

# ILLINOIS STATE TEACHER CERTIFICATION BOARD

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

Friday, May 6, 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  
Kay Acklin  
Denise Albrecht  
Marsha Allen  
Richard Ammentorp  
William Briggs  
Andrew Brulle

Roger Chamberlain  
Deborah J. Curtis  
Nina Dorsch  
Ascencion Juarez  
Elliott Lessen  
Laura Lipe  
Linda Malone

Dave Marshall  
Jo Ann Owens  
Linda Tafel  
Denise Williams

### Members Absent:

Dr. Randy J. Dunn,  
Chairman

Eugene Zalewski

### Others Present:

Fouad Abd-El-Khalick  
Amy Alsop  
Bob Bigham  
Deborah Brotcke  
Pat Glenn  
Colleen Herald  
Phyliss Jones  
Mary Daly Lewis  
Gail Lieberman

Dennis Munk  
Lee Patton  
Karl Plank  
Ron Ramer  
Chris Roegge  
Susan Shea  
Lynn Steffen  
Brenda Stonecipher  
Bill Summers

Joy Taylor-Ankenbrandt  
Jay Thomas  
Linda Tomlinson  
Sally Vogl  
Rebecca Watts  
Karen Williams  
Marti Woelfle  
Chet Zych

### **Approval of Minutes:**

The minutes of the March 11, 2005, Illinois State Teacher Certification Board meeting were presented for consideration. William Briggs moved that the March 11, 2005 minutes be approved. Denise Williams seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

### **Public Participation:**

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

Dr. Susan Shea stated she was reacting to highly qualified under ESEA. The first reaction is to the process. The process circumvented the State Teacher Certification Board and the State Board of Education. The guidelines for highly qualified were presented to the State Board of Education at the close of their meeting. They were then sent to superintendents with the direction of the State Superintendent of Education to immediately begin using these guidelines to determine if their teachers were highly qualified. Dr. Shea urged Certification Board members to raise their objections to being circumvented. The State Teacher Certification Board is responsible for determining the certification requirements and characteristics of highly qualified. The Certification Board members are the ones who should give input to the State Board of Education as to point values and what kinds of documents teachers will use to prove that they are highly qualified.

Dr. Shea's next reaction was to the point values given to ESEA highly qualified referred to as Appendix D. There is intent to link it to the Appendix D that exists with the current Local Professional Development Committee (LPDC) process. It would seem smart if the point values remain the same as the point values in Appendix D. Dr. Shea further encouraged State Teacher Certification Board members to encourage the State Board of Education to make the point values as close as possible to the same as it can be in Appendix D.

Dr. Shea asked for the rationale for determining the point value for semester hours. There needs to be a chart for every grade level and certification area – elementary, middle school, secondary, bilingual and special education.

Until OTIS is up and running at the State Board of Education, a chart needs to be available in order to decide who is highly qualified. There must be a highly qualified coordinator recommended in each district to determine if someone is highly qualified.

### **Facilitation Committee's Report:**

Kay Acklin, Chair of the Facilitation Committee, reported the Facilitation Committee met this morning from 8:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. No further information was provided at this time.

### **Item(s) for Immediate Action:**

#### New Program Recommendations –

##### Aurora University – Reading Specialist

Marti Woelfle, Principal Education Consultant, Department of Certification and Professional Development, introduced the following representatives from Aurora University: Dr. Mary Daly Lewis, Dean, College of Education; Dr. Karl Plank, Program Director, Masters Program; Dr. Deborah Brotcke, Professor, Literacy Education; Dr. Jay Thomas, Assessment Coordinator; and Dr. Ron Ramer, Accreditation Coordinator.

Elliott Lessen commended university representatives with regard to the candidate appeal process. Dr. Lessen raised a question with regard to the intent after the District 300 cohort is used. It was noted that individuals at District 300 will probably have diverse experiences although not every school is diverse. Dr. Lessen asked university representatives to explain how an individual will be accommodated who is in a school that isn't particularly diverse in District 300, and also what is the university intent once the cohort has been completed.

University representatives stated Carpentersville is a pretty diverse district although all schools are not in a diverse setting. It is the expectation that the practicum will be in a clinic operated on campus, and that will be a diverse setting as well. Elliott Lessen asked for clarification. University representatives responded that courses will typically (until the practicum) be offered in the district. It will be a cohort-style format. The practicum will be in the clinic on Aurora University's campus.

Linda Tafel raised a question with regard to faculty qualifications. Typically depending on what International Reading Association document you read there is a strong urging of institutions that have graduate programs in reading to support faculty who have a doctorate in reading. The qualifications of the individuals involved in this program (p. 31) have an emphasis in reading, but their doctorate is not in reading. As the program grows, would the next hire likely be

someone with a doctorate in reading? University representatives responded that is correct. The job description is already written and approved.

Elliott Lessen raised a concern regarding the clinical experiences (p. 8). The five hours seem rather minimal. University representatives stated that at the transition point, particularly in the middle of 18 hours, the faculty committee could recommend that those hours be extended. Dr. Lessen suggested staff may want to indicate a minimum of five hours of field experience, rather than five hours.

Deborah Curtis raised a question with regard to follow-up studies. Are there any plans to interview or gather information from school partners with which candidates will be working, or after finishing the program would there be follow-up from the graduates and their employers? University representatives stated post-graduate data will be gathered. Dr. Curtis noted it is important check to see if graduates are having a positive impact on student achievement.

Kay Acklin moved the State Teacher Certification Board recommend to the State Board of Education provisional approval of the Aurora 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.

Northern Illinois University – Learning Behavior Specialist (LBS) II: Curriculum Adaptation Specialist, Behavior Intervention Specialist, Multiple Disabilities Specialist, Technology Specialist

Marti Woelfle, Principal Education Consultant, Department of Certification and Professional Development, introduced the following representatives from Northern Illinois University: Dr. Nina Dorsch, Associate Professor, Department of Teaching and Learning; and Dr. Dennis Munk, Associate Professor, Department of Teaching and Learning.

Elliott Lessen asked that given these are certificates of graduate study, what happens if students are successful but still do not meet requirements for a master's degree. Nina Dorsch stated they are recommended for certification. Dr. Lessen also complimented the university on its assessment matrices.

Kay Acklin moved the State Teacher Certification Board recommend to the State Board of Education provisional approval of the Northern Illinois University Learning Behavior Specialist (LBS) II program with the following four specialization areas: Curriculum Adaptation Specialist, Behavior Intervention Specialist, Multiple Disabilities Specialist, Technology Specialist, 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 six abstentions.

### Olivet Nazarene University – Reading Specialist

Phyllis Jones, Principal Education Consultant, Department of Certification and Professional Development, introduced the following representative from Olivet Nazarene University: Dr. Bill Summers, Director of Graduate Programs in Education.

Elliott Lessen raised a question with regard to the courses listed (p. 2). Under the reading endorsement courses, two courses (767 and 768) appear to be the middle-level endorsement courses which are not necessarily reading content courses, leaving 18 hours in coursework for reading. If someone needs to have 24 hours in reading across areas in order to obtain the reading endorsement, there are only 18 hours in reading.

Bill Summers stated that it was his understanding that these courses are applicable to the NCATE Standards for the Reading Specialist and also the Illinois Standards. The three-tiered program is innovative in that candidates could obtain the reading endorsement by taking the top and at the same time they would obtain the middle-school endorsement.

Elliott Lessen further stated that these courses meet the criteria for the middle-level endorsement. But, the concern is that currently certified teachers who want an endorsement in reading need 24 hours. It seems that if persons are going to obtain a master's degree leading to the reading specialist certificate, they should have at least the same number of hours.

Nina Dorsch recommended some clean-up of the language may be appropriate. With regard to the conceptual framework (p. 4), there is a reference in the foundations area to school media centers and librarianship. Is that because that statement is lifted from the broader institutional look and there are programs in that area? It did not seem to be program-specific. Bill Summers stated that was correct.

Nina Dorsch referred to level four (p. 21) and the assessment system. The payment of all fees is not an assessment. It may be a requirement for exiting the program, but not necessarily a program assessment.

Elliott Lessen (p. 21) referred to permission to start the program and admission to a master's degree program. In level two you have course assessments from completed courses. How many courses do students take before they are told they may not get into a master's degree program? Bill Summers stated that

typically at Olivet it is the first nine hours and then subsequent to that students are subject to a review.

Elliott Lessen stated that the two middle-level courses are not listed in the matrices. If they are being used to account for standards for the reading specialist, they are not in there.

Elliott Lessen referred to the table that talks about the portfolio assessment (p. 20). Three activities deal with staff development which seems to be an important component of the reading specialist program. Two of them are brochures in 775 and 776. The only inservice training is in 774. There is concern for those who are not reading teachers, and for them to complete their staff development piece very early may not be very productive for them. Dr. Lessen suggested university representatives rethink this process when students go through the program. Bill Summers stated that during Olivet's survey they anticipate that a very high percentage (at least in the initial cohorts) will be individuals who have been teaching reading for years, but need to become certified due to the changes in law.

Nina Dorsch stated that according to the creative project (p. 17), there is an allusion to present it at local staff development and critiqued by administration and peers. Dr. Dorsch asked if that is primarily a professional development project where the candidate is conducting some sort of program. Bill Summers replied that generally speaking that is going to be as close to an action research thesis as one can imagine. He provided further clarification and details.

Richard Ammentorp raised a question stating that the requirement for admission (p. 5) is an education degree and Illinois certification. With initial and standard certification, is this an implication that the teacher is at the standard certification level or can a teacher who is at the initial level enter into the program? It was his understanding that one does not become certified until after one completed four years of teaching on an initial certificate.

Dennis Williams clarified that the initial certificate is full certification. Nina Dorsch stated this would parallel, for example, going for an administrative certificate (Type 75). Bill Summers shared that initially they were under the impression that one had to have two years' experience similar to the Type 75. Subsequent to that, they were informed that one does not need to have the two years' experience, but does need certification.

Deborah Curtis clarified that a reading specialist requires two years, but one does not need to have it to enter the program.

Elliott Lessen asked Dennis Williams to provide clarification in terms of hours. Given the two middle-level courses are not included in the matrices, which means they do not reflect any of the standards, and given we are in a standards-

based mode and rules still talk about hours for endorsements, please provide guidance in terms of the issue that someone obtaining a master's degree from Olivet would only have 18 hours of reading as opposed to someone getting an endorsement on an existing certificate would have 24 hours.

Dennis Williams and Phyliss Jones stated that two more reading courses will need to be added. Dave Marshall clarified that it is his understanding that the reading endorsement is 18 hours. Starting July 1, 2006 it will be 24 hours of reading.

Linda Tafel understands how the field experiences are tied to the courses. It is less clear what will be required of the students to demonstrate their ability to work with children in a collaborative classroom setting or a clinical setting. Bill Summers provided information with regard to Dr. Tafel's inquiry. Dr. Tafel further asked if the evaluations of clinical practice have been developed for the program. Dr. Summers stated they are in the process of doing that at this time.

Linda Tafel referred to the first description for 776, second sentence (p. 11), "teachers will develop individual assessment plans for students with severe learning problems related to literacy." The focus on special needs students ... If this course is really dedicated to special needs children or to children who are in the general population. The program proposal reads as though it is serving the reading needs of special education students as opposed to students in the general population. Bill Summers replied this course is not a special education course. Dr. Summers made a note that the description will be revised. Dr. Tafel suggested that one approach university representatives may wish to review is differentiating reading instruction based on the needs of the learners.

Kay Acklin moved the State Teacher Certification Board table the Olivet Nazarene University Reading Specialist program with the primary focus being the 18 hours versus 24 hours. Linda Tafel seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

***(Break 9:55 a.m. – 10:05 a.m.)***

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

Elliott Lessen moved that the State Teacher Certification Board remove from the table the University of Illinois at Urbana - Champaign Alternative Teacher Certification: Math / Science program proposal. Jo Ann Owens seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

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

At the request of State Teacher Certification Board members, Phyliss Jones provided a walk-through of the addendum provided to Certification Board members addressing the changes made to the Alternative Teacher Certification: Math / Science program proposal.

Kay Acklin moved the State Teacher Certification Board recommend to the State Board of Education provisional approval of the University of Illinois at Urbana - Champaign Alternative Teacher Certification (Secondary Education): Math / Science 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)]. Linda Tafel seconded the motion. The motion passed with four abstentions.

Linda Tafel asked if the university representatives could prepare a one-page document detailing the changes that could be inserted into the program proposal. This would be helpful for Certification Board members in order to see what the new program now looks like.

#### Status Report(s) –

##### Olivet Nazarene University – School Counselor Program

Bill Summers offered to provide an oral status report with regard to the School Counselor Program. Since State Teacher Certification Board members would like to have a written report, they decided to defer this item until the August meeting of the Certification Board.

##### University of Saint Francis – Music Education

Since State Teacher Certification Board members requested additional information be provided in the status report for the Music Education Program, they decided to defer this item until the August meeting of the Certification Board.

Linda Tafel requested that the report include the number of students the university plans to enroll in the program. Phyliss Jones clarified that an additional "Point #9" could be added to the existing report to accommodate this

request. Dr. Tafel further stated that if new faculty have been hired, that should be an additional bullet point as well.

#### Proposals for Activities that Meet Requirements for Standard Certificate Eligibility

Linda Tafel moved that the “Proposals for Activities that Meet Requirements for Standard Certificate Eligibility” dated May 2, 2005, be approved. Dennis Williams added the following induction and mentoring program to the list: Villa Grove School District – Douglas County. William Briggs seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote. (See Attachment)

#### Renewal of Standard / Master Certificates (Group B List)

Dennis Williams reported there are no renewals on the Group B List at this time.

William Briggs confirmed that the random drawing for individuals who are going to be audited will occur after July 1, 2005.

#### “High Objective Uniform State Standard of Evaluation” (HOUSSE)

Dennis Williams welcomed Bob Bigham, Gail Lieberman and Sally Vogl to the table.

Since Dr. Susan Shea addressed this issue during Public Participation, Dennis Williams mentioned that the process staff used was not intended to circumvent the State Teacher Certification Board or to not include everyone in the process. This is the beginning of this process. Staff felt they needed to move quickly because school districts must begin reporting now regarding classes taught by highly qualified teachers. A decision was made that a first draft document would be sent to school districts. The formal process is now beginning where we bring this document to you for discussion. We are looking at two different standards. The one for Appendix D was based on 120 maximum points to be used for the five-year period. That was not the intent for this document.

Gail Lieberman provided a brief background overview with regard to the Title II visit from the United States Department of Education (USDE). There was a request to change the experience points in the HOUSSE. The law says 50. There was also a lengthy discussion as to how to tie into the recertification process to make it easier for someone to follow. The document before the State Teacher Certification Board has been shared with the “original” team of visitors from USDE. They indicated that they do not approve or disapprove. School

districts have to report to the State Board of Education their classes not taught by highly qualified teachers.

Bob Bigham stated that some of the items corrected in the old version of HOUSSE and *No Child Left Behind (NCLB)* were that the federal government indicated the document was not clearly stated enough for teachers to go through it and understand where they fit. Another problem was the statement that anyone having a special education certificate was highly qualified. Staff then had to revise the document to reflect special education teachers meet the same highly qualified requirements as any teacher of content.

Staff also wanted to recognize any credits a person held (3 points for any credit, 60 points for meeting the middle-grades requirements, 80 points for secondary requirements, 10 points for any credit beyond that). An individual can receive 10 points per year up to five years (50 points) out of 100. With regard to teaching experience, if individuals were elementary teachers for those five years and taught all common elementary subjects, they can count five years for each of those subjects (experience would apply to each elementary year taught and subject).

The overall requirements for *NCLB* by federal law are that one must have a full certificate (no waiver), a bachelor's degree, and content expertise. For new elementary teachers, having passed the state exam is the only option allowed. Teachers at another grade level can also demonstrate content-area competence by having a major in the subject or 32 hours (equivalent to a major), an advanced degree, or an advanced certificate. Veteran teachers (defined as someone with one year or more of teaching experience) can use the HOUSSE criteria also. In writing the HOUSSE, the number of avenues has been expanded to garner points. One addition is teachers who have an elementary master certificate receive 100 points.

Sally Vogl shared several changes that need to be made to the rules version of the HOUSSE document. Beginning on p. 79, item (e), representatives of USDE felt that the number of points given was overly generous in consideration of the number of points given for semester hours of college credit. This will be realigned with the continuing professional development unit (CPDU) credit that those activities would receive -- instead of 15 points per activity, one point per full hour of participation.

Elliott Lessen referred back to c. Semester hours indicate 3 points per semester hour. Students are sitting for 15 hours per semester hour. If they take a 3-hour course, they will only receive 9 hours for 45 hours of seat work. If they then complete a workshop, they would receive more credit for a workshop for CPDUs. Dr. Lessen recommended that 15 points should be given per semester hour. If this change is not made, we are saying to teachers don't take college courses, take workshops instead in order to become highly qualified.

Gail Lieberman stated that USDE was criticizing the participation in conferences each being three hours. They thought the 15 was too high. They did not criticize (c). Subsection (c) could be modified without a problem from the federal representatives.

Sally Vogl shared the approach that was used: to assign a lower number of points for semester hours that are less than you need to be even minimally qualified; to give an extra boost when you have the package that you need for the assignment; and to give a higher number of credits per semester hour once you have exceeded the state's minimum. Ms. Vogl indicated that subsection (c) is only about the semester hours of college credit below the number required for an endorsement. It is calibrated for each of the grade levels. Item (d) is semester hours beyond the number required for an endorsement. It provides 10 points each. There is a different value per semester hour depending upon where it places the teacher in relationship to the requirements for his or her grade level in that subject area.

Richard Ammentorp stated that unless these can be aligned to recertification, this will be a nightmare. There must be consistency. Gail Lieberman shared that there was an effort to do this.

Elliott Lessen stated that we should be trying to facilitate teachers becoming highly qualified and not bar them from being highly qualified. Many teachers have been teaching for a long time. New programs and new certification rules for new teachers have raised the bar. We should facilitate the teachers that are already out there becoming highly qualified in a way that does not create a nightmare between recertification and HOUSSE. Gail Lieberman shared that staff were trying to be as inclusive as possible. Richard Ammentorp asked if there was a way of looking at what we currently have in recertification and aligning it to HOUSSE in order to comply with federal government requirements for highly qualified.

Bob Bigham stated there was concern that everything in recertification would have to be applicable to the content area. Sally Vogl shared that staff have gone activity by activity for certificate renewal and placed as many of them in there as could be demonstrated to have a connection to content. With the exception of semester hours, each activity is given the same points as for certificate renewal. Ms. Vogl further stated that, if we consider additional points for the semester hours below the number required or for the exact number of hours required, there may be a mathematical discrepancy. The 15 for the hours above what is required is probably the only place where more generosity could be introduced.

Elliott Lessen again raised the concern about teachers attending a workshop or conference and receiving more points than taking a graduate course.

Bob Bigham stated that the federal government requires persons considered highly qualified to have a major or a test – 18 hours is not the equivalent of a major. In middle grades individuals are eligible to be assigned to second fields with as few as 9 semester hours. There is a balancing act. There was agreement that the 15 points for the extra hours is very well worth considering.

Elliott Lessen stated that in item e a person can go to 45 hours of workshops and receive 45 points. But, in item (c) a person can sit in a class for 45 hours and only receive 9 points. For certificate renewal every semester hour counts the same.

Laura Lipe asked how far back someone can go to become highly qualified. Sally Vogl stated that there is no “how far back” – if you have it, you have it. Bob Bigham stated that OTIS will have to be completely revamped in order to provide computation if someone is determined highly qualified. The highly qualified status (per subject) would be recorded on OTIS.

Dennis Williams clarified that prior to OTIS being completed it would be up to the individual certificate holder (the teacher) to determine if they are highly qualified. Bob Bigham is developing a question/answer paper process and chart for teachers to use until OTIS is in place. The teachers would maintain records demonstrating they are highly qualified in the same way they would for professional development. Several Certification Board members indicated that if teachers are expected to keep two sets of records, they will be overwhelmed.

Dennis Williams further clarified that the school district has the responsibility when they are hiring and assigning teachers. They would not have the information that would let them make the determination if a teacher is highly qualified. The individual certificate holder will have the information. Teachers who receive highly qualified through HOUSSE will accumulate a variety of different documents the school district will not have in their possession. This would be a self-reporting process between the individual teacher and the school district.

William Briggs raised the concern that teachers would need to have a chart indicating points used for certificate renewal and another chart for HOUSSE. Sally Vogl clarified that other than the discussion regarding semester hours and the different value for them, all of the other points in the document are the same points that are given in the context of certificate renewal. The only issue with the points is that semester hours don't appear to be appropriate to treat numerically in this context as they are in certificate renewal.

Ascencion Juarez asked if teachers will have to maintain their own records determining that they are highly qualified and then report that information to the state. Sally Vogl clarified that a district has to report to the state. The fundamental requirement is that in the school report card data collection, districts

are required to identify the number of classes that they have, the number that are staffed by highly qualified individuals and the number that are not. A district needs to make that determination. For the extra activities that a teacher may want to receive points for under HOUSSE, the district will need to remind its teachers that it does not have all the evidence and the teacher will need to identify those items that are countable. The communication of that information has to begin with the only person that has that information. An automated system (OTIS) will eventually record this information.

Linda Malone asked how it will affect self-contained fifth and sixth grade classrooms where the teachers teach everything. Bob Bigham stated that according to *NCLB*, fifth grade is considered middle grades. One would be expected to meet the middle-grades requirements. Nina Dorsch stated that she sees disconnect between elementary teachers and middle grades. Richard Ammentorp shared his concern that we will lose every fifth and sixth grade teacher in the state (and special education teachers).

Bob Bigham is going to verify this information, but he believes the federal government states that teachers at a middle-grades level, whether teaching self-contained or not, must have the same high-quality standards as anyone who is teaching at the middle-grades level. If there is a need for modifications, those will be made.

Elliott Lessen asked for the definition of a K-12 certificate with a self-contained general education endorsement. Bob Bigham stated that the new endorsement structure that came into effect July 2004 allows that to happen.

Denise Williams asked how far back a teacher can go to show things such as having had a student teacher, etc. that would add points. Bob Bigham stated there is no limitation.

Denise Williams inquired with regard to the narrative document (p. 7) if teachers have a major in a subject indicated on the transcripts what differentiates that from the veteran teacher going through HOUSSE. Bob Bigham stated that teachers would not need to use the criteria under HOUSSE if they had a major in a subject. They could have garnered enough credit in a specific subject area to total 32 hours, and that constitutes a “constructed major” in that subject.

Denise Williams indicated there is a breakdown with regard to what is called the social studies as a group that is broken down into the geography, civics, etc. When you look at the sciences, it states a “blanket” science. The sciences are not broken down, whereas the social studies areas are. Ms. Williams further stated there is concern with regard to the small districts where teachers have to teach many of the same subjects.

Gail Lieberman stated that *NCLB* defines core academic areas. We are trying to match a person being highly qualified against the core content. The law does not differentiate the sciences.

Muhammad Abdullah asked how 30-year teachers document that they had a student teacher in (for example) 1980. Richard Ammentorp asked then does that student teacher qualify for a fifth-grade teacher to be highly qualified in math for 10 points, and then highly qualified in social studies for 10 points, etc? Sally Vogl clarified that if a person's teaching experience is in multiple subjects it will count for each of those subjects. With regard to documentation, etc. William Briggs raised a concern about a conflict between individual teachers and their administrator.

Dennis Williams stated there is concern because this information has been sent to district superintendents. They are already looking at teachers within their school districts now. The teacher has nothing at this time to use in order to calculate if they are highly qualified. At the end of the school year is when administrators look at hiring.

Deborah Curtis stated (1) we will have candidates who potentially might choose to be teachers choose otherwise due to these complicated issues; (2) any induction and mentoring program cannot resolve the issues that are inherent in this system which will affect retention of teaching coming into the field; and (3) experienced veteran teachers who for the most part in research indicates are the effective teachers in the classroom are going to be moved out of teaching for the benefit of those who can document specific pieces as opposed to demonstrating real expertise in the area. In every one of those categories – bringing people in and recruiting, retaining those who come into the field as well as respecting the work of those who are out there – this is a nightmare. We are causing our own school staffing problems.

Elliott Lessen stated there are incredible shortages. Dr. Lessen referred to Part 27.350 – General Curricular Standards for Special Education Teachers. We are not preparing special education teachers to be physics teachers, but any special education teacher is not teaching the same curriculum. These are already embedded in the content test for the LBS I. Why are we saying this is not sufficient for highly qualified for special education teachers? At least with regard to special education, it would seem appropriate that a group from the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE), several higher education faculty, and representatives from the Illinois Education Association and the Illinois Federation of Teachers sit down and look at this and come up with something that is reasonable either by certificate level or overall.

In response to a comment that maybe Illinois should withdraw from participation in *NCLB*, Gail Lieberman shared that Illinois receives \$850 million with regard to *NCLB*, separate from IDEA, etc.

Sally Vogl stressed the fact that districts have to report now. And, having been told what is in place is not acceptable, staff had to make a decision whether to let districts report based on what is in place in the rules now, or provide districts with the benefit of the most recent information available. The latter was chosen with the understanding that it is an imperfect approach.

Laura Lipe asked what happens to districts that employ teachers who are not highly qualified. Gail Lieberman responded that USDE stated verbally in a meeting that districts do not have to fire those teachers who are not highly qualified. It is a problem for the school district. With regard to veteran teachers, districts should have done what was needed to get the teachers highly qualified. Also, as of 2002, districts can not employ new teachers who are not highly qualified.

Marsha Allen asked about letters that have been sent home to parents indicating their child's teacher(s) are not highly qualified while the teachers believe they are. Gail Lieberman shared there are sample letters on the Illinois State Board of Education website. She suggests individuals saying, "this teacher is not highly qualified but they are qualified because of", and then bullet those points. There is no state form letter. Linda Malone stated that she believes parents won't take the time to understand the difference between qualified and highly qualified.

Linda Malone raised a question that if teachers find they are in a predicament affecting their employment, what should they be told. Dennis Williams shared that staff are trying to make districts understand this information becomes effective at the end of the 2005-06 school year.

Richard Ammentorp asked if it would be possible to not have any paperwork for Regional Offices of Education and local professional development committees to contend with, but to wait until OTIS has been modified, and then after OTIS has been updated, to send notification material to school districts.

Kay asked clarification with regard to the reporting requirements. Gail Lieberman stated the report asks for the number of classes not taught by highly qualified personnel. This is an annual spring data collection to be returned by June 15, 2005.

Andrew Brulle indicated that in the rules there is a term that is bothersome, "requirements for full certification". Dennis Williams stated that HOUSSE and the proposed amendments to the rules are separate. Issues regarding the proposed rules will be addressed.

Dennis Williams clarified that before OTIS can be programmed, these rules and policy must be adopted and finalized. Districts have to report now. The collection of the data has opened for districts to report. Either the districts report

in error, or we give the districts something to use for that reporting purpose. HOUSSE will only be needed by those teachers that do not meet the highly qualified in all of the other available methods. The federal government wants to know the numbers of highly qualified and what is the state doing to help those teachers become highly qualified if they are not.

Elliott Lessen stated that if teachers have been under the assumption based on what they were using that they would be highly qualified by the end of this year, and then we now impose rules that they suggest they are not, this causes a problem.

Elliott Lessen moved the Illinois State Teacher Certification Board table any of the rules that deal with HOUSSE for special education and that a committee or task force be formed including representatives from the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE), higher education, Illinois Education Association (IEA) and Illinois Federation of Teachers (IFT) to meet, review, and work with staff in terms of what exactly is required, what the feds require and what that means. A report is due to the Certification Board members by their September 2005 meeting. Kay Acklin seconded the motion. The motion passed with one nay vote.

Elliott Lessen moved the Illinois State Teacher Certification Board recommend to the State Board of Education for consideration the rest of HOUSSE. Linda Tafel seconded the motion. The motion failed with 7 aye votes and 10 nay votes.

Linda Tafel confirmed that several of the issues that need to be addressed are the 100 points, the fifth grade (self-contained) teachers, the veteran teachers, and the word "or" with regard to compliance.

#### Amendments to Rules for Certification (Various)

Sally Vogl summarized the proposed amendments to the rules for certification.

Kay Acklin asked that the definition of what "full" certification means be included in the first sentence. Sally Vogl stated that full certification means any of the types of certificates listed in the rules.

Several questions were raised with regard to registration for certification testing and the collection of information about the institution each individual is attending. Pat Glenn clarified that the rule is being revised to reflect current practice as far as the content of test registration forms is concerned.

Nina Dorsch moved the Illinois State Teacher Certification Board recommend to the State Board of Education for consideration the proposed rules relating to

certification with the exception of Appendix D. Elliott Lessen seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

***Lunch Break (12:30 p.m. – 1:10 p.m.)***

Elliott Lessen moved that Superintendent Dunn and Dennis Williams create an additional Ad Hoc Committee made up of constituents from Illinois Education Association, Illinois Federation of Teachers, administrators (district and regional), and higher education to review the rest of the HOUSSE recommendations other than special education including the points and also use the transcript from today's meeting that would have additional issues that were raised by members of the State Teacher Certification Board. A report is due to the Certification Board members by their August 2005 meeting. William Briggs seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

**Item(s) for Discussion:**

**State Teacher Certification Board Operating Procedures**

Dennis Williams stated the Legal Department is not present to review the Operating Procedures because they are hopeful that there may be more recommendations provided. The Legal Department plans to be available at the June meeting of the Certification Board in order to discuss the revised procedures.

Kay Acklin clarified several items in the document submitted by the Illinois Education Association. The sentences that begin with the word "comment" are the comments provided by the Illinois Education Association. Everything else is a combination of two types of proposed changes. Lou Ann Reichle made suggested changes in December 2004. The underlined or crossed out items are from Ms. Reichle. Items that are underlined or crossed and that are in bold are from the Illinois Education Association. Also, there is an omission in the Illinois Education Association document. With regard to p. 1, Duties and Responsibilities, "in consultation with" ... the proposal stated, "in consultation with the State Board of Education."

From all of the comments being made from the Illinois Education Association in terms of perhaps changing the Operating Procedures, the most important two changes are on p. 7, the section pertaining to meetings (c 1, 2, 3). Perhaps there was some wording that could be inserted for these items so we are in compliance with state law. On p. 8, there is the same situation (item e and 5). Perhaps the attorneys could re-work number 5 so we are clearly in compliance with state law.

Linda Tafel stated several areas do not comply with how the Certification Board currently conducts business. Those areas could be eliminated. The Operating Procedures should reflect how the Certification Board is currently operating.

The following issues and recommendations were discussed,

- Secretary of the Facilitation Committee
- Membership Terms (second full terms of members)
- Officers (Co-Chair of Facilitation Committee and Secretary to Certification Board)
- Membership Procedures (nominations)
- Quotation Marks Detailing Statutory Language
- Chair of Facilitation Committee (rotation)

Since Linda Tomlinson was an author of the Operating Procedures, Certification Board members asked her to share the history of this document and provide clarification.

Linda Tafel shared that earlier today the Facilitation Committee recommended to Dennis Williams that the Legal Department look very closely at the two sections pertaining to meetings. Dr. Tafel volunteered to draft a document that represents current operating procedures of the State Teacher Certification Board. The draft document will be available for the June meeting of the Certification Board.

**Item(s) for Information:**

**Renewal of Standard / Master Certificates (Monthly Report – Group A List)**

Dennis Williams reported that there were 17,069 recommendations for Standard / Master Certificates renewed in Group A for the period of March 1, 2005 through May 5, 2005.

**(Note:** Due to the size of the printout, the report 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.)

### Basic Skills Scoring Model Study

Pat Glenn provided an overview of the Basic Skills Test Scoring Model Study. Ms. Glenn clarified the difference between the Compensatory Scoring Model and the Disjunctive Scoring Model.

In the Compensatory Scoring Model the total test scale score determines whether a candidate passes or fails the test, as long as a candidate also attains the minimum allowable score for each of the four sub-areas.

The Disjunctive Scoring Model applies separate passing scores to each Basic Skill test sub-area.

Linda Tafel suggested the Basic Skills Test Scoring Model Study document be shared with the Illinois Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (IACTE).

### Latin Content-Area Test Committee

Dennis Williams and Pat Glenn provided an update with regard to the Latin Content-Area Test Committee. This committee has asked to meet with the State Board of Education members because they still believe that the Latin test is too difficult. It was noted that at this time there is a 100 percent pass rate for this test.

### Program Report Format

Marti Woelfle disseminated several documents to the Certification Board members. State Board of Education staff are scheduled to attend an upcoming NCATE clinic. Any information with regard to the program report format will be shared with the State Teacher Certification Board.

### STCB Audit Committees (Thursday, June 2, 2005)

Marti Woelfle stated that five institutions will be reviewed for institutional accreditation and program review. They include:

- Greenville College
- Illinois Wesleyan University
- Lake Forest College
- Lincoln Christian College
- Trinity Christian College

The State Teacher Certification Board agreed to meet as a Committee of the Whole on Thursday, June 2, 2005. Each institution evidence box will be available for review at 8:30 a.m. The committee will formally begin at 9:00 a.m.

Marti Woelfle agreed to meet with new members of the Certification Board on Wednesday, June 1, 2005 from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. at the State Board of Education office (State Board Room, Fourth Floor).

Marti Woelfle stated that the State Board of Education is seeking outstanding Illinois educators to serve as team members for accreditation reviews of Illinois teacher preparation institutions. Staff will offer Institutional Review Team Training on June 14 - 17, 2005 at Greenville College, Greenville, Illinois.

#### Directory Update (Expanded On-Line Resource)

Marti Woelfle shared that the revised on-line ISBE Directory of Approved Programs has proven to be very successful. State Board of Education staff have asked institutions to provide updated information (as applicable) for the following areas:

- Middle Grade Coursework
- Early Childhood Special Education Letter of Approval
- Bilingual / ESL Letter of Approval / Endorsement

This information will facilitate the electronic application process and will assist individuals seeking coursework.

#### **Secretary's Report:**

Dennis Williams introduced and welcomed Denise Albrecht to the Illinois State Teacher Certification Board. Ms. Albrecht was appointed to the Certification Board effective March 17, 2005. She is completing the term of former Certification Board member Amy Alsop.

Dennis Williams shared that there currently is no back log in Certification. A 30-day turnaround time has been established.

Dennis Williams reported that the following certificates have been revoked by the State Superintendent of Education:

Gerald Huddleston

- Standard Elementary Certificate No. 1861214
- Standard Secondary Certificate No. 1861215

Gary W. Chioda

- Secondary Certificate No. 1362567
- Special Certificate No. 1585665

Steven Dimovski

- Secondary Certificate No. 1287503

Lance R. Freeman

- Standard Secondary Certificate No. 1899457
- Substitute 90-Day Certificate No. 1866186

Eric R. Shull

- Substitute Certificate No. 2173646

Dennis Williams reported the following members of the State Teacher Certification Board have terms expiring June 30, 2005:

William Briggs	IFT	First Term
Roger Chamberlain	IPA	Second Term
Nina Dorsch	IACTE	First Term
Ascencion Juarez	CPS	First Term
Elliott Lessen	IACTE	First Term
Laura Lipe	IEA	First Term
Linda Tafel	IACTE	Second Term

**Adjournment:**

With no further business, Andrew Brulle moved that the State Teacher Certification Board adjourn. William Briggs seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote. The State Teacher Certification Board meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

APPROVED

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary

**ATTACHMENT**

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

Recommended for Approval  
by State Board Staff  
May 2005

Antioch Community High School District 117 – Lake County  
Addison School District 4 – DuPage County  
North Boone CUSD 200 – Boone County  
Metamora Township High School 122 – Woodford County  
Consolidated School District 158 (Huntley) – McHenry County  
Prophetstown-Lyndon-Tampico 3 – Whiteside County  
Patricia Marshall / Carbondale CHS 165 – Jackson County  
Mendota Township High School 280 – LaSalle County  
Villa Grove SD – Douglas County

**Districts that Adopted Approved Programs**  
May 2005

Dieterich Community Unit 30 – Effingham County  
Clay City CUSD 10 – Clay County