AGENDA (timeframes are estimated for planning purposes)

1. Roll Call

2. Board Member Participation by Other Means

3. Public Participation 10:30 – 10:45 a.m.

4. Minutes of the September Ad Hoc Rules Committee Meeting (pp. 2-4)

*5. Rules for Initial Review 10:45 – 10:50 a.m.
   a. Part 260 (Reading Improvement) (Marica Cullen) (pp. 5-13)

*6. Rules for Adoption 10:50 – 10:55 a.m.
   a. Part 75 (Incentive Grants for Agricultural Science Teacher Education) (Mark Williams, Patrick Murphy) (pp. 14-25)

7. Committee Agenda Planning/Additional Items

8. Adjourn

* Items listed with an asterisk (*) will be discussed in committee and action may be taken in the plenary session.
Chairman Ruiz called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. After the roll call, he announced that all members were present and therefore no members would be participating by other means. Further, no one had signed up for public participation.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
David Fields moved approval of the minutes of the Committee’s meeting of June 18, 2008, and Chris Ward seconded the motion. It was adopted unanimously, and the minutes were approved as presented.

5. RULES FOR INITIAL REVIEW

6. RULES FOR ADOPTION

Chairman Ruiz turned the meeting over to General Counsel Darren Reisberg, who indicated he would focus particularly on two of the numerous sets of rules on the agenda.

PART 245 (Education of Homeless Children and Youth State Grant Program)
Mr. Reisberg noted that new Part 245 was being presented as both rules for initial review and emergency rules for adoption. The rules were needed in order to permit implementation of a grant program pursuant to the appropriation of $3 million in state funds for this fiscal year. These funds were over and above the federal funding received under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Assistance Act. Mr. Reisberg explained that corresponding legislation had been proposed during the 2008 Illinois legislative session but not enacted. However, its failure was attributed to technical issues rather than to a substantive disagreement, so it had been decided that the present rules would be based on the content of that bill. Mr. Reisberg indicated that, assuming adoption of the emergency rules, a Request for Proposals would be issued right way in order to use the funds as intended for the program.

PART 305 (School Food Service)
Mr. Reisberg pointed out that the version of the rules being presented for adoption differed from the version previously presented. He recalled the disparate items of public comment that had been received on this rulemaking, particularly with regard to the standards that were to be inserted. As a result of the public comment, the decision had been made to recommend
removing the standards from the rules and to proceed only with the less substantive items of updating that were needed. These would include deletion of the language stating that ISBE would review the report of the Wellness Policy Task Force and initiate a rulemaking in response, since those actions had been taken and no longer needed to be stated.

Mr. Reisberg concluded by noting that Shelley Helton was available by telephone and asking whether the Board members had any questions for her, Sally Vogl, or himself in connection with Part 245, Part 305, or any of the other sets of rules that were on the agenda.

Brenda Holmes thanked all the staff involved with preparing the various rules and asked for clarification on the presence or absence of new requirements in Part 305 that would differ by grade levels, such as in the size of portions or packages. She recalled the issue that had been discussed previously regarding the difficulty cafeteria staff might encounter when serving students in a wide range of grade levels if this were the case. Mr. Reisberg responded that there were still distinctions in the rules but not the additional layers of complexity that would have been introduced by the proposed version of the rules. In other words, schools would continue to proceed on the same basis as had been in place for some time.

To illustrate this point, Rules Coordinator Sally Vogl identified two provisions in the current rules that did make distinctions based on grade level. Ms. Holmes followed up by stating her desire to be comfortable in voting in favor of the rules' adoption and asked whether the most current version had been reviewed by interested parties and whether such a review should perhaps occur prior to action by the Board. Darren Reisberg noted that there had not been a subsequent public comment period with respect to this version and recapped the sequence of steps that had been taken prior to and during the rulemaking in order to secure broadly based input and reactions. He characterized the present version as a response to those interactions that would typically not require an additional public comment period. However, he indicated that a further review could be built into the process if the Board so desired. Several other Board members stated that they had no concerns with moving forward, and Superintendent Koch mentioned the confusion that might ensue due to misunderstanding as to the status of the draft. It was determined that this item of rulemaking would be removed from the consent agenda for the plenary session and voted on separately.

Andrea Brown asked about the relationship of the grant program to be established under new Part 245 to the existing requirements and activities under the McKinney-Vento Act. Darren Reisberg explained the effort to construct a program that would correspond closely to the proposed state statute and also make sense in light of the federal program. He pointed out that districts would not be permitted to use the state grant funds to pay for efforts that were already required. These funds were intended to supplement what districts already had available.

There were no questions on the other set of rules being presented for adoption, Part 35 (Mentoring Program for New Principals). There was also no discussion needed on the remaining rules for initial review, which included:

- Proposed Repeal of Part 110 (Program Accounting Manual);
- Proposed Repeal of Part 125 (Student Activity Funds and Convenience Accounts);
- Proposed Amendments to Part 130 (Determining Special Education Per Capita Tuition Charge);
- Proposed Amendments to Part 235 (Early Childhood Block Grant);
- Proposed Amendments to Part 525 (Regional Offices of Education and Intermediate Services); and
- Proposed Repeal of Part 500 (Replacement of Required Rules).

7. COMMITTEE AGENDA PLANNING/ADDITIONAL ITEMS
Sally Vogl discussed the possibility of presenting proposed new Part 75 (Incentive Grants for Agricultural Science Teacher Education) for adoption at the October meeting despite the fact that the public comment period would not end until just before the Board meeting. She noted the
desirability of implementing the new program as soon as possible and suggested placing the rulemaking on the agenda so it could be adopted barring the identification of any unduly complicated issue.

Ms. Vogl also indicated that several sets of rules would need to be updated to reflect the repeal of the Program Accounting Manual (Part 110) and that those amendments would be brought before the Board as time permitted over the coming months, depending upon which sets of rules might also need substantive revisions based on the advice of the responsible divisions. Finally, the October agenda might include any urgent rulemaking necessitated by newly signed legislation.

8. ADJOURNMENT
Vinni Hall moved that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was seconded by Lanita Koster, and the meeting was adjourned at 9:25 a.m.
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
Darren Reisberg, General Counsel
Connie Wise, Assistant Superintendent, Standards and Assessment

Agenda Topic: Action Item: Proposed Amendments for Initial Review: Part 260 (Reading Improvement Program)

Materials: Recommended Rules

Staff Contact(s): Marica Cullen, Division Administrator, Curriculum and Instruction

Purpose of Agenda Item
The purpose of the agenda item is to present the proposed amendments for the Board’s initial review.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
This agenda item links to Strategic Plan Goal 1 (academic achievement and success) and Goal 2 (highly prepared and effective teachers and school leaders).

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
The Board will be asked to adopt a motion authorizing the solicitation of public comment on proposed amendments to Part 260.

Background Information
Section 2-3.51 of the School Code establishes the Reading Improvement Block Grant (RIBG) Program, a formula-based grant that is provided to school districts with schools serving kindergarten through grade 6 and is designed to help improve reading achievement and instruction. Under the law, the State Board of Education is authorized to reserve up to 2 percent of the money allocated for the RIBG program for “teacher training and re-training in the teaching of reading”.

In the past, the bulk of the 2 percent set-aside has been used to advance the Reading Recovery program by providing financial support to teachers who wish to be trained in this technique. During the last year, however, the agency has embarked on the Response to Intervention (RtI) initiative, with a focus on professional development activities in reading instruction. A Request for Proposals (RFP) for RtI training was released in FY 2008. Additionally, the agency released an RFP to fund school districts and other entities in FY 2009 that wish to become accredited Reading Recovery training sites or to fund the training of Reading Recovery teacher-leaders.

Since the amount of funding under the 2 percent set-aside is insufficient to fund all eligible applicants that may wish to apply for the programs described above or other professional development opportunities, agency staff are proposing amendments to rules governing the formula portion of the Reading Improvement Block Grant to define the criteria for applying for and receiving grants under a competitive process.

Analysis and Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action and Communications
Policy Implications: Proposed Subpart B will identify the applicants eligible to apply for professional development grants under Part 260, establish the procedures and requirements for both initial and continuation applications, and provide the criteria for review and awarding of grants. The proposed amendments contemplate two pools of applicants: school districts, charter schools and approved public university laboratory schools, which would apply on behalf of their teachers who would participate in the professional development activities, and these applicants and other entities, which would apply to establish the training programs.

Additionally, the proposed amendments allow sufficient flexibility for the State Superintendent to identify in each RFP the training approaches that would best meet the needs of school staff or support statewide priorities for improvement of teaching and learning. This flexibility will enable agency staff to target limited resources toward programs with the greatest likelihood of success, without first having to conduct a lengthy process to amend the rules.

Each RFP also would communicate the amount of the 2 percent set-aside to be awarded and the length that grants will be in effect (i.e., one, two or three years). The decision to renew a grant in any subsequent year of a funding cycle would be made based on the amount of the RIBG appropriation, the activities the grantee proposes for the grant period, and the grantee’s adherence to the terms and conditions of the grant received in the immediately preceding grant period.

Budget Implications: For FY 2009, the RIBG program received $76,139,800. Of that amount, $1,520,725 was set-aside for “teacher training and re-training”, with $1,220,497 allocated for professional development competitive grants.

Legislative Action: None.

Communication: See below.

Pros and Cons of Various Actions
The proposed amendments set forth the agency’s policies and practices for awarding competitive grants under Section 2-3.51 of the School Code. Having these policies and practices in rules ensures uniformity in the grant-making process and provides eligible applicants an equal opportunity to compete for funding.

The Illinois Administrative Procedures Act requires that state agencies set forth their policies in administrative rules. These proposed amendments, once promulgated, will enable the agency to be in compliance with the act.

Superintendent’s Recommendation
The State Superintendent recommends that the State Board of Education adopt the following motions:

The State Board of Education hereby authorizes solicitation of public comment on the proposed rulemaking for:

Reading Improvement Program (23 Illinois Administrative Code 260),

including publication of the proposed rules in the Illinois Register.

Next Steps
With the Board’s authorization, staff will submit the proposed amendments to the Administrative Code Division for publication in the Illinois Register to elicit public comment. Additional means, such as the Superintendent’s Weekly Message and the agency’s website, will be used to inform interested parties of the opportunity to comment on this rulemaking.
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

NOTICE OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

TITLE 23: EDUCATION AND CULTURAL RESOURCES
SUBTITLE A: EDUCATION
CHAPTER I: STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
SUBCHAPTER g: SPECIAL COURSES OF STUDY

PART 260
READING IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

SUBPART A: READING IMPROVEMENT BLOCK GRANT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>260.10</td>
<td>Definitions (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260.20</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260.30</td>
<td>Eligible Applicants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260.40</td>
<td>Allowable Expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260.50</td>
<td>Procedure and Criteria for Approval of Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260.55</td>
<td>Eligibility for Continued Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260.60</td>
<td>Allocation of Funds (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260.70</td>
<td>Distribution of Grant Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260.80</td>
<td>Year-End Reporting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBPART B: READING IMPROVEMENT PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>260.100</td>
<td>Purpose and Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260.110</td>
<td>Eligible Applicants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260.120</td>
<td>Application Procedures and Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260.130</td>
<td>Proposal Review, Approval and Grant Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260.140</td>
<td>Application Content and Approval for Continuation Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AUTHORITY: Implementing and authorized by Section 2-3.51 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/2-3.51].

SUBPART B: READING IMPROVEMENT PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

Section 260.100 Purpose and Implementation

a) This Subpart B establishes the application procedure and criteria for selection by the State Board of Education of eligible applicants to receive funding for teacher training and re-training in the teaching of reading pursuant to Section 2-3.51(a) of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/2-3.51(a)]. For the purposes of this Subpart B, “professional development” shall be understood to mean any combination of training, re-training or other professional development activities.

b) The State Superintendent of Education annually may allocate up to 2 percent of funds appropriated to the Reading Improvement Block Grant Program for professional development grants, as defined in subsection (a) of this Section.

(Source: Added at 33 Ill. Reg. __________, effective ____________)

Section 260.110 Eligible Applicants

a) An applicant’s eligibility for a grant shall be determined by the purpose of the program being funded, i.e., receipt of professional development by the applicant’s staff, as defined in Section 2-3.51(a-5)(6) of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/2-3.51(a-5)(6)], and employed in any of kindergarten through grade 6, or provision of professional development by the applicant.

1) A public school district, charter school, or public university laboratory school approved by the Illinois State Board of Education providing instruction in kindergarten through grade 6 may apply for funding to pay the costs associated with its staff’s receipt of professional development services and activities.

2) In addition to the eligible applicants identified in subsection (a)(1) of this Section, a regional office of education, postsecondary institution, and other not-for-profit entity may apply for funding to conduct specific professional development programs, as may be identified in a given Request for Proposals (RFP) issued in accordance to Section 260.120 of
b) Each RFP shall state whether joint applications for funds may be submitted by any combination of eligible applicants, as described in subsection (a) of this Section, subject to the conditions stated in subsections (b)(1), (b)(2) and (b)(3) of this Section.

1) If a joint application is submitted, then an administrative agent shall be designated.

2) The superintendent from each of the participating school districts and the official authorized to submit a proposal on behalf of any other eligible entity as defined in subsection (a) of this Section shall sign the joint application.

3) An eligible applicant shall only participate in one proposal for a specific program.

(Source: Added at 33 Ill. Reg. __________, effective ______________)

Section 260.120 Application Procedures and Content

a) When an allocation for professional development grants is made available pursuant to Section 260.100(a) of this Part, the State Superintendent of Education shall issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) specifying the information that applicants shall include in their proposals, informing applicants of any bidders’ conferences, and requiring that proposals be submitted no later than the date specified in the RFP. The RFP shall provide at least 45 calendar days in which to submit proposals.

b) It is the intention of the State Board of Education to approve Reading Improvement Professional Development Grants for no more than a three-year period. Each RFP will indicate whether the grant will be funded for one, two or three years. Funding in each subsequent year is subject to a sufficient appropriation for the program and satisfactory progress of the grantee in the previous grant period. (See Section 260.140 of this Part.)
c) Each RFP shall indicate the descriptive information that initial applicants will be required to provide about their proposed programs. For the purposes of this Subpart B, initial applicants are those that did not receive funding under this Subpart in the year previous to an application or that are completing the last year in a funding cycle. The proposal description shall include:

1) evidence of the applicant’s need for the professional development (e.g., reading achievement data, rationale for targeting specific grade levels or schools, current availability of and access to other professional development opportunities);

2) the criteria for identifying participants to receive the professional development;

3) a list of the activities and services to be provided and how those will improve reading instruction;

4) evidence of commitment of the school staff in implementing or continuing the reading program that was the focus of the professional development;

5) a description of the strategies to be employed for participating staff to share their knowledge with other staff in the school; and

6) the data to be collected and methods to be used to determine the success of the professional development program on improving reading instruction and student achievement in reading.

d) The RFP shall require completion of a budget summary and payment schedule as well as a budget breakdown, i.e., a detailed explanation of each line item of expenditure.

e) Each RFP shall identify any area or areas of high priority for the funding cycle.

f) Each RFP shall include such certifications, assurances and program-specific terms of the grant, as the State Board of Education may require, to be signed by the applicant that is a party to the application and submitted with the proposal.

g) Applicants may be requested to clarify various aspects of their proposals. The contents of the approved proposal shall be incorporated into a grant agreement to
Proposals submitted for funding to establish a professional development program shall be evaluated in accordance with the following criteria.

1) The proposal presents a convincing rationale about the need for the professional development based upon the students’ reading progress and the school’s continuing need for improvements, as indicated by testing data or other relevant information. The number of staff estimated to participate in the professional development and the grade levels to be served are appropriate based on this need and will strengthen the ability of the school to improve reading achievement in measurable ways. (25 points)

2) The proposal sets forth a clear understanding of why current reading instruction is not successful with all students and knowledgeably articulates how intensive, ongoing professional development will lead to improvements in reading achievement for those students. (25 points)

3) The content, sequence and duration of the initial and any follow-up professional development appears to be of sufficient quality and length to have a positive effect on instructional practices. (15 points)

4) Sufficient evidence is presented of the commitment of the school’s administrators and teachers to implement or continue the targeted reading improvement strategies and methods after the conclusion of the professional development. Identified sources of funding for the planning and implementation are sufficient to successfully sustain the approach to reading instruction that was the focus of the professional development. (15 points)

5) Appropriate strategies are proposed for participants to share the knowledge gained and lessons learned in the professional development.
with others in the school, and these strategies will allow for successful implementation of the reading program throughout the school. (10 points)

6) The proposed budget is cost-effective based on the number of teachers to be trained and the activities proposed. (10 points)

b) The selection of proposals for funding may be based in part on geographic distribution and/or the need to provide resources to school districts and communities with varying demographic characteristics.

c) Priority consideration may be given to proposals with specific areas of emphasis, as identified by the State Superintendent of Education in a particular RFP.

d) The State Superintendent of Education shall determine the amount of individual grant awards. The final award amounts shall be based upon:

   1) the total amount of funds available for Reading Improvement Professional Development Grants; and

   2) the resources requested in the top-ranked proposals, as identified pursuant to subsections (a), (b) and (c) of this Section.

(Source: Added at 33 Ill. Reg. __________, effective _____________)

Section 260.140 Application Content and Approval for Continuation Programs

The requirements of this Section shall apply to those applicants seeking funding to continue professional development programs beyond the initial grant period.

a) In order to continue to operate a Reading Improvement Professional Development program, a grantee each year shall submit an application for continuation. The application shall include at least the following:

   1) an overview of the program to date (e.g., training provided, number of participants, topics addressed);

   2) a description of the activities and services proposed for the renewal period;
3) budget information for the year in which the application is being made; and

4) the certifications, assurances and program-specific terms of the grant referred to in Section 260.120(f) of this Part that are applicable to the renewal period.

b) A professional development program shall be approved for continuation provided that:

1) a need continues to exist for the program, as evidenced by reading achievement data and the proposed numbers of teachers to be served;

2) the activities and services proposed will be effective in improving instruction and student achievement in reading;

3) the proposed budget is cost-effective, as evidenced by the cost of proposed services in relation to the numbers to be served and the services to be provided; and

4) in the year previous to the continuation application, the applicant complied with the terms and conditions of any grant it received pursuant to this Subpart B.

(Source: Added at 33 Ill. Reg. __________, effective _____________)
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
         Darren Reisberg, General Counsel
         Susie Morrison, Special Assistant to the Superintendent
         Linda Tomlinson, Assistant Superintendent

Agenda Topic: Action Item: Rules for Adoption –Part 75 (Incentive Grants for Agricultural Science Teacher Education)

Materials: Recommended Rules

Staff Contact: Mark Williams and Harley Hepner, Division of Career and Technical Education
               Patrick Murphy, Division Administrator, Educator and School Development

Purpose of Agenda Item
The purpose of this agenda item is to present new Part 75 for the Board’s adoption.

Expected Outcomes of Agenda Item
The Board will be asked to adopt these proposed rules.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
This set of rules, while derived directly from a recent legislative initiative, will also contribute to achievement of Goal 2 in that implementation of this program is intended to result in the recruitment and retention of additional teachers in the field of agricultural education.

Background Information
These rules respond to Public Act 95-153, which was enacted in 2007 but funded for the first time for Fiscal Year 2009. The Act added Section 2-3.80a to the School Code, directing ISBE to establish a “training continuum” for teachers of agricultural education that begins with awareness and recruitment at the secondary level. The new law identifies specifically the entities that are eligible for funds under this program and the categories of activities for which the funds may be used. The rules have been structured based on the understanding that all the eligible applicants are to receive grant awards. The amounts will vary according to the activities proposed by the participating universities and community colleges and the areas of priority selected for funding from year to year.

This new set of rules was presented for the Board’s initial review at the August meeting and subsequently published in the Illinois Register to elicit public comment. The public comment period extends through October 20, so it was still in progress as this Board packet was being completed. We determined that it would nevertheless be advisable to present the rules for adoption this month, in order to enable staff to issue the request for applications and initiate the program as soon as possible. The issues that had been raised as of this writing are discussed in the Summary and Analysis of Public Comment below. Any additional comments that are received after the packet is posted will be discussed with the Board during the meeting of the Rules Committee, along with any resulting recommendations for change.
Analysis and Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action and Communications

Policy Implications: Please see above.

Budget Implications: None.

Legislative Action: No legislative action is needed to permit implementation of this program. However, our discussions revealed that the term “student teaching” was used in the legislative language where the broader range of field experiences had actually been meant. This will narrow the use of grant funds for one of the types of activities listed in the law unless an amendment is enacted. We believe the sponsor intends to seek such an amendment. If the law is changed, then the rules will need to be revised accordingly.

Communication: Please see “Next Steps” below.

Pros and Cons of Various Actions
Promulgation of new rules is necessary in order to establish the basis for soliciting proposals and awarding funds under Section 2-3.80a of the School Code. Failure to move forward with rulemaking on this topic would create a problem with implementing the statutory provisions.

Superintendent’s Recommendation
The Superintendent recommends that the State Board of Education adopt the following motion:

The State Board of Education hereby adopts the proposed rulemaking for:

Incentive Grants for Agricultural Science Teacher Education (23 Illinois Administrative Code 75).

Further, the Board authorizes the State Superintendent of Education to make such technical and nonsubstantive changes as the State Superintendent may deem necessary in response to suggestions or objections of the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules.

Next Steps
Notice of the adopted amendments will be submitted to the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules to initiate JCAR’s review. When that process is complete, the rules will be filed with the Secretary of State and disseminated as appropriate.
Summary and Analysis of Public Comment
Part 75 (Incentive Grants for Agricultural Science Teacher Education)

Comment
It was suggested that the reference to “institutions of higher education” in Section 75.10 be revised to state “institutions of higher and postsecondary education”.

Analysis
The purpose of Section 75.10 is simply to identify the program that is described and regulated in Part 75. The program is designed to involve both certain community colleges and certain public universities. The phrase “institutions of higher education” is correct in this instance. It includes all the eligible participants in this program and does not, as the commenter apparently believed, omit community colleges. (See the definition of “public institutions of higher education” found in Section 1 of the Board of Higher Education Act [110 ILCS 205/1].)

On the other hand, referring to “institutions of postsecondary education” would be inaccurate, since that term includes private business and vocational schools, which are not eligible to receive grants under this program. Consequently we believe the introduction to the Part is adequate as currently stated. It should also be noted that the immediately following Section specifically identifies the eligible applicants and leaves no doubt that certain community colleges are meant.

Recommendation
No change is needed in response to this comment.

Comment
Changes were proposed to Section 75.30(b) with regard to the submission of grant applications. It was suggested that “the instructor who is primarily responsible for completion of the grant activities” should submit the application, with letters of support from that individual’s department or division chair. Along the same lines, the commenter perceived that the rules had generally been written with the university system in mind and without accommodating the administrative structure of community colleges.

Analysis
The proposed rule does not discuss who submits the application. Rather, the earlier draft was revised in response to a suggestion received during the preliminary review to require that the application be signed by an authorized representative of the institution. Further, the proposed rule would require letters of support from the heads of both the agriculture department and the education department at the applicant institution.

Within community colleges and universities, internal protocol may vary in terms of authority to bind an institution to the contents of a grant application. We therefore believe it would be inappropriate for ISBE to assign this authority and responsibility to an individual instructor, even with support from that individual’s immediate supervisor. Instead, we continue to believe the correct posture for ISBE is to require the signature of whoever is the authorized representative of a specific institution. We are less concerned with dictating the mechanics of submission than with respecting the internal delegation of authority for such applications.
As to the perceived over-emphasis on the universities, we should point out that the overall legislative directive stated in Section 2-3.80a of the School Code relates to “an agricultural science teacher education training continuum”, and that all the activities for which funds can be used relate to agricultural science teacher education, professional development for agricultural science teachers, or training for those who prepare agricultural science teachers. It seems clear that both a teacher preparation program and an agriculture department should be implementing this program together and that neither should proceed without the involvement of the other. We would therefore be reluctant to delete the proposed requirement for letters of support from both these departments at the applicant institution, as was suggested by the commenter.

That requirement is not intended to limit community colleges’ participation by disregarding their administrative structures. Instead, since organizational terminology is likely to vary among institutions, we believe the phrase “head of department” can be interpreted broadly and will encompass whichever individual at a community college is responsible for the connection between agriculture and teacher preparation. Such a connection is inherent in the statutory limitation of eligibility for community colleges to those that offer an “articulated agriculture science teacher education course of study”.

**Recommendation**
Section 75.30 should not be revised in response to this comment.

**Comment**
Another commenter asked that the words “where or if applicable” be inserted in Section 75.30(b) after the phrase, “heads of the agriculture and education departments”. The commenter states that community colleges do not have education departments and that attempting to obtain a letter of support from such an official in a community college would pose an unreasonable burden.

**Analysis**
As noted above, we believe that the intent of this legislation is for the agriculture department and the teacher preparation program in an eligible institution to work in tandem. While a community college may not have a “department of education” listed as such, it will offer teacher education courses within a specified department of the institution. The head of the department responsible for the education program, along with the head of the agriculture department, will need to sign the letter of support. In order to clarify this process while acknowledging the diversity of organizational arrangements within community colleges, the proposed rules should be changed as follows.

**Recommendation**
Section 75.30(b) should be revised to state:

b) Each application shall be signed by an authorized representative of the institution, and each shall be accompanied by a letter of support signed by the heads of the agriculture department and education departments, as applicable, the education department or the department responsible for the education program at the applicant institution.

**Comment**
In Section 75.40(a), insertion of the words “teacher education” was proposed before “candidate recruitment and retention initiatives”.
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Analysis
The purpose of subsection (a) is to identify the activities that will qualify as teacher education candidate recruitment and incentives (i.e., those that may be paid for with grant funds). All the activities listed are described as relating only to individuals who may be interested in agricultural education or who are on their way to becoming agricultural education teachers. Therefore, omitting the words “teacher education” from the phrase being defined, which was done simply for the sake of brevity, makes no substantive difference in the meaning of the rule. That is, the activities cannot be paid for with respect to “candidates” for anything other than teacher education. However, if this was not clear to some members of our audience, there is no reason not to make the suggested change.

Recommendation
Proposed Section 75.40(a) should be revised to state:

a) For purposes of this Part, “teacher education candidate recruitment and retention activities” include:

Comment
It was suggested that Section 75.50(a)(2) be revised as displayed below:

2) Proposed expenditures for the services of master teachers and practitioners as support for student teaching will enhance teacher education candidates’ understanding of agricultural education as a profession and broaden their awareness of the varied facets of agriculture and agriculturally based careers.

Analysis
The statement in this subsection forms part of the criteria for the review of proposals. It relates directly to the activity identified in the statute as “having Master teachers and practitioners assist with the preparation, coordination, and supervision of student teachers”.

The suggested revision would depart from the statutory reference to “student teachers” in favor of “teacher education candidates”. The latter is a much broader term and would thus change the nature of this particular activity, because it would permit grant funds to be spent for the assistance of master teachers and practitioners to candidates throughout the entire duration of their preparation.

Based on our discussions with proponents of the legislation that established this new program, we understand that this was, in fact, their intent. However, the term “student teaching” denotes one specific, culminating field experience that teacher education candidates must complete. This is a term that is uniformly understood in teacher education and has been used in Article 21 of the School Code. Thus we do not believe that ISBE can interpret the statutory reference to “student teachers” to mean all teacher education candidates at any stage of their preparation programs.

ISBE should, of course, amend this rule if the statutory language is revised to reflect that intention. As noted under “Legislative Action” above, this is an aspect of the rules that will need to await further action.

Recommendation
No change should be made in the rule in response to this comment.
Comment
The rules were stated to have “shifted the focus from getting more students aware of and enrolled in the agriculture sciences education to getting the students through the university system and certified”. The commenter stated that this had not been the legislative intent and would not “resolve the lack of teaching capacity we are now experiencing.” In addition, it was his view that, if the rules are implemented as proposed, “this unique opportunity to positively impact our future teaching cadre will be diluted, misaligned and encumbered to the point that its success will be jeopardized.”

Analysis
This commenter did not identify specific portions of the proposed rules that would have these undesirable consequences. The rules incorporate all the activities that are allowed by the statute, and the rules permit both the community colleges and the universities to conduct those activities. Further, the rules permit the State Superintendent to identify particular areas of priority from year to year that will respond to relevant needs. Specifically, and in line with the statutory directive for “an agricultural science teacher education training continuum beginning at the secondary level”, the proposed rules establish outreach and recruitment among high school students as one important focus of the grant program. Funding for these activities is certainly available to the community colleges, whose involvement most interested the commenter.

It is axiomatic that the future teaching cadre that was mentioned by the respondent will be comprised of individuals who have completed approved preparation programs and attained certification. We therefore cannot explain how a lack of teaching capacity can be resolved without also ensuring that more of those who are recruited at the secondary level or from among community college students do go on to complete programs of preparation and become certified as agricultural science teachers. While there is a clear role for community colleges in this initiative, a strong role for the teacher preparation institutions is equally inherent in the statute.

Recommendation
No change is called for in response to this comment.
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AUTHORITY: Implementing Section 2-3.80a and authorized by Section 2-3.6 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/2-3.80a and 2-3.6].

SOURCE: Adopted at 32 Ill. Reg. _____, effective _____________.

Section 75.10 Purpose and Applicability

This Part establishes the application procedure for and criteria for allocation of grant funds to eligible institutions of higher education under the agricultural science teacher education program established under Section 2-3.80a of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/2-3.80a].

Section 75.20 Eligible Applicants

Eligible applicants under this Part shall be as specified in Section 2-3.80a of the School Code, provided that public community colleges that provide an articulated agriculture science teacher education course of study are only those that offer at least:

a) the introductory agricultural education course for which transfer credit is accepted by the public universities under the Illinois Articulation Initiative (see the information posted by the Illinois Board of Higher Education at www.itransfer.org); and

b) a one-semester-hour internship or other, equivalent field experience.
Section 75.30 Application Procedure

a) When State funding is expected to be available for the agricultural science teacher education program for a given fiscal year, the State Superintendent of Education shall issue a request for applications from eligible entities. This request shall:

1) indicate the amount or expected amount of the appropriation for the program and the expected range for grant awards;

2) describe the required content and format of applications and identify the activities that will receive priority consideration for funding, if applicable;

3) identify the data that recipients will be required to collect and report regarding the activities conducted with the funds provided and the results of those activities, as well as the timelines for reporting;

4) include such certifications, assurances, and program-specific terms of the grant as the State Superintendent may require; and

5) indicate the deadline for submission of applications, which shall provide applicants with at least 30 days in which to respond.

b) Each application shall be signed by an authorized representative of the institution, and each shall be accompanied by a letter of support signed by the heads of the agriculture department and, as applicable, the education department or the department responsible for the education program at the applicant institution.

c) Applicants may be requested to clarify various aspects of their proposals. The content of the approved proposal shall be incorporated into a grant agreement to be signed by the applicant’s authorized representative and the State Superintendent.

d) Each participating institution’s eligibility to receive funding in fiscal years following the initial appropriation for this program, or following the institution’s initial receipt of funding, as applicable, shall be contingent upon the submission of:
1) a description of activities undertaken to date and any other information required to be reported, demonstrating that the project has been implemented in conformance with the grant agreement;

2) an updated project narrative that discusses the services and activities for which the funding will be used and a rationale for the activities to be undertaken;

3) an updated budget summary and payment schedule for the coming fiscal year, including a narrative budget breakdown;

4) signed certifications, assurances, and program-specific terms of the grant, as applicable to the renewal period.

Section 75.40 Program Specifications; Allowable Expenditures

Funds provided pursuant to this Part may be expended only for activities and initiatives conducted in accordance with subsection (b) of Section 2-3.80a of the School Code and this Section.

a) For purposes of this Part, “teacher education candidate recruitment and retention initiatives” include:

1) the identification of students in Grades 11 and 12 who may be interested in pursuing agricultural education as a profession; and

2) activities and strategies that are designed to attract these and other students to teaching in agricultural education, including, but not limited to:

   A) introducing the students to multiple aspects of agricultural work and agricultural education in Illinois;

   B) providing mentors or other forms of personal support to the students as they determine whether to pursue careers as agricultural education teachers and as they progress through the teacher preparation program; and
C) providing scholarships, stipends, or other forms of financial or in-kind support that will make completion of a teacher preparation program in agricultural education more affordable and accessible to students from a broad range of backgrounds.

b) Each institution that elects to deliver professional development experiences for new teachers shall first seek approval as a provider of professional development for teachers in this field under the applicable provisions of the rules of the State Board of Education for Certification (see 23 Ill. Adm. Code 25.855, 25.870, and 25.872).

c) For purposes of this Part:

1) a “master teacher” is a teacher with no fewer than six years of teaching experience, ending no more than ten years prior to submission of an application under this Part, in the field of agricultural education, exclusive of teaching experience on a provisional vocational or temporary provisional vocational certificate; and

2) a “practitioner” is an individual who, as demonstrated by the institution’s proposal narrative:

   A) is currently engaged, or has been engaged within the previous 10 years, in an agricultural occupation requiring knowledge and skills in agricultural science, agricultural mechanization, agricultural business, horticulture, or agricultural resources; or

   B) holds a provisional vocational certificate endorsed for a skill area related to agricultural education and is currently teaching, or has taught within the previous 10 years, in a position requiring that certificate.

d) A university shall expend no more than five percent of the grant funds received for professional development for the staff of its agricultural education teacher preparation program.

e) Activities shall be supported by funding under this Part only to the extent that they do not duplicate or supplant efforts already conducted by or under the
auspices of the community college or university. The use of grant funds for administrative expenditures shall be limited to amounts demonstrably necessary for the implementation or coordination of additional activities under this Part.

**Section 75.50 Criteria for the Review of Proposals; Allocation of Funds**

Each applicant may propose to expend grant funds for one or more of the four types of activities discussed in subsection (b) of Section 2-3.80a of the School Code. Subsection (a) of this Section includes review criteria for all four types of activities; however, the individual criteria that are not relevant to the activities included in a particular proposal shall be disregarded in its review. The State Superintendent of Education shall make final determinations regarding the amounts to be provided based upon the total funds appropriated for this initiative and the amounts necessary to fund high-quality proposals that are most responsive to the area or areas of priority identified in the request for applications.

a) **Quality of the Plan (80 points)**

1) Proposed recruitment and retention strategies appear likely to:

   A) promote increased awareness of agricultural education as a potential career among students from varied backgrounds and communities;

   B) create enhanced incentives for individual students to enter and persist in teacher preparation programs in agricultural education; and

   C) help eliminate barriers that may otherwise prevent individuals from completing preparation programs in this field.

2) Proposed expenditures for the services of master teachers and practitioners as support for student teaching will enhance candidates’ understanding of agricultural education as a profession and broaden their awareness of the varied facets of agriculture and agriculturally based careers.

3) Plans for delivery of professional development for new teachers provide evidence that the training is designed in response to the expressed needs of individuals who are in their first five years of teaching in the field of
agricultural education and the districts or cooperatives where they are employed.

4) Planned expenditures for professional development for a university’s agricultural education staff are demonstrably related to the needs of those individuals.

b) Cost-Effectiveness (20 points)

The proposal represents a cost-effective use of State resources, as evidenced by the amounts requested for the proposed activities in relation to the numbers of students or teachers to be served and the services to be provided.