NOTE: Staff presentations and detailed Board discussion typically take place during Committee meetings one month prior to State Board action in the plenary session.

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2006
6:00 – 8:00 p.m.  Danville Budget Hearing:  Finance & Audit Committee of the Whole
Room 306 Vermilion Hall, Danville Area Community College
2000 East Main Street, Danville

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2006
10:30 a.m.  Education Policy Planning Committee
Board Room
1-866-297-6391 (listen only);  Confirmation # 1 6 2 6 7 0 4 4

11:30 a.m.  Lunch Break

12:30 p.m.  Finance & Audit Committee
Board Room
1-866-297-6391 (listen only);  Confirmation # 1 6 2 6 7 0 4 4

*1:45 p.m.  Ad Hoc Rules Committee of the Whole
Board Room
1-866-297-6391 (listen only);  Confirmation # 1 6 2 6 7 0 4 4

3:30 – 5:30 Budget Hearing:  Finance & Audit Committee of the Whole
Board Room
1-866-297-6391 (listen only);  Confirmation # 1 6 2 6 7 0 4 4

* The meeting will begin at the conclusion of the previous session.

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 2006
8:30 a.m.  Governmental Relations Committee of the Whole
Board Room
1-866-297-6391 (listen only);  Confirmation # 1 6 2 6 7 0 4 5

9:30 a.m.  ISBE Plenary Session
Board Room
1-866-297-6391 (listen only);  Confirmation # 1 6 2 6 7 0 4 5

November 17-19, 2005  State Board Members attending IASB/IASA/IASBO Joint Annual Conference

State Board of Education “Meet & Greet” Conference Attendees, Comiskey Room, Hyatt Regency
Friday, November 17 from 1:30 – 3:30;  and
Saturday, November 18 from 1:30 – 3:30.

Sunday, November 19, 9:45 a.m.  – Thomas Lay Burroughs Outstanding School Board President Award
(during Third General Session)

NOTE: Chairman Ruiz will call for a break in the Board Plenary Session on Thursday at which time the Board will go into closed session.

All State Board of Education meetings listed on this agenda will be accessible to persons with disabilities. Persons planning to attend who need special accommodations should contact the Board office no later than the date prior to the meeting. Contact the Superintendent's office at the State Board of Education, Phone: 217-782-2221; TTY/TDD: 17-782-1900; Fax: 217-785-3972.
ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Board Room
100 North First Street, Springfield, Illinois
Thursday, November 16, 2006
9:30 a.m.

Public Conference Call Number: 1-866-297-6391 (listen only); Confirmation #: 1 6 2 6 7 0 4 5
The Plenary Session will also be audio broadcast via the Internet.

NOTE: Staff presentations and detailed Board discussion typically take place during Committee meetings one month prior to State Board action in the plenary session.

Plenary Business Meeting
A. Roll Call/Pledge of Allegiance
B. Resolutions & Recognition
   1. Joe Fatheree, 2006-07 ISBE Teacher of the Year (pp. 3-4)
   2. 2006-07 Student Advisory Council (p. 5)
   3. Resolution of Recognition for Casey-Westfield (p. 6)
   4. Resolutions for Blue Ribbon Schools (p. 7)
   5. Resolution of Recognition for Randy J. Dunn
C. Public Participation
D. Superintendent's Report
   * Consent Agenda
      All action consideration items listed with an asterisk (*) are considered to be routine and will be enacted in one motion and vote. Any board member who wishes separate discussion on any item listed on the consent agenda may remove that item from the consent agenda, in which event, the item will be considered in its normal sequence.

Action Considerations
   *1. Approval of Minutes
      a. October 19, 2006 (pp. 8–17)
   *2. Rules for Initial Review
      a. Part 1 (Public Schools Evaluation, Recognition and Supervision) (pp. 18–43)
   *3. Amendment of Student Information System Contract (pp. 44–46)
   4. Financial Plan of Harrisburg CUSD #3 (pp. 47–63)
E. Announcements and Reports
   1. Status Report from Hazard, Young, Attea and Associates (Bill Attea)
   2. IBHE Liaison Report (Dr. Proshanta Nandi)
   3. Superintendent’s Announcements
   4. Chairman’s Report
   5. Committee Reports
F. Information Items
   1. Monthly Informational Reports
      a. Monthly Status Report on Rulemaking (pp. 64–70)
      b. SBE Fiscal & Administrative Monthly Reports (pp. 71–86)
G. Adjourn

NOTE: Chairman Ruiz may call for a break in the Board Plenary Session at which time the Board will go into closed session.
Illinois State Board of Education Meeting
MINUTES
November 16, 2006
Illinois State Board of Education
100 North First Street, Springfield, Illinois

ROLL CALL/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Dr. Chris Ward, Vice Chairman, called the meeting to order at 9:45 a.m. Chairman Ruiz asked Ms. Jean Ladage, Assistant to the Board, to call the roll. A quorum was present. Dr. Randy Dunn, State Superintendent of Education, was also in attendance.

The Board members, Dr. Dunn, and anyone who wished to join them faced the American flag and recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

Vice Chairman Ward announced that the Board meeting was being audio-cast live over the Internet.

Members Present:
- Dr. Christopher Ward, Vice Chairman
- Dr. Vinni Hall, Secretary
- Dr. Andrea Brown
- Mr. Dean Clark
- Dr. David Fields
- Mr. Edward Geppert, Jr.
- Ms. Brenda Holmes
- Ms. Joyce Karon
- Mr. Jesse Ruiz, Chairman (Chairman Ruiz joined the meeting via conference call for a short time following roll call.)

RESOLUTIONS & RECOGNITION

Dr. Chris Ward, Vice-Chairman introduced and welcomed Mr. Joe Fatheree, 2006-07 Illinois Teacher of the Year. Dr. Ward stated that “Mr. Fatheree’s nomination lists him as an Instructor of Technology at Effingham High School, but he is much more than that. He started out as an English teacher, switched to history, and then to technology. Throughout his transitions there has been one constant; his firm commitment to creating a learning environment that reaches all students, including those who some have already given up on, and to challenge them to fulfill their potential. Joe’s accomplishments in the classroom and the community are numerous and multi-faceted so I am going to ask him to tell you about those himself.”

Mr. Fatheree stated that he grew up in a small impoverished community in Southern Illinois. He is an educator and a filmmaker who owes much of his success to a friend who inspired him to seek education. Joe has always been influenced by children who are at risk and goes out of his way to bring out the best qualities in all students and help them do the same for other students.

Three years ago Joe stated that he started a program after school to adopt a community; theirs’ being Metro East Area. The “No Barriers Project-creating opportunity through education” was designed to help students understand how extreme poverty impacts student success. His first effort was recruiting a group of students to pilot a poverty literacy program. During the program’s first year, students collected over 2500 coats for homeless children living in the East St. Louis Area. In the second year, the students collected over 4000 books and partnered with KCET, a PBS station in St. Louis, to find a literacy expert to take the books into homes of disenfranchised children to help them improve their reading skills. He also formed a partnership with a school in East St. Louis were his students have taught their students literacy skills, technology and film
They have also discussed the social and civic responsibilities of young adults. Mr. Fatheree commented the students don’t want to leave and go home; they want to stay; and they want to learn. The children that were initially being helped are now helping other children find their way out of poverty. That is what teaching is about, helping kids find their place in the world today. Students participating in this program are learning both academically and socially by gaining insight into other cultures and breaking down the barriers of miscommunication and misunderstanding. Every child on this earth is significant and deserves the right to learn. Joe hopes as Teacher of the Year to challenge teachers to open the door and bring the world into the classroom.

Mr. Fatheree has made several films for PBS and is a recipient of three Emmy Awards. Joe looks forward to developing movies where children can tell their own success stories. Joe stated that we have great things going on in education in this state and he looks forward to speaking this next year and celebrating the great educational happenings in Illinois. He thanked the Board for allowing him speak to them today.

Dr. Vinni Hall commented on what an amazing man Mr. Fatheree is, and how delighted she is to have him representing Illinois as Teacher of the Year.

Ms. Brenda Holmes commented that Mr. Fatheree is a perfect representative for the teachers of Illinois. Ms. Holmes asked that the Board find ways to showcase Mr. Fatheree’s passions and initiatives, and possibly fund and support them. Ms. Holmes also recognized and thanked Ms. Ann Muraro of our Public Information Division for all her help with the Teacher of the Year. Ms. Muraro is the contact person for Joe Fatheree.

Superintendent Dunn introduced Ms. Andrea Wingo, Assistant to the Superintendent and Advisor to the 2006-07 Student Advisory Council. Ms. Wingo will be leading a team of staff directing the 2006-07 Student Advisory Council.

Ms. Wingo recognized the Student Advisory Council members and their elected officials:

- Micah Berman, University of Illinois Laboratory School
- Kent Kiefer, Hamilton County High Schools
- Emma LePere, Belleville West Township High School
- Ryan Ornstein, Grayslake North High School
- Allison Tharp, Newton Community High School
- Andrea Lockley, East Richland High School
- Ariel Austin, King College Prep High School
- Nicholas Diaz, West Leyden High School
- Amy Maldonado, School of Social Justice High School
- Alix Olian, Highland Park High School
- Anna Bittman, New Trier High School (Co-Chairperson)
- Michael Byerley, Lemont High School (2nd Co-Chairperson)
- Joya Anthony, E. St. Louis Senior High School (Vice-Chairperson)
- Stephanie Matos, Carl Schurz High School (Secretary)
- Samuel Schoenburg, Springfield High School (Parliamentarian)

Ms. Anna Bittman, Co-Chairperson introduced the SAC elected officials and commented on how they are looking forward to working with the Board in the future. Ms. Bittman briefly updated the Board on the SAC’s previous year
projects and discussed upcoming plans for future projects. She also read the Student Advisory Council Mission Statement. Dr. Ward welcomed the SAC and stated that the Board looks forward to hearing from them at future meetings.

**Motion:**
Ms. Joyce Karon moved that the State Board of Education adopt the resolution recognizing Mr. Clyde Frankie and Casey-Westfield High School for their team effort and dedication to providing all students with a quality education following a fire at the school. Ms. Karon further moved that the Board adopt the resolution recognizing the eighteen USDE Blue Ribbon Schools from the State of Illinois. Those schools include:

- Cambridge Elementary School, Cambridge
- Lincoln Middle School, Park Ridge
- North Ward Elementary School, Tuscola
- Paul Butler Junior High School, Oak Brook
- Pleasant Hill Elementary School, Winfield
- Robert Frost Elementary School, Mt. Prospect
- Romona Elementary School, Wilmette
- Saint Anne Catholic School, Barrington
- South Elementary School, Des Plaines
- St. Lawrence O’Toole School, Matteson
- St. Theresa School, Palatine
- St. Thomas of Villanova, Palatine
- Westgate Elementary School, Arlington Heights
- Windsor Elementary School, Loves Park
- York Center Elementary School, Lombard
- Haines Middle School, St. Charles Comm. Unit SD 303
- Jones College Prep High School, Chicago
- Tremont High School, Tremont

Mr. Ed Geppert seconded the motion and it passed with a unanimous voice vote.

**Motion:**
Dr. Vinni Hall moved that the State Board of Education adopt the resolution honoring Dr. Randy J. Dunn. Ms. Joyce Karon seconded the motion and it passed with a unanimous voice vote.

**Resolution**

_Honoring_

Randy J. Dunn, Ed.D.
November 2006

WHEREAS, Randy J. Dunn, completed his doctoral degree in educational administration at the University of Illinois and his undergraduate studies in education at Illinois State University; and

WHEREAS, he began his education career as a fourth grade teacher in Gibson City, Illinois, later serving as principal at Paw Paw Grade School and Roanoke-Benson Middle School, then serving as Superintendent of the Argenta-Oreana Community Unit School District and the Chester Community Unit School District; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Dunn served as Chair of the Department of Education Administration and Higher Education at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale; and

WHEREAS, he has served as a consultant to school districts throughout Illinois on issues including strategic planning, financial analysis and administrative restructuring; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Dunn accepted the call to serve as Interim State Superintendent of Education in September, 2004, and answered the State
Board’s call to continue to serve as the state’s chief education officer through 2006; and

WHEREAS, during his time as State Superintendent, he led the Agency’s efforts to improve the Agency’s service to and support of Illinois educators while keeping a clear focus on improving student learning; and

WHEREAS, as State Superintendent Dr. Dunn led education in Illinois using an open, inclusive process - seeking input, weighing options, and never failing to make the best decisions for Illinois students; and

WHEREAS, through his expertise, honesty, integrity, openness and warm sense of humor, Agency employees and State Board of Education members quickly learned why Dr. Dunn is held in such high regard by educators throughout Illinois and beyond; and

WHEREAS, from the first students who entered his classroom in Gibson City to the more than two million students in Illinois schools today, Dr. Randy Dunn has served Illinois education wisely and well, making it clear that Illinois’ loss is Kentucky’s gain;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Illinois State Board of Education extends its heartfelt appreciation to Randy J. Dunn on this, the sixteenth day of November, 2006, for his untiring work and dedication and wishes him much success as President of Murray State University.

Chairman Jesse Ruiz addressed Dr. Dunn by phone from Israel. The Chairman thanked Dr. Dunn for his friendship as well as his dedication and hard work, and wished him all the best.

Mr. Dean Clark thanked Dr. Dunn for all the time, effort and energy he has put into making ISBE what it is today. Mr. Clark commented that it is gratifying to see what Randy has done throughout the state and the way he has worked with Board members and staff. Mr. Clark comment on what a great amount of respect Dr. Dunn has throughout the state and thanked him for everything he has done for Illinois.

Mr. Ed Geppert commented that Dr. Dunn has been a great supportive resource in the budget process in regards to information and advice. He has helped build confidence throughout the state in regards to the State Board, and the agency is far better now for him being here.

Dr. Dave Fields commented to Dr. Dunn that success leaves footprints and that Dr. Dunn has certainly left them here in Illinois.

Ms. Brenda Holmes thanked Dr. Dunn not only for the hard work he had contributed to the agency but also helping the Board work together. Brenda wished Dr. Dunn tremendous success at Murray State University.

Dr. Andrea Brown thanked Dr. Dunn and that she will miss him and his ability to be a great interpreter.

Dr. Chris Ward thanked Dr. Dunn for his wisdom and leadership, noting that he is a great human being who has represented himself well throughout Illinois.
Superintendent Dunn thanked everyone for their kind comments and stated that he loves Illinois and will continue to keep track of its developments and continued progress. Dr. Dunn commented the Board has presented great leadership and the staff at the ISBE has been an excellent group of people to work with. Dr. Dunn commented that being the Superintendent of Education for Illinois has been an opportunity of a lifetime and he thanked the Board for the opportunity and their friendship.

| PUBLIC PARTICIPATION | Janet Milkovich from Recording for the Blind Dyslexic spoke to the Board on the service improvements that have been made possible by the FY 07 budget funding. She asked that the Board continue to support services for the disabled and noted that there are 310,000 special education students in Illinois and 210,000 of these students do have the capacity to improve their reading comprehension and retention by learning through listening. RFB&D currently serves 9,000 students in the state. Ms. Milkovich asked that the Board increase the FY08 funding to $325,000.00 which would allow RFB&D to renew the memberships of the 100 schools they are now serving and allow them to expand to 100 new schools. Ms. Milkovich said she cannot think of a single school that does not need their services and asked that we continue to support RFB&D.  

Ms. Paula Pergament from the Adler Planetarium spoke on the Adler’s Education Programs. Their goal is to inspire interest in science and they work toward achieving this by providing teachers with professional development, classroom materials and giving students unique educational experiences in the classroom. The Adler looks forward to partnering with the ISBE to provide distance learning and educational resources to schools throughout Illinois. She also invited the Board to meet with Adler’s educational staff and to tour the Planetarium when they are traveling in the area. Ms. Pergament thanked the Board for their continued support and allowing her the time to speak to them today.  

Ms. Sue Walter, Union Professional Development Director, Staff Liaison and a member of the Illinois Federation of Teachers’ Special Education Task Force thanked the Board for the clarification and in-depth discussion on Part 226 Special Education proposed rules at yesterday’s committee meeting. Ms. Walters stated that IFT is strongly opposed to the proposed language, which would increase the percentage of students with IEPs who can receive services in a general education classroom during a given period from 30% to 40%. This change will affect the quality of services/instruction provided to students with IEPs, as well as students in the general education classroom. The other issue they are strongly opposed to is the proposed language on class size/case load and they urge the State Board to maintain the current Illinois categorical class size/case load numbers with the exception of a resource class size/case load, which they recommend changing to a maximum of 15. Ms. Walters thanked the Board for the opportunity to provide comments on Part 226 Special Education proposed rules.  

Dr. Hall commented that Special Education teachers support students with a variety of needs and that too many children in a classroom can be a serious problem.  

ANNOUNCEMENT: Dr. Chris Ward announced that in support of National Recess Week and in conjunction with Cartoon Network’s Operation Rescuing Recess Program, the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPERINTENDENT’S REPORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consent Agenda Items and Motions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of the Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules for Initial Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment to Student Information System Contract</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board has received a sort of *public participation via U.S. Mail*. Hundreds – maybe thousands of students have sent hand-written notes and hand-drawn sketches in support of National Recess Week which was celebrated the week of September 18, 2006. The letters are on display in Becky Watt's office and the Board is encouraged to browse through them. The students emphasized the importance of recess and listed the activities that they enjoy, such as: *four-square*, basketball, swings, *tag*, and going down the slides.

**Vice Chairman Ward** commented that all items listed with an asterisk (*) on the agenda are considered to be routine and will be enacted in one motion and vote. Any board members who wishes separate discussion on any item listed on the consent agenda may remove that item from the consent agenda, in which the event, the item will be considered in its normal sequence.

Superintendent Dunn gave the Board members a brief summary on the items on the consent agenda. Dr. Dunn then asked General Counsel Darren Reisberg to summarize the proposed action on rules.

Mr. Reisberg reported that the only rulemaking coming before the Board today involves changes to Part 1 (Public School Evaluation, Recognition and Supervision) related to school and district improvement plans and updates to the rules on qualifications for supervisory and administrative personnel. The Superintendent is recommending that the Board authorize the solicitation of public comment on this rulemaking, including publication of the proposed amendments in the Illinois Register.

Vice Chairman Ward asked for a motion regarding the consent agenda.

**Approval of the Minutes**

Mr. Dean Clark asked that the minutes of October 19, 2006, be corrected to read Maine East High School and Maine South High School under Mr. Michael Pressler’s public participation testimony. The minutes were corrected as requested by Mr. Clark. Dr. David Fields moved that the State Board of Education minutes be approved (as corrected) for the meeting on October 19, 2006. Mr. Dean Clark seconded the motion and it passed with a unanimous voice call vote.

**Rules for Initial Review**

**Part 1 (Public Schools Evaluation, Recognition and Supervision)**
The State Board of Education hereby authorizes the solicitation of public comment on the proposed rulemaking for:

Public Schools Evaluation, Recognition and Supervision (23 Illinois Administrative Code 1),

including publication of the proposed amendments in the *Illinois Register*.

**Amendment to Student Information System Contract**
The State Board of Education authorizes the State Superintendent to increase the current contract with IBM up to $595,000 for purposes of additional work, as documented, to be completed on the Student Information System.

END OF THE CONSENT AGENDA
**Financial Plan of Harrisburg CUSD #3**

Superintendent Dunn noted that just over a year ago, Harrisburg CUSD #3 was certified in financial distress. Harrisburg submitted their three-year financial plan to the State Board on December 2, 2005. Since that time Harrisburg has hired a new superintendent, Dennis Smith. Superintendent Smith has reviewed the plan and is here today to ask for modifications to the plan. Debbie Vespa, Division Administrator for School Business and Support Services, introduced Superintendent Dennis Smith of Harrisburg Community Unit School District #3.

Superintendent Smith asked to take a minute to thank Dr. Dunn for all he has done to help him better understand education and transition into Southern Illinois.

Superintendent Smith stated that the previous plan was too optimistic which did not encourage the local school board to act quickly to make the changes necessary in order to avoid the oversight panel. The new plan was presented to the Harrisburg Board asking them to consider a Working Cash Bond or cuts in the amount of $425,000.00. Superintendent Smith stated that the Board is currently working on his suggestions and will determine next week if they will run a Cash Bond and what the amount will be. They cannot consider a Cash Bond without it being in the plan, so Superintendent Smith has written it into the plan and specified that it would only be used for debt reduction. Superintendent Smith stated that school board is aware that they need to do something to help the school district and he intends to see that they do with his help. Deb Vespa also noted that Superintendent Smith is looking into an internal oversight panel to help the district oversee their financial issues.

Ed Geppert complimented Superintendent Smith for coming forward and taking a leadership role to help the district improve their financial status.

**Motion:**

Mr. Ed Geppert moved that the Illinois State Board of Education hereby approves the amended financial plan submitted by Harrisburg Community Unit School District #3. Mr. Dean Clark seconded the motion and it passed with a unanimous voice vote.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REPORTS:**

**Status Report from Hazard, Young, Attea and Associates**

Mr. Bill Attea from Hazard, Young, Attea & Associates, Ltd. (HYA) shared with the Board copies of the revised draft of characteristics desired for the state superintendent search. Mr. Attea noted that now that the elections are over HYA will be meeting with the Governor’s staff to update them on the search and ask for their input. HYA is seeking the Board’s approval on the following criteria:

**Revised Draft . . . Characteristics Desired**

The Illinois State Board of Education seeks an experienced educational leader who has been a teacher and administrator at the elementary, secondary and/or college level(s). The sought after individual will place the interests of students as a priority at all times and has demonstrated the ability to:

- Address the educational and political responsibilities of the position, while placing the educational needs of students ahead of political expediency.
- Communicate effectively with all stakeholders, both internal and external to the Agency.
• Lead and manage a complex organization through a strong leadership team that builds capacity within the organization.
• Improve student performance through a comprehensive system of standards and assessment and the implementation of proven methods that address the achievement gap, and by encouraging local districts to access resources available at the local, regional, state and federal levels.
• Build consensus and rally support for sustainable change.
• Be responsive to the needs of all students, local districts, Regional Offices of Education and other constituents.
• Understand the requirements of federal and state laws and regulations, as well as the impact on student learning, and oppose laws and regulations that deter the ability to maximize student learning.
• Build positive relationships with constituents who are internal and external to the organization.
• Work successfully with the Governor, State Legislature, Congress and the U.S. Department of Education.
• Develop processes and procedures necessary to provide consistency in decision-making and to ensure effective and efficient operations.
• Facilitate the Governor and State Board in defining and articulating a vision for the State, and provide the leadership to implement the vision through effective short and long term strategic planning.

The State Board seeks an individual who has a commitment to equitable opportunities for all students, through understanding of school finance and the resultant inequities of current funding mechanism, and a commitment to take leadership in securing additional resources and the development of a new formula that will ensure that additional funding will contribute to greater equity across the state. The Board also seeks a leader who is collaborative yet decisive, who demonstrates integrity, objectivity, fairness and vision and who establishes high expectations for self and others.

An earned doctorate from an accredited institution is preferred.

Joyce asked if the list was in order of importance. Mr. Attea responded by saying that this list is actually the priorities by the constituent groups that HYA had met and interviewed. The list is presented as a totality of what Illinois is looking for in our next Superintendent.

The Board will place approval of the criteria on the December agenda.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Reports</th>
<th>Board Operations Committee of the Whole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No meeting this month.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Education Policy Planning Committee**

Dr. Fields reported that he and the following committee members were in attendance: Dr. Andrea Brown, Mr. Ed Geppert, Dr. Vinni Hall, and Ms. Joyce Karon. Dr. David Fields commented that the committee discussed the following topics:

• Approved the minutes for the October 2006 EPPC Meeting
• Dana Kinley and Lizzanne DeStefano, U of I, Urbana/Champaign reviewed the results of the of the implementation study of the Illinois Learning Standards with the Committee.
• Connie Wise discussed and reviewed the Statewide Report on Staff and Administrator Demographics.
• Becky McCabe spoke to the Committee on increasing the current contract with IBM for the Student Information System.
• Dr. Dunn and Ginger Reynolds shared a research project on High School Reform from Great Lakes West.

Finance and Audit Committee of the Whole
Mr. Edward Geppert reported that he and the following committee members were in attendance: Dr. Andrea Brown, Ms. Brenda Holmes and Mr. Dean Clark. Mr. Edward Geppert reported that the committee discussed the following topics:
• Linda Mitchell updated the Committee on the FY 08 budget.
• Deb Vespa gave an update on the Financial Oversight Panel and School Finance Authorities including the changes in the Harrisburg Financial Plan.
• Approved the minutes for the October 2006 Committee Meeting.
• Mr. Geppert noted that five of the eight scheduled budget hearings throughout the state have been held.

Governmental Relations Committee of the Whole
Ms. Brenda Holmes reported that she and the following committee members were in attendance: Mr. Dean Clark, Mr. Jesse Ruiz & Dr. Chris Ward. Ms. Holmes reported that the members of the committee discussed the following topics:
• Approved the minutes for the September 2006 Governmental Relations Meeting
• Nicole Wills and Josh Jacobs updated the Board on the upcoming legislative initiatives for the 2006 Veto Session.
• Nicole and Josh reviewed the 2007 legislative proposals with the Committee and will continue to review on a regular basis.
• Discussed advocacy issues with the General Assembly and Governors’s Office.

Ad Hoc Rules Committee
Mr. Darren Reisberg reported that all members were in attendance, with the exception of Mr. Ruiz. Mr. Reisberg reported that the members discussed the following topics:
• Public Participation: Ms. Penny Richards, Ms. Charlotte Desjardins, Ms. Sue Walter from IFT and Daryl Morrison from IEA spoke on Part 226 Special Education Rules.
• Dr. Chris Koch reviewed and answered questions on Part 226.
• Reviewed information items on Less Red Tape.

Superintendent’s Announcements
Illinois Board of Higher Education Liaison Report
Dr. Dunn introduced Dr. Proshanta Nandi who has been joining us at the Board meetings as a representative from the Illinois Board of Higher Education. Dr. Nandi spoke on the issues discussed at the Illinois Board of Higher Education meeting on October 10, 2006. Dr. Nandi stated that they discussed the approval of new programs and members were updated on the budget. They also welcomed Dr. Glenn Poshard the new President of Southern Illinois University. Dr. Nandi commented that there is great concern over proprietary education. Many universities are granting doctorate degrees without advisors or oversight, and that this type of educating is here to stay and we are going to have to find ways to work with it and know when to draw the line.
Dr. Nandi commented that on a personal note he is very concerned by the violence in the schools, and feels that as educators we should work together to address this problem. Dr. Nandi asked that we do everything in our power to help reduce the violence and crime in our schools and to provide a safe environment for learning.

Dr. Dunn noted that the Chicago Lighthouse for the Blind is in its centennial year and has chosen to honor the Board with a Centennial Medal which he accepted on their behalf. The Chicago Lighthouse for the Blind is very grateful for the funding they have received in the FY07 budget. Dr. Dunn asked that everyone take a moment to look at the centennial medal on display.

Dr. Dunn commented that Ms. Meta Minton, Director of Public Information, will be leaving the State Board of Education and moving to Florida to be an editor for the Daily Sun Newspaper in Lady Lake, Florida.

Information Items

Vice Chairman Ward asked that the Board members please read the Monthly Status Report on Rulemaking and the State Board of Education Fiscal and Administrative Monthly Reports printed in the Board meeting materials each month for information purposes. There were no inquires this month regarding these reports.

Closed Session

Dr. Vinni Hall moved that the Board enter into closed session under the exceptions set forth in the Open Meetings Act of the State of Illinois as follows:

Section c 1 for the purpose of considering the appointment, employment, compensation, performance or dismissal of an employee;

Section c 3 for the purpose of considering the selection of a person to fill a public office;

Section c 11 for the purpose of considering pending or probable litigation against or affecting the Board; and

Dr. Hall further moved that the Board might invite anyone they wish to have included in this closed session.

Dr. Dave Fields seconded the motion and it was passed with a unanimous roll call vote.

The open meeting recessed at 11:30 a.m. and the Board went into closed session at 11:40 p.m. The open meeting reconvened at 12:25 p.m.

Motion for Adjournment

Ms. Brenda Holmes moved that the meeting be adjourned. Dr. Andrea Brown seconded the motion and it passed with unanimous voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dr. Vinni Hall
Board Secretary

Mr. Jesse Ruiz
Chairman
GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
November 16, 2005
Springfield, Illinois

Committee Members Present
Brenda Holmes, Chair
Chris Ward
Dean Clark

Other Board Members
Joyce Karon
Vinni Hall
Ed Geppert
Dave Fields

Others
Randy Dunn
Jean Ladage
Winnie Tuthill
Josh Jacobs
Nicole Wills
Darren Reisberg

Board Members Absent
Jesse Ruiz

1. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:
   There was no public participation.

2. INFORMATION ITEM
   • The September Governmental Relations committee notes were made a part of the record.
     The motion was made by Dr. Chris Ward and seconded by Dean Clark.

3. VETO SESSION UPDATE
   • Several bills, including two State Board initiatives are before the General Assembly awaiting potential action:
     o SB 2796 (ISBE initiative – Due Process Hearing Procedures) – The Senate concurred on the House amendments on Wednesday the 15th. The bill will now be sent to the Governor for signature or veto.
     o SB 858 – Requires private school teachers to undergo background checks. This legislation is under discussion with interested parties and the legislation’s sponsor. It will be on hold until the spring until all parties agree on the language.
     o SB 1856 (ISBE initiative – Obsolete & Duplicative Sections of School Code Repeal) – This legislation was heard before the House Education committee on Wednesday and passed out to the floor. The sponsor, Representative Lang, has agreed with a committee request to hold the bill until chart is provided by ISBE outlining all specific statutes proposed for repeal and the explanation of why such statutes were proposed.
     o SB 863 – Cleans up an issue from SB 2202, which passed last spring and sets parameters for early childhood teachers and student teaching candidates.
     o SB 380 – The House Education committee took testimony on, but did not act upon, this legislation that would allow the Oswego School District to extend their general obligation bond debt limitation.
     o SJR 94 (Waiver Resolution) – The House and Senate Education committees held substantive discussions on the 2006 fall waiver report. Committee members made numerous comments on the Board’s recommendations and individuals gave testimony, but no action was taken. In the House Education Committee, a legislator made comments about the Board sending over P.E. applications without comment when the junk food rules just passed. There was also consternation from legislators over the Chicago Public Schools application and the State Board was asked to provide Board members specific thoughts on why the Board members voted to send over the CPS application without comment. In the Senate, Senator del Valle asked numerous questions about driver’s education staffing levels at the State Board, driver’s education teacher training and driver’s education curriculum.

   • During the recent election, both chambers remained with Democrats in the majority, though the Senate Democrats gained enough seats so that they now have a veto proof majority. General leadership or committee leadership will not be known until the 95th General Assembly convenes in January.
4. **2007 LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS**

   **SBE LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS**

- Legislative proposals 1, 2 and 3 (SBE Federal Indirect Cost Recovery Fund, General State Aid/AllKids Calculations and Technology Immersion Pilot Project Extension) are all technical changes or do not create any substantive policy changes to agency operations.

- Proposal 4 - (No Attendance Penalty – Interrupted Day) – If there is an interrupted school day, the whole district must be released for no attendance penalty. This legislation would allow just one school to be released when it is not necessary for the entire district to be released without the district facing an attendance penalty.

- Proposal 5 – (Parent Teacher Conferences) – This would allow three ways of computing parent-teacher conferences in the Code so that waivers are not needed.

- Proposal 6 – (Special Education Personnel – 180 Day) - This change will alter the Special Education Personnel Reimbursement calculation for a full school year to 180 days instead of the current 185 days. Districts are required to set a school calendar at 185 (which allows for 5 emergency days), but the minimum school term is 180 days. Currently, districts are being penalized reimbursement because the formula is based on the 185 days. Board members Brenda Holmes expressed concerns that there could be a perception issue with this particular proposal and would emphasize working with the special education advocacy groups to make sure they understand the intent and impact if this proposal does move forward.

- Proposal 7 – (General State Aid – 22 Payments) – This proposal was before the Board last year. It does not reduce the dollar amount for General State Aid; it simply reduces the number of payments from 24 to 22.

- Proposal 8 – (Financial Oversight Panels) – Currently, there are three statutory provisions that govern Financial Oversight Panels (FOP) and School Finance Authorities (SFA) and all have different levels of authority. This proposal would combine the three statutes so that any new action would fall under a new FOP, but existing FOPs or SFAs would continue to operate under current provisions. Committee member Ed Geppert requested the rationale for changing the number of FOP members from three to five under the new FOP.

- Proposal 9 – (H/L/S P-TELL Exemptions) This legislation would allow districts to go outside of the Property Tax Extension Limitation Law to correct issues that are violations of the Health/Life/Safety Code. In order to increase accountability, districts would be required to do a Capitol Development Plan and they would be on a five year cycle for review instead of a ten year review. Board members asked Deb Vespa to put together a summary outlining the process for applying for Health/Life/Safety funds.

- Proposal 10 – (PA 94-1019 Clean-up) – This legislation corrects certain issues from the reorganization legislation from the spring that were inadvertently not addressed within the final draft of the legislation. It does not change the intent of the new reorganization law.

- Proposal 11 – (Article 11E re-org Incentives) – Under the new Article 11E, the intent was the new reorganizations would be eligible for incentive dollars, but PA 94-1019 unintentionally left some things out and this proposal fixes those issues.

- Proposal 12 – (Reading Improvement Block Grant) – Helps streamline and clarify the Reading Improvement Block Grant

- Proposal 13 – (Educator Supply & Demand Report Changes) – Changes the date of submission for the Educator Supply & Demand Report and makes the submission every two years instead of annually.

- Proposal 14 – (Obsolete & Duplicative Round 2) – This legislation continues efforts to clean up the School Code.

- Proposal 15 – (School Holiday Waivers) – Would allow decisions concerning school holiday waivers to be done at the local level without requiring a waiver.

- Proposal 16 – (NBPTS – required mentoring) – Would require master’s teacher to provide mentoring in order to be eligible for the stipend and would allow mentoring to take place during the day.

- Proposal 17 – (Eliminate CEU) – Eliminates the Continuing Education Unit (CEU) as a measure of professional development. This proposal does not eliminate options for teachers doing professional development, but instead has all professional development done under one measure – Continuing Professional Development Units (CPDUs).

- Proposal 18 – (Fee increases for certificates/endorsements) – Would increase the fee for certificates and endorsements from $30.00 to $50.00 and would require Master’s certificates.
to pay an application fee, which under these new requirements would be $50.00. Additionally, individuals seeking approvals (i.e. paraprofessionals, educational interpreters) would be required to pay a $25 fee (currently there is no fee). Brenda Holmes requested that the Certification Division provide a breakdown of the way the money in the Teacher Certification Revolving Fund has been used the last three years.

- Proposal 19 – (Eliminate out-of-state testing waivers) – This legislative proposal would require out of state applicants to take all the state tests (no waivers would be given), but applicants would be given a provisional certificate for a longer period of time (two years) to allow them time to take all necessary tests.

- Proposal 20 – (Eliminate the Alternative Math-Science Certificate Statute) – This proposal would eliminate this particular certificate because no such programs or certificate have ever been granted and an alternate math-science certificate can be gained through other statutory provisions.

- Proposal 21 – (Combine Resident Teacher Cert and Illinois Teacher Corps) – Confusion exists because of similar language in these two statutes. This proposal would combine and streamline the language.

- Proposal 22 – (Combine & Revise Alternate Certification Statutes) – Currently there are three provisions for alternate certification. This proposal would eliminate one provision and combine the remaining two to streamline the language.

- Proposal 23 – (School Breakfast Program) – Makes more changes to the School Breakfast Program. This proposal would change the reporting requirements to the Governor and General Assembly. Chairwoman Holmes requested staff provide information regarding who this proposal helps and why the need for the date changes.

- Proposal 24 – (Textbook Publication Technology) – This proposal changes a reference to assistive technology to make it more general. What is currently referenced in statute is out of date and the technology used now will soon be out of date.

- Proposal 25 – (Fee for Duplicate Certificate) – Raises the fee for duplicate certificates from $8.00 to $20.00.

- Proposal 26 – (Retired HQ Teachers Returning to Work) – This proposal would allow highly qualified teachers who are retired to return to the classroom in hard-to-staff schools.

- Proposal 27 – (General Obligation Debt Limitation) – Increases from 6.9% to 9% for dual districts and 13.8% to 15% for unit districts as the percentage that a school district can extend its general obligation debt limitation without special legislation. The proposal also allows a district to extend greater than 9% or 15% depending on the type of district, to 30% without special legislation, but still requires a referendum.

- Proposal 28 – (School Construction) - These changes do not change the priority list or application cycle for any districts that have submitted applications. The proposal changes the definition of aging school building, allows special education co-ops and vocational co-ops to be eligible for funds and sets the grant index at .75, which is the maximum the state will contribute under current law, allows districts with a poverty concentration of 95% or higher to have a grant index of .95 (i.e. state provides 95% of funds), removes obsolete language to debt service grants and allows a Committee of Ten to apply for funds on the behalf of a newly consolidated district.

5. **BOARD ADVOCACY**

- Chairwoman Holmes emphasized if Board members would like to visit the Capitol or express an opinion to legislative officials, to check with Nicole Wills and Josh Jacobs to make sure the Board members have the latest information on the legislation. It was also emphasized that when speaking with legislators, Board members were speaking the Board as a whole, not as individual members.

- Vinni Hall urged meeting at least once a year with members with the education committees to have either a formal or informal discussion on education issues.

6. **ADJOURN**: Committee member Chris Ward made the motion to adjourn and it was seconded by Dean Clark. The Governmental Relations Committee meeting adjourned at 9:33 A.M.
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Vinni Hall called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

1. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: Daryl Morrison, representing the Illinois Education Association, provided that organization’s position on Part 226 (Special Education). With regard to the provisions on class size and case load, he described the large number of calls received from IEA members. He noted the great concern and considerable amount of misinformation among affected individuals. Mr. Morrison also mentioned the favorable position of the State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities regarding these amendments. He pointed out that the IEA does not have any representation on that Council, stating that the IEA had recommended someone but that no appointment had yet been made by the Governor. In addition, the earlier task force on which the IEA had had representation had been divided on this issue and no agreement had been reached. He hoped the IEA members’ comments would be taken into consideration.

As to the change from 30 to 40 percent prevalence of students with disabilities in a “general education classroom”, Mr. Morrison indicated that “big things” might occur in districts. He noted that he had attended all but four of the hearings that had been held around the state and that teachers had repeatedly stated great concern for increasing class size and case load, as those changes would affect students in both general and special education. He reiterated the IEA’s opposition to the rules as they stood.

Sue Walter, union professional development director and staff liaison for special education of the Illinois Federation of Teachers, provided two hand-outs for the Board: (1) a written copy of the IFT’s testimony; and (2) a compilation of comments from general education teachers discussing the change from a 30 percent limit on special education students in a general education classroom to 40 percent. She noted that a recent article in the IFT publication had apparently prompted many responses and that the IFT strongly opposed the changes related to case load and class size, which are not related to the reauthorization of IDEA. She pointed out that students have come to require increasingly complex services and that the consequences for failure to make adequate yearly progress add to the pressure on educators. As proposed, she believed the rules would have the potential to negatively affect the quality of services. She highlighted the following additional points.

The rules permit use of the “discrepancy model” in identifying a specific learning disability only if Response to Intervention (RtI) is first used. The IFT recommends the option of using either approach at local discretion. Ms. Walter noted that the final federal regulations would allow this and stated that
Illinois should not exceed the federal requirements. The rules should not preclude appropriate decision-making, which might lead to either over- or under-representation.

She stated that the IFT also opposes the categorical class size changes and urges ISBE to maintain the current maximums, except that the limit for resource classes should be reduced to 15 in light of the diverse students served. The period-by-period basis stated in the rules could allow teachers to have unlimited caseloads, would be impossible for ISBE to monitor, and would therefore be susceptible to abuse. Ms. Walter also recollected her participation in the 2004 task force that had been unable to come to consensus on this issue.

Lydia Bullock, also representing the IFT, yielded her time allotment to Ms. Walter so that the latter could continue her remarks. Ms. Walter proceeded to outline further the IFT’s opposition to permitting general education classrooms to include as many as 40 percent students with disabilities, based on decreasing the quality of services to students with individualized education programs as well as those without IEPs. She read a comment from a high school mathematics teacher whose greatest frustration was the inability to give students the kind of attention they need, especially when large numbers of students have IEPs. In a class of 30 students, 30 percent equates to six to eight students. The general educator works with the special education teacher and also exercises “constant vigilance”, but should be doing more. This teacher expressed anxiety for the potentially dramatic effect of the proposed changes, stating that 30 percent already is a great challenge.

Ms. Walter went on to note that she had served as a special education teacher for 21 years and had been struck by the fact that not one of the letters had said, “These kids should not be in our classrooms.” All had been focused instead on meeting their needs.

Penny Richards, of the Learning Disabilities Association of Illinois, noted that she would not re-read the statement she had presented earlier during the meeting of the Educational Policy Planning Committee. She indicated that parents lack knowledge of what RtI means and that no timelines are provided, or information as to what will be examined. She stated that students can remain in “flexible delivery” for up to four years. Also, there is no accommodation for RtI students in higher education (because they are identified as “eligible” but not as having learning disabilities). She went on to state that, among the incarcerated population, there is a high prevalence of individuals with learning disabilities. As a surrogate parent for the Department of Corrections, she felt parents are refused services because RtI is in general education rather than special education, and that the only recourse is due process. Ms. Richards also indicted that a case load of 100 to 150 would result from the proposed rules. She concluded that the task force referred to previously had been disbanded because its members would not agree with ISBE’s position.

Finally, Ms. Richards indicated ISBE would not have to delete so much of the language from Part 226, indicating that all that is required is to report to LEAs on the rules that exceed federal requirements...

Susy Woods, vice chairperson of the State Advisory Council, indicated that she took the opportunity to comment very seriously and wanted to offer clarification regarding the Council’s position on case load and class size. She noted that information may be changed as it is repeated, and that the Council supports the spirit of the rule changes, acknowledging that the document is not perfect but represents a compromise among all who want to shape it. She considered the amendments a “brave attempt” to move away from categorical labels, which she believed to be essential. The approach taken was stated to be a different way of thinking, and she noted that it would be impossible to look at the entire field of special education and find agreement. She pointed out that the Advisory Council includes quite a variety of people and that, on balance, the Council supports these rule changes, emphasizing also that the changes must be implemented correctly.

Charlotte Desjardins, Executive Director of the Family Resource Center on Disability, indicated that the role of these centers is to make sure families understand their rights. She described receiving more than 4,000 calls per year over a period of many years. She stated that this was not the first
time a different proposal had come up, indicating that ideas had surfaced over and over to expand
class size and case load. She exhorted the Board, “Do not be the first Board to accept these
changes.” She went on to remind the Board that students are placed in a special education
classroom as a last resort, when their needs are too complex or unique to be served in the general
education classroom. Inclusion in general education is the best option when feasible, but it is not
always feasible. She urged the Board to think about the impact on students with severe or profound
needs and not to believe money could be saved by cutting services to them. She described it as
simple common sense to invest in their future today, because that would save money in the long run.

2. MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER AD HOC RULES COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
Brenda Holmes moved that the minutes of the October meeting of the Ad Hoc Rules Committee of
the Whole be approved. Dean Clark seconded the motion and it carried on a voice vote.

3. DISCUSSION ITEM
With the Board’s permission, Agenda Item 4 was moved forward and addressed prior to Agenda Item
3, so that Dr. Koch could provide an update on the rules for Special Education (Part 226). Dr. Koch
was joined by Beth Hanselman, Division Administrator for Special Education Services in Springfield.

Dr. Koch began by noting it was exciting to be a part of special education at this time because so
many people care about it. He went on to note that some 70-75 percent of the comments received on
the proposed amendments related to case load and class size, characterizing this as a “lightning rod”
issue. He reminded the Board of the informational steps that the agency had taken, including the
public hearings and a variety of presentations. He recapped the five questions that had guided the
development of the proposed amendments:

1) Does the current rule duplicate federal language?
2) Does the rule offer express protection to students?
3) What need for regulation is indicated by our experience in general supervision?
4) What has been the thrust of public comment in the past?
5) What does research show?

Dr. Koch emphasized that financial aspects had not been part of the criteria as some seemed to
suppose. He noted that this was not the first time people had said there were too many regulations
and noted that HR 359 had caused review efforts along these lines to begin several years previously.
He also noted that changing the 1970s version of some provisions in the rules would be difficult
because it was “tenacious” and expressed his understanding of the fact that not all the parties would
agree to the changes. He expressed his respect for Mr. Morrison and Ms. Walter and wished to state
in defense of the State Advisory Council that there had, in fact, been two teacher members until
August and that other vacancies on the council also exist, including one for a special education
director.

Dr. Koch wished to dispel one of the “myths” that were consistently relied upon by commenters, i.e.,
that repetition in the rules enhances protection. He pointed out that federal law and regulations carry
sufficient weight on their own and that a reduction in the volume of Part 226 would not reduce any
protection for students. He acknowledged that making sure everyone knows about the underlying
requirements and follows them is another big job. He went on to note that the final version of the
federal regulations was very close to the version that had been originally proposed and that, in any
case, the State Board would have had no opportunity to change any federal provisions through this
rulemaking. The only latitude that exists with respect to ISBE’s rules is to go beyond the federal
requirements where that is deemed appropriate, not to diminish those requirements.

On the subject of Response to Intervention, Dr. Koch agreed that it could be confusing to parents but
stated that it was also confusing to parents not to know, even after an IEP meeting, the reading level
of their children. The majority of students, he indicated, have either learning disabilities or
speech/language problems. Reading is very important to their education, and it is important to use
standards in measuring their learning. Dr. Koch stated that it had been proven again and again that
the greatest gains are not realized when students are placed separately and without access to the
general curriculum. Further, RtI does not imply a delay in referral, which parents can make at any
time. RtI is one of a menu of scientifically based approaches, and he indicated that ISBE would
provide guidance on its application.

Dr. Koch then summarized the major changes being made with regard to case load and class size.

1) Definition of “General Education Classroom”: This definition had its origins in the Corey H.
litigation and related monitoring issues. Dr. Koch stated that there have not been many
complaints regarding violations of the 30 percent maximum and acknowledged that this may not
be a true indicator because teachers may be concerned about retaliation. He noted further that
the term “case load” is not actually defined and therefore means different things in different
schools. He stated that all sorts of factors affect what case load is acceptable in particular
circumstances and that the fundamental question must be whether the students are receiving the
services set forth in their IEPs.

2) Categorically Stated Class Sizes: Dr. Koch noted that these provisions were a product of the
1970s and that districts frequently indicate they are no longer dealing with students in this
manner. He affirmed this would not mean categorical classes are to be eliminated altogether,
because the full range of placement options must be maintained. He further pointed out that a
number of states do regulate class size and then summarized the existing provisions of Section
226.730. That rule currently lays out 17 categories of students, each with three potential limits on
class size (the basic limit, the limit increased for unique circumstances, and the limit with a
paraprofessional). Dr. Koch pointed additionally to the current requirement that each class size
be driven by children’s needs, stating that that rule would continue to be in place. He agreed with
the earlier statement that there is no magic number. What was done in the proposed
amendments was to eliminate the top and bottom extremes of the range, so it should be evident
that there would be some “winners” and some “losers”.

Dr. Koch then outlined some of the specific changes involved and went on to point out that students
with the same disability do not all have the same educational needs. That is, each student’s
placement is a function of the IEP, not of the disability type. An additional factor that is relevant in this
connection is the Court Monitor’s interest in this rule because of its relationship to the least restrictive
environment. Overall, the Monitor supports movement away from categorical determinations and
may always weigh in on relevant rules. On a related note and with regard to the comments that
stated students with disabilities would be “forced” into general education, Dr. Koch pointed out that
federal law requires that first consideration be given to placement in the general education classroom
with whatever supports and accommodations are necessary. Only if this placement is not feasible
does consideration move away from the general education classroom.

The Board members then proceeded to discuss the issues that had been raised. Dr. Hall requested a
set of the items of public comment, and Dr. Fields asked to what extent information had been shared
with the IEA and the IFT. Dr. Koch responded by describing the various interactions but noted
uncertainty as to how much is generally understood about enforcement and complaints.

Ms. Holmes asked why there was such an apparent lack of congruity between ISBE’s expectations
for the implementation of these provisions and the level of concern raised in the field. In other words,
she wished to understand what was causing the fear that the IEP would no longer control the
provision of services. Dr. Koch acknowledged that there are concerns regarding enforcement and
that the question was legitimate in terms of whether the general education teacher would get the
support that is needed. He indicated that the same question exists now, so that one must ask
whether the situation will get worse. However, he noted that the 40 percent maximum had been in
place in Chicago for five years, so it needed to be clarified that the recent cuts in aides and teachers
in the Chicago Public Schools were not related to this proposed rule change as some commenters
had assumed. As to abuses, Dr. Koch pointed out that federal law includes safeguards but ISBE
needs specific information on which to base enforcement. Someone has to take the step of making a complaint when requirements are not being observed.

Dr. Hall followed up on the change from 30 to 40 percent, understanding that noncategorical placement has its points. Dr. Koch responded that nothing in the rules suggests ignoring a child's diagnosis, only acknowledging that each child is different. Dr. Hall expressed concern for teachers who are required to address a wide variety of needs and the impact this load may have on all the students. It was noted that the 40 percent flexibility would exist in Chicago regardless of this rulemaking and that parents sometimes differ on where they would like their children to receive services.

Dr. Brown noted the importance of the context and recalled the early days of special education and the large element of distrust that existed in the late 1960s and 1970s. She indicated it would be unfortunate for these issues to become a power struggle between decision-makers at the state and local levels. She noted that lots of things may not be working at the desired level of quality and that class size is a problem everywhere.

Mr. Geppert discussed class size from the perspective of a general education teacher. He reminded his fellow Board members that more and more demands had been placed on classroom teachers in recent years. From his point of view, adding another demand would be unacceptable. He believed that the existence of the 40 percent maximum for Chicago was not a sufficient reason to extend that maximum throughout the state.

Ms. Holmes asked Mr. Morrison, Ms. Walter, and Ms. Desjardins to return to the table to provide their perspectives on this issue in terms of the discrepancy in assumptions about how the rule would work in practice. Ms. Desjardins stated that two different realities were being discussed. She noted that Dr. Koch had talked about what the rules call for, but the rules were only a piece of paper. The reality that parents confront is how the rules are implemented. If requirements are relaxed, the problems grow even larger, because the promised supports are not forthcoming. Contrary to what Dr. Koch had stated, her belief was that money is involved, particularly in the implementation of requirements.

Further, the more open to interpretation a requirement is, the more Ms. Desjardins believed it would be subject to problems. In response to a question from Dr. Brown, she replied that it is not a matter of trust but rather a matter of what is happening.

Ms. Walter agreed with this point of view but also noted that when an entity opposes a proposal it is well advised to offer an alternative that would be acceptable. She reiterated that the earlier task force had not found one. To Ms. Holmes' probe as to whether the status quo were acceptable, Ms. Walter replied that IFT's members would like fewer students per class because of their increasingly complex needs.

Mr. Morrison concurred and noted that Dr. Koch had said he would like to talk about the violations that were going on. In some cases, the prevalence of students with disabilities in general education classrooms was 50 or even 60 percent. IEA was concerned that it would be the unions that would eventually be called upon to regulate the system, i.e., through complaints and grievances.

Dr. Brown expressed partial agreement and noted that the “ideal situation” is not just to assess a child's needs but also to understand the classroom into which the child may be placed. She stated that there must be an expectation for professional educators to have a commitment to serving the students and that numbers were a poor substitute for the overall context.

Mr. Geppert agreed that numbers are a poor tool but stated that they were the only tool available. He could envision granting exceptions on a case-by-case basis when districts were able to justify inability to observe the 30 percent limit, rather than opening the possibility of 40 percent to all 800 school districts, particularly in light of all the pressures districts are under.
Dr. Koch noted that nothing in rules could, in and of itself, end the kinds of scenarios that had been described, because ISBE can only investigate situations that are made known to the agency. He then moved on to note, with respect to the abbreviated format of the rules, that the promised side-by-side display of the Illinois rules and the federal regulations would be coming.

Ms. Hanselman offered two points for consideration. First was ISBE’s potential for communicating to parents how to bring issues of compliance to the agency’s attention. She noted the agency’s ability to assist parents in terms of better advocacy for services, supports, and training. Second, she pointed out that the entire responsibility for serving students with disabilities in the general education setting was never meant to rest on the general education teacher. The proposed rule did state that the special education teacher must be present and provide assistance such as differentiated instruction.

Dr. Dunn indicated his continuing support for the proposed amendments and pointed to the statutory role of the Advisory Council in commenting on rules. He stressed that ISBE had been open to hearing many points of view and that teachers’ voices had, indeed, been heard. In his view it was time for Illinois to “catch up with the rest of the nation”.

4. DISCUSSION OF RULES FOR INITIAL REVIEW

PART 1 (Public Schools Evaluation, Recognition and Supervision)

Mr. Reisberg noted that this set of amendments encompassed two separate aspects and turned the discussion over to Division Administrator Myron Mason to outline the first of these. Mr. Mason indicated that the revisions to the accountability framework were intended to conform those Sections of the rules to recent statutory revisions. For example, he pointed out that ISBE no longer is required to approve school improvement plans but does need to monitor their existence. He also discussed several electronic components of the accountability system such as the school improvement plan and information on adequate yearly progress.

Interim Division Administrator Linda Jamali then briefly summarized the new rule setting forth requirements for administrative and supervisory positions. These requirements were generally already found in an appendix to Part 1 which had, however, become out of date and difficult to read. There were no questions from the Board members on Part 1.

5. INFORMATION ITEMS

Mr. Reisberg indicated that the Board packet included a quarterly update on the comprehensive rules review and the resolution of “LessRedTape” communications. Ms. Holmes explored the possibility for some more detailed response when a legislative change would be needed in order to respond to a correspondent’s area of concern.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Dr. Fields moved to adjourn the meeting and Mr. Geppert seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m.
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The Education Policy Planning Committee meeting convened at 10:32 a.m.

1. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:** Penny Richards, Vice President of Learning Disabilities Association of Illinois was in attendance to give a summary of statements on the Part 226 Rules.

   Charlotte Des Jardins, Executive Director of Family Resource Center on Disabilities was also in attendance to comment on the proposed Part 226 special education rules.

2. **MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 2006 EPPC MEETING:** The Committee approved the minutes for the October 2006 EPPC Meeting.

3. **RESULTS OF STANDARDS IMPLEMENTATION STUDY (Dana Kinley and Lizanne DeStefano, UIUC):** Dana Kinley gave a brief introduction of Lizanne DeStefano from the University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign who was in attendance to guide the Committee through the results of the study of the implementation of the Illinois Learning Standards. Ms. DeStefano prepared and gave the Committee a summary of this study. She began by stating that the evaluation of this implementation is a four-year study funded by the Illinois State Board of Education and this study began in February 2005 and will continue through June 2008. She further stated that this study builds on the 1999-2002 Illinois Learning Study and serves the following three purposes:

   - To assess the extent to which local districts are implementing ILS;
   - To identify factors which enhance or inhibit implementation; and
   - To investigate the relationship between ILS implementation and student achievement.

   Lizanne then informed the Committee of the five levels of the survey, which are as follows (Figure 1 and 2 on handout):

   - Maintenance of a Non-Standards-Led System;
   - Awareness and Exploration of a Standards-Led System;
   - Transition to a Standards-Led System (which Lizanne said was an important level);
   - Emerging New Infrastructure to Support a Standards-Led System; and
   - Predominance of a Standards-Led System.

   Further, Ms. DeStefano referred the Committee to Figure 3 on the handout, which shows the average ratings of the dimensions of the Illinois Learning Standards.

   Lizanne briefly summarized the recommendations on the handout, which are as follows:
To increase implementation, ISBE should produce materials and professional development that describe how schools can reach higher levels of implementation;

ISBE should facilitate Community and Stakeholder Awareness of ILS by providing schools with examples of ILS-based report cards, newsletters and other parent-oriented information;

To facilitate use of ILS resources, ISBE should consolidate them in an easily-accessible package; and

To help bring schools into higher levels of ILS implementation, ISBE should provide schools and Regional Offices of Education with training or other similar resources for use during local professional development activities.

Dr. Hall commented on how part of our budget should support the ways in which we can bridge the gap of achievement. She further commented on how she likes the idea of making the standards a package. Vinni would also like to see some links with some teacher strategies.

Andrea Brown is interested in more information on disaggregation of the status of how standards are embedded in special education and vocational education and to find out if there are teachers that feel like the standards were in conflict with them.

Brenda Holmes requested an explanation of the definition of “implementation of the ILS”. She further asked at what point the Committee will see the plan for the re-examination of standards. Dana Kinley responded by stating that if there were any Committee or Board members who would be interested in participating in our external advisory committee. Dana further added that there is an internal advisory committee as well. Ms. Holmes believes it is very important that we have “experts” in this particular area.

4. STATEWIDE REPORT ON STAFF AND ADMINISTRATOR DEMOGRAPHICS (Connie Wise): At the request of Dr. David Fields, Richard Yong of the Data Analysis staff was in attendance to answer any questions about the statewide report on staff and administrator demographics. The Committee discussed the report.

Dr. Fields stated that this topic was brought up about a year ago and again at the Board Retreat in Bloomington, relative to the distribution of minorities. What should we do to increase and encourage in total number of teachers and administrators of color across the state? He further stated that the Board needs to focus on this topic.

Brenda Holmes commented on how excellent of a report this was and how it looked very well put together.

Superintendent Dunn commented on the money this issue takes to do it well. He further stated on how education careers have to compete with other career choices and that if there were some kind of package to intice students to go in to the field of education.

Board Member Vinni Hall commented on how the enrollment in education programs has diminished. Mr. Yong stated that his division has heard from districts that they have done everything to hire minorities, but have a difficulty finding minority people and that it makes them look bad.

The Committee discussed the possibility of getting additional information from the Board of Higher Education. Brenda Holmes added that with regard to Board of Higher Education, since the Student Assistance Commission is under the umbrella of the Board of Higher Education, there are some minority teacher scholarships and if they can provide us some data on this, that could be helpful.

Superintendent Dunn believes that a partnership with Board of Higher Education is the way to go.

Board Member Joyce Karon is going to contact a representative from Board of Higher Education.
5. **RECOMMENDATION TO AMEND STUDENT INFORMATION SYSTEM CONTRACT** (Connie Wise and Becky McCabe): Becky McCabe was in attendance to speak to the Committee about increasing the current contract with IBM to provide additional development, help desk support and preparation of documents and communications to district personnel that will result in the design and building of data structures to capture and post assessment score data for school districts.

The increase amount is $595,000. Dr. Hall asked if this increase would impact our current budget. Becky McCabe stated that the money for the increase is available through Assessment.

Brenda Holmes asked when IBM would complete this contract. Ginger Reynolds stated that it was June 30, 2007. Ms. Holmes requested the budget history from General Counsel Darren Reisberg.

Joyce Karon believes it is time to zero in and let the system run for awhile. Becky commented that this increase takes care of all of our assessments now. She believes we can continue to use this without adding more. Ginger responded also by saying that the demands for reports and data continue to grow and we need to keep up with that.

The Committee approved the Superintendent’s recommendation to be adopted.

6. **BOARD EMERGING ISSUE: HIGH SCHOOLS** (Randy Dunn and Ginger Reynolds): Ginger began by stating that in a previous Board Meeting, the Board requested to review the plans of the Coalition and the research project coming from the Great Lakes West, which this research project was given to the Committee for reviewing and discussing.

Andrea Brown requested that at some point, we might identify small schools.

Brenda Holmes thinks this is a tremendously significant issue and believes this is already behind schedule and would like to have an extensive discussion on this issue. Dr. Fields stated that the Committee could have a discussion on December’s agenda.

Superintendent Dunn stated that this is one of the Board’s emerging issues and suggested to bring a meeting of the minds, that the Board should have strong direction on where this should go. Dr. Dunn gave an example that they (staff) have had discussions with people from the Gates Foundation about their involvement for high school reform efforts. He further stated that this could take us in a direction and that we should have a discussion and see what that strategic plan looks like from the Coalition and allow Gates some time to make their decision, but we have some very frank discussions with Gates about how it is going to be hard to do this in Illinois.

In referring to the report, Ms. Holmes also requested a written definition of “alphabetic principle”.

The Committee discussed having a separate meeting to hold the discussion on this topic. Dr. Fields stated that we will determine how much time we will need on whether to hold a separate meeting.

7. **ADDITIONAL ITEMS:** No additional items.

**ADJOURNMENT:** Vinni Hall moved to adjourn the EPPC meeting and Joyce Karon seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m.
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1. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
Chairman Geppert noted that the Board received a letter from Dawn Weinberg, Agriculture Literacy Coordinator for Hancock and McDonough Counties, thanking the Board for their support of the Agriculture Education line item. Chairman Geppert then asked if there was anyone wishing to address the committee. No one came forward.

2. MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER FINANCE & AUDIT COMMITTEE MEETING
Chairman Geppert asked if anyone had objections or corrections to the October meeting minutes. No objections or corrections were stated and the minutes will be placed on file.

3. ILLINOIS PURCHASED CARE REVIEW BOARD
Linda Mitchell introduced Tim Imler to present information on the Illinois Purchased Care Review Board. Tim Imler, Division Administrator for Funding and Disbursements, provided the committee with an overview of the Illinois Purchased Care Review Board (IPCRB). Mr. Imler walked the committee through the structure of the IPCRB, the rate setting process IPCRB follows in setting rates for private special education facilities, potential factors driving the increased cost of private facility placements (claim amounts), the rules governing the IPCRB rate setting process, and the volume of rates set by the IPCRB. Mr. Imler also noted that ISBE is the primary rate setter for tuition rates for the state. Committee members discussed out-of-state rates, wrap services and their relationship to cost controls, rate setting in different areas of the state, and prorated amounts for the special ed private tuition line item with Mr. Imler, Ms. Mitchell and Dr. Chris Koch.

4. ILLINOIS PROGRAM ACCOUNTING MANUAL
Linda Mitchell introduced Deb Vespa to present a draft document with potential changes to the Illinois Program Accounting Manual (IPAM), which Ms. Mitchell noted had not been changed since 1994. Ms. Vespa noted that there are revisions necessitated by changes at the state and federal level, as well as other general recommendations. The plan is to bring the recommended changes back to the Board in January or February for approval.

- State drivers:
  - PA 93-1036 – asked ISBE to streamline rules. One proposal in revising IPAM is to put all of the rules related to activity funds in one place.
  - PA 93-0234 – requires ISBE to define a “balanced budget.” Ms. Vespa is working with constituent groups to come up with a definition. One idea is to look at districts that are deficit spending and comparing it to fund balances (i.e. deficit spending versus 3 times the fund balance and deficit spending versus 4 times the fund balance). If a strict expenditure versus revenues approach is taken, 398 districts would have to submit a deficit reduction plan. Using a 3 times comparison, 128
districts would have to submit a plan, while at 4 times 169 districts would have to submit a plan.
  o HB3480 – requires accounting for revenues and expenditures from vendor contracts.

- Federal drivers:
  o Every 5 years USDE approves an indirect cost calculation for federal grants. ISBE has submitted the same rate for the last 15-20 years. USDE want termination costs pulled out of these rates (i.e. severance payments of unused sick and vacation time).
  o The federal government updated their accounting handbook and each year we have to submit financial data to the federal government and we want to bring our data in line with theirs.

- Other suggestions:
  o Revise the structure of IPAM. Rename and redefine local funds. Create a capital improvement fund for major projects. Change financial reporting for GAAP purposes.

Committee members discussed the cost of changes to IPAM to the school districts, software packages, the burdens on districts of complying with the new rules and gathering data by attendance centers.

5. **UPDATE ON REQUEST FOR PLANS FROM SCHOOL DISTRICTS CERTIFIED AS IN FINANCIAL DIFFICULTY**
   Linda Mitchell stated that at the last meeting the Board certified two districts – Harrisburg and Divernon – as being in financial difficulty. Formal notification and a request for a financial plan were sent to the districts. She indicated that the district financial plan will be forthcoming. Mr. Geppert questioned whether Divernon had issues borrowing for payroll. Deb Vespa replied that there were no issues.

6. **FY2007 BUDGET UPDATE**
   Linda Mitchell reported on the budget hearings held to date. Ms. Mitchell also reported to the committee that ISBE has had an initial budget meeting with the Governor’s Office of Management and Budget. Ronny Wickenhauser added that the Commission on Government Forecasting and Accountability will be providing a revenue presentation at the December board meeting. Mr. Clark asked about FY06 GSA numbers not being finalized. Mr. Wickenhauser reported that ISBE is still waiting on data from Cook County and that there is some concern about not having the data.

   Mr. Geppert thanked P.E. Cross, Regional Superintendent, for hosting the budget hearing in Mt. Vernon and the Lake County Federation of Teachers for hosting the budget hearing in Gurnee and updated the members of the committee on the presentations.

7. **ILLINOIS SCHOOL PURCHASING NETWORK UPDATE**
   Linda Mitchell introduced Karen Helland to provide an update on the Illinois School Purchasing Network. Ms. Helland reported that 420 school districts are registered with U.S. Communities. Ms. Helland continues to answer district questions about participation with U.S. Communities. It was noted that districts benefit from the purchasing network because everything has already been bid so the districts do not have to go through the bidding process. Ms. Helland reported on contacts from other vendors asking about joining U.S. Communities. Ms. Helland stated that ISBE is approaching a point where a decision needs to be made on the direction of the program and noted potential areas of expansion. Ms. Mitchell reported on some of the areas of potential expansion and asked for the Board’s thoughts. Committee members expressed that services are more challenging than commodities as it relates to defining quality, terms, and expectations. There was a brief discussion concerning Illinois firms participating in U.S. Communities and the cost of the purchasing network. Although there are no Illinois headquartered companies in the program currently, many of the firms have business operations in Illinois and employee people residing in the state in stores and distribution centers. There is no cost to participants in the program.

8. **ADDITIONAL ITEMS**
   There were no additional items.

Mr. Geppert thanked the Chicago Teachers Union for the use of their facilities.

**Adjourn:** The Finance and Audit Committee adjourned at 12:02 p.m.
1. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:
   No participation

2. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. FY08 Budget Update
   Linda Mitchell stated that ISBE is half way through the budget hearings and they would be completed by the December 2006 board meeting. ISBE is preparing schedules for the Annual Report and will present a draft at the next board meeting. Additionally, the Commission on Government Forecasting and Accountability will present a preliminary FY08 revenue forecast at the December 2006 board meeting.

B. Update on Financial Oversight Panel and School Finance Authorities
   Deb Vespa stated that Winthrop Harbor passed their referendum. Divernon is continuing their discussions on reorganization. Deb Vespa also updated the committee on the status of Cairo, Hazel Crest, Round Lake and Venice. Cairo School District is still experiencing difficulty due to staffing issues with the administrative office, a decline EAV, and declining enrollment. The financial status for Hazel Crest has improved. They are now Financial Recognition. Round Lake’s financial status is improving as well and it is estimated that they will be Financial Recognition as well. However, they continue to face difficulties that accompany increasing enrollment. Venice School District continues to have difficulties. With a decreasing enrollment and EAV they have not been able to balance their budgets.

3. DECISION ITEMS

A. Minutes of the October Finance and Audit Committee Meeting
   Motion to accept the October minutes approved.

B. Update on Financial Plan of Harrisburg CUSD #3
   Deb Vespa announced that Harrisburg has a new Superintendent this year. He has been discussing budget options with the local school board. The Superintendent would like to present an amended plan to the State Board for approval. He has also received the approval of his board to attempt to issue working cash fund bonds that will help them in the future. Deb Vespa also discussed other options that the Superintendent is considering.

   Motion approved to recommend to the full board on November 16, 2006.
4. **Additional Items**

   Linda Mitchell stated that ISBE will be issuing a request for proposal on the entity system as part of the Data Warehouse effort.

   Ronny Wickenhauser announced that next month ISBE should have preliminary General State Aid estimates, but ISBE still does not have any data from Cook County.

5. **Adjourn**