AGENDA

1. Public Participation

2. Minutes of the September Education Policy Planning Committee Meeting (pp. 2-3)

3. Social and Emotional Learning (p. 4)
   (Roger Weissberg of UIC, Mary Utne O’Brien CASEL Executive Director, and Chris Koch)

4. Systemically Noncompliant Districts (Becky Watts, Ginger Reynolds, Darren Reisberg) (pp. 6-15)

5. Coalition for Illinois High Schools (John Ourth and other Coalition representatives) (p. 16)

6. Highly Qualified Teachers Plan Update (Linda Jamali) (pp. 17-21)

7. Student Advisory Council Operational Planning (Meta Minton, Jean Ladage, Becky Watts) (pp. 22-23)

8. Additional Items

* Items listed with an asterisk (*) will be discussed in committee and action may be taken in the plenary session.
The Education Policy Planning Committee meeting convened at 12:55 p.m.

1. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: Attorney Ken Florey, who represents Trinity Christian College, was in attendance to present an appeal of an accreditation decision made by the State Teacher Certification Board. He gave a summary of the errors which were in reported data and the review process and that the STCB also improperly considered program reports in determining the accreditation. He further stated that in the College’s view, this is their final appeal and they do not intent to pursue an administrative review action.

Liz Rudenga, provost with Trinity Christian College, was also in attendance to give an additional message to the Committee on the reporting of the Candidate-Faculty Ratio and programs not being considered. She stated that she is thinking about the students of Trinity and how this impacts them and the process for them to be evaluated correctly.

Roger Thornton of Township District #211 was in attendance to follow-up and presented four comments to the Committee as follows:

- Individual ACT scores and the timing of receipt;
- He concurs with staff that the pilot approach should move forward;
- He believes it is essential to get students to the level of rigor they need in coursework; and
- Make this a positive experience, so they have implemented six-week academies for the students

Lonnie Johns of Jacksonville was in attendance to comment on RTI. He referred to his handouts which were given to the Board members.

2. MINUTES OF THE JUNE 2006 EPPC MEETING: The Committee approved the minutes for the June 2006 EPPC Meeting.

3. CONSIDERATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION AND PROGRAM APPROVALS (Linda Jamali, Marti Woelfle): Marti Woelfle was in attendance to have the Committee consider the State Teacher Certification Board’s (STCB) recommendation regarding the unit accreditation of Trinity Christian College and Trinity’s Notice of Objection to the recommendations. Marti gave a summary of her handouts to the Board.

Marti stated that the STCB voted to recommend that Trinity Christian College be assigned “accreditation with probation” as defined in Section 25.125(j)(3) of 23 Illinois Administrative Code.

Marti then referred to Appendix A, the accreditation process, which is based on six standards as follows:

- Candidate Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions
- Assessment System and Unit Evaluation
- Field Experience and Clinical Practice
- Diversity
- Faculty Qualifications, Performance and Development
- Unit Governance and Resources

Marti added that Trinity’s Notice of Objection was focused on three issues, 1) Challenges to specific findings and overall designation; 2) Alleged lack of technical assistance; and 3) An allegation that one of the chief bases for the STCB designating “accreditation with probation” was that several individual programs were not fully approved. She stated that the agency staff does not consider any of these
issues to have merit and recommends that the State Board follow the recommendation of the STCB and require a full visit within two years of the State Board’s decision.

The Committee moved to take the Superintendent’s recommendation to recommend the status of “accreditation with probation” for Trinity Christian College.

4. **ACT CONTRACT AMENDMENT (Becky McCabe, John Craig):** Becky McCabe began by stating her and John Craig were in attendance to bring the Committee their proposal for the contract amendment to proceed forward with the transition over the PSAE to the ACT and moving that from the Harcourt contract.

Dr. Hall asked if this transition would be costing us any extra money. John Craig responded by stating that the Harcourt contract was an overall package deal. It was probably $2.5 to $3 million and ACT is $3.7 or $3.8 million a year. We are getting a better deal out of ACT. John also stated that we are doing much data reporting with ACT now.

Board Members Brenda Holmes and Andrea Brown both asked if there were other states who use ACT. Becky responded that as of now she knows of Colorado and Michigan and she has had numerous calls that states are moving in this direction.

Ms. Holmes also asked if ACT can do the job. Becky responded that they know the program very well and know what they are expected to do and Becky assured the Committee that ACT looked at their capacity before agreeing to take this on.

Board Members Jesse Ruiz and Chris Ward asked about the Quality Control aspect. Becky stated that our vendors have to be available and cooperative with this review team through the end of the process and that the team will report to us on a monthly basis.

Chairman Ruiz asked if ACT provided liquidated damage provisions. John Craig responded with a yes, they do provide that as a deliverable.

The Committee approved the motion to adopt the Superintendent’s Recommendation.

5. **PROPOSAL FOR GRADE 12 PSAE TESTING (Becky McCabe):** Becky McCabe was present to give the Committee a staff report on Township District 211’s proposal for testing students at Grade 12 who did not meet standards on the Grade 11 PSAE. At the Board’s request, staff researched and reviewed the implications for establishing a pilot program to implement this proposal.

Becky stated that she was concerned about the costs and resources if we do this statewide. She said that Illinois has about 7,000 students that take the fall re-take, so about 10 to 20%, but that we budget so that if all kids choose to re-take.

Joyce Karon commented that we need to look at how districts can be creative to get students to achieve, so she is supportive of this and understands the ramifications.

Ginger Reynolds also commented on how this would be more work, so we would need more resources to handle this. Brenda Holmes agreed that the ISBE is understaffed and would need more resources to handle the pilot.

Dr. Hall also said she would like to see this go through as a pilot.

Becky stated that it would be a good idea to have a research study attached to this. She also added that if we were to go statewide after the pilot, then the law would have to be changed to mandate that Grade 12 students who have not met standards, must retake the PSAE.

6. **ADDITIONAL ITEMS:**
   
   (a) **NASBE Public Policy Statements (proposed revisions):** The Committee members had the proposed revisions in their board packets. Dave Fields stated that one topic that will be addressed is the proposal for states to implement a statewide literacy plan.

   The Committee moved that Drs. Hall and Brown will represent the ISBE at the national conference in Louisville and make any determinations as to the NASBE policy statement and vote appropriately.

   There were no additional items.

7. **ADJOURNMENT:** Joyce Karon moved to adjourn the EPPC meeting and Ed Geppert seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 2:23 p.m.
IILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING
October 18, 2006

TO:
Education Policy Planning Committee

FROM:
Christopher A. Koch, Assistant Superintendent

Agenda Topic:
Sustainable Schoolwide Social and Emotional Learning

Materials:
Sustainable Schoolwide Social and Emotional Learning (SEL):
Implementation Guide and Toolkit

Staff Contact(s):
Christopher A. Koch, Ginger Reynolds

Purpose of Agenda Item
To review progress and training materials with regard to the implementation of social emotional learning standards.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
GOAL 2 Improving Educator Quality for All Children.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
Board members will gain an understanding of training materials produced by the Collaborative for Academic, Social and Emotional Learning (CASEL) at the University of Illinois – Chicago and will receive an update on progress with regard to the implementation of social emotional learning standards.

Background Information
The General Assembly passed the Illinois Children’s Mental Health Act of 2003 (P.A. 93-0495). Recognizing the important role that education plays in this system, the Act required ISBE to develop and implement a plan that incorporates social/emotional development standards into the Illinois Learning Standards. The Illinois State Board of Education approved a plan for the incorporation of social/emotional development standards into the Illinois Learning Standards in December of 2003. Policies were developed by school districts, and collected by ISBE staff, which address the role of social/emotional development in district education programs. Policies were provided to ISBE by August of 2004. ISBE staff have been working with the Children’s Mental Health Partnership since that time.

Analysis and Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action and Communications
Policy Implications: All school districts have submitted policies with regard to social emotional learning standards. Professional development is needed for school districts to better understand how to incorporate and measure the implementation of these standards into curricula.

Budget Implications: Training materials such as those presented are being planned for incorporation into statewide professional development using state appropriated funds for this purpose.

Legislative Action: None required
Communication: ISBE is working with the Illinois Children’s Mental Health Partnership and Regional Offices of Education in developing statewide training.

**Pros and Cons of Various Actions**
No action

**Superintendent's Recommendation**
Continue to work with the Children's Mental Health Partnership and the Regional Offices of Education to implement the board-approved plan using state appropriated funds set aside for this purpose.

**Next Steps**
Continue to work with the Children's Mental Health Partnership and the Regional Offices of Education to implement the board-approved plan using state appropriated funds set aside for this purpose.
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Dr. Randy J. Dunn, State Superintendent of Education
Dr. Ginger M. Reynolds, Assistant Superintendent
Darren Reisberg, General Counsel
Becky Watts, Chief of Staff

Agenda Topic: Systemically Noncompliant Districts

Materials: Included with this agenda item are:

(1) A flow chart describing the process for identifying and managing systemically noncompliant districts; and
(2) A written framework for addressing systemically noncompliant districts previously prepared for the Board

Staff Contact(s): Ginger, Darren, Becky

Purpose of Agenda Item
The purpose of this agenda item is for the Board to hear staff’s proposed process and to determine next steps.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
It is expected that the Board will provide feedback on the proposed process and give staff directives for next steps.

Background Information
Staff has prepared a flowchart to describe the proposed process for identifying and managing systemically noncompliant districts, based on prior background materials and discussions with the Board. The flowchart encompasses the Board’s previously adopted Framework for Addressing Systemically Noncompliant Districts.

Analysis and Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action and Communications
Policy Implications: The system for identifying and managing districts as proposed here would allow the Agency to intervene in districts that may not be capable of providing an adequate and safe education for their students.

Budget Implications: If this process is approved, staff will investigate the costs associated with constructing a database for a case management approach to managing districts.

Legislative Action: None
Communication: None

Next Steps
If the Board approves of this proposed process, funds are needed to cover the costs associated with constructing a database for a case management approach to managing districts.
Systemically Noncompliant Districts
October 2006

Case Management Committee (CMC)
Monthly Review

Members:
- Assistant Superintendent for Teaching and Learning
- Assistant Superintendent for Special Education
- General Counsel
- Chief Financial Officer
- Chief of Staff

Database of All Districts
List of Districts in Integrated Intervention Status

Input Sources:
- School Finance
- Special Ed (Complaint System/Compliance Reviews)
- Accountability
- Legal
- Academic Progress/AYP
- Certification
- English Language Learning
- External Assurance
- ROE Services
- Student Assessment

Integrated Intervention
Required

District Identified for Immediate or Graduated Removal from Integrated Intervention Status

Integrated Intervention Not Required – Individual Center to address

District Identified for Outreach and Determination of Need for Intervention

List of Districts in Integrated Intervention Status

Yes

No

District Remains in Integrated Intervention Status
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Education Policy Planning Committee Packet - Page 7
State Superintendent Submits Noncompliance Report to District Superintendent, Board President with cc: to ROE

ISBE Case Management Team meets with District Superintendent, Staff and District Board Members

District Submits Noncompliance Report Response Plan to ISBE

ISBE Case Management Team Assesses Report and Sets Integrated Intervention Plan

Approach determined by extent of State’s legal authority and district’s specific issues

Long Term Integrated Intervention Plan

Short Term Integrated Intervention Plan
Short Term Integrated Intervention Plan

Voluntary

Intergovernmental Agreement between ISBE and District

District Establishes Voluntary Oversight Panel, Approved by State Board

Involuntary

State Board Resolution to Establish Oversight Panel

District and Administrator Provide Updates and Reports to ISBE and State Board

Case Management Committee (CMC) Monthly Review

Deficiencies Corrected

ISBE Staff Deployed to Support District Staff in Correcting Serious Compliance Deficiencies

Long Term Integrated Intervention Plan

Approach determined by extent of State’s legal authority and district’s specific issues
The Illinois State Board of Education has chosen to address the issue of “systemically noncompliant districts” as an emerging issue. Systemically noncompliant districts are those with extensive compliance problems that do not relate solely to the district’s academic or financial status or a single agency division. Instead, these districts’ compliance issues involve fiscal or operational mismanagement, failure to abide by state or federal requirements or concerns across multiple divisions. Further background on systemically noncompliant districts can be found in the February 2006 memorandum to the Board.

By their nature, systemically noncompliant districts will always present unique challenges. There is no “one size fits all” solution for assistance and intervention. However, ISBE will benefit from having an established process for coordinating agency efforts to monitor compliance and determine actions, and a basic framework for structuring short-term interventions and long-term oversight.

I. **Activities Prior to Interventions**

ISBE must establish a consistent approach for identifying systemically noncompliant districts and determining a need for further action. The following steps will serve as a guideline for addressing systemic noncompliance, but specific circumstances may require earlier interventions or additional steps.

1. **Determine integrated compliance districts (ICDs):** Determine districts requiring an “integrated compliance” approach. “Integrated compliance districts” (ICDs) would include those with:
   - Audit findings and recognition reviews indicating management deficiencies;
   - Compliance violations across several divisions; and/or
   - Particular compliance violations or crises that jeopardize the educational and financial stability of the district or the welfare of students.

2. **Establish agency tracking system:** Establish a systematic process to track and coordinate efforts surrounding the ICDs. Initially, all divisions will create their own list of low-performing districts, based on criteria defined by each division. These lists will be compared to determine which districts should be placed on the initial ICD list. All division efforts surrounding the ICDs will be entered into the tracking system.

3. **Coordinate through tracking system and ICD committee:** All ICD issues within the agency will be coordinated via the tracking system and regularly scheduled meetings of an internal committee involving affected Divisions and their Center Directors.

4. **Corrective action for specific issues and technical assistance:** The agency will require corrective action of specific noncompliance areas by an ICD through ISBE’s recognition process. ISBE will offer technical assistance to remedy the
areas of noncompliance, and direct the district to resources for further assistance.

5. **Comprehensive audit:** If the ICD does not demonstrate a willingness and/or ability to address noncompliance through the steps in the recognition process, the agency may perform a comprehensive audit across all program areas to further determine and document areas of noncompliance.

6. **Agency-wide noncompliance report:** Based upon information within the tracking system, the ICD’s response to any corrective action, the comprehensive audit, and consultation with the regional superintendent, staff will create an agency-wide noncompliance report. The noncompliance report will document the district’s history of noncompliance and issues identified in the comprehensive audit, the agency’s efforts to assist the district and obtain compliance, and the district’s response to assistance offered by ISBE and requests for corrective action.

II. **Outreach to District and Determination of Need for Intervention**

The State Superintendent will keep the Board fully apprised of the staff’s intent to submit a noncompliance report to a district and of the results of each step described in this Section.

1. **Submission of noncompliance report and meeting:** The State Superintendent will submit the noncompliance report to the district superintendent and board president (with a copy to the regional superintendent) and schedule a meeting among appropriate ISBE Division Administrators and Center Directors, the regional superintendent, the district superintendent, district senior staff and district board representatives to discuss the non-compliance report and the district’s intentions for remedying the noncompliance. At the meeting, ISBE will indicate that short-term interventions and long-term ISBE oversight can result from the district’s irresponsiveness to the noncompliance report.

2. **Response plan:** The district will be required to submit a response plan to the noncompliance report within an established period of time following the meeting.

3. **Assessment of need for interventions:** Based on the noncompliance report, the district meeting, and the district’s response plan, the agency will assess the need for short-term interventions and/or long-term oversight.

III. **Short-term Interventions**

A. **Definition:** Short-term interventions are those which require the deployment of ISBE staff and/or resources to correct serious compliance deficiencies which, if not corrected within a period of several months (or less), could further compromise the district’s educational programs, financial stability, or the welfare of students. **Examples:**
• Immediate interventions are needed to provide necessary special education services to students for the remainder of the school year, or compensatory services over the summer.

• Immediate control is needed over fiscal decision-making to prevent further mismanagement of state or federal funds.

B. Defined objectives and endpoints: With short-term interventions, the agency assumes that upon the conclusion of the intervention, the district’s board can resume responsibility for the noncompliance area and ISBE can provide heightened monitoring while not directly involving itself in day-to-day district operations. Short-term interventions must have a specified objective and a recommended timeframe. In many instances, ISBE will need to spend the first several days of the intervention determining the full scope of the issue and refining the plan for response.

C. Prior consultation: The regional superintendent should be consulted during the formulation of any short-term intervention. Efforts should be made to contact local legislators and other constituent organizations prior to taking short-term interventions to the extent reasonable, given the nature of the concern and the necessary response.

D. Legal authority: Authority for short-term interventions includes, but is not limited to:

• School district recognition process.
• Authority under IDEIA.
• Agreements for use of specific funds.
• Authority under the EDGAR regulations to perform an in-depth review of a district’s overall management structure.
• Power to appoint a receiver or trustee to administer district affairs under the No Child Left Behind Act corrective action provisions.

ISBE should determine whether additional authority should be requested from the Illinois General Assembly for short-term interventions.

IV. Long-term Oversight

Long-term oversight is necessary when the district’s history of noncompliance, the ISBE/district meeting, and the district’s response plan demonstrate that district management: (i) will not undertake an appropriate response to noncompliance areas; and/or (ii) does not appear capable of sustaining compliance upon the conclusion of any short-term interventions.

A. Preliminary Actions

1. Prior consultation: In addition to ongoing conversations with district representatives, ISBE should consult with, at a minimum, the following individuals/entities regarding the potential need for long-term ISBE oversight:

• The regional superintendent;
2. **Voluntary or Involuntary Determination**: Following the consultation process, ISBE will discuss with the district whether it is willing to negotiate a voluntary oversight partnership agreement or whether it is unwilling to partner with ISBE to address its compliance issues. If the district is unwilling to partner with ISBE to address its compliance issues, ISBE will commence an involuntary oversight intervention as described below.

### B. Voluntary Oversight Partnership

1. **General**: Voluntary Oversight Partnerships are entered into through an intergovernmental agreement between the school district and the Illinois State Board of Education. As a negotiated agreement, specific aspects may vary from the particular provisions set forth below. The term of the agreement should be for a minimum of two years. The State Board should have the right to renew the agreement on an annual basis upon the performance of a review of the results of the agreement, and a determination of the need for further oversight. The agreement must be approved by the State Board of Education.

2. **Structure of VOPs**: The agreement establishing the VOP and approved by the State Board will create an oversight board consisting of at least five members. At least two members will be appointed by the State Superintendent. The remaining members will either be designated in the agreement, or will be appointed by constituents designated in the agreement. The VOP’s membership should be representative of the community and should include representation from the district’s teaching staff. All members must have a written volunteer agreement with ISBE to ensure protection under the State Employee Indemnification Act (5 ILCS 350/1 et seq.).

3. **Responsibilities**: The oversight board will have the responsibilities described in the following subsections. In all areas, the oversight board will attempt to reach consensus with the district’s board. In any dispute between the district board and the oversight board, the State Superintendent shall make the final decision.

   a) **Board member training and operational review**: Development of a board member training plan, in conjunction with IASB. Complete
review of board operational procedures and district/board interactions, with agreement by the local district board to undertake such review and training, and abide by a policy for appropriate board/staff roles and interactions in the agreement.

b) **Corrective Plan for Noncompliance**: In cooperation with the district superintendent and board, development and oversight of the implementation of a corrective plan for the district’s areas of noncompliance.

c) **Staffing Needs Analysis and Plan**: In cooperation with the district superintendent and board, (i) performance of an analysis of critical staffing needs within the district to support the instructional improvement plans and corrective plan for noncompliance; and (ii) development of a strategy for attracting candidates and posting positions to meet the critical staffing needs.

d) **Financial Plan**: In cooperation with the district superintendent and the board, development of a three-year plan for the financial operation of the district addressing, at minimum, the district’s budget, contracts and debt service obligations.

e) **Instructional Improvement Plans**: In cooperation with the district superintendent and board and outside experts selected by the State Superintendent, development and oversight of the implementation of new improvement plans for the district as a whole, and for each individual school building. The instructional improvement plans must specify how the district will seek to maximize community and parental involvement in the instructional programs and overall improvement efforts.

f) **Facilities Maintenance and Improvement Plan**: In cooperation with the district superintendent, board and the regional superintendent, development and oversight of the implementation of a facilities maintenance and improvement plan (if appropriate).

4. **Administrator**: The oversight board will appoint an administrator to serve as its executive officer and the main liaison with the district. The qualifications and designation of the administrator must be approved by the State Superintendent. The administrator will be selected through a competitive process, and may be an individual or representative of an organization. The agency will work with the district to identify funding for the administrator; however, responsibility for paying the cost of the administrator will remain with the district. The contract for the administrator will be through ISBE, with the budget approved by the State Superintendent. The agency may commit additional non-district resources to support the work of the administrator. The administrator will have the following responsibilities:

a) Oversee the implementation of all plans developed by the oversight board.

b) Review all personnel, contracting and budgetary decisions of the district’s board prior to final action to ensure consistency with the plans adopted by the oversight board.
• In the event the administrator determines any personnel, contracting, or budgetary decisions are inconsistent with the plans adopted by the oversight board, the administrator will make a recommendation to the district superintendent and board that the administrator deems is consistent with the adopted plans.

• If the district board refuses to comply with the administrator’s recommendation, the matter will be referred to the oversight board for a final determination. The administrator will make a recommendation to the oversight board for approval or denial. The oversight board will either approve or deny the action, or request additional information.

c) Advise the district superintendent and board on general operational and administrative matters, and direct the district superintendent and board on actions needed to remain in compliance with oversight board-approved plans.

d) Schedule, provide notice, and make arrangements for all meetings of the oversight board.

5. **Engagement of key constituents.** ISBE and the VOP must ensure that the key constituents listed in IV.A.1 remain engaged in the oversight process. The VOP should define specific roles for constituents to build ownership in the improvement activities.

6. **Updates and Reports.** The district and administrator must provide reports for each meeting of the oversight board describing the implementation of the plans developed in accordance with subparagraph (3). Each plan must be updated on an annual basis. In addition, by June 30 of each year, the oversight board will submit an annual report to the State Board of Education.

C. **Involuntary interventions**

Involuntary interventions will be structured similarly to Voluntary Oversight Partnerships. However, involuntary interventions will occur through State Board resolution, instead of an intergovernmental agreement. The State Board of Education will rely on one or more of the following authorities for an involuntary intervention, as applicable:

- Power to appoint an independent authority under Section 2-3.25f of the School Code;
- Power to appoint a receiver or trustee to administer district affairs under the No Child Left Behind Act corrective action provisions; and/or
- Authority to establish a financial oversight panel or school finance authority under the School Code.

ISBE should determine whether additional authority should be requested from the Illinois General Assembly for long-term oversight.
TO: Education Policy Planning Committee
FROM: Dr. Ginger Reynolds, Assistant Superintendent

Agenda Topic: Coalition for Illinois High Schools

Staff Contact(s): Mark Williams, Career Development and Preparation
Dana Kinley, Curriculum and Instruction
Becky McCabe, Student Assessment

Purpose of Agenda Item
To introduce and discuss the mission of the Coalition for High Schools to the Illinois State Board of Education members

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
Aligns with the Board’s Emerging Issues

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
Both Board and Coalition members will be informed about possible strategies of each and be aware of avenues for further collaboration.

Background Information
In June, 2006, the High School Challenge conference was held in Bloomington. This conference came from the work of numerous professional organizations working together. The success of the conference compelled the organizers to create The Coalition for Illinois High Schools.

The following organizations are involved in the Coalition:

ACT Midwest Region
Charles Ramos

Chicago Public Schools
Lydia Nantwi

Illinois Alliance of Administration of Special Education
Gineen O’Neil

Illinois Association of School Boards
Angie Pfeifer
Nesa Brauer

Illinois Association of School Administrators
Brent Clark

Illinois Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development
Donald Kachur

Illinois Association of Regional Superintendents
Jane Quinlan

Illinois Business Roundtable
Jeff Mays

Illinois Education Association
Daryl Morrison

Illinois Federation of Teachers
Amy Alsop

Illinois High School Association
Marty Hickman

Illinois North Central Association
Susan Morrison

Illinois Principals Association
Jason Leahy
John Ourth
Fred Singleton

Illinois State Board of Education
Carol Diedrichsen
Dana Kinley
Joyce Krumtinger
Myron Mason
Rebecca McCabe
Mark Williams

Large Unit District Association
Bob Nielsen
Robin Miller

NCLB Specialist, West 40 Intermediate Service Center #2
Leslie Wilson

NIU’s Social Science Research Institute and Illinois Interactive Report Card (ILRC)
Harvey Smith

Regional System of Support Providers
Doug Dirks

The group held a strategic meeting in September and will be finalizing their mission and belief statements in the near future.

Next Steps: To be determined.
ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING  
October 18, 2006

TO: Education Policy and Planning Committee  
Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Dr. Ginger Reynolds, Assistant Superintendent, Teaching and Learning;  
Linda Jamali, Division Administrator, Interim, Certification

Agenda Topic: Highly Qualified Teacher (HQT) Progress Report

Materials: Summary of Revised HQT Plan

Staff Contact(s): Linda Jamali, Division Administrator (Interim)

Purpose of Agenda Item
To share highlights of the September 29 revised highly qualified plan with the Board.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
Related to Goal 2: Improving Education for all Children

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
The expected outcome of the agenda item is to familiarize the Board with what has been submitted to USDOE for approval.

Background Information
Please see the attached summary of the revisions. If you wish to review the entire revised plan as submitted, it can be sent to you electronically or via mail (120+ pages).

Analysis and Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action and Communications
Policy Implications: Parts of the plan will have policy implications; staff will need to first see what is approved by USDOE.

Budget Implications: There will definitely be budget implications for next year as certain components of the plan are implemented.

Legislative Action: Legislative action will be necessary on a couple of items.

Communication: The Agency will communicate some components of the plan with the field.

Next Steps
Staff will continue to keep the Board informed as to USDOE’s acceptance of our revised HQT Plan.
Summary of Revised Illinois’ Highly Qualified Teacher Plan

The Highly Qualified Teacher Plan that the Agency submitted on July 7, 2006 was examined by a team of peer reviewers and found to be deficient in certain areas. As a result, deficiencies were corrected and submitted to USDOE by September 29, 2006.

The six requirements are below, along with the areas revised and how those concerns were addressed.

**Requirement One**

*The revised plan must provide a detailed analysis of the core academic subject classes in the State that are currently not being taught by highly qualified teachers. The analysis must, in particular, address schools that are not making adequate yearly progress and whether or not these schools have more acute needs than do other schools in attracting highly qualified teachers. The analysis must also identify the districts and schools around the State where significant numbers of teachers do not meet HQT standards, and examine whether or not there are particular hard-to-staff courses frequently taught by non-highly qualified teachers.*

We stated in the July plan that we were in the process of modifying our data collection instrument. The proposal was found deficient in two areas of requirement one. Our team added new data to the September plan. We offer special thanks to Connie Wise and Terry Chamberlain for allowing their staff to assist with this process.

**Information Added to the Revised Requirement One**

1.) Does the analysis identify particular groups of teachers to which the State's plan must pay particular attention, such as special education teachers, mathematics or science teachers, or multi-subject teachers in rural schools?

2.) Does the analysis identify particular courses that are often taught by non-highly qualified teachers?

Our revised plan included results of a survey designed to determine the reasons that teachers were not highly qualified, detailed information on the Educator Certification System and a more detailed analysis of the 2004-2005 data based on additional information received from Data Analysis.

Surprisingly, small rural schools had a lower proportion of not highly qualified teachers than did other school situations. Poor and minority students in urban situations seem to bear the burden of the not highly qualified teacher problem, both in schools making and not making AYP. The percentage of classes taught by not highly qualified teachers in districts ranges from 12% to 58.3%. Middle school and social studies teachers were of particular concern in that many are assigned to classes where they do not meet the federal requirements, although they do comply with state requirements. The recording of HOUSSE results on ECS may significantly reduce these problem areas.

**Requirement Two**

*The revised plan must provide information on HQT status in each LEA and the steps the SEA will take to ensure that each LEA has plans in place to assist teachers who are not highly qualified to attain HQT status.*
Our July plan did not include an explanation of how we would measure annual measurable objectives for HQT.

Information added to the Revised Requirement Two
We indicated that school districts that do not have 100% of staff HQ at the end of 2006-07 must have a general plan, including district support, to make their teachers highly qualified and each teacher must have a plan to become HQ within two years. ROEs will be responsible for monitoring the districts

1.) This year, Illinois will have new data for the 2005-06 school year using ECS and the Agency will identify districts and schools not meeting AMO and work with them to ensure that AMO is met by reducing the number of non HQ teachers by 50% each year until the 100% goal is reached.

2.) Any school/district that has 100% of its teachers highly qualified by the end of the 2006-07 school year but has one or more non-highly qualified teachers in 2007-08 and beyond must decrease by 50% the number of non-highly qualified teachers each year until they reach the 100% level.

Requirement Three
The revised plan must include information on the technical assistance, programs, and services that the SEA will offer to assist LEAs in successfully completing their HQT plans, particularly where large groups of teachers are not highly qualified and the resources of the LEAs will use to meet their HQT goals.

Of the six components of Requirement Three, Illinois was found deficient in only one: Does the plan include a description of how the State will use its available funds (e.g. Title I, Part A, including the portion that goes to the State agency for higher education; other Federal and State funds as appropriate) to address the needs of teachers who are not highly qualified.

Information added to the Revised Requirement Three
The peer reviewer’s main concern was that we separate the strategies used to assist teachers in becoming highly qualified as opposed to more effective. We accomplished this task by separating the strategies into four distinct yet interrelated areas:

1.) Strategies to identify which teachers are or are not recorded as highly qualified, and
   a.) provide a means to record them as being highly qualified, or
   b.) create a plan for them to become highly qualified, or
   c.) hire and assign highly qualified teachers to core content areas.

2.) Strategies to
   a.) retrain teachers who are not highly qualified to become highly qualified,
   b.) train highly qualified core-content area teachers to add a special education endorsement and encourage teacher candidates in core-content areas to add special education, and
   c.) encourage universities to train teacher candidates in special education programs to also be highly qualified in a core-content area.

3.) Strategies to create a continuous supply of highly qualified teachers in core content areas in low-performing schools so that the student in these schools are not taught at a higher rate by non highly qualified teachers.
4.) Strategies to assist educators in becoming more effective or recruiting and retaining highly qualified educators in low-performing schools.

We also updated and expanded information on Illinois programs that assist teachers in these two areas.

**Requirement Four**
*The revised plan must describe how the SEA will work with the LEAs that fail to reach the 100 percent HQT goal by the end of the 2006-07 school year.*

Requirement Four was met in the July plan. However, we clarified how the RESPROS focus assistance to schools and LEAs not making AYP.

**Requirement Five**
*The revised plan must explain how and when the SEA will complete the HOUSSE process for teachers not new to the profession who were hired prior to the end of the 2005-06 school year, and how the SEA will limit the use of HOUSSE procedures for teachers hired after the end of the 2005-06 school year to multi-subject secondary teachers in rural school eligible for additional flexibility, and multi-subject special education teachers who are highly qualified in language arts, mathematics, or science at the time of hire.*

Peer reviewers found that our plan described limited use of the HOUSSE somewhat beyond the intent of this rubric.

**Information added to the Revised Requirement Five**
It is the belief of Agency staff that the state law requiring all teachers to first meet Illinois requirements for assignment and *in addition* comply with NCLB, makes our teachers better able to demonstrate content competence through HOUSSE. Endorsements for teaching at the middle grades level ensure that teachers have at least 18 semester hours of credit in the subject; current endorsements at the secondary level ensure that teachers have at least 24 semester hours in a subject for assignment or endorsement. Therefore, veteran teachers using Illinois HOUSSE will most often have substantial academic credit that makes them knowledgeable in their fields.

The U.S. Department of Education has indicated it will not eliminate HOUSSE through regulation but will encourage states to limit HOUSSE while awaiting the results of Congressional reauthorization of NCLB, in the expectation that HOUSSE will be eliminated. Until reauthorization has been completed, the current HOUSSE requirements will continue to apply to veteran teachers.

Other than the two major groups---new special education teachers of multiple subjects who are highly qualified in either language arts, mathematics, or science or new rural school teachers of multiple subjects who are highly qualified in one subject---our revised plan allows veteran teachers to use HOUSSE to complete their professional development plans and veteran teachers (or administrators who are reassigned to teaching) to use HOUSSE if they are assigned to any new subject after the 2005-06 school year.

We also estimated that one percent of teachers will fall into the latter categories for veteran teachers.
**Requirement Six**  
*The revised plan must include a copy of the State’s written “equity plan” for ensuring that poor or minority children are not taught by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers at higher rates than are other children.*

We were found deficient in one area: Does the plan indicate that the SEA will examine the issue of equitable teacher assignment when it monitors LEAs, and how this will be done?

- We added an “equity plan” to the forms that will be accessible to LEAs on IWAS.
- We also stated how various strategies (discussed in Requirement Three) relate to the state equity plan. For example: *Promote Induction and Mentoring in High Need Schools;* Illinois has instituted Beginning Teacher Induction Pilot Programs.
- Information regarding the increase in the foundation level and how the foundation level helps high need schools the most was included in the revised plan.
- Preliminary data on teaching experience shows that there is little difference in experience between teachers in high poverty and low poverty schools. There is more of a difference in experience between those teaching in high minority and low minority schools. Even this difference, however, is not dramatic.

**Conclusion**  
We believe that our revised plan should answer any questions that remain. We await word from the USDOE on what, if anything, will require further clarification.
TO: Education Policy Planning Committee

FROM: Meta Minton, Director of Public Information
       Becky Watts, Chief of Staff
       Jean Ladage, Board Services Coordinator

Agenda Topic: Student Advisory Council Operational Staffing Plan

Materials: Membership List

Purpose of Agenda Item
During mid-August, Meta Minton, Jean Ladage and Lateasa Polito read and analyzed student essays and letters of recommendations for each candidate applying for the Student Advisory Council. Based on the review of materials submitted and interviews conducted, a selection of ten new Student Advisory Council members was selected. With these ten new members, that brings the total to fifteen members total.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
Related to Goal 2: Improving Education for all Students

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
Collect input from Board members on the involvement of the Student Advisory Council.

Next Steps
The members of the Student Advisory Council will meet with the State Board on November 16, 2006 in Springfield.
### Student Advisory Council 2006-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year in School</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>High School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anna Bittman *</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Winnetka</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>New Trier H.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Byerley *</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Lemont</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>Lemont Township H.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Kiefer</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Dahlgren</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Hamilton County H.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Lockley *</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Olney</td>
<td>Richland</td>
<td>East Richland H.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Matos</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>Carl Schurz H.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alix M. Olian</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Highland Park</td>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>Highland Park H.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Schoenburg</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>Sangamon</td>
<td>Springfield H.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison Tharp</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Steinte Marie</td>
<td>Jasper</td>
<td>Newton Community H.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joya Anthony</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>East St. Louis</td>
<td>St. Clair</td>
<td>East St. Louis Senior H.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariel Austin *</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>King College Prep H.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micah Berman</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Urbana</td>
<td>Champaign</td>
<td>University of Illinois Laboratory School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Diaz *</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Northlake</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>West Leyden H.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma LePere</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Millstadt</td>
<td>St. Clair</td>
<td>Belleville West H.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Maldonado</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>School for Social Justice H.S., Little Village Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Ornstein</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Round Lake Beach</td>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>Grayslake Community H.S. North</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Returning Students