AGENDA

1. Roll Call
2. Board Member Participation by Other Means
3. Public Participation
4. Minutes of the January Education Policy Planning Committee Meeting (pp. 2-3)
5. High School Emerging Issue Discussion (pp. 4-11)
6. Definition of Technology Literacy (Dana Kinley) (pp. 12-16)
7. Review of Reading First Grant over $1 million (Dana Kinley) (Plenary pp. 154-156)
8. Review of Mathematics and Science Partnerships RFP (Dana Kinley) (Plenary pp. 157-158)
9. Review of Preschool for All RFP (Kay Henderson) (Plenary pp. 159-160)
10. Guidelines for School-Community Partnerships (Barbara Shaw and Christopher Koch) (Plenary pp. 165-196)
11. PSAE Pilot Proposal from District 211 (Becky McCabe) (pp. 17-29)
12. Illinois New Teacher Collaborative Informational Update (pp. 30-38) (Linda Kolbusz-Kosan, INTC and Linda Jamali)
13. Committee Agenda Planning/Additional Items
14. Adjourn

* Items listed with an asterisk (*) will be discussed in committee and Board action may be taken in the plenary session.
The Education Policy Planning Committee meeting convened at 2:50 p.m.

1. **ROLL CALL:** David Fields took roll call.

2. **BOARD MEMBER PARTICIPATION BY OTHER MEANS:** There was no participation from Board members through any other means.

3. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:** Fulton Nolen, Jr., Daryl Morrison and Leslie Wilson, were in attendance as members of the Coalition for High Schools, to mainly observe and to generally speak on the terms of the implementation of the “Perspective of High Schools Renewal” document.

   Leslie Wilson extended an invitation to the Board Members to attend the next meeting of the Coalition on February 26, 2007, in Bloomington at the IHSA headquarters.

4. **MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 2006 EPPC MEETING:** The Committee approved the minutes for the December 2006 EPPC Meeting.

5. **GROWTH MODEL TASK FORCE REPORT (Becky McCabe):** Becky McCabe was in attendance to present the Legislative Report of the Task Force on Growth Models, per Senate Joint Resolution 87. She stated that the Task Force was put together by the Legislature and the State Superintendent in order to address the issues encountered from the field on how to measure growth over time. She further stated that the report includes recommendations which require funding. Further, due to not having scores available, we were unable to produce models as part of what the Superintendent asked the Task Force to do.

   Board Member Brown asked if we (ISBE) could provide technical assistance for the Growth Models to schools. Becky stated that ISBE does not have the resources to provide technical assistance, but there are other districts that have started to look at the variety of models that could be used and we could network districts from those districts.

   Board Member Holmes referred to pages 18 and 19 of the Recommendations and asked what ISBE’s role is in responding to the budgetary recommendations and whether or not we should have included this in the FY 08 funding. Ginger Reynolds stated that since our assessment system is not fully approved, we would not be eligible to apply for this pilot until the spring. Becky McCabe further stated that we responded to the legislature and had not brought this to the Board for anything additional. Ms. Holmes thought this was timely in relation to the adoption of the budget and it was suggested that Becky work with Ronny Wickenhauser on the funding issue and hopefully obtain this information by Thursday’s Board meeting.
Board Member Karon asked if the Task Force looked at the cost of providing Plan and Explore would be and the savings to school districts and what they currently spend. Becky did not have the figures in front of her to answer Ms. Karon but stated that she could obtain this information as soon as possible.

6. DISCUSSION REGARDING THE RFSP FOR ELL-ISAT AND ELL-PSAE TO REPLACE CURRENT IMAGE ASSESSMENT (Becky McCabe): Becky McCabe and John Craig were in attendance to discuss and obtain authorization from the Board for the Request For Sealed Proposal for the English Language Learners assessment, which has been known as IMAGE. The name has changed so it will now be called ELL-ISAT or ELL-PSAE. Becky referred the Committee members to their Board item.

Becky stated that there was an error in the “Next Steps” but this will be brought back to the Board in February.

7. PRE-K FOR ALL GRANT AGREEMENTS OVER $1 MILLION (Cindy Zumwalt):
   a. Schaumburg School District #54
   b. Illinois Action for Children

Interim Superintendent Koch began by stating that the State Board has a new process for grant agreements over $1 million. He stated that agreements that exceed the $1 million will now come before the Board. He briefly stated that there are two grant agreements this month for the Board’s approval, one for Schaumburg District 54 and the other for the Illinois Action for Children.

Board Member Holmes recognized Cindy Zumwalt’s experience and expertise in this project.

8. HIGH SCHOOL EMERGING ISSUE DISCUSSION: Dave Fields stated that due to the time, he asked the Committee to move this item to the February meeting so we could have more time on this issue.

Board Member Holmes asked about obtaining more refinement on this issue. Chairman Fields stated that the staff was to just obtain some information to bring to the Committee of the Whole to have a more full discussion on where we would like to go as next steps.

Ginger Reynolds referred the Committee to page 27 and then further stated that the Coalition has asked if the Board is interested in helping fund some workshops, which is $200 per workshop and there are 4 workshops, for a total of $800.

Board Member Holmes suggested that the Board members should attend the February 26 meeting first and that we need to also discuss if there is money in the budget for this.

The Committee discussed that the money is there to help budget these workshops.

9. COMMITTEE AGENDA PLANNING/ADDITIONAL ITEMS: Ginger Reynolds suggested to have Division Administrator Mark Williams attend an EPPC meeting at some point to give the Board a review on the next Perkins legislation.

Brenda Holmes requested that the Committee have a discussion on the “wellness policy”.

Chris Koch asked if the discussion on re-enrolling task force on truants’ alternative program item would appear at February’s EPPC meeting and the Committee confirmed that it would be.

Dave Fields reiterated that the EPPC Committee will discuss the High School Emerging Issue at next month’s (February’s) meeting.

10. ADJOURNMENT: Vinni Hall moved to adjourn the EPPC meeting and Joyce Karon seconded the motion. The EPPC meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Christopher Koch, Ed.D., Interim State Superintendent of Education
       Ginger Reynolds, Ph.D., Assistant Superintendent

Agenda Topic: High Schools Emerging Issue

Materials: The Committee Chair requests that members review the materials in their High Schools Emerging Issue binders, especially “The Context and Status of High School Reform in Illinois” prepared for the Board February, 2006 along with information prepared for the January 2007 EPPC meeting.


Staff Contact(s): Ginger Reynolds, Becky McCabe

Purpose of Agenda Item
The purpose of this agenda item is to allow the Committee of the Whole an opportunity to discuss how it would like to proceed with regard to its Emerging Issue of High Schools.

The Draft Memorandum of Understanding with the Gates Foundation is provided at the request of the State Superintendent for your review and comment.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Board may choose to continue the discussion at a future meeting, propose action items, seek to initiate legislation, direct the Agency to conduct research, or determine some other course of action.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Board may choose to place the Gates Memorandum of Understanding on the March Plenary agenda for vote.

Background Information
Since the Board designated high schools as one of its Emerging Issues, at least two major opportunities for further work in Illinois have developed:

1. The Coalition for Illinois High Schools grew out of the 2006 conference *The High School Challenge*. This group is comprised of a long list of education stakeholders in Illinois, including the Illinois State Board of Education, who are interested in initiating high school reform. The Coalition has developed a mission statement and goals, and currently is planning a series of workshops across the state to bring attention to the uses of and possibilities for specific assessments in high school. The Board is supporting this effort. The Coalition also is planning a conference for June 2007 to build upon last June’s conference at which Willard Daggett will speak, though the full agenda still is in
development. This group of influential stakeholders is ready to work with the Board as it plans further high school involvement.

2. The Bill and Melinda Gates foundation has expressed interest in working with the Agency, the Governor, and the Board to build capacity in Illinois for the increased achievement of all students. The Gates Foundation is particularly interested in high schools, and its focus areas include college and work readiness. Gates is interested in finding areas of mutual interest with the Board, including high schools.

The Board has at least two – not mutually exclusive – avenues for influencing high schools. One avenue involves presenting educators with best practice professional development and technical assistance. This avenue operates on the assumption that local schools and districts are in the best position to know what will work best in local communities and that the state role in high school renewal is one of capacity building. This kind of state influence could take many specific forms, including statewide conferences, regional workshops, and individual, local assistance.

The second avenue involves legislative or policy regulation. It also could involve incentive funds for high schools to change in ways the Board deems desirable. This avenue operates on the assumption that the Board’s role in improving high schools is one that necessitates incentives and/or control in order to initiate real change. Possible Board actions on this avenue might include mandating a more strenuous high school curriculum, instituting a high school exit exam, or providing incentive funds for schools to establish course exit exams.

Since the Board is dedicated to data-driven decision making, the following information about high schools may be useful in framing the discussion:

- **The number of high schools not making adequate yearly progress has risen.** The number of high schools not making adequate yearly progress (AYP) has risen from 270 in 2004 to 313 in 2005.

- **ACT are scores up, but the achievement gap remains.** ACT results for Illinois’ graduating class of 2006 rose from 20.3 in 2005 to 20.5 in 2006. This continues the positive upward trend in Illinois, where the average composite score was 20.1 in 2002.
  - The national average composite score in 2006 was 21.1; however, it is important to remember that Illinois is only one of two states where all students take the ACT exam.
  - Average composite scores for all racial/ethnic groups increased in 2006. The composite score for African-American students was up 0.1 from the previous year to 16.9; and the average composite score for Hispanic students was up 0.2 from the previous year to 17.7. However, there still is a significant gap between scores for minority students and the scores for white students.

- **The graduation rate has increased since 1997.** The graduation rate was 87.8 percent in 2006, up from 81.6 percent in 1997.

- **The dropout rate has declined since 1997.** The dropout rate declined from 6.4 percent in 1997 to 3.5 percent in 2006. Dropouts include students in grades 9-12 whose names have been removed from the district roster for any reason other than death, extended illness, graduation/completion of a program of study, transfer to another school, or expulsion.
• **The chronic truancy rate is generally unchanged.** The chronic truancy rate was 2.2 percent in 2006, compared to 2.3 percent in 1997. Chronic truants include students, subject to compulsory attendance, who have been absent without valid cause from such attendance for 10 percent or more of the previous 180 regular attendance days.

Highlighted below are two programs that serve high schools students which also may help to frame the discussion:

1. **Truants’ Alternative and Optional Education Program (TAOEP):** This program offers modified instructional programs and other services designed to prevent students from dropping out of school and to prevent truancy and chronic truancy. Grants are awarded through a competitive process.
   a. In FY 05, TAOEP served approximately 40 percent more students than were served in FY 04, up to 70,875 from 51,143. Increases in students served by Chicago School District 299 account for much of this statewide increase.
   b. Among downstate programs, regional offices of education served the highest number of students (64.5%) compared to local education agencies (21.1%), community colleges (7.3%), or vocational education centers (2.1%).
   c. In 2005, almost 80 percent of high school students enrolled in optional education programs earned at least one academic credit, and 68 percent improved attendance.
   d. Also in 2005, 69.2 percent of 12th grade students enrolled in a TAOEP program graduated from high school.

2. **Illinois Regional Safe Schools Program (RSSP):** This program provides Illinois with a system of alternative education programs for students in grades six through twelve who are subject to suspension or expulsion based on the disciplinary policies of the school district they attend.
   a. In 2005 there were 47 RSSP programs with 97 sites operating in the state of Illinois.
   b. 44.6 percent of students enrolled in an RSSP program in 2005 were White, 39.4 percent were African-American, and 13.9 percent were Hispanic.
   c. 71.3 percent of these students were male.
   d. In 2005, 71.7 percent of high school students enrolled in an RSSP program earned at least one high school credit.
   e. In 2005, 52.9 percent of 12th graders enrolled in an RSSP program graduated from high school.
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING AMONG
THE OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR ROD BLAGOJEVICH,
THE ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION, AND
THE BILL & MELINDA GATES FOUNDATION FOR
THE ILLINOIS COLLEGE AND WORK READINESS PARTNERSHIP

I. INTRODUCTION

This Memorandum of Understanding establishes a partnership among the Office of the Governor Rod R. Blagojevich (Governor's Office), the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE), and The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (Foundation), in relation to the State's policies and programs for ensuring Illinois students are prepared for college and work.

Each partner has demonstrated a commitment to addressing college and work readiness. The following efforts serve as examples of this commitment:

- **Governor's Office**: Governor Blagojevich successfully led the effort to increase Illinois' high school graduation requirements for the first time in more than 20 years; has supported policies leading to increased rigor in high schools; and has proposed the formation of a P-20 Council to better address the linkages between secondary and higher education.

- **Illinois State Board of Education**: ISBE has focused on college and workforce preparation by selecting high school reform as a Board emerging issue, and by adopting as a central component of its strategic plan the goal of fostering 21st Century literacy skills. ISBE is also working with the Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity (DCEO) and other state agency partners on improving the preparation of students for work and careers and is chairing the Illinois Workforce Investment Board Task Force on K-12 career development. ISBE, DCEO and other agency partners are working to expand the innovation talent pool in Illinois through a variety of strategies including: (i) promoting science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) education; and (ii) aligning the State's activities with career and technical education and industry-led efforts such as the iBIO biosciences education initiative.

- **The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation**: Through its partnerships in communities across the nation, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation is committed to raising the high school graduation rate and helping all students - regardless of race or family income - graduate as strong citizens ready for college and work.

Through this partnership, the Foundation will provide coordinated, sustained technical assistance to the Governor's Office, ISBE, and other partners (such as a State P-20 Council, if created) to help the State create an overall framework for policy enactment and implementation and step-by-step action plans for particular issues. The Foundation will provide its technical assistance primarily through Holland & Knight's Education
Policy Team. Holland & Knight’s Education Policy Team has extensive expertise on the process of state policy change, and has assisted numerous states to leverage federal law and national reforms to move state policy. As part of this partnership, Holland & Knight will help ISBE and the Governor's Office make linkages to the Foundation's other core partners and national best practices, and will maintain the connection between the State of Illinois and the Foundation for possible participation in multi-state initiatives.

II. PARTNERSHIP DESCRIPTION

1. Focus on College and Work Readiness

In support of the State's efforts to implement effective policy change, the partnership will focus primarily on objectives and strategies relating to college and work readiness. Within this focus, the following three areas will receive particular emphasis:

1. **Alignment:** Are high school expectations aligned with college and work expectations? What should all graduates know and be able to do? To what extent should and can the educational system personalize education and help each student achieve his/her full potential?

2. **Measurement:** How does the State measure whether students are entering college and the workforce with the necessary skills? What data systems are needed? How is data used by the State, school districts, and institutions of higher education to determine student achievement, evaluate instructional strategies, and determine the need for support and interventions? What subject areas and skill-sets are measured? What role should/can assessments play?

3. **Support and Interventions:** How does the State provide support and interventions to ensure districts are preparing students for college and work? How does the State ensure equitable distribution of high quality teachers and instructional materials? Should the assistance and intervention system include student-level as well as school- and district-level institutions? What accountability systems can and should exist for community colleges and institutions of higher education?

2. Blueprint for Enactment and Implementation of Policy Change

Initially, the Governor's Office and ISBE, in consultation with the Foundation and Holland & Knight, will identify the appropriate working team for this effort. Holland & Knight will then work with the partnership members to develop an Illinois-specific blueprint defining strategic objectives and possible short- and long-term initiatives relating to college and work readiness, with an emphasis on the areas of alignment, measurement, and support and interventions. The blueprint will identify the primary and secondary government entities responsible for undertaking the initiative (e.g., ISBE, Governor's Office, IBHE, ICCB, DCEO, ROEs, etc.), and a capacity and support analysis of the resources needed to effectuate the desired outcome.
This blueprint will serve as a working document for managing and facilitating the progress of the partnership and can be revised over time as circumstances warrant. As a starting point for the blueprint, Holland & Knight will analyze and build upon:

i. the goals, objectives and initiatives identified in ISBE’s strategic plan;
ii. information and analysis generated as part of ISBE’s recent focus on high school reform;
iii. information and analysis developed by ISBE and the Governor's Office through their collective focus on State support and interventions for low-performing schools and districts;
iv. information and analysis generated during the development and implementation of the Governor's 2006 education plan;
v. initiatives undertaken by DCEO's Bureau of Workforce Development and the Illinois Workforce Investment Board relating to workforce preparation;
vii. Holland & Knight's analysis of the key policy indicators relating to high school reform, and other available state policy analysis frameworks reflecting multi-state consensus and lessons learned through the nationwide focus on college and work readiness; and
vii. The work of core Foundation partnership organizations such as the National Governors Association (NGA), Achieve, the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), and the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE).

While the partnership will seek to leverage federal law and national reforms, the blueprint must be Illinois specific and consistent with Illinois values, objectives, governance structures, legal requirements and state and local capacities.

3. Identification of key policy issues and areas that are ripe for State action

As the blueprint is developed, the members of the partnership will identify specific initiatives that are both ripe for State action and critical to the State’s implementation of its policy objectives. Holland & Knight will coordinate the development of a step-by-step action plan to address each selected initiative. On some issues, Holland & Knight will develop the action plan primarily working with ISBE, with general coordination with the Governor's Office. On other issues, the reverse will be true. The action plan will include recommendations for: (i) other external partners that can assist with the implementation of the initiative; (ii) necessary staffing and/or contractual support needed to carry out the initiative; and (ii) identifying and obtaining the other necessary resources to carry out the initiative.

4. Participation in regular meetings and follow-up to help manage and succeed in the process of policy change

Holland & Knight and the Foundation will schedule regularly meetings with ISBE and the Governor's Office (as separate meetings, or collectively, as deemed appropriate
by the partnership) to track progress on the overall blueprint and discuss next steps for specific action items. Between these meetings, Holland & Knight will coordinate directly with members of ISBE and the Governor's Office team to assist with the management and implementation of policy change. Holland & Knight will provide semiannual detailed reports to the Governor, State Board, and State Superintendent on the status of the partnership's initiatives and anticipated activities during the next six months, providing an opportunity for the State's leadership to evaluate outcomes and future policy directions. More frequent reports on specific issues will be provided upon request.

III. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

The services provided by Holland & Knight within the scope of this partnership will be at no cost to the State. Holland & Knight's services will be provided through the support of the Foundation, based upon the Foundation's budget for this partnership. The Governor's Office and ISBE agree that the state-specific policy planning arising out of the partnership can be shared with Foundation staff, other states, and other core partners assisting the Foundation on its national college and work readiness initiatives. If the Governor's Office or ISBE require or desire deeper policy support or legal counseling on specific matters beyond the scope of services provided through the support of the Foundation, Holland & Knight and/or the Foundation will work with ISBE and the Governor's Office to address the need for those services on a case-by-case basis.

The partnership formed under this Memorandum of Understanding will extend until June 30, 2008, with an option for renewal by all parties dependent on a review of the services performed, State needs, and policy outcomes. The parties to this Memorandum of Understanding may amend it at any time through a written agreement signed by each of the parties, and any party may terminate this Memorandum of Understanding at any time through written notice to the other parties.
In demonstration of their agreement to the terms set forth in this Memorandum of Understanding, authorized representatives of the Governor's Office, ISBE, and the Foundation have set forth their signature below.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR ROD R. BLAGOJEVICH

By: ____________________________
Its: ____________________________
Date: __________________________

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

By: ____________________________
Its: ____________________________
Date: __________________________

THE BILL AND MELINDA GATES FOUNDATION

By: ____________________________
Its: ____________________________
Date: __________________________
Ilinois State Board of Education Meeting
February 21-22, 2007

To: Education Policy Planning Committee

From: Ginger M. Reynolds, Ph.D., Assistant Superintendent
Dana F. Kinley, Division Administrator

Agenda Topic: Definition of Technology Literate for ISBE Board Approval

Materials: Survey Results - National Educational Technology Standards for Students (NETS-S)

Staff Contact(s): Glenda S. Bequette

Purpose of Agenda Item
The Division of Curriculum and Instruction is requesting that the Board approve the definition of technology literate that was developed by a group of Illinois educators to comply with the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB).

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
The Division of Curriculum and Instruction is requesting the Board to approve the following definition of technology literate to comply with NCLB:

“Technology literate is the ability to contribute effectively in a global society through the appropriate use of technology to solve problems, to communicate, to collaborate, and to connect information, ideas, and learning.”

This definition is broad enough in its scope and foundation to provide a universal description of technology acuity regardless of grade level while at the same time pinpointing specific domains of function. This definition reflects the Five Applications of Learning which are an integral part of the Illinois Learning Standards and 21st Century Skills (Career Development and Workforce Preparation).

Background Information
The Enhancing Education Through Technology Act of 2001 (Title II, Part D of NCLB) outlines three goals. One of these goals is to assist every student in crossing the digital divide by ensuring that every student is technologically literate by the time the student finishes the eighth grade, regardless of the student's race, ethnicity, gender, family income, geographic location, or disability. The U.S. Department of Education notified states in January of 2005 that it would be the responsibility of each state to define the term technology literate. It is expected that in February of 2008, the Agency will be required to report on technology literate eighth graders through the Comprehensive Consolidated State Performance Report. Additional information about this requirement will be forthcoming.

Illinois’ current Five-Year Technology Plan, “Digital-Age Learning,” addresses the issue of technology literacy standards:

Illinois also adopted as its technology literacy standards those delineated by the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) in the National Technology Education Standards (NETS-S). At its May 2002 State Board meeting, the Board
“…endorsed the use of these standards for K-12 students…” These standards reflect the Six Essential Learnings for technology adopted by ISBE in 1995. ISBE will take actions to assure that Illinois educators, students, and parents are aware of these standards and are addressing them in their educational planning and accountability.  
http://www.isbe.net/curriculum/elearning/pdf/tech_plan.pdf (page 5)

An awareness of these standards and their integration into the curriculum varies, according to an online survey of educators (administrators, technology personnel, and classroom teachers) in April 2006. The results specific to the NETS-S from 7,424 educators who responded are summarized in the attachment. It is clear from these results that further outreach to school districts is needed in order for them to use these standards as a way to gauge students’ level of technology literacy (see “Communication” section below).

The Agency partnered with the North Central Regional Education Laboratory (NCREL)/Learning Point Associates to host several meetings with administrators, technology coordinators, and practicing teachers to define technology literate. In addition, the field wanted to develop a Web-based resource for Illinois schools, administrators, and teachers. This online resource is a collection of best practice guidelines for Illinois educators to use in gauging the efficacy and profundity of current integration practices in local schools, districts, and state level classrooms and in support the NETS-S.

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

**Policy Implications:** ISBE must report on the number of technology literate eighth graders by February of 2008. Illinois has 874 districts; approximately 771 are elementary and unit districts and would be impacted by this request. Staff is working to determine how this data can be collected.

**Budget Implications:** In FY07 (2006-2007 school year), Illinois received approximately $11,005,654 for the Enhancing Education Through Technology (EETT) grant program (federal NCLB funds). Half of the EETT funds are distributed by formula to eligible school districts, with the remaining EETT funds distributed competitively.

The formula grants are based on the number of Title I students and are awarded to all districts with Title I student populations. Districts are notified of the level of funding to be received in the fall through the Electronic Grant Management System (eGMS). Each recipient must use at least 25 percent of its funds to provide ongoing, sustained and intensive, high-quality professional development for both formula and competitive grant funds. The recipient must provide professional development in the integration of advanced technologies, including emerging technologies, into curricula and instruction and in using those technologies to create new learning environments.

**FY 07 EETT Formula Breakdown**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of Districts</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Illinois Districts (LEAs)</td>
<td>874</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of LEAs NOT eligible for EETT funding</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAs with Grant Awards from 0 - $1,000</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAs with Grant Awards from $1,001 - $5,000</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAs with Grant Awards from $5,001 - $20,000</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAs with Grant Awards from $20,001 - $100,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAs with Grant Awards of $100,000 or more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Formula grants range from $15.00 to $2,985,228.00. Over eighty percent (80%) of the districts in Illinois receive less than $5,000 through EETT.

Fifty-eight (58) of the 67 districts not receiving funds for EETT are elementary or unit districts who may be impacted by the technology literate reporting requirement. At this time, it is unclear whether the U.S. Department of Education will require those districts not receiving funds under this program to report.

The competitive EETT grant awardees who serve grades five and/or eight were required to assess their students’ technology literacy as a pre- and post-test. Information and analysis of that data will be available for the affected districts in May of 2007.

Legislative Action: None.

Communication: Upon the approval of this definition, it will be disseminated to all Illinois School Districts through various avenues (State Superintendent’s Weekly Newsletter, Regional Offices of Education/Intermediate Service Centers/Learning Technology Centers, listservs, ISBE staff presentations, etc.). Currently, staff members have been presenting at conferences (local & state) on the topic of the NETS-S in order to comply with the May 2002 Board directive. Staff will develop a NETS-S/Technology Literate training to be used with educators and the general public. It would then be the responsibility of each impacted district to determine how the definition is measured/assessed at the local level.

**Pros and Cons of Various Actions**

**Pros**
- Districts would be provided with a broad definition of technology literate. Districts will then have the opportunity to determine how this definition is reflective of their students and how it will be assessed/evaluated at the local level.

**Cons**
- The lack of adequate funding (state and federal) may make it difficult for districts to measure/assess eighth graders for technology literacy.

**Next Steps**
Staff will bring this to the full Board for adoption in March.
April 2006 ISBE Survey Results on the National Educational Technology Standards for Students (NETS-S)

In April 2006, ISBE surveyed Illinois administrators (superintendent, assistant superintendent, business manager, curriculum director, principal or assistant principal), technology personnel (network specialist, network analyst, district-level technology director, building-level technology director, or library media director/specialist) and classroom teachers on a wide variety of topics (grants, professional development, standards, etc.).

Each of the surveys asked participants about their familiarity/awareness of the NETS-S. The information noted is reflective of the responses received by the identified participant groups.

Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20. How familiar are you with the National Educational Technology Standards for Students (NETS-S)? Choose one.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Aware</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heard of them</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware, but not sure if they are being integrated in daily classroom instruction.</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are integrating them in their daily classroom instruction.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Technology Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14. Are you aware of the National Educational Technology Standards for Students (NETS-S)?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not aware.</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heard of them.</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware, but not sure if they are being put into practice.</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are integrating them in their daily classroom instruction.</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ISBE Survey Results – April 2006
### 6. Are you aware of the National Educational Technology Standards for Students (NETS-S)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not aware</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heard of them</td>
<td>1439</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware, but need additional knowledge for integration in my curriculum.</td>
<td>1771</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am integrating the NETS-S in my curriculum.</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5971</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. Has your school district integrated the National Educational Technology Standards for Students (NETS-S) into the curriculum?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No, NETS-S are not integrated into the curriculum.</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure if NETS-S are being integrated into the curriculum.</td>
<td>4262</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, NETS-S are integrated into the curriculum.</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5971</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Education Policy Planning Committee

FROM: Dr. Ginger Reynolds, Assistant Superintendent

Agenda Topic: Prairie State Achievement Examination Pilot Proposal from District 211

Materials: Additional Information from District 211, included at the request of Superintendent Thornton

Staff Contact(s): Becky McCabe, Student Assessment
                Connie Wise, Data Analysis
                Gayle Johnson, Student Assessment

Purpose of Agenda Item
To discuss the advantages and concerns regarding a proposal to administer the Prairie State Achievement Examination (PSAE) to seniors who did not meet standards on the PSAE during their junior year.

The intention of this proposal is to require high school senior students to retake the PSAE if they did not meet the standards for PSAE in their junior year. This would be a change from current practice where seniors may voluntarily take the PSAE to improve their scores.

The proposal expects that the results of the PSAE from grade 11 will increase intense educational programs for high schools seniors who did not meet the standards on state testing.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
After a full discussion of the pros and cons of this proposal, the Board will direct ISBE staff about how to proceed.

Background Information
In January, 2006, District 211 Superintendent Roger Thornton contacted Dr. Ginger Reynolds and ISBE staff to discuss his local district board’s proposal for allowing seniors who did not meet standards on PSAE during their junior year to retake the PSAE, and allow those results to count toward AYP.

By law, seniors may voluntarily retake the PSAE in the fall of their senior to improve their scores or they may take a portion of the PSAE to meet the PSAE graduation requirement. The fall date of administration provides students with ACT scores in time to apply for college. The seniors’ scores, however, are not included in AYP calculations.

On February 14, 2006, Superintendent Thornton met with State Superintendent Randy Dunn and State Representative Suzanne Bassi to discuss his proposal for senior testing and the recalculating of AYP. Superintendent Thornton and his administrative staff then presented to the State Board Educational Policy Planning Committee in March, 2006, their educational support for high school students in their district, their concerns about seniors who fail PSAE, the need to continue instructional rigor, and the impact that low performing student scores have on AYP. A petition from the District 211 School Board was presented to the ISBE Board requesting the
additional administration of the PSAE for those seniors who failed the PSAE and requesting that the results be used to adjust the school's AYP status.

In June 2006 ISBE staff reviewed the proposal and brought their concerns to the Board. ISBE staff checked with the U.S. Department of Education and confirmed that AYP cannot be calculated as proposed by this petition. Therefore, AYP recalculation cannot be included in this proposal.

Superintendent Dunn asked ISBE staff to look into the possibility of piloting such a proposal. Staff returned to the Board with the pros and cons of such piloting. Dr. Reynolds emphasized to the Board that staff and resources at ISBE would not allow for such a pilot to occur without additional funding. The Board suggested that ISBE might be willing to accompany District 211 in a request to the legislature for appropriate funding so such a pilot could be administered.

At this time, and prior to engaging in a request for funding with the state legislature, ISBE staff would like to engage in a discussion with the Board regarding the implications of such a proposal.

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

Policy Implications:

There would be a number of policies regarding the administration of the PSAE that would need to be adjusted or revised with ACT and ISBE staff in order to allow for seniors to take the PSAE at the same time as juniors (in the spring).

The scores and data collection would need to be delineated and formatted differently to provide results to individual students and schools but not count toward AYP.

The School Code also would have to be changed. If the School Code is changed to allow for this retesting proposal, then additional policy would have to be developed.

This proposal would move Illinois closer to implementing a state exit exam.

Budget Implications:

There would be costs implications:

The estimated per-student cost for taking the PSAE on a multiple test basis is $72 per student.

If we continued the current fall retake test and then added the retesting of seniors in the spring, the cost of an additional test (not including make-up tests and administrative costs) is $65.

Approximately 47% of Grade 11 students fail to meet the standards on the PSAE. Therefore, approximately 59,000 students would take the test at least twice, which would require an increase of over $4,829,021 per year, increasing to $5,185,000 in FY 11. This cost figure includes ACT writing.
If the Board directed ISBE to go forward with this proposal as a pilot, then costs would vary depending upon how many students participated. There also would be research costs associated with evaluating the pilot.

Legislative Action:

The Illinois School Code states: "Any student who fails to earn a qualifying score for a Prairie State Achievement Award in any one or more of the academic areas on the initial test administration or who wishes to improve his or her score on any portion of the examination shall be permitted to retake such portion or portions of the examination during grade 12."

The School Code would have to be changed so that students who fail the PSAE in their junior year would be required to re-test in their senior year.

If the Board directs staff to move forward with a pilot, then the School Code would not need to change until the pilot was implemented statewide.

Communication:

As a pilot, school districts would need to be notified of the opportunity to participate in such a study. If the pilot were implemented statewide, it would be necessary to contact all high schools with rules, policies, and procedures regarding the new requirement.

**Pros and Cons of Various Actions**

**PROS**

- Students have an opportunity later in their senior year to increase their PSAE scores.
- This might allow districts another year to demonstrate enhanced educational opportunities and learning for students.
- PSAE would be administered in the spring with the juniors, with no fall Grade 12 re-take necessary.
- Vouchers for taking the ACT portion only of the PSAE to receive a regular high school diploma might not be necessary.

**CONS**

- There are limited resources and time at the schools to add the intense instructional coursework necessary for students to pass the PSAE in their senior year.
- Accurate data collection and administration of the PSAE would have to occur at the school level so test results would be valid.
- This proposal requires that all schools participate, which would require additional student information documentation and the identification of all students who did not pass PSAE to participate in the retake. Collecting and matching these two pieces of data would put additional resource strain on local districts and the state.
- Testing Grade 11 and Grade 12 students during the same administration would require more specific protocols and data collection.
• A spring administration for Grade 12 students could prevent them from receiving ACT scores from PSAE testing in time for college entrance applications.

• The law would have to be changed so Grade 11 students who do not earn at least a Meets Standards PSAE score in reading and in mathematics would be required to retake the PSAE in Grade 12.

• An increase of over $4,829,021 per year, increasing to $5,185,000 in FY 11 to cover the additional students participating in the testing.

Additional staff concerns for consideration:
This change would result in more state testing, but not necessarily more rigorous instruction for high school students. Better uses of resources might include continuing to enhance instruction and to provide an aligned curriculum to improve achievement, rather than using the threat of more mandated tests. The use of school time and district and state resources might better serve students if they supported more rigorous high school instruction.

This type of educational proposal might be better handled by local districts. They know their students and can provide incentives and other graduation requirements that would best support their particular students’ achievement. The ACT EPAS program, in the Board’s budget under the Growth Model line item, provides the benchmark information that would inform how well students are doing prior to PSAE testing.

Some additional questions that would need to be answered include:
• What would be the compliance implications regarding students who don’t participate?
• How would the state address students who require accommodations?
• How would the state address students who don’t take PSAE but instead take the IMAGE or the IAA?
• What are the consequences of not passing the PSAE in the senior year for students and schools?
• What happens to students who take the PSAE but don’t earn a score due to misadministration by the school? Are they required to take the test again?
February 8, 2007

Dr. Ginger Reynolds
Illinois State Board of Education
100 North 1st Street
Springfield, Illinois 62777

Dear Dr. Reynolds:

Thank you for the opportunity to present additional information to the Illinois State Board of Education Policy Planning Committee regarding Township High School District 211’s proposal to administer the Illinois Prairie States Achievement Examination to high school seniors. We have appreciated the Committee’s consideration of the proposal and wish to work with you to advance the proposal.

I am enclosing ten (10) copies of the additional information and would welcome questions or request for any specific information not contained in the enclosed. We will be in attendance at your February 21, 2007, meeting in Springfield, and will welcome any questions you or the Committee Members might have.

Thanks again for your work with us on this important proposal.

Sincerely,

Roger Thornton
Superintendent

Enclosures

c: Township High School District 211 Board of Education
Administrative Council Members

"Building the future, one student at a time."
February 6, 2007

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

FROM: Township High School District 211

RE: TOWNSHIP HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT 211 PROPOSAL
    FOR APRIL SENIOR PSAE TESTING

I. Senior Year State Retest Proposal

Background Information

The faculty and administration of District 211 have embraced the spirit of the Illinois
School Accountability System and its standards, as articulated by Illinois State
Standards and measured by the Prairie State Achievement Examination (PSAE). Since
the inception of the Illinois School Accountability System, our faculty has developed
significant academic initiatives to increase student achievement in reading,
mathematics, and many other academic areas. There is an abundance of data
supporting the positive impact of these initiatives on student achievement.

However, it is an unfortunate fact that many students enroll in District 211, and other
high schools around the State, with reading and mathematics skills inadequate to permit
them to fully participate in a high school curriculum of necessary rigor to prepare the
students to meet or exceed standards on the PSAE, which is comprised of a college
entrance examination (ACT) and a workplace entrance examination (WorkKeys). This
is not a statement of blame, but rather an indisputable fact. We accept the challenge of
accelerating these students during the four years of high school to a point where they
will successfully master concepts and skills engendered in the State standards. This is
our obligation to each student and to our community, and it is an obligation that we
embrace.

It remains indisputable that not all high school students are in a position to succeed in
mastery of the State standards after less than three years of their high school education,
regardless of our efforts to accelerate their academic performance. It just isn’t enough
time. It is to that end that we came to the State Superintendent of School Randy Dunn
over a year ago with a proposal to extend and require senior year PSAE testing in April
for those students who were unsuccessful on that test as juniors. In March 2006,
several educators from District 211 appeared before this Committee to ask that our
petition be validated and advanced to the Board of Education and State Legislature.
Additional Information

We recently were informed that your Committee again would review the Petition that was originally brought before you last year, and we were told that District 211 could submit information and documents that may be helpful to this discussion. The following documents are enclosed to demonstrate the work that our educators have already done to increase student achievement and to encourage their best effort on the State tests.

- Process for Instructional Improvement in Township High School District 211
- Academic Initiatives in Township High School District 211
- Recommended Incentives for Students Taking the Prairie State Achievement Test
- Copy of the February 9, 2006 Township High School District 211 Petition to the Illinois State Board of Education

Please note that these efforts are not restricted to a single year of high school, or even just the years preceding the current State test schedule. Rather, they are aimed at graduating students who have real options following four years of high school, and enhancing their capacity to be successful at the options that they chose to pursue.

Based on the last received Prairie State Achievement Examination test results for District 211 schools (school year 2004-2005), approximately 300 of our students failed to meet State standards in reading or mathematics by five points or less on the PSAE scale of 120 to 200. This score is, by law, recorded on their school transcript. They and their parents are given documents saying that these same students were unable to meet State standards in reading or in mathematics. Many, if not most of these students, have been identified as below average achievers throughout all of their school years. Many are from historically low achieving demographic groups. Yet, all of these students arguably are within striking distance, five points or less, of success on the last standardized test that they may ever take. We hope that you agree that they deserve that opportunity.

These students have over a year remaining in their high school education, and we believe that these students could still be successful if given an additional year of instruction. Additional information follows that serves to demonstrate the steps our teachers and leaders have accomplished in their quest for greater student learning. We again ask for your strong support to extend the emphasis on achieving the Illinois Learning Standards throughout the senior year, with the added opportunity for more Illinois students to achieve passage of the PSAE.
II. Process for Instructional Improvement in Township High School District 211

Background Information:

In response to the Illinois School Accountability System and the Prairie State Achievement Examination, Township High School District 211 has embarked on an instructional improvement process that has the goal of increased academic achievement by all students. Although the majority of our students are succeeding academically, the disaggregated data clearly reveals the needs of a significant and growing at-risk population of minority and, oftentimes, low income students are not being met. The Illinois School Accountability System requires us to address the academic needs of these at-risk students, but the professional commitment of educators prompts us to go beyond the law.

We have posed three questions in our effort to most quickly and effectively improve the academic achievement of all students: “What do we want students to know?”; “How do we know they know it?”; and “What will we do if they don’t know it?” Exploration of these questions by our faculty and administration has resulted in a process of instructional improvement that has been guided by focusing on: data to drive curricular decisions; the individual student rather than the majority of students; and the educational research regarding best academic practices. The process has challenged some traditional beliefs of teachers and administrators; thus, it continues to evolve as the culture of the district changes.

Additional Information:

Staff members have responded to this academic challenge with the development of over 50 instructional initiatives and programs to assist in addressing the academic needs of various groups of our students, including the range of students from at-risk to academically strong. Throughout the process, there has been a shift in thinking by our staff members regarding our role as educators. Teachers look beyond what is taught and focus on what has been learned. Although there is much still to accomplish, many challenges related to having every student maximize his or her academic potential are being addressed, as indicated in the chart that follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHALLENGE</th>
<th>DATA &amp; RESEARCH</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on individual student scores</td>
<td>Data reveals that approximately 30% of students are not meeting Illinois State Standards. The majority of the students are minority, low income, or special education students.</td>
<td>Curricular initiatives have been developed to meet individual student needs: cohort programs; increased classroom time; and required freshman, sophomore, and ESL summer academies have been instituted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a sense of urgency among our faculty, students, parents, and community to assist our current students not on track to meet standards.</td>
<td>Data reveals there were course sequences in mathematics and English in which students did not perform well on the PSAE examination. These students tended to complete only the minimum graduation requirements in mathematics. Students in remedial programs in our district had little chance of success. This fact was highlighted and staff determined this was not acceptable.</td>
<td>The academic rigor of mathematics and English course sequences has been carefully reviewed and changes have been made. The emphasis has been shifted from remediation to acceleration (see below). An additional required mathematics course at the 300 level has been added to the graduation requirement for District 211 students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine critical learning standards in reading, writing, mathematics, and science.</td>
<td>Research indicates that a focus on critical skills in core subjects is necessary for improving student achievement in all academic areas. Dr. Robert Marzano has worked with us since August 2005.</td>
<td>Critical learning standards have been developed after a careful review of course objectives, Illinois State Standards, and the College Readiness Standards and have been reviewed by Dr. Marzano.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforce critical learning standards in reading, writing, mathematics, and science in the elective areas.</td>
<td>Research indicates that standards must have leverage, meaning that success in one standard is very likely to be associated with success in other standards.</td>
<td>As part of the School Improvement Plan, all elective areas have focused on the natural connections that can reinforce the critical learning standards in English, mathematics, and science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on acceleration, not remediation.</td>
<td>Course data indicates that students in the M114 Algebra sequence have a 35% success rate on the PSAE. Students in the M117 Algebra sequence have an 88% success rate on the PSAE. Course data indicates that students in the E101 English sequence have a 9% success rate on the PSAE, whereas students in the E102 English sequence have a 71% success rate.</td>
<td>The key factor in addressing this challenge is providing additional time dedicated to the curriculum of the area of deficiency. (1 ½ periods that include the opportunity to increase a prior semester’s grade.) Acceleration of students to higher academic levels was a top priority of summer academy programs. This also became a school level priority. A student course acceleration form was developed to encourage student advancement into higher level courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHALLENGE</td>
<td>DATA &amp; RESEARCH</td>
<td>ACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Shift in focus from what is taught to what is learned.                    | Historically, educators have focused on what they teach with the goal of ensuring students are taught the important skills and concepts. This perspective allows for factors outside of the teacher's control to be considered such as student motivation, ability, or socioeconomic status. A shift in viewpoint of accepting responsibility for what students learn is required to produce an acceptable level of student achievement. | Test data has been analyzed to determine if students are mastering the critical learning standards and skills in each subject area. Review of data is an objective process that focuses on what is learned rather than how is it taught, presented, etc. What works???
<p>| Shift from summative examinations to a combination of formative and summative examinations. | Research indicates that students who are given frequent formative assessments on critical skills have a greater chance of academic success. The early interventions to assist student learning improve students' overall academic achievement. | The critical learning standards have a minimum of four data points for each skill, three formative and one summative assessment. Teachers will collaboratively develop a common assessment and, in most cases, will work in professional learning communities to determine the three formative assessments. Students will have the opportunity to track their learning of the critical learning standards. |
| Challenge teacher beliefs, assumptions, biases, and expectations,          | Research clearly reveals that all students can learn at high academic levels. The individual teacher has the greatest impact on student achievement. | It is not acceptable for any student not to meet standards. When students leave high school, they should thrive and be contributing members to society. |
| Embrace data as a useful indicator of progress. Teachers must honestly confront the sometimes brutal facts. | Data provides the evidence whether students have learned what has been taught. | Decisions regarding course rigor, instructional innovations and programs, and student mastery of skills is verified by a continuous analysis of both course and program data. |
| Shift from using averages to analyze student performance to a focus on the success of each student. | Data shows that the use of averages can have a very detrimental affect. Low achieving students may be left behind because the majority of students understand the skill or standard. | Averages are no longer acceptable when used to review student academic performance. The focus is on the learning of all students. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHALLENGE</th>
<th>DATA &amp; RESEARCH</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create a pyramid of interventions for those students who are not able to</td>
<td>Research shows that all students can learn, but they may not learn at the same</td>
<td>Site-based interventions have been developed to meet individual student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learn the critical skills in the time allotted in the classroom.</td>
<td>pace or have the same background knowledge as other students in the class.</td>
<td>needs. Each initiative will be evaluated to determine the evidence that this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>initiative will help teachers become more effective in assisting all students to learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>at high levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on the latest educational research available to guide our</td>
<td>Our capability to research is limited, thus we must seek outside expertise from</td>
<td>Staff members have attended conferences and workshops and have read and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educational decisions for students.</td>
<td>nationally recognized educational experts.</td>
<td>discussed research in a learning community environment from today’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>leading educational experts including: Robert Marzano, Douglas Reeves,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Dufour, Mike Schmoker, Rick Stiggins, Katie Haycock, and others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The process of refining our vision for the quality of education that we must provide our students has been challenging. However, it is only through the constant effort, with its many challenges, exciting innovations, and occasional setbacks, that we can truly gauge our dedication to developing every student to his or her capacity. In the process of maximizing student achievement, our district has committed itself to this cultural transition, not just as a way to address Illinois School Accountability System requirements, but as an opportunity for maximizing our own capacity as educators.

III. Academic Initiatives in Township High School District 211

Numerous improvement initiatives have been implemented by faculty of all subject areas at our schools, and progress has been documented. The successes and failures of the academic initiatives are shared regularly at the Curriculum Committee meetings to encourage ideas for continuous improvement of our services to students. Several visits to other schools and communications with other educators have taken place in our search for best practices. The following initiatives serve as examples of the programs, curricular changes, and instructional strategies developed and implemented during the past three school years.

A third year of mathematics, with successful completion of a 300 level course, has been added to the District 211 requirements for graduation.

Critical learning standards have been developed, in consultation with Dr. Robert Marzano, in the areas of reading, writing, mathematics, and science and are reinforced in the elective areas.
Extended time classes have been initiated in algebra and science to provide at-risk students with the additional time necessary to learn the skills that will lead to advancement in those curricular areas.

Students who failed mathematics courses first semester have been placed in extended time mathematics courses during the second semester, in order to provide students an opportunity to re-learn the mathematics skills and to continue their mathematics course sequence.

Mandatory Incoming Freshman, Sophomore, and English as a Second Language Summer School Academies have been developed for freshmen and sophomore students at-risk of not meeting the reading and mathematics state standards, as measured by the Prairie State Achievement Examination.

A six-week summer program, Project Excel, has been developed to provide intensive English and mathematics skill enhancement at a rigorous level, so students will be able to advance from regular to the accelerated level as freshmen.

Cohort programs have been created to assist the summer school academy students with their transition to high school.

Before and after school tutorial programs have been initiated to assist students who are not meeting academic standards.

WorkKeys software has been incorporated into the curriculum, and individual study time is also provided to interested students.

Sophomore students who are predicted to not meet state standards by their junior year can take a semester class in which teachers will focus specifically on individual preparation to succeed in reading and mathematics, and to provide additional skill development.

A freshman biology co-teaching initiative involving the science and special education departments has assisted special education students to advance into the mainstream science classes. Teaching strategies have been shared among the regular education and special education teachers which have benefited all students in that program.

Freshman and sophomore integrated learning communities have been designed to combine core subjects using a problems-based approach and shared teaching strategies.

PSAE review materials and strategies have been integrated into the core curricular courses.
Integration of reading and mathematics skills has occurred throughout the curriculum as part of the annual school improvement plan.

Addition of PSAE and WorkKeys style questions have been incorporated throughout the curriculum.

Increased emphasis of students' acceleration into higher level classes has been the focus of all teachers. There are no longer remedial classes, only classes aimed at acceleration to higher levels of performance.

Formative and summative assessments have been developed collaboratively by staff members to measure student learning.

A mathematics "looping" pilot has been developed so students can remain with the same mathematics teacher for several years in a row, with the intent of accelerating student learning in mathematics, culminating with calculus. This effort will involve minority student groups who are either under-represented in, or absent from, the most advanced mathematics courses. Some will experience a double mathematics period during one or more semesters to achieve the necessary level of learning.
TO: The Education and Policy Planning Committee

FROM: Ginger Reynolds, Ph.D., Assistant Superintendent
       Linda Jamali, Division Administrator, Certification

Agenda Topic: Update on the Beginning Teacher Induction Pilot Programs

Materials: Editorial from Chicago Tribune, Pilot Program Information Chart

Staff Contact(s): Phyliss Jones

Purpose of Agenda Item
The purpose of this agenda item is to update the Committee on the progress of the ten pilot induction programs in Illinois. This informational item was requested by the Committee Chair. Linda Kolbusz, Pilot Program Coordinator, will be providing the update to the Board. The Chicago Tribune editorial and the Pilot Program Information Chart are provided at her request.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
These programs relate directly to Goal 2, Improving Educator Quality for All Children.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
The update is expected to inform the Board about progress made by the pilot programs.

Background Information
The ten pilots were selected by a team of educators from proposals submitted through a competitive RFP from thirty-eight districts and/or ROEs.

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

Policy Implications: One of the purposes of the project is to demonstrate the applicability and portability of various models for induction on varying populations of teachers, in various configurations of P-12 settings across the State.

Budget Implications: As the number of programs increase across the state, requests for funds from the State Board budget will increase.

Legislative Action: No legislative action is necessary at this time.

Communication: Information about the programs has been circulating across the state through articles in various newspapers. Arne Duncan, Barbara Eason-Watkins, and members of the Chicago New Teacher Center have been interviewed on WBBM about their pilot. A presentation entitled Moving Statewide Induction Policy Forward: Illinois’ Statewide Induction Pilot Initiative was just presented by staff from the Illinois New Teacher Collaborative, the Illinois Education Association, the Joyce Foundation, and the Chicago New Teacher Center at the New Teacher Symposium in California.
Pros and Cons of Various Actions
At present, this is an update.

Superintendent’s Recommendation
None

Next Steps
To be determined.
Editorial from the Chicago Tribune

Classroom ideas that work
------------------------

February 4, 2007

The Illinois public school system is designed to educate 2 million students. Too often, that system serves everyone but kids.

We know the problems, and we know how they interfere with the goal of giving every child a decent education. Fortunately, we know more about solutions. Experience and experimentation give us a better idea about which schools work, and why. Research informs us which strategies yield the greatest learning gains.

What follows here is not an exhortation to spend more money on the status quo. You won't read arguments for increasing spending on computers, transportation, new textbooks or construction--as necessary as those expenditures may be to operate a school.

States that have invested heavily in their existing education systems, hoping for miracles in student performance, eventually realize nothing much changes when no constraints are placed on how the money gets spent.

A single-minded focus on lifting student performance is the only justification for additional sacrifice from taxpayers. But accomplishing that ambition will require reallocating existing money and changing incentives. Improvement will result not from pouring more money into the education system we have, but in creating the education system we need.

Most schools know what they need to do to improve performance. To be accountable to taxpayers, schools should be able to access more dollars as long as they're spent wisely--on research-driven ideas that change school cultures and boost student proficiency.

Pennsylvania created a smart mechanism that incorporates accountability into new funding for high-impact strategies. There, schools may access a pool of money, but only if they spend it on a limited menu of proven strategies. Poorer districts are able to draw more money, but all districts have access, depending on areas of greater need. Illinois should adopt that model.

Interviews with scores of researchers and educators over the course of a five-month inquiry uncovered general consensus on which strategies work. A broad array of schools around the country have proven they do work, even with the kinds of kids many people have written off as impossible to teach.

The Tribune proposes seven strategies that should guide school reform here. We will examine two of them today.

- Significantly improve teacher and principal quality.

Nothing in a school affects student performance as much as superior teaching. And few schools excel without outstanding principals.

How do we raise the bar? Provide intensive, high-quality mentoring programs for principals and new teachers--and for teachers in schools that are changing curricula to better align with state learning standards. The Chicago New Teacher Center is one of a new breed of intensive mentoring and induction programs that can be replicated broadly across Illinois.
Program coaches demonstrate new teaching strategies, provide help in how to tailor instruction to students at varying levels and provide immediate feedback in the classroom.

The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future calculated that when a teacher leaves a Chicago school, the district spends $17,000 to $22,000 to recruit and train a replacement. That means teacher attrition costs Chicago $83 million to $106 million a year.

Intensive programs like the New Teacher Center, which has an average cost of $10,000 to $12,000 for a two-year training program, keep up to 90 percent of their alumni in classrooms for at least five years. That saves a district money. Even better, it significantly boosts student achievement.

Convincing the best teachers to make education a career is essential. "Teachers don't generate the most student gains until about year five," said Barnett Berry, president of the North Carolina-based Center for Teaching Quality.

Terrence Carter represents a new breed of principals who entered the profession from business through an excellent principal training program called New Leaders for New Schools. The program, which operates in Chicago and five other cities and is about to add two more, imposes higher expectations on principals.

Carter, the principal of Clara Barton Elementary School in Chicago's Auburn Gresham neighborhood, persuaded a handful of teachers to modify what and how they taught based on the analysis of assessment data. Carter said those teachers produced dramatic jumps in their students' performance, and that was all it took to convince others at Clara Barton to follow suit. In 2005, 18.6 percent of 3rd through 8th graders there passed the state math exam. The following year, 40.9 percent did. In reading, the pass rate jumped to 48.5 percent from 33.6 percent.

In 2006, the state distributed a modest $1.75 million in mentoring grants to 10 regions or districts around the state.

It's time for Illinois to create a statewide, high-quality mentoring and induction program for all first- and second-year teachers, following the lead of California, Connecticut and New York City.

While we're putting demands on grade schools in exchange for money, let's do the same for the state's public universities.

The need for high-quality mentoring and induction programs might be eased if teachers were better prepared for classroom realities when they come out of college. Admission standards and graduation requirements at many schools of education are notoriously weak. Universities have to be more rooted in what's needed for classroom success, less on la-la land theories of education. And state regulators need to wake up and start paying attention to all the schools that fail to set even minimum standards.

Arthur Levine, president of the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation, has described the nation's education schools as "the Dodge City of the education world ... unruly and disordered."

Education schools operate like factories, packing in students to make money and conferring degrees regardless of graduates' ability to pass basic skills tests. Most schools do little to steer promising students into areas of high need, and nothing to recruit better would-be teachers who already exhibit aptitude in, say, math.

Judy Erwin, executive director of the Illinois Board of Higher Education, struggles to change that culture. One strategy: Make colleges and universities more accountable for outcomes as a condition for receiving state funding.

That's a good start. Illinois' public universities rely on the state to cover 21 to 43 percent of their budgets. They'll listen.
Illinois teachers earn more money for their years of experience, and for having advanced degrees. But they don't earn more money based on how well they teach. That is, their compensation isn't based on the results of their work--how well students learn. That has to change.

The most significant student gains usually come around a teacher's fifth or sixth year. How frustrating, then, that 40 percent of new teachers leave the profession before their fifth year.

Teachers and schools need to be rewarded for superior performance--and weeded out for poor performance--measured in part by the size of gains made by students over time. Other important measures include whether gains are achieved year after year, the quality of lesson plans, and skills observed during in-classroom evaluations. "The simple rule is that if nobody's job or livelihood depends on student performance, you should be surprised to see student performance change," said Stanford University's Eric Hanushek, an expert on school economics and finance.

"We do not recognize our most accomplished teachers," said Barnett Berry. "We don't pay them more, and we don't give them the kinds of opportunities they must have to spread their expertise."

Illinois should provide money to school districts that adopt a system of performance risk and reward for teachers. Teacher quality would improve with the introduction of private sector standards: financial incentives, performance tests, rigorous evaluations, production results and a greater possibility of getting fired for poor performance.

It can be done. And the inspiration for that can come from inside the classroom. The Chicago Public Schools recently won a sizable grant from the federal government's new Teacher Incentive Fund--$27.5 million over five years--to institute a thoughtful plan for performance incentives to reward high-performing teachers and promote professional development.
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Pilot Sites for the ISBE Funded Beginning Teacher Induction Pilot Programs

10 pilots were funded by the Illinois State Board of Education for the 2006-2007 school year. These pilot programs represent large and small districts, Regional Office of Education's, other professional development agencies, partnerships with universities, and single districts located throughout IL. They also represent a variety of characteristics/demographics, ie. size, income, grade level and subject areas, partnerships, and delivery systems.

A variety of approaches are used as each funded project incorporates mentoring, formative assessment of new teachers performance, and intensive professional development for the participants based, at least in part, upon individual induction plans. Programs serve no fewer than 10 new teachers, and all teachers served with grant funds are in their first year of teaching. Each teacher holds either an initial certificate (which may be an initial alternative certificate) or a provisional or alternative certificate that is issued before an initial certificate can be issued. No program serves more than 75 new teachers unless there is specific rationale to demonstrate that each new teacher in the program receives comparable and adequate support.

List of 10 Sites for Beginning Teacher Induction Pilot Program Funded by ISBE

Chicago Public Schools, Instructional Area 14
CUSD #300 (Carpentersville/Dundee)
Rockford School District #206
Springfield School District #186
Quincy School District #172
Lee/Ogle ROE #47
ROE SchoolWorks Champaign-Ford ROE #9 and Vermilion ROE #54
Plainfield School District #202
St. Clair ROE #50
Champaign CUSD #4

For further information contact the INTC (Illinois New Teacher Collaborative at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, Illinois).
Linda Kolbusz-Kosan, lkolbusz@uiuc.edu, 217-244-3166 or Dr. Renee Clift, rtclift@uiuc.edu, 217-244-7389.
### Pilot Sites for the ISBE Funded Beginning Teacher Induction Pilot Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentors:</th>
<th>Chicago</th>
<th>Carpentersville*</th>
<th>Rockford*</th>
<th>Springfield*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection Requirement</td>
<td>General description</td>
<td>Masters, tenure, 3 yrs</td>
<td>Tenure, 5 yrs.</td>
<td>Tenure, 5 yrs, Master pref.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>3 days quarterly</td>
<td>3 days quarterly</td>
<td>3 days quarterly</td>
<td>3 days quarterly for lead mentors; 3 initial days for building mentors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-going Support</td>
<td>Weekly ½ day</td>
<td>MONTHLY – one hour</td>
<td>Bi-weekly ½ day</td>
<td>Bi-weekly ½ day for lead mentors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Released</td>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>2 Full time</td>
<td>2 Full time and 15 retired</td>
<td>Part time for lead mentors; None for building mentors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Teacher Observation</td>
<td>Using Formative Assessment System</td>
<td>3 times per year</td>
<td>3 times per year</td>
<td>3 times per year; 2 by lead mentor; 1 by building mentor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Training (Summer)</td>
<td>4 days +1 day observation</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>3 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Training</td>
<td>Monthly after-school seminar</td>
<td>Quarterly follow-up seminars</td>
<td>Monthly staff development seminars</td>
<td>Monthly follow-up seminars after school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-going Support and Prof. Development</td>
<td>Weekly individual support from mentor</td>
<td>Weekly individual support from mentor</td>
<td>Weekly individual support from mentor</td>
<td>Bi-monthly individual support from building mentor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran Teacher Observation</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>1 per semester</td>
<td>Possible, not required</td>
<td>Required, mentor to accompany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create ILPs or Goals</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online teacher/mentor support</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Training</td>
<td>3 half-days</td>
<td>3 half-days (none to date)</td>
<td>1 - 3 Sessions by CEC</td>
<td>3 half-days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominant Partner</td>
<td>CNTC</td>
<td>CEC</td>
<td>CEC</td>
<td>CEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-Mentor Ratio</td>
<td>16:1 and 11:1</td>
<td>1:7</td>
<td>Full time 15:1; Retired 4:1</td>
<td>1:1 building mentors; 30:1 teacher/lead Mentor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Mentors</td>
<td>4 regular, 1 spec. ed. 5 total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 full time, 15 retired</td>
<td>50; 3 lead mentors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of new teachers</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partnership with the Consortium for Educational Change (CEC)
## Pilot Sites for the ISBE Funded Beginning Teacher Induction Pilot Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentors:</th>
<th>Quincy</th>
<th>Plainfield</th>
<th>Champaign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection Requirement</td>
<td>Experience, success req.</td>
<td>Certificated, 3 yrs in dist, trained</td>
<td>Must have completed CFT Mentor training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters, tenure pref.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>1 initial training session</td>
<td>2 day</td>
<td>1.5 days using Foundations in Mentoring from New Teacher Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Optional Cognitive Coaching Training (35 participating)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-going Support</td>
<td>Monthly meetings</td>
<td>Three 60-minute meetings</td>
<td>Four district-wide meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On-line support for Cognitive Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Released</td>
<td>Observations and part of initial training</td>
<td>Only for observations; stipend for after-school time</td>
<td>21 hours release time shared with novice teacher for observation, co-visits to classrooms, shared planning, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Teacher Observation</td>
<td>3-5 times per year</td>
<td>3 times per year</td>
<td>3 observations per year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Teachers:

| Initial Training (Summer)                    | 2 days                  | 2 days                 | 5 day New Teacher Academy          |
| Additional Training                          | Monthly follow-up seminars | 15 hours of workshops   | Monthly meetings                    |
| On-going Support and Prof. Development       | Weekly individual support from mentor | Two 90-minute mtgs. | On-going meetings with mentors; quarterly with principal and mentor |
| Written Reflections on Practice             |                         |                        | Monthly written reflection         |
| Veteran Teacher Observation                  | 1-2 days                | No                     | 3 observations per year             |
| Create ILPs or Goals                        | Yes                     | Yes                    | Yes                                 |

### Other:

| Online teacher/mentor support               | For 2nd year teachers   |                       |                                     |
| Principal Training                          | 1 initial training session |                       | Overview of program and induction checklist shared |
| Predominant Partner                         | Federation of Teachers   | Learning Point Assoc. | Champaign Federation of Teachers    |
| Teacher-Mentor Ratio                        | 2:1                     | 2:1                   | 1:1                                 |
| Number of Mentors                           | 16                      | 75                    | 52                                  |
| Number of new teachers                      | 32                      | 150                   | 52                                  |
## Pilot Sites for the ISBE Funded Beginning Teacher Induction Pilot Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentors:</th>
<th>Lee/Ogle ROE</th>
<th>ROE SchoolWorks</th>
<th>St. Clair County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection Requirement</td>
<td>District decision based on approved program information</td>
<td>Experience, subject/grade taught</td>
<td>5 yrs experience, nominated by school/teachers assoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>4 days and 2 evenings throughout year</td>
<td>6 days</td>
<td>4 evenings in Sept-Jan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-going Support</td>
<td>During the training and district support</td>
<td>Support provided throughout year during ICE21 training</td>
<td>Optional evening sessions with new teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Released</td>
<td>Regular release time OR stipend with some release</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Possible release. Teachers and mentors will receive $500 stipend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Teacher Observation</td>
<td>One formal observation</td>
<td>3 times per year</td>
<td>3 times during year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Teachers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lee/Ogle ROE</th>
<th>ROE SchoolWorks</th>
<th>St. Clair County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Training (Summer)</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>1.5 days (Fri. night-Sat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Training</td>
<td>2 evenings ROE+ district</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>4 evening sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-going Support and Prof. Development</td>
<td>Meet with mentor once per week in first quarter, then once per month</td>
<td>Saturday sessions</td>
<td>Informal meetings with mentors (in prep time, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Reflections on Practice</td>
<td>Quarterly with mentor written response</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 times during year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of student work with mentor</td>
<td>As part of mentor sessions, ISAT/PSAE prep</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing, one formal conference with mentor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lee/Ogle ROE</th>
<th>ROE SchoolWorks</th>
<th>St. Clair County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veteran Teacher Observation</td>
<td>1 day per semester</td>
<td>1 time per year</td>
<td>3 times per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create ILPs or Goals</td>
<td>Prof. Dev. Project</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lee/Ogle ROE</th>
<th>ROE SchoolWorks</th>
<th>St. Clair County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online teacher/mentor support</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>e-mentors</td>
<td>Yes (listservs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Training</td>
<td>Administrators 2 1/2 days</td>
<td>Pre and Post program conference (1 day each)</td>
<td>Admin Acad &amp; materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominant Partner</td>
<td>School districts</td>
<td>School Districts and ROEs</td>
<td>School Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-Mentor Ratio</td>
<td>1:1 where possible</td>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Mentors</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of new teachers</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of districts</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>