

**ILLINOIS STATE TEACHER CERTIFICATION BOARD**

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

**Friday, September 10, 2004**

**MINUTES**

**Call to Order / Roll Call:**

Robert Schiller, Chairman, Illinois State Teacher Certification Board, called the Illinois State Teacher Certification Board meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. Dr. Schiller asked Dennis Williams, Interim Secretary, to call the roll. A quorum was present.

**Members Present:**

Robert E. Schiller, Chairman  
Dennis Williams, Interim Secretary

Muhammad Abdullah  
Kay Acklin  
Marsha Allen  
Amy Alsop  
William Briggs  
Andrew Brulle  
Roger Chamberlain  
Deborah J. Curtis  
Nina Dorsch

Connee Fitch-Blanks  
Ascencion Juarez  
Elliott Lessen  
Laura Lipe  
Linda Malone  
Dave Marshall  
Linda Tafel  
Denise Williams  
Eugene Zalewski

**Note:** Mr. Williams reported Mary Jane Morris, Teacher Representative for the Illinois Education Association, resigned as a member of the State Teacher Certification Board. Ms. Morris accepted a position with the Illinois Education Association as a UniServ Director in the Marion, Illinois area.

**Members Absent:**

No members were absent.

**Others Present:**

Laura Barwegen  
Lucille Buscher  
Pat Glenn  
Karen Haworth  
John Hunt  
Karen Johnson  
Laurie Jolicoeur  
Phyliss Jones  
Judith Sweeney Lederman  
Norman Lederman  
Jerry Ligan  
Debbie Meisner-Bertauski

Lee Patton  
Lou Ann Reichle  
Susan Shea  
Brenda Stonecipher  
Kathy Stratton  
Joy Taylor-Ankenbrandt  
Linda Tomlinson  
Pat Van Slyke  
Sally Vogl  
Donna Wakefield  
Karen Williams  
Marti Woelfle

**Approval of Minutes:**

The minutes of the August 6, 2004, Illinois State Teacher Certification Board meeting were presented for consideration. William Briggs moved that the August 6, 2004 minutes be approved. Denise Williams seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

**Public Participation:**

- *Debbie Meisner-Bertauski, Director of the Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant Project, Illinois Board of Higher Education*

Ms. Meisner-Bertauski outlined the grant, supported by the Illinois Board of Education, Illinois Board of Higher Education and the Illinois Community College Board, focusing on Middle-Level reform in Illinois. The grant consists of three goals. The first is to develop a middle-level certificate. The second and third goals support this in building capacity in teacher preparation programs and recruitment. As each agency committed to move the agenda forward during the course of the grant, she offers her support of the recommendations that the Middle-Level Advisory Panel is prepared to present to the Certification Board.

- *Laurie Jolicoeur, Served on the Latin Teacher Certification Committee, President of the Illinois Classical Conference*

Ms. Jolicoeier shared that she would like to dissuade Certification Board members from endorsing the Latin certification exam. Over the course of the production of the Latin exam, the Committee has chosen unanimously not to endorse it. She highlighted the following reasons for this decision: (1) Impact

of the candidates / students; (2) Exam lacks uniformity in the way the questions are asked; (3) The level of questions in the pool of questions far exceeds what would ever be expected of teachers. The reading passages of the exam are very long and should also reflect what a high school teacher needs to be competent at. Most of the reading passages do not come from authors that high school teachers teach. The exam was not field tested in Illinois. Ms. Jolicoeier also distributed to Board members a handout regarding why the Latin Test is unfit for the purpose it is designed to serve.

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

Linda Tafel, Chair of the Facilitation Committee, indicated the Facilitation Committee had met earlier and would like to revise the agenda to proceed through E – Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and to add the following:

7. Proposed Amendments to Part I Rules
8. Middle Grades Task Force Report Timeline Proposal

F. Item(s) for Information  
(Closed Session)

G. Secretary's Report

At the conclusion of business, the Board will move into an Audit Team as a whole to consider the standards met with weakness for the Illinois Institute of Technology (IIT) in accordance with the decision of the State Board, October 2002, and then make recommendations based on their determination. Muhammad Abdullah moved for approval of the revised agenda. Elliott Lessen seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

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

#### **Facilitation Committee Membership**

Linda Tafel moved that the Facilitation Committee for 2004-2005 be composed of the following Board members:

Kay Acklin, Chair  
Marsha Allen  
Nina Dorsch  
Linda Tafel  
Eugene Zalewski

Elliott Lessen seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

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

Elliott Lessen moved that the “Proposals for Activities that Meet Requirements for Standard Certificate Eligibility” dated August 30, 2004, be approved. Nina Dorsch seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote. (See Attachment)

#### Renewal of Standard / Master Certificates

Linda Tafel moved that the list of “Renewal of Standard / Master Certificates” be approved. Elliott Lessen seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote. (See Attachment)

#### New Certification Tests Passing Scores

Dr. Schiller asked Pat Glenn, Principal Education Consultant, Department of Certification and Professional Development, be present for explanation and clarification of the recommended passing scores and preliminary pass rate data.

Ms. Glenn stated that the Bias Review Committee recommends that the panel-based recommended passing scores be adjusted for measurement error as follows:

For the tests comprising 100 multiple-choice items:

- Adjust the panel-based recommendations by +1 SEM for the following fields:
  - Dance (63)
  - Elementary/Middle Grades (61)
  - Music (60)
  - Science: Chemistry (63)
  - Science: Physics (62)
  - Social Science: Geography (61)
  - Social Science: History (64)
  - Technology Specialist (61)
  
- Adjust the panel-based recommendations by +2 SEM for the following field:

Social Science: Sociology and Anthropology (63)

- Set the passing scores for the remaining tests comprising 100 item multiple-choice items at the panel-based recommended raw scores.

For the foreign language tests comprising 80 multiple-choice items and two constructed-response items:

- Adjust the panel-based recommendations by -1 SEM for:  
Hebrew – Written (6) and Oral (6)  
Italian – Oral (6)
- Set the passing scores for the remaining tests comprising 80 multiple-choice and two-constructed response items at the panel-based recommended raw scores.

For the foreign language tests comprising all constructed-response items:

- Adjust the panel-based recommendations by +1 SEM for:  
Chinese Cantonese  
Reading Comprehension (5)  
Language Structures (5)  
Written Expression (5)  
Chinese Mandarin  
Reading Comprehension (5)  
Language Structures (5)  
Written Expression (5)
- Adjust the panel-based recommendation by -1 SEM for Korean – Written Expression (6)
- Adjust the panel-based recommendation by -2 SEM for Korean – Oral Expression (6)
- Set the passing scores for the remaining tests comprising constructed-response items at the panel-based recommended raw scores.

Andrew Brulle asked if there are any specific plans for the monitoring of future performance data. Pat Glenn indicated data will be provided to Board members as requested.

Roger Chamberlain inquired in regard to the low scores for physical education. Pat Glenn suggested it may be the elementary versus secondary testing. Dr. Chamberlain indicated that as a principal it is becoming increasingly difficult to find highly qualified physical education teachers. Ms. Glenn proposed it may be due to geographical reasons. Elliott Lessen further shared it may be because there are fewer K-12 than 6-12 produced physical education teachers thus, more 6-12 may have taken the new K-12 test without, perhaps being adequately prepared.

Andrew Brulle asked staff to provide an explanation why some of the cut scores are recommended to be increased by 1 SEM and then some decreased.

Pat Glenn provided a summary regarding the panel-based passing score recommendations for the Foreign Language Fields and the grading on the scale score.

Denise Williams raised a question regarding Biology and the Sciences. There are 8 examinees listed under the Non-Caucasian and then there is nothing reported. Ms. Glenn indicated no data is provided if there are fewer than 10 within a reporting group. The basis is for confidentiality reasons and statistical stability.

Nina Dorsch confirmed that because the July testing results would not have been scaled until this meeting that institutions, in looking at those who would be student teaching this fall, needed to submit their content test scores, and that they were in effect deferring deadlines. Ms. Glenn stated that institutions need to use their best professional judgment.

Andrew Brulle asked if staff could address the concerns of the Latin Certification Committee. Ms. Glenn provided a brief history in regard to the Latin testing issues. Ms. Glenn further stated she was taken back and somewhat unsettled because it was felt all concerns were addressed, and the needs of the Latin Certification Committee were appropriately addressed. It was noted that she was only aware that four members of the Committee had raised concerns.

Elliott Lessen (referring to Attachment B) stated that when looking at all of the Non-Asian language fields it does not appear in the numbers that Latin is discrepant significantly from any of the others in terms of scores. Ms. Glenn indicated that the process uses the median rather than the mean. If the mean were used, the scores would have been much lower.

Kay Acklin expressed her feelings of discomfort in regard to the questions and concerns from the Latin Certification Committee. Ms. Acklin asked if it were possible to pull this item out of the recommendations for passing scores, and ask individuals to go back, discuss and iron out some of the discrepancies/concerns.

Elliott Lessen stated that given the Latin scores are not discrepant at all from the other Non-Asian language scores, and given that Ms. Glenn has been asked to come back and share a year's worth of data when there would have been more individuals tested, he felt the Certification Board should accept the scores. Dr. Lessen also felt that Dennis Williams and Pat Glenn could work with this group and address any of their concerns in the meantime.

Andrew Brulle indicated he would like to see the Certification Board recommend or even insist that the testing group and Latin teachers continue to meet and discuss all of the items very specifically instead of waiting an entire year. Linda Malone also expressed concern and felt the two groups should meet.

Dennis Williams again clarified that in his experience with the Latin Certification Committee that only four individuals came forward with concerns. It was also noted that the Committee consisted of 10-12 individuals.

Linda Tafel moved that the State Teacher Certification Board recommend to the State Board of Education for consideration at their September 2004 meeting adoption of the panel-based recommended passing scores for the 46 new content-area certification tests as adjusted by the Bias Review Committee. William Briggs seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Linda Tafel moved that the State Teacher Certification Board ask State Board staff to report in October 2005 on progress with regard to all of the tests' passing scores that are approved today. Elliott Lessen seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Linda Tafel, on behalf of the State Teacher Certification Board, directed State Board staff, Dennis Williams, Pat Glenn and others as appropriate, meet with the concerned parties with regard to the Latin test. Dr. Tafel also asked that a report be provided to the State Teacher Certification Board members at their November 2004 meeting concerning this item.

New Program Proposal –  
National-Louis University – Speech-Language Pathologist Type 73

Ms. Marti Woelfle, Principal Education Consultant, Department of Certification and Professional Development, introduced the following representatives from National-Louis University: Dr. Jerry Ligan, Interim and Associate Dean; Ms. Karen Haworth, Director of Outreach; Dr. Donna Wakefield, Program Coordinator of Special Education; and Dr. Patricia Van Slyke, Associate Professor and Director of the Speech-Language Pathology graduate program.

After reviewing the rubrics, scoring at the end of the portfolios, and also the field evaluation sheets, Andrew Brulle recommended that better explanations be

provided with regard to the ratings 1 through 4. The evaluation sheets are fine, but the explanation of exceeding standards, meeting standards, etc. is weak. When a variety of people do ratings, receiving consistency among the ratings is difficult. In the portfolio scoring, the examples of suggestions were excellent as what to include as artifacts, but Dr. Brulle again suggested more detailed scoring.

After reviewing the rubrics and seeing there were a number of assignments, Andrew Brulle raised the concern that it appears that the only way for assessing candidates for possible continuation or non-continuation of the program is by their grade point average. He asked if there was any provision for students who are doing poorly on some of the standards as opposed to the overall grade point average. Both Dr. Wakefield and Dr. Van Slyke provided explanation to the concern. Dr. Brulle again stressed his concern of the reliance on the grade point average, especially when we are standard-based not course-based.

Nina Dorsch noticed that assessment prior to clinical experiences included the GPA, portfolio, etc. She asked what the program would do if, for example, the electronic portfolio was less than wonderful, or the competency appraisals indicated less than competent. Specifically she inquired, "Is there a mechanism in place, perhaps a performance review process, where if candidates were deficient in one of those areas, as opposed to GPA, they could be placed on probation, dismissed from the program, etc.?" Dr. Van Slyke indicated that in the practicum program (Practicum 1, 2 and 3) candidates must achieve a grade of B in each prior practicum in order to move forward to the next. If a student were to achieve a C then he or she would have to repeat that practicum including the hours they would need to have to meet the 400 clinical clock hours. Dr. Wakefield stated the portfolio review is completed in each of those practicums.

Eugene Zalewski asked if the program would be offered in Lisle. Dr. Van Slyke responded that was correct. Satellite locations are a possibility for the future. For the first two years, the location will be on the Lisle campus. When the program was originally designed, National-Louis was teaming with DuPage County.

Dr. Zalewski stated that from the college catalog it appears that some of the courses already seem to be offered. He inquired if they have a program that was not certificate directed. Dr. Van Slyke indicated that the program was begun and some of the courses were outlined and written initially. Then the standards for the State of Illinois were changed as well as the standards for the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) which will take effect in 2005. The curriculum was re-written to meet the standards for Illinois and ASHA.

Dr. Zalewski further asked how long it would take for a candidate to complete the program. Dr. Van Slyke responded three years on a part-time basis. It is a very extensive course.

Elliott Lessen commented that (referring to pages 22-23) Patricia Van Slyke and Donna Wakefield have themselves listed with doctorate and master's degrees. All of the degrees should be listed and be consistent as well.

Elliott Lessen moved that the State Teacher Certification Board recommend approval to the State Board of Education for the new program proposal for Speech-Language Pathologist Type 73 at National-Louis University. Linda Malone seconded the motion. The motion passed with one abstention.

#### Proposed Amendments to Part I Rules

Dr. Schiller indicated that these are technical corrections, and asked Sally Vogl, Rules Coordinator, be present for questions raised by Certification Board members. Joining Ms. Vogl at the table was Karen Johnson, Interim Division Administrator, Career Development and Preparation.

Ms. Vogl took the opportunity to thank Ms. Johnson for the significant assistance she provided in this endeavor so the continuity of certification policy was not lost.

Williams Briggs moved that the State Teacher Certification Board recommend to the State Board of Education for consideration at their September 2004 meeting the Proposed Amendments to Part I Rules. Elliott Lessen seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

#### Middle Grades Task Force Report Timeline Proposal

Dennis Williams distributed the Middle Level Task Force Report Timeline to Certification Board members.

Dr. Schiller invited Dr. John Hunt, Superintendent, Antioch School District 34, Lake County, to present and answer questions. At the end of this year, Mr. Hunt will have completed 34 years as an educator.

Dr. Hunt offered his support of this initiative and provided an overview of this endeavor as well as the following timeline:

##### **Through June 30, 2008**

Continue to issue the middle grades endorsement to teachers based upon the focused set of standards approved in December 2003.

**July 1, 2008**

Begin to issue a new middle grades certificate to teacher candidates who have completed a teacher education program that is focused on the complete set of middle grade standards submitted in the April 2004 Middle Grades Task Force Report.

**July 1, 2008**

Begin issuing initial certificates based upon a simplified pattern:

Early Childhood – birth through grade 3 (unchanged)

Elementary – kindergarten through grade 5

Middle Grades – grade 5 through grade 9

Secondary – grade 9 through grade 12

**After July 1, 2008**

The middle grades endorsement would no longer be issued.

New graduates would be required to have the new middle grades certificate in order to teach in grades 5-9.

Practicing teachers would be entitled to exchange a current certificate for two certificates from the simplified pattern above in the following instances:

- (1) the teacher has already earned the middle grades endorsement; or
- (2) the teacher submits transcripts that show completion of the middle grades endorsement coursework; or
- (3) the teacher can document three or more years of successful teaching at the middle level; or
- (4) the teacher submits passing scores on the middle grades core and subject matter tests (see below).

A core test of pedagogical knowledge (APT middle grades) based upon the middle grade standards will be required for teachers earning the middle grades certificate.

Middle grades subject matter tests based upon appropriate broad and interdisciplinary content standards will be required for teachers earning the middle grades certificate.

Dr. Hunt concluded his comments and asked for support for the proposal as presented.

Kay Acklin asked why this proposal was being presented at this time ... what is the urgency. It was her belief that this report was to be presented at the October 2004 meeting of the Certification Board. Dennis Williams stated the proposal was to be presented at the September or October meeting date(s).

Connee Fitch-Blanks inquired why this item was not in the packet sent to Certification Board members last week. Dennis Williams replied that the Facilitation Committee had to decide if this item would be added to the agenda since it was requested after the 48-hour deadline we have for accepting agenda items.

Linda Tafel shared an excerpt from the June 2004 meeting packet which had the standards and the recommendations of the Task Force. Dr. Tafel clarified that there have been no changes to the language of the original report. In June the standards were approved. The Certification Board agreed to then consider their recommendation with regard to this timeline in the Fall.

Andrew Brulle raised a concern that he does not know how the 2008 timeline can be implemented. He recommended that it be moved to 2010. Elliott Lessen and Kay Acklin agreed. From a higher education perspective, Dr. Lessen indicated this would allow programs to make the necessary adjustments, and allow the secondary programs to make some choices. Students could make informed decisions as well for their academics.

Linda Tafel moved that the State Teacher Certification Board request amendment to the timeline to reflect the following:

Through June 30, 2010  
July 1, 2010  
After July 1, 2010

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

Linda Tafel moved that the State Teacher Certification Board recommend to the State Board of Education the recommendation for the middle grades certificate with the accompanying timeline. Dave Marshall seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Elliott Lessen asked that the minutes reflect the State Teacher Certification Board has already accepted the standards, and everyone is appreciative of the options available for current teachers to be able to be "grandfathered in" as middle level certified teachers as this timeline goes into effect in 2010. The extension of the dates to 2010 allowing higher education programs to readjust is very good for everyone, especially the students.

Elliott Lessen asked that it be stated at the State Board of Education meeting that both of the above-mentioned votes were unanimous with all members of the Certification Board voting.

Roger Chamberlain shared that he has served on the Certification Board for five years and has been engaged in all of these middle-level certification discussions. He cannot compliment and applaud everybody enough who have supported and worked so hard to carry this movement to the Board. It is a very strong statement about a unique age level that needs special qualified staff to teach them.

***Break (Reconvene and Enter Into Closed Session at 10:55 a.m.)***

Elliott Lessen moved that the Illinois State Teacher Certification Board enter into closed session under the exception set forth in the Open Meetings Act of the State of Illinois (5 ILCS 120/2(c)) as follows:

Section 2(c)(11) for the purpose of discussing pending litigation; and

Dr. Lessen also moved that Lou Ann Reichle, Legal Advisor; Dennis Williams, Interim Secretary to the State Teacher Certification Board; and Kathy Stratton, Recorder, Multi Media and Web Services, be present at the Closed Session.

Linda Tafel seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

***Closed Session***

***(Note: Open meeting reconvened at 11:10 a.m.)***

**Secretary's Report:**

Dennis Williams shared that the backlog is decreasing. Staff are working overtime. The backlog has moved from July to December which is a significant decrease. It is anticipated, if the current rate continues, the backlog in January 2005 should be down to within three or four months.

Elliott Lessen commented that with the change in Part 25 teachers who are interested in a subsequent certificate can apply to the state through December 31, 2004.

In regard to the status of the districts' options to retain or eliminate their LPDCs, Mr. Williams reported the following:

- 645 districts have responded to the request of updating their LPDC status on CeRTS.
- 144 districts have opted to retain their LPDCs.

- 501 districts have eliminated their LPDCs.
- 250 districts are yet to respond.
- The deadline to notify on CeRTS has been extended to September 30, 2004.

Mr. Williams distributed to Board members a handout outlining this information.

Dennis Williams stated that if an LPDC exists, it is its responsibility to review the Statement of Assurances form at the end of the five years. The form will soon be ready for distribution. The local committee can also give pre-approval of the travel.

Linda Malone stated that her district dismissed their LPDC Committee, but they have an advisory person. Dennis Williams clarified that an advisory committee has no authority to make any recommendations. The regional office makes the recommendations for renewal.

William Briggs asked what will happen on September 30, 2004 if everyone has not responded. Mr. Williams indicated districts would be contacted via telephone. Also, Mr. Briggs asked if providers were still being evaluated. Mr. Williams responded that was correct, and Mr. Williams was further asked to provide a brief description of the Evidence of Completion form.

A revised, "Procedures for Renewing the Standard / Master Certificate", handout was distributed to Certification Board members.

Dave Marshall clarified the statement that 144 districts have opted to retain their LPDCs. He asked about options to evaluate whether districts wish to keep an LPDC and if there was a timeline for the decision. Dennis Williams indicated a district can contact State Board of Education staff at any time with changes.

Mr. Marshall also asked about audits of the assurance statements and professional development. Mr. Williams responded that determinations are still being considered in regard to the percentages to be completed. The regional offices and State Board will handle these. The audits will be determined by computer and be completely random so there are no suggestions of anything out of proportion.

Mr. Williams shared that State Board staff are working with regional offices in order to provide trainings throughout the state.

Denise Williams raised a question regarding the erroneous information that was distributed to all of the regional offices pertaining to the "Fact Sheet". Mr. Williams responded the original document on the ISBE web site indicated that the proportionate reduction for a master's degree was going to take effect immediately. That information was based on the legal interpretation. Since then

State Board staff learned that the intent of the lawmakers was that the reduction was to be the next consecutive cycle, not the first. The document was removed from the web site and replaced with the correct material. It was suggested that the updated material be provided to the districts directly from the State Board of Education.

**Item(s) for Immediate Action: (Continuation of Agenda Item E)**

Illinois Institute of Technology (IIT) – Science Program

Linda Tafel provided an overview of the tasks before the Certification Board members. Since there are several new Board members, it was suggested that Dr. Tafel review the issues with regard to the decision of the Science Program at IIT.

In October 2002 the State Teacher Certification Board rendered a decision with regard to initial accreditation of IIT as a teacher preparation institution and offered recommendations to the State Board regarding program approvals for Mathematics and Science.

Subsequently, the State Board revised the decision of the Certification Board and issued specific language with regard to the Science program. The State Board made the decision that IIT as an institution would be accredited and granted program approval for Mathematics and provisional approval for Science.

With regard to the Science program, the State Board went through each of the six NCATE standards indicating whether or not each of the standards was met or met with area(s) for improvement. The State Board also in its administrative order noted that IIT would have an 18-month review, and they have now come back to the STCB.

In August the Certification Board reviewed the IIT report, but it was not reviewed specifically in relation to the six standards. Last month this motion was tabled for approval of the Science program. It is the feeling of the Facilitation Committee, in consultation with the State Superintendent and Legal Counsel, that the best approach is to move into an Audit Team and use the specific findings for Standards 1 through 6 and analyze the report submitted by IIT as their 18-month report to determine whether or not the findings of the State Board of Education stand or the findings be revised.

This is the first time the Certification Board has encountered this particular type of review, but we will use the format as used in the past for 18-month reviews and look at specific weaknesses that were cited in the report.

The Facilitation Committee believed Board members individually need to look at the following two documents: (1) report the State Board issued in March 2002, including the standards and the decisions for each standard including area(s) of weakness cited; and (2) program approval worksheet used for the 18-month review. Also, staff prepared for each Board member a copy of the report that was received at the August meeting.

Elliott Lessen asked for additional clarification. Linda Tafel stated the Certification Board is dealing only with the provisional approval that was given to the Science program. Dr. Tafel further stated it is important to recognize that the Certification Board does not typically look at programs using this framework. But this was the manner in which the State Board organized its decision. The Certification Board would not be looking at these specific weaknesses until 2007 because the unit was accredited. Given the fact that IIT has been informed that they were to address these weaknesses, and that is what they believe they did in their report, the Certification Board will use these weaknesses as the analysis for their report

At the end of the deliberations, the State Teacher Certification Board should be in a position to render a decision with regard to program approval or not for the Science program. If the State Teacher Certification Board has additional comments for IIT with regard to advice that the Board has for them between now and their next visit in 2007, that can be offered to them separate from the Board's decision.

There are two separate tracks to travel: (1) the decision; and (2) the feedback from the weaknesses.

### ***Lunch Break***

### ***Work Session (12:10 p.m. – 12:45 p.m.)***

Discussion began by Linda Tafel citing Standard 1 – Candidate Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions. Standard 1 was met with one area of improvement: The unit has not presented an articulate description of coherent programs in science education.

Eugene Zalewski raised a question to the university staff if they had a chance to look at the matrix. It is assumed that on paper it identifies all of the standards and all of the items under the standards. From that standpoint, it is his assumption it is there, but perhaps lacks coherence.

Andrew Brulle stated he felt the matrices were fine. Dr. Brulle's concern is the reliance on grades. Referring to page 28, the grade point average is discussed and no class is accepted with a grade below a B. Just because a person has a grade in the class, does not mean that they have met a standard in that class.

Dr. Brulle recommended removal of this item, but does not know if it is enough for an area for weakness.

Linda Tafel stated that in reviewing the text that the concern was regarding program sequences not being in place. The sequences are there. The recommendation would be to remove this weakness with the rationale that the program sequences are now in place.

Linda Tafel cited Standard 2 – Assessment System and Unit Evaluation. Standard 2 was met two areas for improvement: (1) The unit's assessment system does not include a comprehensive and integrated set of evaluative measures; and (2) The assessment system does not include data collection on candidate dispositions.

Nina Dorsch cited the first weakness statement, specifically the idea of integration. One of the State Board findings regarded the portfolio following the student through the program. In reviewing the narrative (pages 28-29) regarding the portfolio, the response seems to be, "well it is being developed and revised all along the way." The problem is that the portfolio is being developed and revised, but it is never being evaluated along the way. Also, on the chart (page 32) the portfolio does not appear until the end. It is not implicit who is checking the portfolio along the way until they get to the end. It was unclear how the portfolio relates to the grades as the primary measure of success of the program. Dr. Dorsch still had concerns regarding the first weakness statement for Standard 2.

William Briggs asked if, at the university level, it is pretty standard just to deal with the portfolio and then the content of it which would provide a variety of assessments. Elliott Lessen indicated that portfolios normally encompass minimally required assessments for every student throughout a program as well as other artifacts that individual faculty or students decide they are going to place in the portfolio.

Nina Dorsch shared her belief that the discussion is formative versus summative assessment. Her concern was whether the portfolio is used as a formative assessment along the way and how it was checking progress toward the standards.

Linda Tafel asked Board members to look at the language which indicates "comprehensive and integrated." She asked how the portfolio is used in formative assessment to provide an integrative notion of evaluation. Connee Fitch-Blanks suggested that revisions be made to this statement.

Elliott Lessen noted that assessment pieces were presented, but the issue of the integration is what is difficult. Nina Dorsch suggested the revision may be that it does not include an "integrated" set, and the "comprehensive" may be deleted.

Linda Tafel stated the revision would read as follows, “The unit’s assessment system does not include an integrated set of evaluative measures.” The rationale would be the Certification Board sees the comprehensiveness, but not necessarily the integration.

In regard to the second statement, “the assessment system does not include data collection on candidate dispositions”, Andrew Brulle commented. The data sources are indicated on pages 29-30. The concern was there are no formal screening points for dispositions other than Appendices I and J. The flowchart (page 32) does not indicate specific points for the faculty to affirm that a student is exhibiting appropriate dispositions for continuation of the program.

Nina Dorsch stated that the faculty endorsement for student teaching is based on grades, and it is also based on apparently pre-student teaching clinical evaluations. (Appendix J)

Linda Tafel asked Board members to re-visit the language, “The assessment system does not include data collection on candidate dispositions.” Nina Dorsch stated her specific question was, “How is this systematic?”

Kay Acklin cautioned Board members to focus on the wording, “does not include data collection on candidate dispositions.” If Board members are saying it does not, how can we add whether or not it is systematic? We need to be careful what the weakness statement is, and are we staying with evaluating whether or not that has changed.

Nina Dorsch stated that in looking at the specific standard (page 22), the language talks about regular and comprehensive information from internal and external sources. Kay Acklin indicated that the words “regularly and systematically compiled” are used.

Linda Tafel asked Board members to again re-visit the language and provide some indication about where the data collection on dispositions should be. Connee Fitch-Blanks raised a question concerning program versus unit. Linda Tafel stated in this particular instance the Certification Board is using the text given through the State Board of Education’s decision which was applied to the Science program.

In returning to the second weakness statement, “the assessment system does not include data collection on candidate dispositions”, Andrew Brulle shared the suggested wording, “the assessment system does not clearly indicate how data on candidate dispositions are collected and used throughout the program.” Williams Briggs asked for further clarification.

Linda Tafel asked Board members to look at the State Board of Education's findings and conclusions (page 9). It states that, "Although the Institutional Report indicates that the candidates interview mentor teachers, including dispositions, the assessments required under the standards are of candidate's dispositions, not those. IIT's response does not show an understanding of the standards, concludes that the weakness statement identified by the State Teacher Certification is warranted and should be retained." The question is whether or not the 18-month report indicated that data are being collected on candidate dispositions. Nina Dorsch indicated that was correct. The weakness would be removed with the rationale that data is being collected. Standard 2 would still be met with one revised weakness – Statement #1, the unit's assessment system does not include an integrated set of evaluative measures.

Kay Acklin asked if once the Certification Board removes this weakness statement could advice still be given to the program. Ms. Acklin suggested these comments be included in the rationale for removal.

Linda Tafel indicated that each of the standards will be revisited to see if there is advice to be given to the institution with regard to the present state of the standards.

Standard 3 – Field Experiences and Clinical Practice was met.

Standard 4 – Diversity was met with two areas for improvement. The first one, "the full-time faculty of the unit is not culturally or ethnically diverse." William Briggs suggested that area for weakness be removed because the institution offered two positions and the individuals did not accept them. It is a common problem, and the university did make the effort. Elliott Lessen concurred.

In regard to the second area for improvement, "attention to the needs of exceptional learners or the developmental needs of all learners is not evident." Elliott Lessen shared his concerns regarding this item. In a review of what students do for the courses, he does not see anything there in particular. He did not find anything in the particular assignments describing what students are supposed to be doing with regard to applying their learning to adapting for students with special needs, students who are lower performers in some of the hard-to-staff teaching schools, etc.

William Briggs referred to the copy of the letter dated August 26, 2004 sent by IIT staff to Superintendent Schiller. The last point in bold explaining "ALL" ... this was IIT's opportunity to be clear, instead they chose the sarcastic approach, saying, "Basically, we do not know how to say ALL in a way that the Committee can understand. ALL means ALL. We address these issues in every class syllabi. Somehow the Committee failed to see this inclusion." IIT had the opportunity to explain, and they chose not to do so.

Elliott Lessen shared this was the response given in August. He pointed out that it is one thing to say we do something, but if it is not explicit in the syllabi students do not know what they have to do. We are only going by what is presented on paper.

Denise Williams asked if the Board could re-visit the first weakness statement. It was mentioned in the rejoinder to the Certification Board that IIT had tried and individuals had failed to accept the positions, etc. If we remove the weakness statement, it is as if the Board is saying the full-time faculty is culturally and ethnically diverse. Ms. Williams stated that in the past the Certification Board has not attached a weakness to other institutions that are no less diverse than this institution. Elliott Lessen indicated that standards identify “acceptable” as the affirmation of the value to diversity shown through good faith efforts made to increase or maintain cultural diversity. Ms. Williams further stated that in the past a weakness statement was kept even though good faith had been present at the institution. Linda Tafel explained that was because it was under the old standard language. It was agreed the first weakness statement would be removed.

In re-visiting the second weakness statement, Elliott Lessen stated that based on the document, the Board members do not know if all of the candidates actually have experiences with exceptional students; they may with students from different diverse background racial groups. Nothing in the syllabi indicates that experiences do not help candidates reflect on diversity or develop skills for having a positive effect on student learning.

Connee Fitch-Blanks indicated that there was a large paragraph on diversity and special needs (page 39). At the bottom of the paragraph, specific courses were listed. Nina Dorsch responded that this should be evident in the syllabi.

Kay Acklin made the following important point. The Certification Board is only judging what is provided. If this program proposal is not written well, the Board members are only reacting to what is written.

Elliott Lessen suggested the statement be revised to say, “The attention to the needs of exceptional learners or the developmental needs of all learners shows limited evidence.” Muhammad Abdullah and William Briggs asked for further clarification regarding exceptional learners. Does this need to be evident in all courses?

Linda Tafel reviewed the proposal for Standard 4. The first area of improvement will be revised and the second area of improvement will be revised to read as follows, “There is limited evidence of attention to the needs of exceptional learners or the developmental needs of all learners.”

Standard 5 – Faculty Qualifications, Performance and Development was met.

Standard 6 – Unit Governance and Resources was met with one area for improvement which read, “It is unclear if the unit effectively manages or coordinates all elements of the teacher education program.”

Elliott Lessen stated this area for improvement could be removed. Nina Dorsch agreed. The primary concern regarding rationale provided by the State Board of Education was the unit was obligated to accept all of this coursework so they had excessive course loads and requirements.

Linda Tafel confirmed that the area for improvement for Standard 5 will be removed so far as the Science program is concerned.

Linda Tafel reviewed each of the standards to ensure all Certification Board members were in agreement of the final decisions.

#### Standard 1 – Candidate Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions

Met

Remove the area for improvement

Rationale: The program sequences are in place.

#### Standard 2 – Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

Met with one area for improvement

The first area for improvement will be revised as follows, “The unit’s assessment system does not include an integrated set of evaluative measures.”

Remove the second area for improvement

Rationale: The assessment system does include data collection on candidate dispositions.

#### Standard 3 – Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

Met

#### Standard 4 – Diversity

Met with one area for improvement

Remove the first area for improvement

Rationale: An attempt has been made to hire staff. Two positions were offered and the individuals did not accept them.

The second area for improvement will be revised as follows, “There is limited evidence of attention to the needs of exceptional learners or the developmental needs of all learners.”

#### Standard 5 – Faculty Qualifications, Performance and Development

Met

## Standard 6 – Unit Governance and Resources

Met

Remove the area for improvement

Rationale: It is clear that the institution is effectively managing or coordinating all elements of the Science program.

Elliott Lessen moved to bring to the table the Illinois Institute of Technology Science program. Kay Acklin seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Elliott Lessen moved that the State Teacher Certification Board recommend continuing approval to the State Board of Education the Illinois Institute of Technology Science program, thereby authorizing the institution to continue offering the program. Linda Tafel seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Linda Tafel asked that during the discussion phase, the Certification Board members offer advice to both the institution and staff working with the institution with regard to any suggestions in the six standard areas as the Board evaluates this program in relation to other program reviews. IIT will come up for review in 2007.

There were no comments regarding Standard 1.

In regard to Standard 2, Kay Acklin stated there was consensus that the data collection was not systematically happening, and the recommendation to the institution be to focus on systematic collection of data on candidate dispositions. Nina Dorsch added the expectation of the review in 2007 will not only be that there is an assessment system, but that the institution is using that data for program improvement.

Connee Fitch-Blanks suggested that Standard 4 should include diversity in all course syllabi that is reflective of work in accommodations and modifications for the breadth of special needs learners. Dr. Fitch-Blanks further recommended that the institution continue their efforts to recruit a more diverse teaching population.

Laura Lipe stated that this report was not well written. There was a lot that could not be read between the lines. The written document can only be taken at face value. If the Certification Board does not receive all of the information, Board members can only base their decisions on what is presented.

Denise Williams asked that the record indicate that the letter dated August 26, 2004 received by Superintendent Schiller from the Illinois Institute of Technology should have been edited before it was sent. There was terseness in the written

letter. Ms. Williams again emphasized the letter contained many spelling errors as well as misspelled names.

**Special Note:** Kay Acklin, Facilitation Committee Chair (2004-2005), suggested the Facilitation Committee plan to meet at 7:45 a.m. on the morning of the Certification Board meetings in order to allow for adequate time for discussion.

**Adjournment:**

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  
September 2004

(None)

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

Recommended for Approval  
by State Board Staff  
September 2004

Aurora University

**ATTACHMENT**

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

Recommended for Approval  
by State Board Staff  
September 2004

Homewood-Flossmoor High School  
Community Consolidated School District 93  
Gurnee School District 56  
Sunset Ridge School District 29  
Carmi-White County School District 5  
Rochelle Township High School District 212  
East Coloma School District 12

Cook County  
DuPage County  
Lake County  
Cook County  
White County  
Ogle County  
Whiteside County

**Districts that Adopted Approved Programs  
September 2004**

\* 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  
September 2004

(None)

## **ATTACHMENT**

### **Renewal of Standard / Master Certificates**

List was available for review up to the week prior to the STCB meeting. A final printed version is available upon request.