree College. Dr. Cipfl's presence verifies and validates that Jim Dennis as President of McKendree College is strongly committed to this particular program. When Dr. Cipfl was asked to join the McKendree College family over a

year ago, the primary purpose was to help grow the education program and to bring this particular education leadership dimension to that program.

Furthermore, Dr. Cipfl is proud to announce that one of the individuals named Superintendent of the Year not long ago is coming on board as a member of the faculty of McKendree College.

Linda Malone asked college representatives to elaborate on the diversity of staff. Joe Cipfl stated that diversity of the staff continues to grow. The most recent faculty employed have been African Americans. McKendree is looking at growing the Hispanic population within the faculty.

Linda Malone further asked how McKendree College will ensure the candidates will reflect professional ethics. George Fero stated staff will review professional ethics in the candidates' reflective writings throughout the program and through references provided when admitted to the program and during the internship at total evaluation. Ethics are also addressed in the ETS rubrics. Candidates will be receiving a lot of instruction on professional ethics. Joe Cipfl noted that McKendree College is considering a leadership and core value initiative with the entire student body as well as faculty and staff. That would have impact on these types of endeavors. Ms. Malone asked if there is follow-up once the candidates complete the program. Dr. Fero stated that the assessment system will be serving the candidates at completion. Employer surveys will be conducted in order to obtain feedback on students.

Kay Acklin moved the State Teacher Certification Board recommend to the State Board of Education provisional approval of the McKendree College Type 75 General Administrative Certification – Principal / General Administrative 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)]. Denise Williams seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Break (10:30 a.m. – 10:40 a.m.)

Rockford College – Learning Behavior Specialist I (LBS I)

Dr. Dunn stated that at the November 5, 2004, meeting of the State Teacher Certification Board, the Rockford College Learning Behavior Specialist I (LBS I) program proposal was tabled. At that time Rockford College representatives were asked to rework the proposal in light of the concerns and questions raised.

Brenda Stonecipher, Principal Education Consultant, Department of Certification and Professional Development, introduced the following representatives from

Rockford College: Ms. Barbara Swanson, Acting Department Chair; Mrs. Lynn Stafford, Professor of Special Education; Dr. Elizabeth Drame, Professor of Special Education and Alternative Certification Liaison; and Dr. Debra Dew, MAT Director and Certification Officer.

Nina Dorsch referred to the description of phases (p. 11). Phase I is labeled Admission to Teacher Education. This indicates at the end of that section that in order to be admitted into Phase II that the candidates must pass the Illinois Basic Skills Test. Phase II is labeled Admission Requirements to Student Teaching. Given the current legislation, Dr. Dorsch inquired why the Illinois Basic Skills Test would come before Phase II rather than for Admission to Teacher Education.

Barbara Swanson responded that the Basic Skills Test is taken during the candidates' very first field experience. It is in this spot so that if candidates have taken the test and not passed the test they can take it again.

Nina Dorsch asked college representatives to explain when the formal admission to teacher education occurs. Barbara Swanson stated that the formal admission to teacher education is when the declaration of major is signed which is sometimes after 45 hours completed. Dr. Dorsch inquired if Rockford College requires the Basic Skills Test to be taken and passed prior to the declaration as a major. Ms. Swanson responded they do not. Dr. Dorsch emphasized this is very problematic under the current law.

Barbara Swanson indicated that candidates must successfully complete the first field experience before being admitted to the major. The candidates would have then taken the Basic Skills Test during that first field experience.

Andrew Brulle stated that the current law reads the candidates do have to pass the Illinois Basic Skills Test prior to being "admitted" to the program. Also, prior to admission to student teaching a candidate must have passed the content-area examination. Nina Dorsch explained it is a problem of the operational definition of when a candidate is admitted to the program. The program proposal reads as though the candidates are admitted to teacher education and then take the test.

Nina Dorsch referred to the charts of intended sequence of coursework (p. 20, 21). Dr. Dorsch asked if this is essentially a five-year program. College representatives responded that is correct.

Since the assessment course comes after methods courses, Nina Dorsch inquired where candidates develop diagnostic assessment knowledge and skills before they would deal with methods, specifically where is diagnostic assessment learned and why would it not come prior to methods. Elizabeth Drame stated that for the undergraduate sequence, candidates are taking the methods course for students with disabilities and they are also taking their diagnostic course at the same time.

With regard to the admission criteria (p. 14), Nina Dorsch raised a question involving the points assigned to various components of the application in relation to the total points required. It is a little problematic in the sense that in some ways staff seem to look at the three letters of recommendation as a disposition indicator. Dr. Dorsch suggested college representatives may wish to rethink how points are distributed within the requirements for admission.

Linda Tafel stated that since this new proposal is significantly different from the one reviewed in November, how did college representatives rethink the program moving from a special education program to an LBS I program in terms of a paradigm shift?

Elizabeth Drame indicated the program did take a paradigm shift. Staff focused more on developmental processes and how disability impacts the developmental processes at all levels and age ranges. Staff were initially looking from a categorical perspective. Staff had to rethink how they conceptualize special education from a cross-categorical approach rather than a categorical approach. Lynn Stafford stated it was very advantageous to look at practically what they were implementing and doing in the schools, and then see the diversity of learners. Debra Dew stated she spent time looking at other programs.

Andrew Brulle raised several questions regarding assessment processes. First, how do staff plan to keep track of and use the data for both student assessments and program assessment? It looks like the only program information staff will use is survey of graduates and current candidates. To that end, Dr. Brulle asked that college representatives describe the assessment plan in more detail.

Barbara Swanson stated that the pieces of assessments used are North Central and the state review (external), but the unit itself reviews the program together. There is a MAT graduate study review, and a MAT advisory council meets to offer advisement. There is a special education advisory committee and an undergraduate survey follow-up that helps faculty understand what things need to be changed in the program. A cooperative teacher survey is disseminated at the end of every semester to the cooperating teachers who have had student teachers.

Internally, a committee just reviewed every program on campus which has been a large review process. Also, course evaluations that come from the college as well as most professors have a separate evaluation tool that students complete. There is an exit interview in student teaching. Also, there is a portfolio and assessment that is presented twice in a showcase portfolio presentation which is assessed by a rubric. Student faculty evaluations and course evaluations are conducted.

Kay Acklin moved the State Teacher Certification Board recommend to the State Board of Education provisional approval of the Rockford College Type 10 Learning Behavior Specialist I (LBS I) 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)]. Roger Chamberlain seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

University of Illinois at Urbana - Champaign – Alternative Teacher Certification: Math / Science

Phyliss Jones, Principal Education Consultant, Department of Certification and Professional Development, introduced the following representatives from University of Illinois at Urbana - Champaign: Dr. Fouad Abd El Khalick, Associate Professor, Science Education; and Dr. Chris Roegge, Director of the Council on Teacher Education.

Nina Dorsch referred to the Continuation in the Program (p. 22) looking at dispositions. Dr. Dorsch asked university representatives to share what dispositions in particular are being looked at and how are they related to the conceptual framework.

Fouad Abd El Khalick stated they are interested in the candidates' interest in teaching in urban and rural environments. Staff are also looking to see if there is a commitment to working in these environments and caring about kids and their learning as only compared to learning about science.

Nina Dorsch indicated the commitment is probably related to pillar three of the conceptual framework. The dispositions should be tied together and specifically identified. Fouad Abd El Khalick stated that in the statement candidates have to write and talk about diversity, technology, and experiences formal / informal in teaching children. Each one of the components of the narrative statement directly ties to each one of the pillars.

Andrew Brulle referred to selection and admission criteria (p. 16). Point #5 states passage of the Basic Skills Test and the appropriate content-area test are required prior to admission. Point #4 requires substantial college-level coursework in the discipline for which the candidate is seeking certification (a minimum of 18 credit hours). Dr. Brulle asked that with the *NCLB* emphasis on highly qualified teachers, don't candidates have to have a major or the equivalent of a major in the subject area. Dr. Brulle shared his concerns that will these candidates, once they finish, be able to be identified as highly qualified teachers.

Fouad Abd El Khalick responded that they have individuals from the engineering fields who are interested in becoming math teachers. A degree in engineering

has some courses labeled as math on the transcripts, but they take math courses that are not labeled as math – they come under engineering rubrics. Those individuals tend to be very qualified in math. Another component is thinking about what we are contending with. Nationwide about one-third of those teaching secondary math do not have certification in their area; they neither have a major nor minor in some cases.

Andrew Brulle shared that the math work in engineering is very different from math that comes out of a math curriculum for a math major. Dr. Brulle asked if a person who has only 18 hours meets the *NCLB* requirements for highly qualified, which is a major in the subject.

Linda Tafel stated that Point #4 (p. 16) needs to come into compliance with *NCLB* requirements so that when these students complete this program they are eligible to be identified as highly qualified. Nina Dorsch responded that whether that substantial number of hours in a content area was in with their original bachelor's degree or a combination of with a bachelor's degree and remedial work, and/or depending upon your institution's policy, credit for life experience, the number of hours probably needs to reflect the *NCLB* mandate.

Dave Marshall stated that in order to receive a secondary teaching certificate an individual must have a 32-hour major in some area. Additional endorsements can be obtained with 24 hours. To be highly qualified for *NCLB*, a teacher may have 24 hours and pass a content-area test as well as the 32 hours. Dennis Williams shared that if an individual passed the test they can be highly qualified, but they must have the endorsement. Not only does the program not meet *NCLB* requirements, but it does not meet current Illinois standards to get an endorsement. Deborah Curtis shared her concern and recommended that Point #4 (p. 16) be reviewed again.

Deborah Curtis raised a question regarding field experiences. Part of the time for the candidates would be spent in a junior high or middle-level building in the early field experiences. When referring back to the course requirements, there is a course that begins to address the issue of a middle-grades endorsement (p. 18 – EDPSY 430 indicating two hours). The current middle-grades endorsement requires six hours (three hours in psychology piece and three hours in middle-level philosophy piece). That is not evident in the program proposal.

Fouad Abd El Khalick shared that in the secondary program, there is a practice of placing students in their field experiences in middle schools and also during student teaching. It was not meant to address the middle-level certification. Deborah Curtis suggested that staff are sending individuals out to participate at those levels who are not fully prepared according to state requirements. Individuals would not be employable, and yet they are out in the field experiences prior to certification. Dr. Curtis raised the concern that if there is going to be placement in a middle-grade setting that the expectation be there for both

teacher candidates to gain the appropriate credentials to be there. Otherwise you are placing candidates in a school where that administrator could never begin to hire that individual later on.

Fouad Abd El Khalick stated that methods courses tend to reinforce the experience as well. Deborah Curtis responded that if you review the language for the middle-grades endorsement, it is not content specific. It is about the middle-grades concept. Dr. Curtis encouraged university representatives to review this piece again or build it into the program.

Andrew Brulle stated that in the matrices under several of the assessment activities, the term discussion is listed as an assessment activity. Dr. Brulle raised the question how that will be assessed. In some cases discussion is the only assessment activity listed. Dr. Brulle referred to page 58 of the program proposal – 9O, 9P and 9Q. Fouad Abd El Khalick responded that part of this is covered when the students are doing their field placements. All of those are assessed by the rubrics for field placements. Many of the assessments are handled in other more formal ways. Dr. Brulle recommended that these are assessed by field experience or by the cooperating teacher, supervisor of evaluations, etc.

Linda Tafel raised a question as to how the mentors, in Chicago Public Schools and other school districts, and university staff are working together to ensure all students will be supervised in the same way. Fouad Abd El Khalick shared that all of the supervisors and students will be linked through an online course that makes sure there is consistency. The criteria for selection of the mentors are very specific. Through that course the mentors will be in touch with the cohort at all times. There will be coordination with the course instructor to ensure consistency as well.

Denise Williams referred to the Selection and Admission Criteria (p. 18) specifically Point #8 and the reference to applicants who will be employed by schools outside of the Chicago Public Schools. These applicants will have to have worked within their area of expertise for a minimum of five years after earning their bachelor degrees. Ms. Williams further shared that there is nothing that states what a requirement would be for minimal experience. Fouad Abd El Khalick agreed that was not stated in the proposal since the law does not state a minimum experience.

Linda Tafel asked university representatives for clarification regarding the requirement for Point #4 (p. 16) in order for State Teacher Certification Board members to state the need for modifications so they can vote on the proposal, or perhaps Certification Board members would be voting for something that is out of compliance with highly qualified guidelines.

Fouad Abd El Khalick asked if it would be fair to go to the 24 by completion of the program. Nina Dorsch stated that could be done or to not specify a number for purposes of this program proposal. The document could state that coursework in the discipline is in compliance with *NCLB*. Then staff should work with State Board of Education staff to identify precisely what that would be. Andrew Brulle suggested information could be added to the section regarding the recommendation for a teaching certificate (p. 23) or perhaps program completion (p. 25).

Dave Marshall stated that candidates would need to have that requirement completed before they receive their one-year provisional alternative teaching certificate. Candidates would need to have the 24 hours or have to meet Illinois certification requirements plus the *NCLB* requirements prior to receiving the one year.

Andrew Brulle indicated he would like to give the faculty some leeway, and instead of indicating hours to say the equivalent of "X" number of hours or the equivalent of a major or minor in the subject. It is important that these individuals have met the highly qualified definition.

Phyliss Jones suggested that could be added to continuation in the program because that is before their recommendation for provisional alternative teaching certificate, and that would be part of what they would have to do to get to that point and then go into the classroom. Andrew Brulle stated it could come under the recommendation for provisional that the candidate has met all of the equivalencies.

Linda Tafel referred to the program sequence (p. 15, 16) and how there is no allowance for the completion of additional coursework. It would need to be very clear on the assessment on the front end where individuals were in terms of meeting those requirements. On one hand trusting the faculty to make these judgments is a good thing, but on the other hand there are very strict guidelines about what those 24 hours have to be. Dr. Tafel shared that she does not feel that this issue can be resolved with the addition of some kind of language, and that the Certification Board may need to table this item and bring back this specific criterion at a future meeting if language could be identified and there is compliance with *NCLB*.

Andrew Brulle clarified that he would like to see a process as to how the judgment of equivalency may occur.

Kay Acklin shared her concern that members of the Certification Board are talking in many respects about numbers and requirements (number of hours). Ms. Acklin is concerned about the philosophy and thinking in the program proposal about turning out the best qualified candidates we can have in our schools. The numbers can be corrected, but there needs to be some kind of

philosophy behind the numbers that mean we want the best individuals coming out to teach in our schools in Illinois.

Nina Dorsch suggested to some extent that is embedded in the current rules governing certification. Dr. Dorsch stated that we as a state have minimal requirements that indicate that quality while not necessarily being limited to those things. Presuming the standards have been met, the Certification Board would not want to approve something that is contrary to the normal certification route and codified by *NCLB* and “high objective uniform state standard of evaluation” (HOUSSE) for any specific program.

Linda Tafel moved the State Teacher Certification Board table the new program proposal from the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign for an Alternative Teacher Certification: Math / Science program. It is also requested that university representatives be provided with a summary of comments in light of the concerns and questions raised. Particular attention should be directed to the selection and admission criteria to be in compliance with *NCLB* and subject-area requirements. Dave Marshall seconded the motion. The motion passed with three abstentions.

Phyliss Jones asked if the State Teacher Certification Board would accept an addendum rather than university representatives rewriting the entire program proposal. Ms. Jones clarified that a rewrite of the program needs to clearly state that to be admitted the individual must pass the test and have at least 18 hours, but to continue and to go into the classroom must have the equivalent of the 24-hour major that is necessary and passing of the test. Again, the admission section, continuation in the program section and also Point #4 (top of p. 22) will be rewritten.

Linda Malone inquired if members of the State Teacher Certification Board could also receive a summary of comments that are provided to university representatives.

Fouad Abd El Khalick stated this program does not compromise quality of preparation at the pedagogical level in any respect. It is as rigorous and detailed as the regular program. There is no compromising whatsoever. If you look at some other alternative education programs approved in the state, individuals come during a summer and take a few courses and then go into schools. The quality was number one, and there is an entire year of extensive coursework. There is no shortchanging in terms of the quality of preparing individuals.

Item(s) for Discussion:

New IDEA Legislation / Definition of Highly Qualified

Dr. Dunn introduced Gail Lieberman, Special Assistant for *NCLB*. Ms. Lieberman stated the following aspects from The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) as it was reauthorized, and also these are changes from before:

- Supporting high quality in terms of pre-service preparation on professional development for all persons who work with children with disabilities in order to ensure that such personnel have the skills and knowledge necessary to improve the academic achievement and functional performance of children with disabilities including the use of scientifically based instructional practices to the maximum extent possible.
- The qualification shall ensure that each person employed as a special education teacher in the state who teaches elementary, middle or secondary school is highly qualified by the deadline established in the No Child Left Behind Act. In implementing this section, the state shall adopt a policy that includes a requirement that LEAs in the state take measurable steps to recruit, hire, train and retain highly qualified personnel to provide special education and related services under this part to children with disabilities.

Gail Lieberman encouraged anyone interested in *NCLB* and IDEA to review the PowerPoint that is available on the ISBE website. Some points include:

- NCLB exempts those special education teachers who provide solely consultative services to core subject teachers.
- The Illinois State Board of Education is required to establish and maintain qualifications for personnel including that these persons have the content knowledge and skills to serve children with disabilities.
- States may design a HOUSSE especially for special education teachers as long as it does not establish a lesser standard for the content knowledge requirements of special education teachers compared to the standards for general education teachers.

Gail Lieberman shared several discussions that occurred during a recent visit from representatives of the United State Department of Education (USDE). These include:

- Job assignments need to differentiate between content direct service teachers versus otherwise.

- The content level needs to be at the student's instructional level.
- HOUSSE needs to address those teachers who teach in more than one content area. You need to be highly qualified in all of the areas that you are teaching when you have two or more content areas. There is a two-year process to become highly qualified in all of the relevant areas.

Gail Lieberman stated that the State Board of Education is looking very seriously at how to revise the HOUSSE that has been adopted in rules. We are designing probably three HOUSSES: (1) elementary, especially in terms of the veteran teachers to be as clear as possible; (2) secondary; and (3) special education.

One thing in terms of process is how to design and finish designing the HOUSSES for review and potential revision of the current rules, and then potential revision of the OTIS online system for teachers to review their credentials.

Gail Lieberman continued her discussion by answering questions raised by members of the Certification Board.

Due to the Department of Education's recent visit and the changes that need to be made to HOUSSE, the "OTIS – NCLB Highly Qualified (HOUSSE) Online Application" agenda item was not presented for discussion. Gail Lieberman stated HOUSSE needs to be changed to reflect only 50 percent for teaching experience instead of 60 percent. There are other changes as well. Special education needs to be addressed as well.

Dennis Williams stated staff would like to bring forward a "draft" of the new HOUSSE revisions in April for the State Teacher Certification Board to recommend to the State Board of Education for approval.

Kay Acklin asked that the proposed HOUSSE document be received in an adequate amount of time so it can be reviewed at length before the April meeting of the Certification Board. Linda Tafel asked if a document could be drafted to reflect "Old HOUSSE" (current requirements) and "New HOUSSE" (proposed requirements).

Item(s) for Immediate Action: (Continuation)

Proposals for Activities that Meet Requirements for Standard Certificate Eligibility

Linda Malone moved the “Proposals for Activities that Meet Requirements for Standard Certificate Eligibility” dated March 7, 2005, be approved. Nina Dorsch seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote. (See Attachment)

Renewal of Standard / Master Certificates

Linda Malone moved the Group A list of “Renewal of Standard / Master Certificates” be approved. Denise Williams seconded the motion. Dennis Williams confirmed there are 3,598 recommendations for approval. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Kay Acklin raised a question with regard to the clarification of Group A and Group B lists. Dennis Williams stated that Group B is a situation where the LPDC made a recommendation for non-renewal and the regional office reviewed it and made a recommendation for renewal. When this situation occurs, Mr. Williams investigates each case.

Linda Tafel moved the Group B list of “Renewal of Standard / Master Certificates” be approved. Kay Acklin seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote. Dennis Williams confirmed there are three recommendations for approval.

Kay Acklin moved the State Teacher Certification Board give Dennis Williams the authority to authorize the renewal of Standard / Master Certificates for the Group A list of teachers (those receiving recommendations from both LPDC and regional offices) on a regular basis with a monthly report on this activity to be provided to the State Teacher Certification Board. Richard Ammentorp seconded the motion. 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.)

Announcement by Dr. Randy Dunn:

Dr. Dunn shared with Certification Board members that he has convened a Task Force to look at streamlining preparation program review and approval. Elliott

Lessen, Dean, Southern Illinois University Edwardsville, has been asked to chair the Task Force. Other members will be solicited reflective of the publics, privates, unions, board of higher education representative, as well as others.

The Task Force's charge will be to review potential ability to streamline the State Board of Education program approval process, look at any redundancy in reporting that may exist and suggest some sort of equivalent process for the non-NCATE institutions, look at the role of other accrediting bodies, review team composition, timeline, training, and consider issues of cost equity that exists for various programs in the state.

There will be a formal issuance of information on this item as soon as involvement of the Task Force members is known.

State Teacher Certification Board Operating Procedures

Linda Tafel moved the State Teacher Certification Board table the discussion with regard to the State Teacher Certification Board Operating Procedures until the April 1 meeting, with a timeline for action and resolution at the May meeting of the State Teacher Certification Board. Dennis Williams was asked to make an additional call for comments and/or suggestions pertaining to the Operating Procedures. And, also provide a summary of those comments to members of the Certification Board before the April 1 meeting. Linda Malone seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Lunch (12:00 p.m. – 12:40 p.m.)

Item(s) for Discussion: (Continuation)

Legislative Action by Illinois State Board of Education

Dennis Williams stated that this discussion will also include Agenda Item E7, "House Bill 343 and House Bill 384". Mr. Williams introduced Nicole Wills, Legislative Liaison, Illinois State Board of Education.

Ms. Wills shared that she primarily works with the House of Representatives. Currently, there are a total of 13 bills that deal with certification that are before the General Assembly. Two of the bills are reciprocal bills. The following summary was provided:

- Senate Bill 380 requires that the State Board of Education work in collaboration with the Regional Offices of Education to develop additional

improvements to certification and streamlining processes. The bill was re-referred to rules. The State Board of Education did not oppose this legislation.

- Senate Bill 1676 would allow National Board Certified guidance counselors to be issued an Illinois Master Certificate and to receive the \$3,000 stipend. Currently, there are seven counselors in the state and nine working towards it. Marti Woelfle provided additional information. This bill is currently on second reading in the Senate.
- House Bill 8 will not go anywhere at this point. This bill essentially said that a teacher from another state who has achieved National Board Certification must not be required to take the exam in order to receive a Master certificate. This bill is currently in the Education Committee. This bill has been re-referred to the House Rules Committee.
- House Bill 164 deals with Charter schools. It would require all Charter school teachers hired after the effective date of the law to have a certificate. This is for the City of Chicago, not for any Charter schools downstate. This bill was brought forward by the Chicago Teachers' Union, but opposed strongly by Chicago Public Schools. This bill passed out of the House and is on second reading at this time.
- House Bill 343 would eliminate the requirement that students pass the Basic Skills Test as a prerequisite to enter the teacher preparation program and also eliminate the need for the content-area test as a prerequisite for student teaching assignment. This bill has been re-referred to the House Rules Committee.
- House Bill 384 only dealt with the content-area test and eliminated the requirement before student teaching. This bill moved forward. There was an amendment placed on this bill that says it is up to a university's discretion. This does not change the requirements that you have to pass student teaching before program completion.
- House Bill 881 and Senate Bill 223 are reciprocal bills. It is a gifted education bill intended to reinstate the gifted education provision in the School Code that was repealed in 2003. The part concerning certification is that a provision in the bill would have required a gifted education certificate to be established. It would have also included the agency establishing professional development training. An amended version of this bill should remove the certification requirements.
- House Bill 1141 is a bill that the State Board of Education opposed. This bill would have put in the Code that CPR and first aid are allowed to be used as

Continuing Professional Development Units (CPDUs). This is already allowed. This bill has been tabled by the sponsor.

- House Bill 1150 and Senate Bill 768 are reciprocal bills. These bills as written will not go anywhere in the House. This establishes a transition specialist certificate.

Linda Tafel moved the State Teacher Certification Board convey to the State Board of Education strong support of the current rules with regard to House Bill 384. Roger Chamberlain seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Item(s) for Immediate Action: (Continuation)

Amendments to Rules for Certification (Various)

Dennis Williams welcomed Sally Vogl, Illinois State Board of Education. Ms. Vogl began her discussion by providing an update of the rules that were recommended to the State Board of Education at the February meeting of the State Teacher Certification Board. Part 475 and the Repeal of 480 are out for public comment for 45 days.

The rules before the Certification Board encompass a number of disparate issues within Part 25 and the certification-related portions of Part 1.

Part I

Requirements for Paraprofessionals

All the revisions in Section 1.630 are being made for technical reasons only. Since this Section was amended last year, it has been clarified that individuals who only conduct parental involvement activities and do not perform any other paraprofessional duties are not required to be qualified as paraprofessionals, so that illustration is being struck from subsection (b)(1). At the same time, some additional language is being inserted into subsection (b)(3) to convey specific federal requirements for the work of individuals who provide instructional support (paraprofessionals). Finally, there will be new material in Part 25 setting forth requirements for educational interpreters, so subsection (e) will be incomplete without the insertion of a reference to those provisions.

Requirements for Teachers in the Middle Grades: Reading and Library Information

Most of the changes in Sections 1.720, 1.745, and 1.755 will eliminate a discrepancy in requirements that resulted from the comprehensive changes that took effect June 1, 2004.

At the time of that rulemaking, there was no intention to change the requirements for teachers in the departmentalized middle grades because other work on middle-grades credentials was in progress. Therefore the existing requirements in Section 1.720 were stated to remain in place and to apply as exceptions to the new provisions for endorsements that are found in Section 25.100 of the rules for certification. The subject-area requirement for a middle-grades endorsement involves 18 semester hours of college credit, and the requirement for reading at all grade levels was also 18 semester hours until the rules changed in June of 2004. As a result, 24 semester hours are now required for reading at the elementary and high school levels, but only 18 hours are required in the middle grades. The same situation exists with respect to library information specialists, and the 24-18-24 “hourglass” is leading to confusion in the field. It seems far preferable to make the requirements for these fields uniform across all grade levels.

With this in mind, new language is being inserted into subsections (a)(4) and (5) of Section 1.720, which deal with these two fields in the middle grades. The effect of these changes will be to institute the 24-semester-hour requirement at the middle grades. By extending the time period during which applications for endorsements in reading based on the 18 semester hours can be accepted (through June 30, 2006), there will be adequate notice of the change. The same extension will be afforded to those at other grade levels as well. The rule is also being changed so that, like deficiency statements for endorsements in other fields, these will be honored for one year after their date of issue.

The new subsection (b)(4) in Section 1.720 intended to clarify that assignment based on meeting minimum requirements is also available in the middle grades.

Safety and Driver Education

The amendment to Section 1.737 makes clear that, for teachers of safety and driver education, the “minimum requirements” are the same as the long-standing requirements for the endorsement. There is no content-area test in this field, so there is no feasible way to set minimum requirements different from the full requirements for the endorsement.

Part 25

Accessibility of Special K-12 Certificates and Supervisory Endorsements (Sections 25.37 and 25.497)

Section 25.37 sets forth the method by which subsequent certificates may be issued. This rule is being amended to address a shortage of teachers who are able to supervise other staff, by making the special K-12 certificate available to certain teachers as a subsequent certificate via a streamlined procedure. Section 21-4 of the School Code authorizes special certificates to be endorsed for supervision, but that same authorization is not provided for early childhood, elementary, or secondary certificates. However, there is not a large number of preparation programs leading to issuance of a special certificate in various subject areas. Consequently, many high school teachers hold secondary certificates, and high schools may lack sufficient personnel authorized to perform certain supervisory functions.

An individual who holds a secondary certificate has completed a great deal of the requirements for the special certificate in the same subject area: an approved program, the coursework required in a major field of specialization, the pre-student teaching clinical experience, and the student teaching (and, in all recent cases, the basic skills test and content-area test). It would seem that the “gap” between the secondary certificate and the special certificate can be filled adequately by requiring passage of the assessment of professional teaching that is relevant to the special certificate, since that is the test that encompasses the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards, technology standards, and English language arts standards that apply to all teachers across the full range of grades.

Therefore, ISBE can reasonably facilitate secondary teachers’ access to supervisory endorsements by enabling them to attain K-12 certification by this means.

Section 25.497, which currently discusses only supervisory endorsement of the school service personnel certificate, is being revised to acknowledge the availability of these endorsements on teaching certificates as well. The relevant sections of the School Code establish the same requirement for graduate-level coursework in each case, and that requirement does not need to be restated in the rule. The rule needs only to establish the content that the coursework is required to address.

Linda Tafel raised an issue regarding the supervisory function of department chairs. There are many other functions that a department chair might serve that are beyond supervisory – program development, interdisciplinary work across programs, etc. – and this states that as long as I am the department chair of “Biological Sciences” that is what I can supervise, but I cannot supervise out of my certificate. Nor, could I be a supervisor or a department chair in a department that is math and science. When we have had discussions before, the currently

defined job of a department chair, whether it is a large school or small school, might very quickly move out of the supervisory realm into lots of other activities. Individuals would then be doing things outside their content expertise and into the range of the standards that have been set for school administrators.

Sally Vogl stated this is intended to only provide someone with a certificate upon which a supervisory endorsement can be added. The issue was explained as being in connection with department chairs who need to be able to supervise. There is no specific regulatory language about the role of a department chair or the types of other tasks outlined beyond supervising other certified staff. Ms. Vogl cannot say if this rule either will permit the difficulty outlined or preclude it. She believes it will not preclude it.

Nina Dorsch indicated that the language being presented talks about an endorsement not just a supervisory one. Dennis Williams shared that staff did not discuss the other duties that a supervisor may hold. It was intended to allow the evaluation of certified staff.

Nina Dorsch shared that in her service region most schools are basically requiring secondary department chairs to have the Type 75 general administrative. Other school districts may have more narrowly defined the role and find that this meets their needs.

Linda Tafel referred to the document (p. 3 of 6) provided by Sally Vogl. Dr. Tafel recommended elimination of the following paragraph:

“Therefore, we believe ISBE can reasonably facilitate secondary teachers’ access to supervisory endorsements by enabling them to attain K-12 certification by this means. If they meet the additional requirements for supervision that are imposed by Section 21-4 of the School Code, they would then be able to serve as department chairs.”

Requirements for School Social Workers and School Counselors (Sections 25.215 and 25.225)

The changes in these two Sections represent a technical correction only. Section 25.720 has recently been revised to reflect the legislative changes that affect testing for out-of-state candidates, and the internal cross-references need to be updated. This correction is also being made at this time in Sections 25.245 and 25.252, whose substantive aspects are discussed below.

Requirements for School Nurses (Sections 25.245 and 25.425)

The current rule for school nurses (amended in July 2004) requires an evaluation of the preparation of out-of-state applicants with respect to the content-area standards. Rather than requiring these applicants to seek certification through

one of the four currently existing Illinois programs (Millikin, NLU, SIU-E, and UIC), staff recommends relying upon the existing degree and licensure requirements, the completion of an out-of-state program or certificate, and the Illinois standards-based licensure examination. This change requires a corresponding change in Section 25.425 (Individuals Prepared in Out-of-State Institutions) to align school nurse requirements with all other Type 73 certificates.

Requirements for Speech-Language Pathologists (Sections 25.252 and 25.255)

These amendments respond to the recent enactment of 93-1060, which changed and simplified the basis on which non-teaching speech-language pathologists are to be certified. A person who holds one of several types of licenses and has completed an advanced degree in the field may now receive this certification if he or she also:

- has completed a preparation program that meets the State Board's content-area standards; or
- has completed a comparable approved program in another state, territory, or possession; or
- holds a certificate issued by another state, territory, or possession that is endorsed for speech-language pathology; or
- has completed 150 hours of supervised experience in speech-language pathology with students with disabilities in a school setting.

Under this new legislation, we are able to delete from the rule a good deal of the complicated requirements that flowed from the previous statutory language. The focus of the changes in the rule is to define the four options now outlined in the law. In particular, the 150 clock-hours of experience must expose candidates to activities that relate to those portions of the content-area standards not demonstrably covered by the other professional preparation that speech-language pathologists undergo. The content-area standards for speech-language pathologists are part of the special education policies that were ordered for implementation by the federal court in *Corey H.*, so an analysis was performed and the "missing" portions of those standards are discussed in the rule as the basis for the 150 hours.

The statute also establishes an interim form of certification that will enable licensed individuals to work in schools to acquire the 150 clock-hours of experience. The rule for this internship (Section 25.255) is modeled on Section 25.227 of the rules, which was added last year to provide an internship in school counseling along the same lines.

Short-Term Authorization
(Section 25.464)

It has become apparent that the list of entities given in the introduction to this rule omits regional offices of education. The point of the rule is to permit short-term authorization to be issued to any entity that is required to employ certified staff, so the list should be replaced with a statement to that effect to avoid omitting affected entities unintentionally.

Paraprofessionals
(Section 25.510)

The change to this Section is a technical one, reflecting the recent proposed repeal of Part 480 and the inclusion of its remaining distinctive provisions within Part 475.

Educational Interpreters
(Section 25.550)

Public Act 90-200, enacted in 1997, established requirements for individuals who wish to represent themselves as interpreters for the deaf but exempted educational interpreters, among others, from those requirements. Instead, the Illinois Deaf and Hard of Hearing Commission was established and required to work with the Illinois State Board of Education to develop recommended requirements for interpreters who serve in schools.

The content of new Section 25.550 conveys the requirements that have been developed under P.A. 92-200. There are two types of interpreters, sign language interpreters and cued speech interpreters, and approval for each type will be available at the initial, standard, and master levels. Emergency approval will also be available. Although the levels are modeled on the teacher certification structure, there is no requirement that an individual progress through lower levels to reach higher ones. Each applicant can be approved to reflect the level of educational attainment and interpreting skill that he or she has demonstrated. Standard and master approval will be renewable based upon evidence of having completed specified continuing education.

Requirements for Approved Providers of Continuing Professional Development Activities
(Section 25.855)

Section 25.855(c)(1) currently requires that approved providers notify the State Board of Education in advance of the first offering of any new activity in the fields for which the providers are approved. This requirement has proven cumbersome in that it results in a large volume of paperwork without any substantive value in terms of quality. Consequently agency staff recommended its deletion.

Linda Tafel moved the Illinois State Teacher Certification Board recommend to the State Board of Education the rules (Part I and Part 25). Richard Ammentorp seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Secretary's Report:

Dennis Williams shared that a letter from the Illinois Federation of Teachers was received recommending Ms. Denise Albrecht to the State Teacher Certification Board to fill the vacancy created by Amy Alsop's resignation. This will be taken to the State Board of Education at their March meeting.

At present there is no backlog in the Certification Department. Applications are being processed within 30 days.

Adjournment:

With no further business, Linda Tafel moved the State Teacher Certification Board adjourn. Andrew Brulle seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote. The State Teacher Certification Board meeting adjourned at 1:40 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
March 2005

(None)

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

Recommended for Approval
by State Board Staff
March 2005

(None)

ATTACHMENT

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

Recommended for Approval
by State Board Staff
March 2005

Triad School District – Madison County
Southeastern CUSD 337 – Hancock County

**Districts that Adopted Approved Programs
March 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
March 2005

(None)