TO: Illinois State Board of Education
FROM: Robert E. Schiller, Superintendent
        Christopher Koch, Director

Agenda Topic: 2002 Title II State Report Card

Materials: Sample Institutional Contextual Reports
           Summary Institutional Data Table with Quartile Rankings
           Section VI: Teacher Waiver Data Table

Staff Contact(s): Michael Long
                 Beth Hanselman

**Purposes of Agenda Item**

- To inform the Board about the development and contents of the Title II State Report Card, which is due to the U.S. Department of Education on October 7, 2002; and
- To identify policy, budget, and communication implications related to the State Report Card.

**Expected Outcome of Agenda Item**

- Board authorization to finalize and submit the State Report Card to the U.S. Department of Education.

**Background Information**

Title II of the 1998 Amendments to the Higher Education Reauthorization Act imposes accountability expectations on institutions of higher education that prepare teachers and the states in which they operate. The law establishes a three-tier reporting system.

- Each teacher training institution is required to submit specific information about its programs and program assessment results to the state in which it is located and to various publics. The first annual reports were submitted in April 2001, and the most recent data were provided this past spring. The 2002 reports are based on 2000-2001 state test results. Colleges and universities are obliged to develop contextual information that commonly includes the institution’s teacher education vision, admission requirements, “notable features and accomplishments,” and
other characteristics unique to the campus. (Two sample institutional context data reports are attached.)

- The Secretary of Education must use the separate state responses in the development of a report to the Congress on teacher preparation. The first report to the Congress was issued by the Secretary in April 2002. This report can be accessed at: http://www.title2.org/ADATitleIIReport2002.pdf. The second congressional report must be submitted in April 2003.

Since the fall 2000, multiple education entities have been engaged in preparing Illinois for Title II compliance. With the State Board of Education, the Governor’s Office, the Board of Higher Education, the Community College Board, and representatives of teacher education institutions have

- concurred on the definitions of “at risk” and “low performing” institutions;
- agreed to “The Illinois Plan for Preparing State and Institutional Report Cards on the Quality of Teacher Preparation” (http://www.isbe.net/teachers/Title_II/tt2info.htm) that was submitted to the U.S. Department of Education in October 2000; and
- endorsed a shared commitment to the use of Title II data and the State Board of Education institutional accreditation and program approval process to support the continuous development and improvement of teacher training in the state.

Although the State Board is responsible for preparing and filing the Illinois Report Card, agency staff members have worked in collaboration with teacher preparation institutions, the state’s teacher certification assessment contractor and others to compile and verify the data for the 2002 report card. The process is in its final stages and will be completed before the October 7, 2002, due date.

**Title II State Report Card Requirements**

The Title II State Report Card requires narrative responses to a series of issues posed by the federal government, data on multiple accountability indicators, and, whenever possible, a document reference or a web address. The report is organized as follows.

**Section I** - Descriptions of state teacher certification or licensure assessments and other requirements.

**Section II** - Description of state teacher standards, and the alignment between state teacher certification or licensure requirements and assessments and state student standards and assessments.
Section III - Data on statewide and institutional pass rates, including the following four tables.

- D1: State-Level Single-Assessment Pass-Rate Data for Regular Teacher Preparation Programs Within Institutions of Higher Education, by Institution
- D2: State-Level Aggregate and Summary Assessment Pass-Rate Data for Regular Teacher Preparation Programs Within Institutions of Higher Education, by Institution
- D3: State-Level Single-Assessment Pass-Rate Data for Regular Teacher Preparation Programs Outside of Institutions of Higher Education, by Program
- D4: State-Level Aggregate and Summary Assessment Pass-Rate Data for Regular Teacher Preparation Programs Outside of Institutions of Higher Education, by Program

(The summary data with quartile rankings is found on an attachment to this report.)

Section IV - Description of the criteria for assessing the performance of teacher training programs.

Section V - A listing of “low-performing” programs in the state, the criteria for identifying these programs, and the forms of technical assistance available to institutions determined to be in this condition.

Section VI - Information on waivers of State certification or licensure requirements.

Section VII - Description of the state’s “alternative routes to teacher certification or licensure, and pass rates for program completers of alternative routes.”

Section VIII - A listing and brief description of efforts by the state to improve teacher quality.

Analysis and Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action and Communications

Analysis

A substantial amount of the narrative in the reports to the U.S. Department of Education and the State Board reflects policies and procedures previously adopted by the Board (e.g., definitions of “at risk” and “low performing,” teacher certification assessments, institutional accreditation and program approval standards and procedures, etc.). These items were introduced in the 2001 Illinois Report Card.
However, two sections of the 2002 federal report, III and VI, deserve particular attention.

Section III: Pass Rate Data

The “Summary Institutional Data Table” (attached) identifies each of the 56 teacher education institutions required to submit testing data for Title II reporting purposes. (Please note that six colleges with fewer than ten program completers do not have score reports on the data table.) The table indicates the number of program completers during 2000-2001 and provides a summary of all pass rate results expressed as a percentage and performance on the basic skills and academic content knowledge tests (e.g., mathematics, English, foreign languages, etc.). Illinois, at present, does not have a test of professional knowledge and pedagogy, although the Assessment of Professional Teaching (APT) is under development and is scheduled to be available in October 2003.

The column entitled “Other Content Areas” reports pass rates on agriculture, business, and other career and technical fields. Finally, “Teaching Special Populations” documents program completer performance on assessments leading to certification in one or more of the special education categories.

By federal law, institutional pass rates are split into four quartiles for each testing area (e.g., basic skills, academic content, etc.). The last four lines on the table detail the quartile range and mean for the various tests, including the summary results.

In examining the data, you will find that the quartiles have minimal dispersion because the passing rates remain high. Consequently, the significance in being in the 3rd quartile on the basic skills test must be tempered by the fact that 98% of the program completers passed. In some instance, institutions with fewer completers are disadvantaged because one failure can drop the quartile ranking from Q1 to Q2. In the summary column, four failures could mean an institution is in the 4th quartile.

The quartile rankings do not have equal populations. For instance, under the summary column, 15 institutions are in quartile 1, 19 are in the 2nd quartile, and only 8 are in the 3rd and 4th quartiles respectively. This is a consequence of the non-disparate pass rates. Finally, a comparison of the summary results between 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 finds 12 institutions moved up at least one quartile while 13 dropped one quartile or more.

Board members will recall that the Enhanced Basic Skills test was introduced in the fall 2001, one year after the reporting period found on the table. It is likely that the 2001-2002 data will evidence a greater dispersion of pass rates and thereby lend more credence to the quartile rankings next year.

However, with the signing of SB1953 (P.A.92-0734), passage of the Basic Skills test, effective this fall, is a condition for acceptance into teacher education. Therefore, the 2004 Title II State Report Card will have a 100% pass rate for all institutions on the
basic skills test because a student cannot become program completers without admittance to a program and that admittance is now contingent upon passage of the test.

The same law also will impact the pass rate on future content tests. The statute stipulates that a candidate may not be admitted to student teaching until she/he has passed the appropriate content knowledge assessment. This aspect of the law becomes effective in 2004-2005. The result will mean that Illinois will have 100% pass rates in all subject-matter tests in the 2006 State Report Card because a person will not be able to become a program completer without student teaching and acceptance into this experience will be determined, in part, by performance on the state content knowledge test. In short, all program completers by law will have passed the basic skills test and the appropriate subject test.

The law, however, is tacit on the Assessment of Professional Teaching (APT) scheduled for introduction in October 2003. If this test is a certification examination rather than a program completion assessment, quartile rankings will reflect the disparate pass rates of program completers at all teacher training institutions. If, however, the APT is required as a condition of program completion, the state will witness 100% pass rates.

Section VI: Waivers of Licensure

• *Individuals Teaching with “Waivers”*- To assure consistency across the country, federal Title II rules define a waiver as “any temporary or emergency permit, license or other authorization that permits an individual to teach in a public school classroom without having received an initial certificate or license from that state or any other state.” Employing this definition, the following teachers are reported for Illinois.

• *Persons employed full-time on a Substitute Teaching Certificate.* (Note: the Chicago Public Schools is the only district in the state authorized by statute to employ individuals holding only a Substitute teaching certificate in a teaching position requiring a teaching certificate.) Substitute teaching certificates are issued to those with a baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited institution of higher learning. Substitutes may or may not have been prepared as a teacher.

• *Persons employed on a Transitional Bilingual Teaching Certificate.* Individuals who receive the Transitional Bilingual teaching certificate must pass the appropriate language proficiency exam and hold the equivalent of an undergraduate degree from a regionally accredited institution of higher learning. Many Transitional Bilingual certificate holders are prepared as teachers in their native country. However, that preparation often does not meet the requirements for an Initial Illinois teaching certificate. Therefore, these individuals must first receive the Transitional Bilingual certificate and
remove all remaining deficiencies prior to earning the Initial Teaching certificate.

- Persons employed on the Resident Teacher certificate. To receive the Resident Teaching certificate an individual must hold a baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited institution of higher learning, be enrolled in a program of preparation approved by the State Superintendent of Education in consultation with the State Teacher Certification Board, and must have passed the Basic Skills and Subject-Matter Knowledge assessments.

- Persons with other Illinois certificates that qualify as waivers under the federal definition include those with provisional vocational certificates, temporary provisional vocational certificates, part-time provisional certificates, and provisional alternative certificates. The latter is issued to candidates completing the internship phase of an approved alternative route to teacher certification program.

It is important to note that the Title II definition of waiver under the Higher Education Act is not entirely congruent with the concept of “highly qualified” as mandated by No Child Left Behind (NCLB) in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. For instance, the provisional alternative certificate is classified as a waiver for the Title II higher education determination, but the holder may be considered “highly qualified” under NCLB because he/she must have passed the state tests to earn the certificate. The same discrepancy can be found for the Resident Teacher certificate because passage of the basic skills and content tests is required as a criterion for issuance of the certificate. The U.S. Department of Education has indicated an intent to resolve these differences for the 2003 report.

Waiver Data

The waiver data reported in Section VI indicate Illinois has a greater percentage of teachers on waivers in 2000-2001 than in 1999-2000. (See attached Teacher Waiver Data table.) In 1999, 2.6% of the teaching force held one of the waiver certificates identified above, while that percentage increased to 3.2 in 2000. This is noteworthy because the total teaching population increased by nearly 4000 in 2000 over 1999.

It is particularly disturbing to note that the percentage of teachers on waivers in high-poverty districts increased from 5.4% in 1999 to 6.5% in 2000. (Federal 1997 poverty data were used by the U.S. Department of Education for the Title II report.) In non-high-poverty districts, the percentage moved from 1.2 to 1.5. The raw number of teachers serving on waivers in high-poverty districts (3066) in 2000-01 exceeds the number of teachers on waivers in all other districts in the state (1299). In 1999-00, 2512 were employed in high-poverty districts; slightly more than 1000 (1008) were teaching in non-high-poverty districts.
In 2000-2001, the waivers for high-poverty districts increased to 3066 while non-high-poverty districts employed 1299 teachers. The 2000-2001 data clearly indicate that high-poverty districts are more than twice as likely to employ teachers on waivers as non-high-poverty districts despite the fact that the poverty districts employ less than 35% of the teachers in the state. This follows the pattern noted in the 2001 State Report Card.

If the quality and qualifications of the classroom teacher remains the greatest determinant in student achievement, then the proliferation of waivers, particularly in districts that have the greatest need, represents a continuing policy problem. When aligned with the “highly qualified” expectations of No Child Left Behind, the matter becomes a political problem as well.

Policy Implications

The Title II State Report Card is intended to provide public accountability for teacher preparation policies and programs. While much has been done in the past few years to reform teacher training, at least one major policy issue remains. As the 2001 and 2002 Title II waiver reports illustrate, the employment of inappropriately certified teachers continues to differentially impact high-poverty districts. Policy considerations regarding the definition of “highly qualified” and the application of strategies to move the state toward full compliance with NCLB may ameliorate the waiver issue. However, policy will need to be attentive to issues of supply, particularly in shortage fields and high demand regions of the state.

Legislative Action

Legislative action may be necessary dependent upon the policy direction taken by the State Board. For instance, a policy to attract qualified teachers to high poverty districts by developing financial incentives may require legislation and, of course, concomitant budget support. Such legislation would be most effective in association with the Board’s partners, including the teacher unions, the Board of Higher Education, the superintendents’ and principals’ associations, and others.

Budget Implications

The budget implications should be driven by policy and legislative determinations. If, for instance, the Board chooses to adopt a policy and seek legislation on signing bonuses, reduced mortgage rates, and/or eligibility for retired teachers to return to the classroom without loss of pension benefits, appropriate budget considerations must be made. Similarly, if the Board were to increase the number of available alternative certification programs by offering financial incentives to institutions, a budget issue would be raised.

There are no budget, policy, or legislative implications for the preparation and submission of the Title II State Report Card.
Communication

Division of Professional Preparation and Recruitment staff will provide the Title II State Report Card to the Public Information Center and the Division of Public Service and Communications. In collaboration, a plan for the public distribution of the report and an explanation of its critical components is being developed.

Pros and Cons of Various Actions

Failure to file the Illinois Title II State Report Card by October 7, 2002, will find Illinois in non-compliance with the federal law.

Superintendent’s Recommendation

The State Board of Education should authorize staff to finalize and submit the 2002 Illinois Title II Report Card to the U.S. Department of Education and to the citizens of Illinois.

Next Steps

Following authorization from the State Board, staff will finalize the 2002 Title II State Report Card and submit it to the U.S. Department of Education not later than October 7, 2002. Prior to submission, however, staff will make the report available to teacher education institutions and other education partners, including the Board of Higher Education, the Community College Board, and the Governor’s Office. Finally, the State Board and the State Teacher Certification Board will be notified of the publication of the report in compliance with federal law.