AGENDA (timeframes are estimated for planning purposes)

1. Roll Call
2. Board Member Participation by Other Means
3. Public Participation  1:00 – 1:15 p.m.
4. Minutes of the September Education Policy Planning Committee Meeting (pp. 2-3)
5. Preschool for All FY10 Funding Report  1:15 – 1:25 p.m.  (pp. 4-15)  
   (Susan Morrison, Kay Henderson)
6. English Language Proficiency Cut-Scores  1:25 – 1:45 p.m.  (pp. 16-19)  
   (Don Evans, Robin Lisboa, Connie Wise, Joyce Zurkowski)
7. School District Report Cards  (Connie Wise)  1:45 – 2:05 p.m.  (pp. 20-61)
8. Adequate Yearly Progress  (Connie Wise)  2:05 – 2:25 p.m.  (pp. 62-68)
9. Private Business & Vocational School Advisory Council  2:25 – 2:35 p.m.  (pp. 69-71)  
   (Linda Tomlinson, Patrick Murphy)
10. Teacher Certification Board Recommendations  2:35 – 2:45 p.m.  (pp. 72-77)  
    (Linda Tomlinson, Patrick Murphy, Linda Jamali)
    a. DePaul University
    b. Aurora University
    c. University of St. Francis
    d. Wheaton College
    e. St. Xavier University
    f. American College of Education
    g. Quincy University
    h. Columbia College
11. Update on ARRA and Race to the Top (verbal update)  (Superintendent Koch)  2:45 – 3:00 p.m.
12. Committee Agenda Planning/Additional Items
13. Committee Wrap-up – as needed  (Superintendent Koch)
14. Adjourn

* Items listed with an asterisk (*) will be discussed in committee and action may be taken in the plenary session.
The Education Policy Planning Committee meeting convened at 10:35 a.m.

1. **ROLL CALL** Dr. Fields requested roll call. (See above.)

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

3. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:** Marilyn Missel, Associate Superintendent of the Catholic Schools with the Springfield Dioceses, offered testimony regarding the funding cuts to the Illinois State Textbook Loan program. Ms. Missel stressed the importance of this program in private and public schools across the state and stated students cannot learn without effective and up-to-date classroom textbooks. The program effectively and efficiently operates for school districts and continues to meet educational needs closely aligned with ISBE’s strategic goals. Ms. Missel is asking the Board to ensure full funding for this program for the FY11 budget.

Jay Diskey, Executive Director of the School Division with the Association of American Publishers, also offered comments to the Board regarding the Illinois Textbook Loan Program. The Association of American Publishers fully supports the program and is hoping the state can restore full funding in FY11. This program serves both public and non public students in every corner of the state. Mr. Diskey explained how the present day print system is moving into the digital era. All of the major curriculum programs developed by major U.S. publishers are available in digital formats and these systems enable classroom teachers to teach, assess, diagnose and prescribe solutions for all types of learners. Mr. Diskey thanked the Board for their time.
Jim Craft with Illinois FFA and Illinois Association of Vocational Agriculture Teachers (IAVAT) addressed the Board regarding agriculture education. He briefly explained the broad parameters of agriculture education curriculum and how funding for “Ag. Ed.” touches the lives of students throughout the State of Illinois. FFA is all about student development, chapter development and community development. The Student Advisory Board noted that Jeffrey Barnes, a previous Student Advisory Board Member, was a FFA Agricultural Services National finalist.

4. MINUTES OF THE JUNE 2009 EPPC MEETING: Dr. Hall moved to approve the minutes of the June 2009 EPPC meeting and Joyce Karon seconded the motion. The Committee, by voice vote, approved the minutes of the June 2009 meeting.

5. 2009-10 STUDENT ADVISORY COUNCIL INTRODUCTIONS: Dr. Fields welcomed the 2009 Student Advisory Council members: Chinelo Agwuncha, Proviso Mathematics & Science Academy; Peyton Bernot, Gillespie H.S.; Sarah Chapman, Indian Creek H.S.; Kojo Fletcher, Glenwood H.S.; Abigail Horan, Rolling Meadows H.S.; Daniel Lopez, Mundelein H.S.; Linda Ly, University Laboratory H.S.; Courtney McGill, Belvidere North H.S.; Christopher Parks, Granite City H.S.; Jordan Ping, Newton Community H.S.; Hannah Rhoades, Auburn H.S.; Julie Sauls, Highland H.S.; and Shelby Wills, Williamsfield H.S. This year’s Co-Chairs are Sarah Chapman and Kojo Fletcher, and Jordan Ping is secretary.

The council will be involved with the State Farm Dropout Prevention Summit in November. The Council will decide on any other specific project following the summit.

6. UPDATE ON RACE TO THE TOP (Superintendent Koch): Superintendent Koch updated the Board on Race to the Top. At the August meeting a matrix outlining the various components for Race to the Top and reform areas was distributed and discussed. Since then, staff have met with all stakeholders and asked for their comments on the matrix by October 18th. Concerns raised at the stakeholder meeting included: unfunded mandates; school districts wanting the General Assembly to act on current budget shortfalls prior to acting on any new legislation; human capital development and tying student achievement to teacher and administrator performance.

Staff have been reaching out to the General Assembly in writing and there are two conference calls scheduled with legislators.

Board members expressed concern about how other stakeholders such as parents, students, and the public are viewing this initiative. Staff explained the four focus areas of and how public input was being sought with each.

Dr. Koch also indicated that we need to be sure that any plan submitted is something we can implement.

7. COMMITTEE AGENDA PLANNING/ADDITIONAL ITEMS: Dr. Brown requested a future update on scaling up initiative and Dr. Hall is looking forward to the upcoming work study to address school violence.

8. ADJOURNMENT: Ms. Karon moved to adjourn the EPPC meeting and Mr. Ruiz seconded the motion. The EPPC meeting adjourned at 11:23 a.m.
ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING
October 29-30, 2009

TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
      Susan Morrison, Special Assistant to the Superintendent

Agenda Topic: Approval of Preschool for All FY10 Funding Report

Materials: Preschool for All FY10 Funding Report

Staff Contact(s): Kay Henderson, Early Childhood Division Administrator

Purpose of Agenda Item

To gain the Board’s approval of the report to be submitted to the General Assembly on November 1, 2009.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan

The goal of Preschool for All is to increase school readiness for preschool aged children (Goal 1).

Outcome(s) of Agenda Item

The Illinois State Board of Education will approve this report for submission to the General Assembly and the Office of the Governor by November 1, 2009.

Background Information

Preschool for All is the expansion of the Prekindergarten Program for Children at Risk of Academic Failure. Illinois Preschool for All is in the fourth year of funding. The initial statute for Preschool for All included the possibility of a sunset after two years; however, the General Assembly voted to extend the sunset until 2010. The Preschool for All statute requires ISBE to submit a report by November 1 of each year, reporting how many programs were funded to serve children in Category 1, primarily children who are at-risk; Category 2, household income eligible children; or Category 3, other children. In FY 09, 95,312 children were served statewide in Preschool for All and the Prekindergarten Program. All children programs funded were in Category 1, serving at risk children.

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

Policy and Budget Implications: The FY10 Early Childhood Block grant (ECBG) appropriation is 90% of the FY09 funding, making it the first time in the 24 year history of the state-funded early childhood program that the appropriation has been reduced. In all other years, except three, the appropriation has been increased. In the three exceptions, the appropriation remained level from year to year.
The reduction in service for FY10 is moderate and misleading (approximately 1,000 fewer children served). The full impact of the FY10 ECBG appropriation reduction will be realized in FY11, due to the fact that in March of FY09, school districts, confident in the stability of funds for continuing programs, did not release preschool teachers. With the reduced FY10 ECBG appropriation districts are forced to meet contractual obligations to teachers with 10% fewer grant funds than FY09. This year they are keeping preschool classrooms open using other funds to cover the loss of grant funds. To avoid a similar situation in FY11, districts will likely release teachers in March 2010. School district and community-based grantees will make service level decisions based on the actual level of the FY11 appropriation, and factoring in the ability of the State Comptroller to pay out vouchers in a timely manner. Many programs started the FY10 fiscal year awaiting payments from their FY09 grant.

Legislative Action: none

Communication: This report will be public in the final form approved by ISBE.

**Pros and Cons of Various Actions**

Approval of the report will allow ISBE to meet the deadline for submission.

**Superintendent’s Recommendation**

I recommend that the following motion be adopted:

> The Illinois State Board of Education approves the Preschool for All FY10 Funding Report for submission to the Illinois General Assembly.

**Next Steps**

Report will be submitted.
MEMORANDUM

TO: The Honorable John J. Cullerton, Senate President
    The Honorable Christine Radongo, Senate Republican Leader
    The Honorable Michael J. Madigan, Speaker of the House
    The Honorable Tom Cross, House Republican Leader

FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D.
      State Superintendent of Education

SUBJECT: Preschool for All funding for FY10 projects. Fall Report on new
         FY10 Preschool for All funding provided to programs.

Section 2-3.71(a)(4.5) of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/2-3.71(a)(4.5)], requires
the Illinois State Board of Education to report the percentage of new Preschool
for All funding in FY10 that was provided to programs serving primarily at-risk
children, the percentage of new funding in FY10 that was provided to programs
serving primarily children with a family income of less than 4 times the federal
poverty level, and the percentage of new funding in FY10 that was provided to
other programs.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact Kay Henderson, Early
Childhood Division Administrator, at 217/524-4835.

Cc: The Honorable Pat Quinn, Governor
    Mark Mahoney, Clerk of the House
    Jillayne Rock, Secretary of the Senate
    Legislative Research Unit
    State Government Report Center
PRESCHOOL FOR ALL
FUNDING REPORT
(REQUIRED BY PA 94-1054)

FISCAL YEAR 2010

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
NOVEMBER 2009
FY2010 Preschool for All Funding Report

Program Overview and FY 10 Funds
Preschool for All is a historic six-year expansion of early childhood programs that makes Illinois the first state in the nation to offer voluntary, high quality preschool to all three- and four-year-olds whose parents want them to participate. The goal of Preschool for All is to ensure that all children are well prepared to succeed in school and in life. Preschool for All also includes new resources to expand quality infant-toddler programs targeted to at-risk children and their families.

Preschool for All was signed into law in July 2006, after passing the General Assembly with strong bipartisan support. When fully implemented, Preschool for All will ensure that 190,000 children in Illinois have access to high-quality preschool. This estimate includes children who are already served in existing State Pre-Kindergarten, Head Start and Early Childhood Special Education programs. During expansion, programs serving children at-risk of school failure are the first priority for new funding, followed by families earning up to four times the federal poverty level, or $88,200 for a family of four.

For FY10, the Early Childhood Block Grant appropriation is $342,235 million. This represents 90% of the FY09 appropriation of $380,261 million, and marks the first time in the twenty-four year history of state-funded preschool that the appropriation has been reduced. For programs outside Chicago, all programs funded through the Early Childhood Block Grant, including Preschool for All, were reduced to 90% of their FY09 funding level. No new programs were funded. All continuing Preschool for All programs are funded in Category 1, serving primarily children who are at risk of school failure.

As a result of the reduced appropriation, an estimated 1,000 children (outside Chicago) will not receive preschool services. Considering the 10% reduction in funding, the number of children not served, compared to FY09, is disproportionately low. This is due to the fact that school districts, confident in the early childhood funding history, did not release preschool teachers in March 2009. In order to meet their FY10 contractual obligations to these teachers, districts kept preschool classroom doors open and covered the loss of ECBG grant funds with local district funds. To avoid a similar situation in FY11, school districts will likely release their preschool teachers in March 2010. School districts and community-based grantees will then consider the actual FY11 appropriation and the ability of the State Comptroller to make payments in a timely manner in deciding whether to maintain, reduce, or discontinue their preschool programs.

Preschool for All is administered by the Illinois State Board of Education, except in Chicago, where the program is administered by the Chicago Public Schools using the same criteria. Preschool for All builds on the foundation of the 20-year-old State Pre-Kindergarten program by expanding resources to reach more children and enhance quality in participating schools, community organizations
and private providers. As with the State Pre-K program, funding for Preschool for All is provided through the Early Childhood Block Grant. However, Preschool for All expands eligibility to all Illinois three- and four-year-olds, though at-risk and moderate-income children will be prioritized during the expansion period. Preschool for All infant-toddler funds will continue to be targeted to programs that serve at-risk children.

Preschool for All also provides new resources for initiatives to improve quality and accountability. Key components include:

- Two year program for 3 and 4-year olds
- Monitoring and accountability
- Training and technical assistance
- Expand supply of certified teachers
- Statewide and program evaluation
- Social/emotional consultation
- Small class size, adult/child ratios
- 180 half-day sessions
- High quality curriculum/assessment
- Parent education and involvement
- Community collaboration
- Professional development

Eleven percent of Preschool for All funding is directed to infant-toddler programs that serve at-risk children and their families. Illinois is the only state to institutionalize its infant-toddler programs to this extent. Extensive information and application guidelines for infant-toddler programs is available on the Illinois State Board of Education website (www.isbe.net). This commitment reflects the core values that undergird Preschool for All— all children deserve a quality early learning experience, but we must start earlier and do more for children who face the greatest challenges.

Preschool for All is based on recommendations drafted by the Illinois Early Learning Council, a statewide advisory board created with bi-partisan legislative support in 2003. The Early Learning Council’s members are appointed by the Governor and leaders of the Illinois General Assembly, and include early childhood practitioners, policymakers, civic and business leaders, advocates and state agencies. Standing committees provide a forum for participation by additional stakeholders.

By building on a strong tradition of quality, Preschool for All places Illinois at the forefront of a national movement to make quality early learning available for all children. Yet many people—from local program directors to leaders of state government—must help sustain the current momentum in order to realize the full vision of Preschool for All children.

**Who is Eligible for Preschool for All?**

Every three-and four-year-old in Illinois is eligible for Preschool for All. Prior to Preschool for All, only children who were classified as at-risk of school failure were able to take part in state-funded preschool. For the first time, programs are allowed to use state dollars to serve children from the broader community. While funding during the five year expansion period will be prioritized according to
need, these priorities are designed with some flexibility so that programs can respond to local circumstances and use resources in as efficient and fair manner as possible.

Given the considerable interest in and need for preschool services, all Preschool for All classrooms are expected to be fully enrolled with 20 children. Programs that do not have a full roster of children should actively reach out to parents and the community in order to recruit students to fill each classroom. Recruitment activities can include outreach to local early childhood networks, participating in community fairs, posters in local businesses and state agencies and door-to-door canvassing.

Preschool for All grant awards will be made each year, depending on available funding appropriated by the General Assembly. While the grant award time frame will vary depending on when the state budget is approved, the Preschool for All grant period will generally begin in the summer of a given program year, no sooner than July 1st, and will extend until June 30 of the program year.

Where is Preschool for All?
Preschool for All will be offered in a diversity of school- and community-based sites and programs. All Preschool for All programs will be funded on a 180 day school year calendar to provide a 2.5 hour, 5 day a week program. Otherwise, local programs will have considerable flexibility with their locations, operational structure and program formats. Applicants other than public school districts must provide evidence of existing capacity to provide early childhood education programs, including the agency’s mission statement, organizational structure, accreditation and other relevant information.

Eligible applicants include:

- public school districts
- university laboratory schools
- child care centers
- regional offices of education
- charter schools
- community colleges
- community organizations
- private preschools
- park districts
- faith-based organizations*
- home-based child-care networks
- other settings

* Faith-based organizations are eligible to be funded for Preschool for All, but may not use state funds to support religious instruction.
Models for Collaboration
Preschool for All is designed to promote a comprehensive approach to early childhood development and encourage collaboration among providers and other community stakeholders to foster creative strategies to meet the complete needs of young children and their families. Many agencies are reworking their organizational thought and practice to emphasize cooperation, coordination, and collaboration. Educational, health, and social service agencies are beginning to recognize that only by working together can they provide services that are integrated rather than fragmented, multidimensional rather than one-dimensional, and continuous rather than sporadic.

Preschool for All encourages joint applications that maximize limited resources, increase the cohesion of services and provide practical avenues for collaboration. Joint applications must designate a single administrative agent and clearly delineate the shared responsibilities of each partner. Applicants can participate in only one application for Preschool for All funds. Within these parameters, Preschool for All providers have considerable flexibility to create partnerships that fit local circumstances.

Preschool for All Program Specifications
Preschool for All program specifications are similar to those of the State Pre-Kindergarten program upon which it is modeled. Preschool for All will enable programs to expand or create new preschool programs, while improving the quality of the overall system. Preschool for All is made up of several required components: 1) Screening; 2) Educational Program; 3) Parent Education and Involvement; 4) Community Collaboration; 5) Staff Requirements and Professional Development.

1. **Screening Component**
All Preschool for All programs must implement a formal screening process to determine a child’s needs and priority for service. While Preschool for All establishes that all Illinois three- and four-year-olds are eligible for preschool, new capacity must be built in order to meet expected demand. During the build-up period, funding was prioritized to programs which serve primarily at-risk children, followed by programs serving children from families earning up to four times the federal poverty rate ($88,200 for a family of four).

Screening should be conducted on a community-wide basis in cooperation with other programs serving young children (e.g., public schools, child care agencies, special education, Head Start, 0-3 programs and Child Find). Programs may use an existing screening instrument or one that they have developed. All screening procedures must include the following requirements.
• Criteria to determine at what point an approved screening instrument indicates that children are at-risk of academic failure, as well as to assess other environmental, economic and demographic factors.

• Mechanisms to measure the child’s development in these specific areas: vocabulary, visual-motor integration, language and speech development, English proficiency, fine and gross motor skills, social skills and cognitive development.

• A parent interview that gathers information about a child’s health and social development; parent’s education, employment, income and age; and other information that indicates risk of school failure or prioritization under income guidelines.

• Vision and hearing screening must be provided.

• Written parental permission for the screening must be obtained.

• Teachers should be involved in the screening process and have access to the results.

2. Educational Program
Preschool for All programs must offer an appropriate education program that addresses all developmental areas. The education program must meet the following requirements.

• Curriculum and instruction are aligned to the Illinois Early Learning Standards.

• The individualized assessment profile for each child is the basis for determining that child’s educational program.

• The following domains of development are addressed: vocabulary, visual-motor integration, language and speech development, English proficiency, fine and gross motor skills, social skills and cognitive development.

• A language and literacy development program shall be implemented for each child based on the child’s individual assessment.

• A snack is provided for participating children in a half-day program.

• Student progress is assessed and documented to ensure that the educational program meets the needs of the student.

• A system is established to routinely advise parents of their child’s progress.
• The staff-child ratio for each classroom must not exceed one adult to ten children. No more than twenty children can be served in a single classroom.

• Programs should serve the maximum number of children in each classroom. Programs must serve all at-risk children before enrolling other children. Children whose families make less than four times the federal poverty level will have the next priority.

• Age-eligible children are enrolled in kindergarten upon leaving the program.

3. **Parent Education and Involvement**

As their children’s first teachers, parents are a crucial piece of a successful early learning experience. Preschool for All will empower parents by providing more choices among programs and settings that fit their unique needs. Preschool for All programs are expected to engage parents in the educational process and support effective parenting practices. Programs must provide parent education and involvement activities in each of the following areas.

• **Communication:** There is meaningful, two-way communication between home and the program on a regular basis.

• **Parent Education:** Parenting skills are promoted and supported.

• **Student Learning:** Parents play an integral role in assisting student learning.

• **Involvement:** Parents are welcome in the program, and their support and involvement are sought.

• **Decision-Making and Advocacy:** Parents are full partners in the decisions that affect children and families.

The following are examples of effective parent engagement practices.

• Parents, families, staff and community members cooperatively develop a mission statement.

• The program develops and implements a written parent involvement plan.

• Staff partner with parents to promote children’s social/emotional and overall development.

• Family activities such as workshops, field trips and child/parent events are organized.
• The program encourages both mother and father/male involvement in children’s lives.
• Parents are encouraged to volunteer in the classroom.
• The program has a lending library for parents, and a toy/book lending library for children.
• The program has a newsletter and regularly sends information home.

4. Community Collaboration
Preschool for All seeks to ensure that children and families get the services they need with a minimum of bureaucracy, and use public resources wisely by avoiding duplication of efforts. Since many families need full-day, year-round placement that includes not only preschool but other comprehensive services like child care and family programs, extra consideration will be given to Preschool for All partnerships that address these broader needs. Examples include partnerships between school districts and child care agencies, networks of family child care providers who share a preschool teacher, or partnerships between preschool programs and local Head Start initiatives.

Characteristics of effective community collaborations include the following elements.

• Programs collaborate with all other nearby programs to address the education, welfare, health and safety needs of young children and their families.
• A clear collaboration and implementation plan is in place.
• Programs have written procedures to assist children with transitions both within the program and between other early childhood programs in the community, including kindergarten.
• Programs establish partnerships with parents and families and encourage them to make decisions regarding their parenting skills and their children’s development.
• The program has a written transition plan with other early childhood programs that addresses the unique needs and situations of families.
• Program staff appreciates the impact of children’s home, community and cultural experiences on their development and learning.
5. **Staff Requirements and Professional Development**

Preschool for All staff will have the knowledge and skills to assist children in reaching their full potential as learners. All program administrators and staff must hold appropriate certifications and/or qualifications for the position for which they are hired. Preschool for All programs are expected to regularly assess the continuing learning needs of the staff and provide appropriate ongoing professional development activities both inside the building and within the broader early childhood community. Major requirements include the following.

- All teaching staff in instructional roles hold either an Initial (Type 02) or Standard (Type 04) Early Childhood Certificate.
- Non-certified staff who assist in instruction meet training and degree requirements.
- Administrators and program staff are knowledgeable about high-quality early childhood programs and are effective in explaining, organizing and implementing them.
- Program has written personnel policies and job descriptions on file.
- Program offers opportunities and resources for staff to share and consult with others.
- Staff development needs are regularly assessed and inform an in-service training program and other appropriate ongoing professional development activities.
- The program has a written professional development plan for all staff.
ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING  
October 29-30, 2009

TO: Education Policy Planning Committee

FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
      Donald W. Evans, Director of Human Resources
      Connie J. Wise, Assistant Superintendent

Agenda Topic: English Language Proficiency Cut-Scores

Materials: Handout

Staff Contact(s): Robin M. Lisboa, Division Administrator for English Language Learning
                Joyce Zurkowski, Division Administrator for Assessment

Purpose of Agenda Item

To present to the Board revised English language proficiency cut-scores that will be used to identify and exit Limited English Proficient students; and to provide information regarding the process followed by ISBE staff and external partners to develop these new cut-scores.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan

English language proficiency is related to GOAL 1 of the Strategic Plan:

Every student will demonstrate academic achievement and be prepared for success after high school. By identifying Limited English Proficient (LEP) students based on State-defined cut-scores, school districts will consistently target students who need language support services to fully access the curriculum and achieve academically.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item

The Board will be informed about the revised English language proficiency cut-scores and the process that was followed to develop them.

Background Information

Since 2006, Illinois school districts have been required to administer the ACCESS for ELLs® to annually assess LEP students in four domains--listening, speaking, reading and writing. Under the State Board of Education’s rules for Transitional Bilingual Education (Part 228), the State Superintendent of Education must establish a definition of LEP based on the results of the state administered English language proficiency assessment (ACCESS for ELLs®). The six proficiency levels on the ACCESS for ELLs® are: (1) Entering, (2) Beginning, (3) Developing, (4) Expanding, (5) Bridging and (6) Reaching. The cut-score established by the State Superintendent in 2006 was a 4.0 overall composite (i.e., 35% reading, 35% writing, 15% speaking, and 15% listening) score.
Students who score below the established cut-score level are considered LEP. This designation has two important consequences: (1) these students are eligible to receive bilingual services in accordance with Article 14C of the School Code; and (2) these students are included in the LEP subgroup for purposes of determining a school’s and/or school district’s Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). On the other hand, students who score at or above the established cut-score are considered English language proficient (it is important to note that, for AYP purposes, districts have flexibility to include “formerly LEP students” in the LEP subgroup for two years after such students have scored at a proficient level).

When the 4.0 composite cut-score was established in 2006, ISBE’s Division of English Language Learning (DELL) acknowledged that future adjustments to the cut-score could be necessary, depending on what the field saw as they implemented the new criteria in relationship to classroom performance and the analyses of assessment results in subsequent years. Now that the Agency has the benefit of additional data, the ACCESS cut-score warrants reconsideration. To that end, the DELL, after receiving data from ISBE’s Assessment Division, held several internal and external meetings to analyze student English language proficiency and academic achievement assessment data from the past two years—the goal of this exercise was to identify the English language proficiency level at which most students met or exceeded state standards on the ISAT or PSAE. For example, in April 2009, ISBE staff met with the Illinois Advisory Council on Bilingual Education to review this assessment data and, in May, 2009, the Great Lakes West Comprehensive Center facilitated a meeting with ISBE staff and a range of key statewide stakeholders.

As a result of these meetings, the State Superintendent is recommending a 4.8 composite cut-score, as well as a 4.2 literacy cut-score (with literacy being the combination of the reading and writing domains). This new cut-score is designed to better predict student ability to participate successfully in English only, grade level classrooms, without support (as opposed to placement in Article 14C bilingual programs). (The State Superintendent similarly recommends the same change to the cut-score for the State screening instrument(s) (WAPT-WIDA ACCESS Placement Test and the MODEL®)).

Both ISBE staff and the stakeholders with whom ISBE staff worked recognize the continuing need to monitor future data to see whether further changes to the cut-score are necessary.

On a related note, as a result of the U.S. Department of Education’s 2008 Title I monitoring, ISBE received a finding for lacking a consistent, statewide criteria to exit students from the LEP subgroup for AYP purposes (the federal finding did not focus on the threshold for exiting LEP students from state bilingual programming). Per ISBE’s current Part 228 rules, the State Superintendent, as noted above, establishes the cut-score; however, districts have the authority to require a higher cut-score and/or to set additional exit criteria to determine when students are no longer LEP. Consequently, exit criteria vary from district to district, preventing a valid comparison of the LEP subgroup across the State.

To address this inconsistency, the State Superintendent is recommending an amendment to the Part 228 bilingual education rules, which will be considered by ISBE’s Rules Committee at the Board’s October 29, 2009 meeting. This proposed change would require consistent exit criteria across Illinois—specifically, districts will be required to use as their exit criterion only the State Superintendent established cut-score.
**Effectiveness**

Last Evaluation of the program: Not applicable.

Results of evaluation or effectiveness indicators: Not applicable.

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

**Policy Implications:** Raising the ACCESS cut score will help ensure that, under Article 14C of the School Code, students remain eligible to receive bilingual education until they acquire the English language skills needed to participate fully in a general education classroom. Although many districts currently employ exit criteria in addition to an ACCESS cut-score, the recommended cut score is a higher ACCESS score than what is currently used by most districts in the state.

Moreover, the proposed rule change referenced above, establishing a uniform exit criteria, will meet the U.S. Department of Education’s requirement under Title I to have one State definition of LEP for the purposes of calculating AYP (and thus will resolve USDE’s 2008 monitoring finding).

**Budget Implications:** Raising the ACCESS cut-score will lead to increased state assessment costs since more students will be required to take ACCESS. It may also lead to an increased number of students who districts must serve in state TBE/TPI programs. The increased number of LEP students may increase districts’ annual TBE/TPI program costs and further prorate state bilingual funding for districts. The State Superintendent recognizes that, in these economic times, policy changes that may result in increased costs need to be carefully considered and generally avoided; however, the evidence indicates that a change here is critical to ensuring that LEP students in Illinois are being properly served.

**Legislative Action:** No legislative action is required.

**Communication:** Agency staff will inform school districts of the revised cut-scores through such mechanisms as the ISBE website, the Superintendent’s Bulletin and the bilingual and assessment listserves.

**Pros and Cons of Various Actions**

**Pros:**

- The revised cut score better ensure that students remain eligible to receive language support services needed to fully access the academic curriculum until they acquire the English language skills needed to participate fully in a general education classroom; and,

- The revised cut score will more closely align the definition of English language proficient and the LEP exit criteria with the English language skills needed to meet or exceed State standards on the ISAT and PSAE; and

- The consistent use of criteria among districts will address a Title I monitoring finding by the U.S. Department of Education.
Cons:

- Raising the English proficiency cut-scores may reduce the number of districts that achieve Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) under Title III of NCLB. Currently, AMAOs include a target of 10% of ELL students achieving English language proficiency each year.

- The number of LEP students eligible to receive TBE/TPI services may increase leading to a reduction in the proration of TBE/TPI funding to districts.

- The demand for bilingual and ESL teachers will likely increase.

**Superintendent’s Recommendation**

I recommend that the following motion be adopted:

The State Board of Education hereby approves, effective January 1, 2010, modification of the cut-score for ACCESS for ELLs®, as well as the State screening instrument(s) (WAPT-WIDA ACCESS Placement Test and the MODEL®) from a composite score of 4.0 to a composite score of 4.8, with a 4.2 literacy (reading and writing) score.

**Next Steps**

ISBE’s Division of English Language Learning will post the English language proficiency cut-scores on the ACCESS for ELLs® webpage and will include this information in the Superintendent’s Bulletin.
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TO:                Illinois State Board of Education

FROM:              Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
                  Linda L. Tomlinson, Ph.D., Assistant Superintendent

Agenda Topic:      Private Business and Vocational Schools State Advisory Council

Materials:         None

Staff Contact(s):  Patrick Murphy, Division Administrator, Educator and School Development

Purpose of Agenda Item
To review and act upon the recommendations for appointment to the Private Business and Vocational Schools State Advisory Council (the “Council”).

Relationship to / Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
In addition to the purpose described above, this agenda item has a linkage to GOAL 1: Every student will demonstrate academic achievement and be prepared for success after high school.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
The anticipated outcome of this agenda item is the approval by the State Board of the State Superintendent’s appointments to the Council for three-year terms beginning immediately.

Background Information
105 ILCS 425/2 of the Illinois Compiled Statutes requires that the State Board of Education approve the State Superintendent’s appointment of members to the Council. Twelve total appointments must be made and each appointment is for a term of three years, retroactive to July 1st of the fiscal year of appointment. The Council must be composed as follows:

(1) Superintendent’s representative;
(1) Chairperson selected by the membership of the council;
(1) Owner or chief managing employee from a business school;
(1) Owner or chief managing employee from a technical school;
(1) Owner or chief managing employee from a home study school;
(1) Public high school vocational counselor in the State of Illinois;
(1) Attorney from the Office of the Attorney General;
(2) Teachers licensed to teach in a business, technical or vocational school;
(1) Attorney from the Cook County State's Attorney's Office;
(2) Former students who have graduated from either a business, technical or vocational school as representatives of the general public.

All owners and chief managing employees appointed to the Council must have a minimum of five years of experience in their position. These members all serve without pay, though they are to be reimbursed for their necessary expenses by the State Board.
Analysis and Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action and Communications

Policy Implications: Approval of these appointments will establish the Private Business and Vocational Schools State Advisory Council and allow such Council to perform those duties set forth in statute.

Budget Implications: None

Legislative Action: None

Communication: The Agency will work to assist the Council in its fulfillment of its statutory duties, and such assistance will include appropriate publication of Council meetings in accordance with the Open Meetings Act.

Pros and Cons of Various Actions

Pros: The convening and subsequent functioning of this Council is necessary to meet a statutory requirement, and the existence of a functioning Council hopefully will help address some of the concerns the Agency has seen with respect to the operation of PBVS in Illinois.

Cons: The Agency is not aware of any downside to approving the State Superintendent’s appointments to the Council.

Superintendent’s Recommendation

I recommend that the following motion be adopted:

The State Board of Education hereby approves the following State Superintendent appointments to the Private Business and Vocational Schools Advisory Council and delegates to the State Superintendent the authority to select the Chairperson for the Council from recommendations made by the Council members.

Superintendent’s representative
Patrick Murphy, Division Administrator, Educator and School Development

Owner or chief managing employee from a business school
Amy Semenchuk, CME, Rockford Career Center

Owner or chief managing employee from a technical school
Michelle Echevarria, Owner, CMK Healthcare

Owner or chief managing employee from a home study school
To be determined

Public high school vocational counselor in the State of Illinois
Ameenah Muhammad, Rich South High School

Attorney from the Office of the Attorney General
To be determined

Two (2) teachers licensed to teach in a business, technical or vocational school
Earnest Lee, Instructor, Elim Outreach Training Center
Marlene Murphy, Instructor, Accountax School of Business, Incorporated
Attorney from the Cook County State’s Attorney’s Office
Karen Dimond

Two (2) former students who have graduated from either a business, technical or vocational school as representatives of the general public
Pedro Martinez, Samland Graduate
Kimberly O’Brien, Everest College

Next Steps
The individuals (and respective organizations, if applicable) will be notified about the approval action taken by the State Board of Education. Per statute, the Council must develop bylaws for the conduct of its business and meet at least three times per year to review and advise the State Board and State Superintendent as may be appropriate on the effectiveness and efficiency by which the rules are regulations are: carrying out the intent of the PBVS Act; protecting the interests of the students; and enhancing the ability of the schools to provide quality courses of instruction.
ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING
October 29 – 30, 2009

TO: Illinois State Board of Education
FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
        Linda Tomlinson, Ph.D., Assistant Superintendent

Agenda Topic: Action Item: Program and Unit Approvals

Staff Contact: Patrick Murphy, Phyliss Jones, Dennis Williams, Diane Lacopo

Purpose of Agenda Item

The purpose of this agenda item is to consider the State Teacher Certification Board’s (STCB) recommendation for:

1. approval of DePaul University program, Aurora University programs, the University of Saint Francis’s programs, Wheaton College’s programs, and Saint Xavier University’s programs recommended by the respective specialized professional associations (SPAs). The STCB also recommends that the State Board place one Saint Xavier University program on probation, as recommended by that program’s SPA.
2. approval of the American College of Education’s new Technology Specialist program.
3. unit accreditation of the Quincy University educational unit.
4. unit accreditation with conditions and approval of the institution’s programs for Columbia College.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item

The State Board of Education will be asked to vote on six motions for continuing program approval, one motion to put a program on probation, one motion for a new program and two motions for unit accreditation.

Background Information

1. DePaul University, Aurora University, the University of Saint Francis, Wheaton College, and Saint Xavier University are NCATE accredited institutions that had accreditation visits previously. These institutions received unit accreditation and program approval for most of their programs. However, some programs were not approved at that time. They have been working with the respective Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs) and have recently received approval. Saint Xavier University’s Learning Behavior Specialist I program was not approved by the SPA.

The following table lists each institution and the specific programs approved by the SPAs and the State Teacher Certification Board.
NCATE Accredited Institutions Recommended for Additional Program Approvals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Original Review Date</th>
<th>STCB Review Date</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Staff Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DePaul University</td>
<td>November 15-19, 2003</td>
<td>June 2004</td>
<td>Social Science – History, Undergraduate</td>
<td>Phyliss Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and Graduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora University</td>
<td>April 12-16, 2008</td>
<td>December 2008</td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>Phyliss Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Science – Biology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Science - History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Saint Francis</td>
<td>February 23 – 27, 2008</td>
<td>June 2008</td>
<td>English Language Arts – Undergraduate</td>
<td>Dennis Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Behavior Specialist I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheaton College</td>
<td>November 4 – 8, 2006</td>
<td>June 2007</td>
<td>Science – Biology, ,  Science – Chemistry</td>
<td>Diane Lacopo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Science – Earth &amp; Space Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Science – Physics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Xavier University</td>
<td>March 17 – 21, 2007</td>
<td>December 2007</td>
<td>General Administrative – Principal</td>
<td>Diane Lacopo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English Language Arts – Graduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Saint Xavier University also submitted a final SPA report for Learning Behavior Specialist I which the SPA gave a “Not Recognized” designation. The Certification Board recommends to the State Board of Education probation for the Learning Behavior Specialist I at Saint Xavier University and recommends an 18-month period during which no new candidates shall be enrolled [Section 25.127 (j) (2)]. Saint Xavier University will submit a new Learning Behavior Specialist I report to the SPA in February, 2010. The corresponding SPA reply report will be given to the STCB for consideration upon the university’s receipt. This will occur within the 18-month window.

(2) American College of Education is an established Illinois Teacher preparation institution that presently offers a graduate program in Principal/General Administration.

The new program proposal for Technology Specialist was presented in the format requested by the State Teacher Certification Board and provides an overview of the knowledge base and how the outcomes relate to the conceptual framework; a description of the course of study, including the field experiences and clinical practice components; assurances that the applicable Illinois standards will be met; a description of the program assessment system; the program faculty and their expertise in this field; and the resources that will be available to support the program and candidates in the program. The STCB determined that the program proposal provides evidence that the Technology Specialist standards (Sections 27.470) will be met, and the proposal
addresses the approval of new program requirements as defined in the Illinois Administrative Rules, Section 25.145.

(3) A State team conducted an on-site continuing accreditation review of Quincy University in March, 2008. At the December 3 – 4, 2008 meeting of the STCB, it was recommended to the State Board that in accordance with Section 25.125 (j) (2) (A) of the State Board’s administrative rules the unit make adjustments so as to satisfy the conditions expressed in the unmet Standard 2 of the 2002 NCATE Unit Standards within six months, and submit documentation that addresses the unmet standard. Quincy submitted the documentation and the STCB undertook consideration of the submission at its September 11 meeting.

The State Teacher Certification Board recommends to the State Board of Education that the documentation submitted by Quincy University satisfies the conditions expressed in the team report dated March 2008 and that Quincy University be granted continuing accreditation of the educational unit. [Section 25.125 (j) (2) (B)]

(4) Columbia College, Chicago, is an established Illinois teacher preparation institution that offers undergraduate programs in early childhood education, elementary education, and visual arts. A State team conducted an on-site continuing accreditation review of the Columbia College November 15 – 19, 2008 using the NCATE Unit Standards Edition 2002 and NCATE review processes. As per the Illinois administrative rules, Section 25.125 (d) (1), the team was accompanied by a state designee who served as a consultant and ex officio member to ensure that the applicable Illinois standards, procedures, rules, and statutes were addressed. The program review was conducted by an ISBE review team in advance of the on-site accreditation review. The program recommendations were submitted to the State Certification Board for consideration on June 5, 2009.

Based on the review of these documents and after awaiting Columbia College’s decision to not bring a notice of objection to the State Board, the Certification Board recommends to the State Board of Education that Columbia College be assigned “continuing accreditation with conditions” with the following unit accreditation findings.

**Standard One: Met with Areas for Improvement**
- Insufficient data are provided to document early childhood candidates’ ability to explain important principles and concepts delineated in state or institutional standards.
- Insufficient data are provided to document art, elementary and early childhood education candidates’ abilities to apply professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills and to consider the school, family, and community contexts in which they work and the prior experience of students to develop meaningful learning experiences.
- Specific data are not provided to document early childhood education candidates’ ability to impact student learning.

**Standard Two: Not Met**
- The unit does not have a comprehensive, effective and systematic assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs.
Standard Three: Met with Area for Improvement

- Insufficient data from the professional community are provided to document candidate progress in field and clinical experiences.

Standards Four, Five, and Six: Met

The program approval process included a review of the program reports prepared from the ISBE findings. Based on these reviews, the State Teacher Certification Board recommends approval of the following programs at Columbia College (Section 25.127 (j) (1) (A):

- Early Childhood
- Elementary Education
- Visual Arts

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan

The approval of the professional preparation programs has linkage to Goal 2: To ensure that every student will be supported by highly prepared and effective teachers and school leaders, policies and processes have been implemented that support preparation programs with a focus on instruction and student learning. These standards-based programs will prepare educators with expertise in discipline-specific content areas and ensure that teachers and administrators demonstrate best practices to help all students learn. Placing the one program on probation also has linkage to Goal 2. The program has 18 months to correct the problems that the SPA has detailed.

Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action and Communications

Policy: None

Budget: None

Legislation Action: None

Communication: Please see “Next Steps” below.

Pros and Cons of Various Actions

- Approval of the programs will authorize the universities to entitle graduates for the various programs as listed.

- Approval of the recommendation to place the Learning Behavior I program at St. Xavier University on probation for an 18-month period during which no new candidates shall be enrolled will allow Saint Xavier University time to bring the program up to standards.

- Approval of the STCB recommendations for the education units will allow the universities to entitle graduates for the various programs as listed.

- Columbia College will have a focused review visit to be held within two years of the State Board’s decision.
Superintendent’s Recommendations

I recommend that the following motions be adopted:

Motion 1
In accordance with Section 25.127 (j) (1) (A) of the State Board’s administrative rules on review of individual programs, the State Board awards continuing approval for DePaul University for the specific professional education preparation programs listed above, as they meet the applicable Illinois content area standards.

Motion 2
In accordance with Section 25.127 (j) (1) (A) of the State Board’s administrative rules on review of individual programs, the State Board awards continuing approval for Aurora University for the specific professional education preparation programs listed above, as they meet the applicable Illinois content area standards.

Motion 3
In accordance with Section 25.127 (j) (1) (A) of the State Board’s administrative rules on review of individual programs, the State Board awards continuing approval for University of Saint Francis for the specific professional education preparation programs listed above, as they meet the applicable Specialized Professional Association standards.

Motion 4
In accordance with Section 25.127 (j) (1) (A) of the State Board’s administrative rules on review of individual programs, the State Board awards continuing approval for Wheaton College for the specific professional education preparation programs listed above, as they meet the applicable Specialized Professional Association standards.

Motion 5
In accordance with Section 25.127 (j) (1) (A) of the State Board’s administrative rules on review of individual programs, the State Board awards continuing approval for Saint Xavier University for the specific professional education preparation programs listed above, as they meet the applicable Specialized Professional Association standards.

Further, in accordance with Section 25.127 (j) (2) of the State Board’s administrative rules on review of individual programs, the State Board awards probation for Saint Xavier University for the specific professional education preparation program listed above, as it does not meet the applicable Specialized Professional Association standards.

Motion 6
In accordance with Section 25.145 of the State Board’s administrative rules on review of new programs, the State Board of Education provisionally approves the American College of Education’s Technology Specialist program, thereby authorizing the university to conduct the program and to recommend candidates for certification by entitlement until the time of the institution’s next accreditation review.

Motion 7
In accordance with Section 25.125 (j) (2) (A) of the State Board's administrative rules, the State Board of Education hereby assigns the status of "continuing accreditation" to Quincy University authorizing the institution to conduct its programs and recommend
candidates for certification by entitlement until the time of the institution’s next scheduled review.

**Motion 8**
In accordance with Section 25.125 (j) (2) (C) of the State Board’s administrative rules, the State Board hereby assigns Columbia College “accreditation with conditions”. A focused visit addressing the unmet standards and additional areas for improvement will be conducted within two years.

Further, in accordance with Section 25.127 (j) (1) (A) of the State Board’s administrative rules on review of individual programs, the State Board awards **continuing approval** for Columbia College for the specific professional education preparation programs listed below as they meet the applicable Illinois Content Area Standards.

- Early Childhood
- Elementary Education
- Visual Arts

**Next Steps**
The higher education institutions will be notified regarding the State Board’s decision in keeping with Section 25.160 of ISBE’s rules. The State Teacher Certification Board will also be notified, and the State Board’s Directory of Approved Institutions and Programs will be updated to reflect the accreditation status.