AGENDA

I. Roll Call/Pledge of Allegiance
   A. Consideration of and Possible Actions on Any Requests for Participation in Meeting by Other Means

II. Public Participation (Those speaking to Part 50 will be asked to wait until the agenda item is called.)

III. Resolutions & Recognition

IV. *Superintendent’s Report - Consent Agenda
   All action consideration items listed with an asterisk (*) are considered to be routine and will be enacted in one motion and vote. Any board member who wishes separate discussion on any item listed on the consent agenda may remove that item from the consent agenda, in which event, the item will be considered in its normal sequence.
   A. *Approval of Minutes:
      1. Special Meeting - October 12, 2011 (pp. 2-3)
      2. Plenary Session - October 20, 2011 (pp. 4-8)
      3. Ad Hoc Rules Committee of the Whole – October 19, 2011 (pp. 9-10)
      4. Board Operations Committee of the Whole: October 19, 2011 (p. 11)
      5. Education Policy Planning Committee of the Whole: October 19-20, 2011 (pp. 12-13)
      6. Finance & Audit Committee of the Whole: October 19, 2011 (pp. 14-15)

End of Consent Agenda

V. Rules for Initial Review
   A. New Part 50 (Evaluation of Certified Employees) (Vicki Phillips) (begins on p. 16)

VI. Announcements and Reports
   1. IBHE Liaison Report (Dr. Proshanta Nandi – unable to attend)
   2. P-20 Council Report (Joyce Karon)
   3. Superintendent’s/Senior Staff Announcements
   4. Chairman’s Report
   5. Member Reports

VII. Information Items
   A. ISBE Fiscal & Administrative Monthly Reports (available online at http://isbe.net/board/fiscal_admin_rep.htm

VIII. Adjourn

This meeting will be accessible to persons with disabilities. Persons planning to attend who need special accommodations should contact the Board office no later than the date prior to the meeting. Contact the Superintendent's office at the State Board of Education. Phone: 217-782-2221; TTY/TDD: 217-782-1900; Fax: 217-785-3972.

NOTE: Chairman Chico may call for a break in the meeting as necessary in order for the Board to go into closed session.
Illinois State Board of Education Meeting
October 12, 2011
via video conference

Chicago Location: ISBE Video Conference Room, 14th Floor
100 W. Randolph Street, Chicago, Illinois

Springfield Location: ISBE Video Conference Room, 3rd Floor
100 N. First Street, Springfield, Illinois

Chairman Gery Chico called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. Mr. Chico asked Jean Ladage to call the roll. A quorum was present between the Springfield and Chicago video conference rooms. Dr. Christopher Koch, State Superintendent of Education, was in attendance in Chicago.

Members Present in Chicago
Mr. Gery Chico, Chairman
Dr. Vinni Hall, Secretary (joined meeting at 1:07 p.m.)
Mr. Steven Gilford
Ms. Lanita Koster

Members Listening by Phone
Mr. James Baumann

Members Absent
Dr. Andrea Brown

Members Present in Springfield
Dr. David Fields
Ms. Melinda LaBarre

Chairman Chico announced that Board Member Jim Baumann submitted a request to participate by telephone for this meeting. However since Mr. Baumann is currently on vacation, his request to participate does not satisfy the provisions in law allowing him to participate and vote by phone. Therefore, he will be listening and speaking, but will refrain from voting on action items. Mr. Chico thanked Mr. Baumann for generously offering his vacation time to participate in this discussion.

None

None

PART 1 (PUBLIC SCHOOLS EVALUATION, RECOGNITION AND SUPERVISION)
The State Board of Education is serving as the lead agency for the RTT-ELC application, and agency staff are working with outside consultants, early childhood education advocates and staff from the Department of Human Services (DHS), Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) and the Illinois Early Learning Council to prepare the application, which is due to the U.S. Department of Education by October 19, 2011. As part of the application, the agency has committed to modifying its policies for birth to age 5 programs through the initiation of rulemaking in Parts 1 and Parts 235. Staff are recommending a 90-day public comment period to ensure ample opportunities for those affected by the rulemaking to voice their concerns or recommend changes.

Superintendent Koch stated that the changes in these rules will impact all school districts, in particular with the Kindergarten Readiness Survey. Dr. Koch expressed the need for all Preschool For All grantees to participate in order to have reliable statewide baseline data. He added there is a need for cohesion in what the Department of Human Services and our agency are doing in early
childhood, and as such, the same standards should apply to all programs and services. Publication of these proposed rules will reinforce the intentions of all agencies to coordinate early childhood education efforts across the state. A more complete explanation of the proposed changes in these two sets of rules is presented under “Policy Implications” in the special meeting materials. http://isbe.net/board/meetings/2011/october/special/packet.pdf. Dr. Koch stated that these rules will ensure that all early childhood programs are coordinated and that there is a fair system in place.

Parent information is another important component as parents would have access to a system that would allow them to view information on the centers in which they would be interested in placing their child. Chairman Chico recommended that the agency publish the ratings for early childhood education centers and daycare centers on the internet so parents can access information on the sites easily and make an informed decision around where they would like to place their child. Mr. Baumann also recommended an application for cell phones for parents to access the same information.

Dr. Koch noted that the Early Learning Challenge Grant application is due by October 19, 2011, and will make us eligible for $70 million dollars over a four-year period. He pointed out that Illinois has been moving in the direction to improve early childhood before this grant opportunity, but the additional funds will help accelerate the process.

Motion:
Ms. Koster moved that the State Board of Education hereby authorizes solicitation of the public comment on the proposed rulemaking for Public School Evaluation, Recognition and Supervision (23 Illinois Administrative Code 1), and Early Childhood Education Block Grant (23 Illinois Administrative Code 235) including publication of the proposed amendments in the Illinois Register.

Dr. Fields seconded the motion and it passed with a unanimous voice vote.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

Dr. Brown moved that the meeting be adjourned. Ms. Koster seconded that motion and it passed with a unanimous voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 1:37 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dr. Vinni Hall
Board Secretary

Mr. Gery J. Chico
Chairman
ROLL CALL

Mr. Gery Chico, Chairman, called the meeting to order 9:18 a.m. Chairman Chico asked Ms. Jean Ladage to call the roll. Dr. Christopher Koch, State Superintendent of Education, was in attendance. A quorum was present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members Present</th>
<th>Members Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Gery Chico, Chairman</td>
<td>Dr. Andrea Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Vinni Hall, Secretary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. James Baumann</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. David Fields</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Steven Gilford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Lanita Koster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Melinda LaBarre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESOLUTIONS & RECOGNITION

Motion:

Dr. Hall moved that the Illinois State Board of Education adopt the resolution recognizing Noble Network of Charter Schools staff and administration for their commitment and dedication to providing Noble Street students with a rigorous college-preparatory curriculum that will prepare them for success post-high school, and for sharing Noble Street’s successful practices with other systems and educators who share the same objectives. Dr. Fields seconded the motion and it passed with a voice vote. Chairman Chico abstained from the vote.

Mike Milkie, CEO from Noble Network of Charter Schools stated that charter school legislation was passed in 1996 and Noble opened in the fall of 1999. Within six years they had a single site with an enrollment of 500 students and in the fall of 2006 they had 10 campuses with an enrollment of 6,500 students. Noble’s ACT scores have improved every year since they have expanded. Mr. Milkie feels this is due to the charter freedoms they have, such as, flexibility in hiring and compensation, which has helped in hiring the best teachers and principals, as well as staff. Noble has worked with the Chicago Public Schools on several joint projects (Gates Compact) and shared their interim assessments, which are given to the students every 10 weeks, which along with their school culture, is paramount to their success. They will continue to share their interim assessments with other schools. Mr. Milkie thanked the Board for the recognition.

Dr. Koch noted that Noble Network of Charter Schools (Noble Street) has been visited by ISBE Legal Counsel Darren Reisberg and Jen Saba and noted that the Charter School Commission is now in effect. Mr. Reisberg added that the culture instilled in the Noble Street schools translates to high school students, primarily minority students, who are eager to learn and to pursue college after graduation.

Dr. Koch informed the Board that North Chicago School District just released an RFP for a charter operator. Mr. Reisberg reported that the North Chicago charter paperwork is now being reviewed within the Legal Department. Jen Saba is making a concerted effort to visit every charter school to make ensure the quality of each charter school is up to par. Quality control within charter schools will be an important role for the ISBE Legal Division and the Charter School Commission. (Charter School Commission Members were named by the Board in September 2011 and their first meeting will be November 15, 2011.)
Chairman Chico recognized and welcomed Jane Quinlan from Regional Office of Education #9 Champaign–Ford Counties.

Cynthia Woods from the Illinois Association of School Boards spoke about the Chicago Schools Tour that will be taking place during the Triple I Conference on November 18, 2011. The School Tours this year will be visiting charter schools and invited all State Board members to attend.

Chairman Chico announced that following the discussion in Ad Hoc Rules Committee, Agenda item IV.B.1 Part 1 (Public Schools Evaluation, Recognition and Supervision) would be removed from the consent agenda and be called for a separate discussion and vote.

**Motion:**
Ms. LaBarre moved that the State Board of Education hereby approves the consent agenda, as presented. Ms. Koster seconded the motion and it passed with a roll call vote. Dr. Fields and Dr. Hall voted yes but abstained from the vote on agenda item C.1. Intergovernmental Agreement: University of Illinois for New Teacher Collaborative.

The following motions were approved by action taken in the consent agenda motion.

**Approval of Minutes**
The State Board of Education hereby approves the minutes for the September 27-28, 2011 Board Strategic Planning Session.

**Rules for Initial Review**
**Part 151 (School Construction Program)**
The State Board of Education hereby authorizes solicitation of public comment on the proposed rulemaking for School Construction Program (23 Illinois Administrative Code 151), including publication of the proposed amendments in the Illinois Register.

**Contracts and Grants Over $1 Million**

**Intergovernmental Agreement:**
**University of Illinois for New Teacher Collaborative**
The State Board of Education hereby authorizes the extension of the Intergovernmental Agreement with The Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois through June 30, 2012, for a maximum amount not to exceed $3,344,060.

**Harrisburg Project**
The State Board of hereby authorizes the Agency staff to enter into an Inter-Governmental Agreement with the Regional Office of Education # 20 – Harrisburg Project through June 30, 2012 in an amount not to exceed $487,345 with four optional one-year renewals.

**Illinois Statewide Technical Assistance Center (ISTAC)**
The State Board of Education hereby authorizes the State Superintendent to enter into a grant agreement with the with the School Association for Special Education in DuPage County (SASED) in an amount not to exceed $24,050,000 over a four year grant term for the provision of the Illinois Statewide Technical Assistance Center.

**END OF THE CONSENT AGENDA**
Darren Reisberg, Deputy Superintendent and Chief Legal Counsel, explained that there were statutory changes that occurred last session that were questioned by the Illinois Association of School Boards. Our proposed rules had language that required school districts to at least include opportunities at the elementary level; kindergarten through 3rd grade for 60 minutes of reading. The statutory language reads; “Each school board shall promote 60 minutes of minimum reading opportunity daily for students in kindergarten through 3rd grade whose reading level is one grade level or lower than his or her current grade level according to current learning standards in the school district.”

Mr. Reisberg stated that given the vagueness of the statute and our understanding that it had been modified to change the verb from “required instruction” to “promote instruction” we have decided to remove that provision from our rulemaking and let the statute speak for itself.

**Motion:**
Dr. Fields moved that the State Board of Education hereby adopts the proposed rulemaking for Public Schools Evaluation, Recognition and Supervision (23 Illinois Administrative Code 1), including the removal of Section 1.430 from the rulemaking.

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.

Mr. Gilford seconded the motion and it passed with a unanimous roll call vote.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**IBHE Liaison Report**
Chairman Chico introduced Dr. Proshanta Nandi from the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE). IBHE held its meeting on Tuesday, October 4, 2011, at Harper College in Palatine. Dr. Nandi shared the following highlights of that meeting:

- Performance funding has been the focus of much of the deliberations of the IBHE lately. Performance funding in meeting state goals in financing higher education is still the main topic of our Board since the new performance funding law, Public Act 97-320 requires the Board to develop a new funding approach for higher education that will reward colleges and universities based on progress in raising educational attainment levels for Illinois citizens. This approach is to begin with next Fiscal Year 2013 budget.

- The IBHE has convened a broad-based steering committee which has provided a vision and set of principles for performance funding. The Board was briefed on several issues under discussion, with every exception that at our next meeting in December, we will be making a final recommendation on performance funding goals and metrics, depending on the progress made by the steering committee which has already met twice, and will be holding two more meetings. The next meeting to be held later this month will be at the Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. It is important to be reminded that performance funding is a linchpin for meeting the “60 x 25” goal shared by the P-20 education community in Illinois of having 60% of adult Illinoisans with college degrees or marketable postsecondary certificates by the year 2025.

- The Board also received an informative and encouraging report from Chancellor Rita Cheng from Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.
about the efforts underway at that campus to align structures and raise exceptions for creating a campus culture that promotes student success and increased course and degree completion.

The IBHE next meeting will be December 6, 2011, at Moraine Valley College in Palos Hills.

Dr. Hall requested that we revisit the Illinois Public Agenda for College and Career Success and make sure copies are available to our Board. Chairman Chico asked that we make sure Dr. Nandi has our report card data to share with the IBHE Board.

Chairman Chico commented that he and Superintendent Koch met with a couple of colleges to discuss the Basic Skills Test. These colleges have concerns that we have raised the cutoff scores from 50% correct answers to 75% necessary correct answers. The performance has fallen greatly so we continue to work with the higher education institutions to improve performance. Mr. Chico added that discussions will continue the licensure board until the issue is solved.

Chairman Nandi recommended that the ISBE and IBHE meet to discuss efforts to help better prepare our K-12 students for their upcoming college years and their future. Chairman Chico agreed that a joint meeting was a good idea, and asked Superintendent Koch to see what can be done to make it possible. Dr. Koch suggested that expectations for teacher preparation programs also be part of that joint discussion.

(No P-20 Council report this month.)

P-20 Council Liaison Report

Superintendent Koch reported that he and board member Melinda LaBarre will be attending the Those Who Excel Banquet on October 22, 2011, in Bloomington. There will be over 250 people attending the banquet this year and the State Teacher of Year will be announced.

Dr. Koch noted that we are tracking several federal bills with Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as well as the NCLB waiver that has caused some activity in Congress. He informed the Board that he sent a letter in his capacity as President of CCSSO, co signed by CCSSO Executive Director, Gene Wilhoit, on the Harkin-Enzi bill. The letter supported Congressional action on the waiver, but also itemized concerns. Superintendent Koch added that he will be meeting with his senior staff to review the recommendations from the Growth Model Task Force and the waiver application to review the application process.

Dr. Linda Tomlinson commented that a group of deans came before the licensure board with a presentation and discussion around the Basic Skills Test. Ms. Tomlinson said that the Agency was asked to provide sub-area scores for the Basic Skills Test and in order to provide that information the test needed to be expanded. We have been working with the testing company to expand the test, and this will involve a new cut score determination because we now have a different number of items on the test. It will also be an online test, which means it will be available anytime, and those wishing to take the test will have to go to one of the testing centers. Agency staff are working with testing centers to work out the details.

Dr. Tomlinson commented that the deans have not asked to lower the score but they did ask us to go to Praxis Testing (a test designed to evaluate academic skills
Chairman’s Announcements

Chairman Chico reported that he, Dr. Koch and Susie Morrison visited Peoria Manual High School, one of the School Improvement Grant (SIG) recipients, and he looks forward to visiting Egyptian School District with Andrea Brown next week.

Mr. Chico also reported that the School Report Cards were released today and that our Race to the Top application has been submitted and we are hoping to receive $70 million dollars. He also met with Susie Morrison and several of her staff to discuss the use of technology in Illinois schools.

Member Reports

Dr. Hall stated that she visited Lombard and thanked Linda Tomlinson and Matt Vanover for helping her prepare for her visit.

Ms. Koster reported that she visited the Illinois Math and Science Academy and attended a work summit and enjoyed listening to Andreas Schleicher who spoke of using data for global learning.

Ms. LaBarre stated that she travelled to UIC to hear Dr. Jerry Weast discuss the Montgomery County School District turn around. Ms. LaBarre congratulated Susie Morrison for receiving the Friend of Education Award from the Illinois Principals Association.

Dr. Fields stated that he felt today’s Board meeting was exceptionally focused on advocating for students wherever they are. He said he was also pleased with our Student Advisory Council member choices and he commended Sarah McCusker, Mike Hatfill and Carol Brooks for all the work they do with the students.

Dr. Hall suggested showcasing various schools at our Board meetings, possibly by internet if not in person.

Chairman Chico thanked Matt Vanover, Mary Fergus and the Public Information staff for helping get the State Board of Education news out to the public.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

Dr. Hall moved that the meeting be adjourned. Dr. Fields seconded the motion and it passed with a unanimous voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 10:35 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dr. Vinni Hall  Mr. Gery J. Chico
Board Secretary  Chairman
I. ROLL CALL
Chairman Gery Chico called the meeting to order at 1:50 p.m. He noted that all Board members except Board Member Andrea Brown were present.

II. BOARD MEMBER PARTICIPATION BY OTHER MEANS
There was no need for Board member participation by other means.

III. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
Ben Schwarm, associate executive director of the Illinois Association of School Boards (IASB), noted that a proposed modification in Section 1.430 of rules governing recognition and supervision, was contrary to statutory language. The proposed amendment implements the provisions of P.A. 97-88, effective July 8, 2011, by modifying curricular requirements for elementary grades to include a minimum of 60 minutes of reading opportunities a day for students in kindergarten through grade 3. Mr. Schwarm indicated that schools would interpret the amendment as requiring 60 minutes of reading “instruction” daily, contrary to law’s requirement that school districts “promote” reading opportunities daily. General Counsel Darren Reisberg responded that staff would review the proposal again before Board action is taken. (NOTE: Staff later determined to remove the provision from the proposed rules and that version of the rules was presented to the Board October 20, 2011, for its initial review.)

IV. RULES FOR INITIAL REVIEW
Board Chairman Chico asked General Counsel Reisberg to summarize briefly the proposals that the Board would be considering. Mr. Reisberg indicated that two sets of rules are before the Board for initial review, and each responds to recently enacted statutory changes.

Part 1 (Public Schools Evaluation, Recognition and Supervision): These amendments implement several new laws. Most notably new Section 1.210 addresses criteria for the approval of entities wishing to provide training for school board members, as is required under P.A. 97-8 (SB 7), effective June 13, 2011. Mr. Reisberg noted that this is the first time that training for local board members has been mandated by law. The requirements take effect with the 2013 school board elections, and the law requires that each board member newly elected or re-elected participate during the first year of his or her term in four hours of training relative to education and labor law, and financial accountability.

Mr. Reisberg explained that while the law authorizes IASB to provide the training, it also allows other entities, approved by the agency in consultation with IASB, to offer training. The proposed rules, therefore, establish an application window of March 1 through May 1 of each even numbered year for these entities to apply for approval, and set forth requirements for the content of applications and the criteria to be used to review and approve those applications. Mr. Reisberg
said that the law is not clear as to the starting point of the training requirement and anticipates that guidance will be provided to the field that any current board member who completes the required training from IASB or an approved entity in advance of the 2013 election would be considered to have met the law's requirements if he or she is re-elected to office.

Mr. Reisberg invited Mr. Schwarm, from IASB, to comment on the proposed training rules. Mr. Schwarm noted that the proposed application process and criteria “are in order” and would fulfill the requirements of the law. Mr. Schwarm also stated anticipates that IASB will implement its training program by the beginning of 2012, and Mr. Reisberg suggested he provide a presentation to the Board about the process once work is completed. Mr. Schwarm also indicated that the organization is developing criteria for the training to be provided. Since the standards upon which entities’ training will be approved must be stated in the rules, Mr. Reisberg reminded Mr. Schwarm to provide those criteria to the agency as part of public comment if IASB’s intent is for all entities to comply.

Several clarifications about the training also were provided in response to Board members comments: that other entities, such as school districts, regional offices of education, universities and some for-profits groups, may currently be providing board training opportunities and that law firms, in particular, are interested in providing the new training now required; that while the law does not require training relative to curriculum and instruction, training in these areas is available from IASB and others; that members of boards of directors of charter schools are not subject to the training requirements unless the board and school district require training via the charter contract; and that issuing sanctions against board members who fail to comply with the training requirements is not a function of the State Board, which can only act against board members in circumstances of low-performing schools, but that regional superintendents of schools’ can remove board members for “willful failure to perform” their duties and a regional superintendent would have to agree that failure to complete the required training meets this standard.

### Part 151 (School Construction Program)

**P.A. 97-205, effective July 28, 2011, adds special education cooperatives as entities eligible to apply for energy efficiency grants under the School Construction Law.** Mr. Reisberg noted that the law was introduced in response to a cooperative who was determined to be ineligible for the program as was originally enacted. Mr. Reisberg also informed the Board that no money is currently available for energy efficiency grants but that authority to issue $20 million in bonds is being considered.

### V. COMMITTEE AGENDA PLANNING/ADDITIONAL ITEMS

Mr. Reisberg indicated that the most significant rulemaking that the Board will consider for initial review in November will be new Part 50, Evaluation of Certified Employees Under Article 24A of the School Code. This Part will incorporate the final recommendations of the Performance Evaluation Advisory Council regarding evaluations for teachers and principals, new and difficult that the council has been working on for more than a year. Final recommendations are expected at the end of October. Mr. Reisberg said that the draft recommendations have been presented at several forums being held around state, noting that Board Secretary Vinni Hall attended the forum in Lombard.

### VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:20 p.m.
I. ROLL CALL: Mr. Chico called the meeting to order at 2:15 p.m. and acknowledged that the Roll Call taken earlier committees remained accurate. (See roll call above.)

II. BOARD MEMBER PARTICIPATION BY OTHER MEANS: None.

III. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: None.

IV. REVIEW NEW NOMINATIONS FOR RESOLUTIONS OF RECOGNITION: Chairman Chico indicated that long before his appointment to this Board, his law office had done some work with Noble Street Charter Schools and he thinks they are a wonderful organization, but he will abstain from the voting on the resolution. Chairman Chico asked Superintendent Koch to share the origin of the recommendation, and members of the Board asked for further information about what schools are recipients of the shared information.

Dr. Koch explained that with the addition of Jennifer Saba in the ISBE Legal Department, staff have been able to be more diligent in reviewing charter schools. The recommendation for recognition came from Ms. Saba following site visits indicating Noble’s creation of an assessment rubric and the review of outcome data. Noble has shared the rubric with several public schools. Therefore, staff recommend that Noble be recognized for their efforts in sharing interim assessments and methodologies with others, including Chicago Public Schools.

The Committee agreed to recommend adoption of the resolution during plenary session.

V. NASBE ANNUAL MEETING REPORT: Dr. Vinni Hall shared that she was in Atlanta October 13-15 to represent the Board at the NASBE Annual Meeting and to witness former ISBE Chairman Jesse Ruiz receive the NASBE Distinguished Service Award. Mr. Ruiz was in attendance and the award was very well received. Dr. Hall announced that the 2012 NASBE Annual Meeting will be held in Chicago and she is very excited that this Board will host other Boards from across the nation.

Dr. Hall will be sharing the notes from the NASBE Annual Meeting as there are some proposed changes and members are encouraged to take a more activist role. She announced that all Board members will be receiving a copy of the report from the “Gearing Up: Creating a Systemic Approach to Teacher Effectiveness” Study Group, on which Chris Ward participated.

Every presentation from the NASBE Annual Meeting is on the following website. http://goo.gl/0bGxK

VI. ADJOURN: The Board Operations Committee Meeting of the Whole adjourned at 2:30 p.m.
I. **Roll Call:** The Education Policy Planning Committee meeting convened on October 19, 2011, at 2:35 p.m. Dr. Fields requested roll call. (See above.)

II. **Board Member Participation Via Phone Conference:** None

III. **Public Participation:** None

IV. **Illinois Policy Academy on the Civic Engagement of Older Adults:**
   Dr. Jane Angelis, Project Director for the National Governor’s Association’s Illinois Policy Academy on the Civic Engagement of Older Adults address the Board and shared materials (http://www.solit.siu.edu/GenServeGen/about.asp). The Illinois group has set a goal to mobilize the talent and leadership of older adults to address issues within the education field by 2017. Three underlying goals are:
   - Work with high school dropouts and increase graduation rates,
   - Develop healthy lifestyles for all generations by boosting health across generations,
   - Support independence for elders.

   Discussion was held regarding the summit held by the Academy which Dr. David Fields and Susie Morrison attended along with representatives from the Department on Aging, and service agencies and organizations. Dr. Angelis indicated the Academy is developing a five-year plan to create awareness of the needs and resources of education and aging and would value the State Board’s input and ideas. The Academy is looking at 2012 to gather information to involve older adults to a greater exposure.

   Dr. Angelis added that a broad network of faith based organizations is an avenue to gather and recruit adults for mentoring in schools and that by 2017 the goal is to have in place a statewide infrastructure to mobilize the talents and leadership of older generations.

V. **District Oversight – Monthly Update:** Superintendent Koch gave an update on district oversight efforts. Dr. John Perkins, Superintendent Koch’s liaison to school district administrators, will be leaving that position in December and a bid has gone out to fill that contractual position. ISBE has hired Art Culver to work in East St. Louis and the work in North Chicago also continues, both focused on addressing significant financial issues. The East St. Louis School District is facing very dire budget projections and may be facing personnel layoffs and building closures. North Chicago feels their projections are a bit more stable. A request for a charter school proposal has been sent out by the district in North Chicago. The Great Lakes Navel base is offering a building for a charter school, however we are recommending that the district also partner with a business to offset costs. A meeting has been scheduled for November 3 to meet with local U.S. Navy personnel, district representatives, legislators and others to ensure a mutual understanding. Weekly meetings are held...
every Tuesday, with representatives from the Lieutenant Governor’s office, the Regional Office of Education, and the support partners for the district.

VI. **Motion for Closed Session**: There were no items to discuss in closed session

VII. **Recess Education Policy Planning Committee until Thursday**: Dr. Fields recessed the meeting at 3:10 p.m. and indicated they would reconvene at 8:15 a.m. on Thursday, October 20.

**October 20, 2011**
8:15 a.m.
Reconvene Education Policy Planning Committee of the Whole

VIII. **Reconvene committee**: The Education Policy Planning Committee reconvened at 8:15 a.m. on October 20, 2011.

IX. **2011 Adequate Yearly Progress Analysis, School Improvement Status, and Report Card Profile and Trends**: Deputy Superintendent Susie Morrison introduced Pooja Agarwal, the new Assessment Division Administrator. Dr. Agarwal and Dr. Shuwan Chiu presented an overview of the State Report Card information and Adequate Yearly Progress results.


Chairman Chico discussed the importance of making AYP. The Federal Government has requirements for schools to make AYP, and when AYP is not being met, parents are given the option of transferring their child to another school that is making AYP. A system of statewide support is activated, targeting schools most in need, providing coaches, resources, and other interventions. Superintendent Koch noted that these assessment instruments are “point in time” instruments and are a snapshot of students’ abilities on a specific day for specific purposes. It was noted that once the Common Core Standards are implemented in 2014-15 there will be new assessment data on which to rely.

Mr. Chico suggested that diversity be kept in mind when creating programs and training teachers. Superintendent Koch discussed the work being done in early childhood education and the Longitudinal Data System. Chairman Chico discussed the meeting he attended with a group of college deans. Superintendent Koch stated Assistant Superintendent Linda Tomlinson is continuing to increase communications with higher education administrators.

X. Dr. Hall moved to adjourn the Education Policy Planning Committee meeting and Ms. Koster seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 9:00 a.m.
I. ROLL CALL: The meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members Present</th>
<th>Members Absent</th>
<th>Staff Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jim Baumann, Chairman</td>
<td>Dr. Andrea Brown</td>
<td>Superintendent Koch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Gery J. Chico</td>
<td></td>
<td>Linda Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. David Fields</td>
<td></td>
<td>Scott Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Steven Gilford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Vinni Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Lanita Koster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Melinda LaBarre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. BOARD MEMBER PARTICIPATION BY OTHER MEANS: None

III. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: None.

III. CONTRACTS & GRANTS OVER $1 MILLION: The Board will take action on the following contracts in the plenary session.

A. Intergovernmental Agreement: University of Illinois for New Teacher Collaborative
   Dr. Chris Higgins, Dr. Chris Roegge and Dr. Mary Kalantzis were present and spoke in support of Teacher Mentoring Program, highlighted accomplishments of the program, and answered questions about the agreement in past years. [http://intc.education.illinois.edu/homepage](http://intc.education.illinois.edu/homepage)
   The Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois Intergovernmental Agreement will provide the following deliverables:
   1. Provide intensive support to existing induction programs – both previously funded programs and non-funded programs – that will continue to operate in FY12.
   2. Identify successful strategies/techniques developed by the formerly funded programs and/or extant program data, and push these out to districts statewide.
   3. Conduct and disseminate results of tightly focused research.

B. Harrisburg Project
   The requirement for special education data and reporting is contained in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004, PL 108-446. The purpose of the RFSP was to enter into an agreement with an entity on a time-and-materials basis for the services of the following professional roles: one (1) project director, four (4) programmer/analysts, four (4) trainers/client support specialists, one (1) technology coordinator, and one (1) program assistant. Proposals were reviewed by a team of five ISBE staff members, including individuals from the Special Education and Services Division, the Funding and Disbursements Division, and the Data Systems Division. The successful bidder was the Regional Office of Education #20 – Harrisburg Project.

C. Illinois Statewide Technical Assistance Center (ISTAC)
   The Illinois Statewide Technical Assistance Center (ISTAC) is ISBE's model of integrated technical assistance designed specifically to build the capacity of school districts to serve the needs of students with disabilities and their families.
   ISTAC consists of four (4) collaboratively functioning projects which include the following.
   1. Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) Network,
2. Illinois Autism Training and Technical Assistance Project (IATTAP),
3. Project CHOICES/Early CHOICES, and

Each project within ISTAC is offered on a statewide basis, is systemic in nature, and is responsible for collecting project data to show positive outcomes for students and schools.

V. BUDGET HEARING PLANNING/ADDITIONAL ITEMS: Linda Mitchell reviewed the following dates; times and places of the budget hearings for FY13:
- October 19 Springfield (immediately following the Board meeting)
- October 24 Champaign
- October 27 Edwardsville
- November 1 Wheeling
- November 29 Chicago

School District Financial Status - Ms. Mitchell indicated that she expects to give the Board an update in November on the financial status of both Cahokia and Lemont Bromberek after reviewing annual financial reports.

VI. MEET THE 2011-12 STUDENT ADVISORY COUNCIL: Superintendent Koch recognized Sarah McCusker, Mike Hatfill and Carol Brooks the advisors to the Student Advisory Council and indicated the students held their first meeting of the school year last evening and this morning. The students introduced themselves. The students are considering a topic of student for the year and are considering cyber bullying prevention as one of the topics they will review.

Aaron Jackson, senior, Grayslake Central High School in Grayslake; Myles Gearon, senior, Walter Payton College Preparatory High School in Chicago; Abhinav Brahmandam, senior, Springfield High School in Springfield; Emily Chesser, senior, Williamsville High School in Williamsville; Paige Logan, junior, Altamont High School in Altamont; Cameron Jodlowski, junior, Olympia High School in Stanford; Jolie-Grace Wareham, junior, Glenbard East High School in Lombard; Conor Reilley, junior, Belvidere North High School in Belvidere; Andrew Van Treeck, senior, Batavia Senior High School in Batavia; Kristin Ishmael, junior, Litchfield High School in Litchfield; Neshal Patel, senior, Neuqua Valley High School in Naperville; Erin Martell, senior, Maine South High School in Park Ridge; and Austin Evans, senior, Lovingston High School in Lovingston.

VII. ADJOURNMENT: Dr. Vinni Hall moved to adjourn. Dr. David Fields seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING
November 18, 2011

TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
Linda Tomlinson, Assistant Superintendent
Darren Reisberg, Deputy Superintendent and General Counsel


Materials: Recommended Rules

Staff Contact(s): Vicki Phillips, Interim Division Administrator

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

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
This agenda item relates to Strategic Goals 1 and 2, in that the rules implement the Performance Evaluation Reform Act of 2010 (PERA), which has as its goal the development of rigorous, valid and reliable evaluation systems that consider both professional practice and student growth to ensure that all schools have effective teachers and leaders, a critical factor contributing to student achievement.

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

Background Information
P.A. 96-861, or PERA, became effective January 1, 2010, and amended Articles 24A and 34 of the School Code to transform the way in which the performance of teachers and principals in Illinois public schools is evaluated. Central to this transformation is the inclusion of data and indicators of student growth (in addition to consideration of professional practice) as a “significant” factor in determining a teacher’s or principal’s performance evaluation rating.

Amendments to PERA by P.A. 97-8 (SB 7), effective June 13, 2011, expanded the use of performance evaluations by holding nontenured teachers to similar standards of evaluation as tenured teachers; that is, probationary teachers (who are evaluated at least once every year rather than at least once every two years like tenured teachers), will also be evaluated using measures of both student growth and professional practice, and their performance will be rated using the four rating categories established for tenured teachers.

Similarly, P.A. 97-217, effective July 28, 2011, requires that assistant principals be included in the performance evaluation system for principals, using both student growth and professional practice for rating performance (the law provides an exception for assistant principals in City of Chicago School District 299 (CPS)). Assistant principals working outside of the city of Chicago, like principals, must be evaluated every school year by no later than March 1. Principals in CPS must be evaluated by July 1 annually.
Beginning with this coming school year (i.e., 2012-2013), school districts must implement these performance evaluations incorporating measures of student growth for principals and, as applicable, assistant principals.

The law, however, phases in the requirement for teacher performance evaluation systems as follows:

- Beginning September 1, 2012, at least 300 schools in CPS and in the remaining CPS schools by September 1, 2013.
- Those schools covered by funding under Section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (“SIG”) awarded to their respective school districts, by the implementation date specified in the grant agreement;
- Beginning September 1, 2015, those school districts whose student performance ranks in the lowest 20 percent among all school districts of their type (excluding CPS); and
- Beginning September 1, 2016, the remaining school districts in the state and those schools in SIG districts not covered by those funds.

As alluded to above, the law also provides that beginning September 1, 2012, school districts must use four specific categories for rating performance -- expanded from three categories of “excellent”, “satisfactory”, and “unsatisfactory” to “excellent”, “proficient”, “needs improvement”, and “unsatisfactory”. The law requires that any tenured teacher who receives a “needs improvement” or “unsatisfactory” rating be evaluated in the school year following receipt of the rating, rather than every two years. Additionally, PERA requires that school districts use the same four rating categories for the evaluation of principals as those used for teachers.

PERA strengthens criteria for evaluators, as well, by requiring that any individual who evaluates teachers, principals or assistant principals after September 1, 2012, successfully complete a prequalification process that includes passage of an assessment to ensure that the evaluator’s ratings “properly align” to the requirements of the law and Part 50. In order to remain qualified to serve as an evaluator, each individual also must complete a retraining program once every five years. Both the prequalification process and retraining program must be developed by, or on behalf of, the State Board or, if a school district chooses to develop its own prequalification/retraining, approved by the agency (see Subpart E of the proposed rules).

Further, PERA requires that the State Board establish a performance evaluation model for both teachers and principals/assistant principals. Use of the model is optional for school districts, which may choose to incorporate the entire model or portions of the model into their performance evaluation plans. Use of some or all of the teacher model pertaining to data and indicators of student growth is required, however, in those instances when the school district and its teachers, using the process of a joint committee set forth in PERA, cannot agree on some or all of the aspects of student growth. In those situations, the district would be required to “default” to the state model for teacher evaluation with regards to areas upon which no agreement was reached. For CPS, use of the state model for student growth is not required if agreement cannot be reached since PERA stipulates that CPS has the authority to implement “its last best proposal”.

Pursuant to PERA, a Performance Evaluation Advisory Council (PEAC) was established to provide to the agency recommendations for the development and implementation of performance evaluation systems. The 32-member council, made up of teachers, administrators and representatives from higher education, education associations, unions and regional offices
of education, has been meeting since early last year. Its recommendations form the basis for Part 50, which is explained in greater detail under “Policy Implications” below.

**Educator Forums.** The key recommendations from PEAC’s draft were shared with teachers, principals and other educators in eight forums held across the state in October and early November. The forums attracted 870 participants, of whom 51 percent were teachers; 17 percent, principals; 22 percent, administrators other than principals; and 10 percent, other individuals. During the forums, participants reviewed the central tenets of Part 50 and electronically indicated their agreement or disagreement with each. As of November 4, 2011, an additional 1,433 individuals responded to the forum questions via an online survey. Of those respondents, 81 percent were teachers, while principals and other administrators made up 6 percent each of the surveys submitted.

Chief among the areas where participants expressed disagreement with the proposed rules is the level at which data and indicators of student growth would be considered to be a “significant factor” in rating a teacher’s performance. Under PERA, the State Board is authorized to establish by rule the relative weight that student growth will have in a teacher’s and principal’s/assistant principal’s final performance evaluation rating. The initial recommendations of PEAC’s teacher evaluation and principal evaluation subcommittees proposed a minimum consideration of student growth as 30 percent of the final rating received. In contrast, PERA requires that under the agency’s state model (explained above), a performance evaluation rating be determined using a minimum of 50 percent student growth. A school district would “default” to this 50 percent threshold in situations where its joint committee is unable to agree on the bar to be set.

Fifty percent of forum participants and 58 percent of those responding online, however, believed that the 30 percent minimum for student growth was too high. For both the forums and the online process, 35 percent of participants and an equal percentage of respondents believed that the 30 percent was appropriate. In response to feedback received at the forums and further discussions with assessment experts, members of PEAC’s teachers’ subcommittee began re-evaluating their initial 30 percent recommendation, questioning the validity and reliability of available assessments to measure a teacher’s impact on student achievement and acknowledging the dearth of assessments to evaluate those teachers providing instruction outside of the core instructional areas.

Recognizing that at least 300 CPS schools, as well as SIG schools, must consider student growth in rating teachers in the 2012-13 school year and that comprehensive measures may not be currently unavailable, PEAC discussed the possibility of phasing in the 30 percent minimum for the school districts first implementing student growth but that districts with implementation dates after September 1, 2014, be required to start at the 30 percent minimum. This approach potentially raises questions of fairness and equity for teachers in districts that are not afforded luxury of the phase-in approach. Nonetheless, staff agreed that much more will be known about performance evaluations by the time the bulk of school districts implement systems starting in the 2015-16 school year. Allowing a phasing in of the 30 percent minimum (a minimum of 25% in 2012-2013, 25% in 2013-2014, and 30% in 2014-2015) would provide those districts first implementing systems to pilot student growth approaches for two years. In this way, the intention of PERA that performance evaluations significantly address -- as well as contribute to improvements in -- student achievement will not be diluted. A similar approach is proposed for principals and assistant principals, thus aligning the teacher and principal/assistant principal systems. (See Sections 50.110 and 50.310 of the proposed rules.)
Based on questions posed at several of the forums, the proposed rules exempt school service personnel, such as social workers, nonteaching speech and language pathologies, nurses, psychologists, and counselors, from the requirement that student growth be considered in their evaluations. (The professional practice of individuals in these positions will still be evaluated, however, as it is currently.) In the near future, PEAC will be revisiting this category of certified staff, who do not provide direct instruction to students, in order to determine how best to measure their contributions to student growth. It is anticipated that Part 50 will be amended sometime next year to incorporate any final recommendations PEAC makes in this regard. Also being left to a second rulemaking is specific direction on the way in which student achievement results for teachers of students with Individualized Education Programs and English language learners will be used to measure the student growth attributed to those teachers.

While not directly relevant to the rules, participants also expressed concerns about the process to prequalify evaluators and for their retraining, as PERA requires. In particular, 61 percent of the participants believed that evaluators should not be allowed to opt out of either the prequalification process or the retraining program, while online respondents were evenly split on the issue. The agency has issued a Request for Sealed Proposals for an entity to develop the prequalification and retraining programs and invited bidders for the contract to propose options for ways in which an evaluator may provide evidence that he or she is qualified to conduct performance evaluations. Any option proposed must include the evaluator’s passage of the state-developed assessment that aligns to PERA and agency rules. (See further discussion of the trainings under “Policy Implications” below.)

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

**Policy Implications.** The proposed rules set forth the minimum requirements for both student growth and professional practice that all school districts must meet when establishing their performance evaluation systems for teachers and principals/assistant principals (Subparts B and D, respectively). Additionally, the data and indicators of student growth contained in the state model for teachers is being placed in Subpart C since some districts may be required to incorporate those criteria into their evaluation plans. As noted under “Background” above, PERA has no requirement for districts to adopt any portion of the state model relative to the evaluation of a teacher’s professional practice, nor are school districts required to adopt the state model for principals, so these models will not be included in the rulemaking. Staff will bring both the teacher performance evaluation model and the principal performance evaluation model to the State Board of Education for its consideration at the December meeting.

As noted above, central to the proposed rules is determining at what level student growth becomes a “significant factor” in rating the performance of teachers or principals/assistant principals and how student growth is to be determined. Illinois is one of many states across the country embarking on the redesign of evaluation systems to factor in student growth. As such, the body of work specific to student growth and “best practices” models is evolving and changing as these evaluation systems are piloted and implemented. Most Illinois school districts will not be required to implement performance evaluation systems for teachers until the 2016-17 school year, giving PEAC and agency staff more time to evaluate what works. CPS and SIG schools, however, must have systems in place for their teachers in less than a year. For this reason, the proposed rules (see Section 50.110) provide an outline for how student growth must be considered when rating student performance by:

- Designating that student growth must constitute 30 percent of the final performance evaluation rating assigned, which will be phased in using 25 percent for the first two
years of implementation for school districts implementing systems in 2012-13 and 2013-14 school years;

• Defining the type of assessments from which the joint committee may choose (which shall not include any state assessment for school districts located outside of Chicago); and

• Allowing joint committees to determine locally how student characteristics will be considered relative to student growth.

The state model for considering student growth for teachers (Subpart C) includes the minimum criteria addressed in Section 50.110 that all districts must meet, plus establishes a process for school districts (except for CPS; see “Background” above). Since it is anticipated that few if any schools will “default” to the state model within the next couple of years, PEAC will continue to flesh out requirements of the model specific to special populations, identification of procedures for reaching agreement on the type of assessments to be used when the joint committee cannot agree, and for both assessments for nontested areas, such as career and technical education and the fine arts, and the measures tied to those assessments, such as student learning objectives.

It is proposed that consideration of student growth for principals and assistant principals also be 30 percent of the final performance evaluation rating assigned, with a two-year phasing in of this minimum level (see Section 50.310 of the proposed rules). The proposed rules state when a student’s score may be included as part of the student growth measure, ensuring that the results can be attributed to principal or assistant principal being evaluated. The proposal also recognizes the unique role of assistant principals by allowing for consideration of other student outcomes, such as attendance, when looking at student growth, provided those outcomes are tied to the individual’s specific duties.

The proposed rules for professional practice for teachers and principals/assistant principals (see Sections 50.120 and 50.320, respectively) define the characteristics of a formal observation, the number of observations that must be conducted, and requirements for the evaluator to meet with the individual being evaluated before the observation takes place and share information about the evidence collected after the observation is concluded. These requirements are intended to help prepare both the evaluator and individual being evaluated for each observation and provide information in a timely manner so that the individual can work towards improvements in professional practice before the final performance evaluation rating is assigned. As with student growth, the proposed minimum requirements for professional practice contained in the rules take effect on the date specified in PERA for the school district to implement a performance evaluation system incorporating student growth.

As indicated under “Background” above, PERA requires certain training of evaluators and allows school districts the option of either developing their own process or program for prequalification and retraining or using the programs to be developed by the State Board. Proposed Subpart E addresses requirements for any locally developed prequalification process or retraining program, specifying that a district may offer a unified program that includes both student growth and professional practice for teachers and principals/assistant principals or only one component for either or both categories of employees. Providing this flexibility allows a district to tailor training for only professional practice, for instance -- a component with which districts are familiar – if it lacks the expertise in student growth necessary to provide effective training. Evaluators in districts offering a single component will be required to participate in the state-developed process for the training not offered locally.
The requirements for locally developed prequalification/retraining programs align to the criteria identified for the state prequalification process and retraining program, including the establishment of competencies that must be exhibited by every qualified evaluator. Consistency across the state and various locally developed training systems is further preserved by requiring that all evaluators pass the state-developed assessment in order to become a qualified evaluator. If an individual fails to pass the assessment, then he or she will be required to participate in the state-developed prequalification process before being allowed to retake the test, thus providing an incentive for school districts to develop high-quality programs.

**Budget Implications.** The State Board of Education anticipates using funds from phase III of the Race to the Top initiative or other federal funds for the prequalification/retraining component of the performance evaluation systems. An RFSP to secure a contractor to develop the training modules was released in early November, with the goal of beginning training in spring 2012.

**Legislative Action.** None.

**Communication.** See “Next Steps” below.

**Pros and Cons of Various Actions**
PERA specifically directs the State Board of Education to conduct rulemaking for performance evaluation systems, with particular attention to the data and indicators of student growth that may be considered when rating performance. To that end, staff have incorporated recommendations from PEAC that help ensure that evaluation systems will be of high quality and rigor, and provide performance evaluation ratings that are valid and reliable. The proposed rules recognize, however, that the use of performance evaluation systems incorporating student growth is evolving and that further rulemaking will be necessary to define key elements of the student growth model, such as appropriate assessments and how student characteristics are considered when measuring the impact a teacher or principal/assistant principal has on student achievement.

Not proceeding with rulemaking will put the agency in conflict with the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act, which requires that agency policies be placed into rules. Additionally, certain school districts currently are proceeding with the design of these performance evaluation systems and need to know the expectations of the agency before those systems are implemented next school year.

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

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

- Evaluation of Certified Employees under Article 24A of the School Code (23 Illinois Administrative Code 50),

including publication of the proposed amendments 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.
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SUBPART A: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

Section 50.10 Purpose

This Part establishes the minimum requirements for the establishment of valid and reliable performance evaluation systems for certified employees, pursuant to Article 24A of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/Art. 24A], that assess both professional competence or practice and student growth. The purposes of this Part are to:

a) identify the minimum components, including those that address student growth, of a teacher performance evaluation system and of a principal and, as applicable, assistant principal performance evaluation system that each school district must implement;

b) provide a State model for the evaluation of teachers that addresses the use of data and indicators on student growth as a significant factor in rating teacher performance, some or all of which shall be required of a school district under certain circumstances outlined in Section 24A-4 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/24A-4]; and

c) establish criteria for locally developed programs to prequalify and retrain evaluators, pursuant to Section 24A-3 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/24A-3].
Section 50.20 Applicability

Sections 24A-2.5 and 24A-15 of the School Code establish the dates for specific groups of school districts (or for schools within certain districts) to implement performance evaluation systems, including both professional practice and data and indicators of student growth, for teachers, principals, and assistant principals that meet the requirements of this Part and Article 24A of the School Code and, for City of Chicago School District 299 (CPS), Sections 34-8 and 34-85c of the School Code. [105 ILCS 5/24A-2.5, 24A-15, 34-8 and 34-85c]

a) Each school district shall implement a performance evaluation system for principals by September 1, 2012. (Section 24A-15 of the School Code)

b) Each school district located outside of the city of Chicago shall implement a performance evaluation system for assistant principals by September 1, 2012. (Section 24A-15 of the School Code)

c) CPS shall implement a performance evaluation system for teachers in at least 300 schools by September 1, 2012 and in the remaining schools by September 1, 2013. (Section 24A-2.5 of the School Code)

d) School districts that have received a grant under Section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as reauthorized by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (PL 107-110), shall implement a performance evaluation system for teachers in those schools that are covered by Section 1003(g) funds by the date set forth in the approved grants. (Section 24A-2.5 of the School Code)

e) School districts located outside of the city of Chicago whose student performance ranks in the lowest 20 percent among school districts of their type (i.e., unit, elementary or high school) shall implement a performance evaluation system for teachers by September 1, 2015. (Section 24A-2.5 of the School Code) For purposes of this subsection (e), “student performance” shall be determined based upon a school district’s overall performance on the spring 2014 administration of the State assessments authorized under Section 2-3.64 of the School Code. [105 ILCS 5/2-3.64]

f) Any school district not subject to subsection (c) or (e) of this Section and schools located in school districts subject to subsection (d) of this Section that are not
covered by a grant under Section 1003(g) of Title I of ESEA shall implement a performance evaluation system for teachers by September 1, 2016. (Section 24A-2.5 of the School Code)

g) In accordance with the provisions of Section 24A-2.5 of the School Code, a school district and its teachers, or exclusive bargaining representative of teachers, if applicable, may jointly agree to an implementation date that is earlier than the date specified in this Section for their district type. When an earlier implementation date is agreed upon, the school district shall provide to the State Board of Education, within 30 days of an agreement’s being executed, a dated copy of the written agreement specifying the agreed upon implementation date and signed by the district superintendent and teacher or the exclusive bargaining representative.

Section 50.30 Definitions

As used in this Part:

“Assessment” means any instrument that measures a student’s acquisition of specific knowledge and skills. Assessments used in the evaluation of principals shall be aligned to one or more instructional areas articulated in the Illinois Learning Standards (see 23 Ill. Adm. Code 1.Appendix D). For the purposes of this Part, assessments will be defined as the following types.

“Type I assessment” means a reliable assessment that measures a certain group or subset of students in the same manner with the same potential assessment items, is scored by a non-district entity, and is administered either statewide or beyond Illinois. Examples include assessments available from the Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA), Scantron Performance Series, or the Star Reading Enterprise, the College Board’s SAT, or Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate examinations, or ACT's EPAS® (i.e., Educational Planning and Assessment System).

“Type II assessment” means any assessment developed or adopted and approved for use by the school district and used on a districtwide basis by all teachers in a given grade or subject area. Examples include collaboratively developed common assessments, curriculum tests and assessments designed by textbook publishers.
“Type III assessment” means any assessment that is rigorous, aligned to the course’s curriculum, and that the qualified evaluator and teacher determine measures student learning in that course. Examples include teacher-created assessments, assessments designed by textbook publishers, student work samples or portfolios, assessments of student performance, and assessments designed by staff who are subject or grade-level experts that are administered commonly across a given grade or subject. A Type I or Type II assessment may qualify as a Type III assessment if it aligns to the curriculum being taught and measures student learning in that subject area (see Section 50.110(b)(2) of this Part).

“Assistant principal” means an administrative employee of the school district who is required to hold an administrative certificate issued in accordance with Article 21 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/Art. 21] or a professional educator’s license issued in accordance with Article 21B of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/21B] endorsed for either general administration or principal, and who is assigned to assist the principal with his or her duties in the overall administration of the school.

“Formal observation” means a specific period of time that is scheduled with the teacher, principal, or assistant principal to directly observe professional practices in the classroom or in the school.

“Joint Committee” means a committee composed of equal representation selected by the district and its teachers or, where applicable, the exclusive bargaining representative of its teachers, which shall have the duties set forth in this Part regarding the establishment of a performance evaluation plan that incorporates data and indicators of student growth as a significant factor in rating teacher performance and addresses professional practice. (Section 24A-4 of the School Code)

“Informal observation” means observations of a teacher, principal, or assistant principal by a qualified evaluator that are not announced in advance of the observation and not subject to a minimum time requirement.

“Metric” means the manner in which two or more assessment scores are compared for the purpose of identifying a change in a student’s knowledge or skills over time.

“Performance evaluation plan” means a plan to evaluate a teacher, principal, or assistant principal that includes data and indicators on student growth as a significant factor in judging performance, measures the individual’s professional practice, and meets the requirements of Article 24A of the School Code and this Part.
“Performance evaluation rating” means the final rating of a teacher’s, principal’s, or assistant principal’s performance, using the rating levels required by Sections 24A-5(e), 34-8, and 34-85c of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/24A-5(e), 34-8, and 35-85c], that includes consideration of both student growth and professional practice.

“Qualified Evaluator” shall have the meaning set forth in Section 24A-2.5 or 24A-15 of the School Code and shall be an individual who has completed the prequalification process required under Section 24A-3 of the School Code or Subpart E of this Part, as applicable, and successfully passed the State-developed assessments specific to evaluation of teachers or principals and assistant principals. Each qualified evaluator shall maintain his or her qualification by completing the retraining required under Section 24A-3 of the School Code or Subpart E of this Part, as applicable.

“Student growth” means a demonstrable change in a student’s or group of students’ knowledge or skills, as evidenced by gain and/or attainment on two or more assessments, between two or more points in time.

“Teacher” means professional employees of the school district who are required to hold a teaching certificate issued in accordance with Article 21 of the School Code or a professional educator’s license endorsed for a teaching field issued in accordance with Article 21B of the School Code. For the purposes of the requirements specific to student growth outlined in Article 24A of the School Code and this Part, “teacher” shall not include any individual who holds a school service personnel certificate issued under Article 21 of the School Code or a professional educator license endorsed for school support personnel issued under Article 21B of the School Code and is assigned to an area designated as requiring this certificate or endorsement, including but not limited to school counselor, school psychologist, nonteaching school speech and language pathologist, school nurse, or school social worker.

SUBPART B: PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PLANS: TEACHERS

Section 50.100 Plan Components Required for the Evaluation of Teachers

Each school district shall implement a performance evaluation plan for its teachers no later than the applicable date outlined in Section 50.20 of this Part. The plan shall address each of the components contained in this Section.
a) The plan shall provide for an evaluation at least once every two years of each teacher in contractual continued service (i.e., tenured); however, a tenured teacher who has obtained a “needs improvement” or “unsatisfactory” rating on the previous year’s evaluation shall be evaluated in the next school year after receiving that rating. (Section 24A-5 of the School Code)

b) The plan shall provide for an evaluation at least once every year of each teacher not in contractual continued service (i.e., nontenured). (Section 24A-5 of the School Code)

c) At the start of the school term, the school district shall provide a written notice (either electronic or paper) that a performance evaluation will be conducted in that school term to each teacher affected or, if the affected teacher is hired after the start of the school term, then no later than 30 days after the contract is executed. The written notice shall include:

1) a copy of the rubric to be used to rate the teacher against identified standards and goals and other tools to be used to determine a performance evaluation rating;

2) a summary of the manner in which measures of student growth and professional practice to be used in the evaluation relate to the performance evaluation ratings of “excellent”, “proficient”, “needs improvement”, and “unsatisfactory” as set forth in Sections 24A-5(e) and 34-85c of the School Code; and

3) a summary of the district’s procedures related to the provision of professional development or remediation in the event a teacher receives a “needs improvement” or “unsatisfactory” rating, respectively, to include evaluation tools to be used during the remediation period.

d) Any professional development provided as part of a professional development or remediation plan under Section 24A-5 of the School Code shall align to Learning Forward’s Standards for Professional Learning (2011) posted at http://www.nsdc.org/standards/index.cfm. No later amendments to or editions of these standards are incorporated by this Section.

Section 50.110 Student Growth Components
Each school district, when applicable (see Section 50.20 of this Part), shall provide for the use in the performance evaluation plan of data and indicators on student growth as a significant factor in rating teacher performance. (Section 24A-4(b) of the School Code) For the purpose of this Subpart B, “significant factor” shall represent at least 30 percent of the performance evaluation rating assigned, except as otherwise provided in subsection (a) of this Section. In situations where a joint committee cannot reach agreement on one or more aspects of student growth within the timeline established under Section 24A-4(b) of the School Code, the school district shall adopt the State model plan contained in Subpart C of this Part with respect to those aspects of student growth upon which no agreement was reached.

a) For a school district implementing a performance evaluation plan incorporating student growth in school year 2012-13 or 2013-14, student growth shall represent at least 25 percent of a teacher’s performance evaluation rating in the first and second years of implementation (for example, 2012-13 and 2013-14 schools years for a school district with a 2012-13 implementation date). Thereafter, student growth shall represent at least 30 percent of the rating assigned.

b) The performance evaluation plan shall identify at least two assessments for evaluating each type of teacher and one or more metrics to be used to determine student growth that are specific to each assessment chosen. The assessments and metrics identified shall align to the school’s and district’s school improvement goals.

1) The joint committee shall identify a measurement model for each assessment employing multiple data points from at least one Type I or Type II assessment and at least one Type III assessment. Assessments used for each data point in a measurement model may be different provided that they address the same instructional content.

2) If the joint committee determines that neither a Type I nor a Type II assessment can be identified, then the joint committee shall identify at least two Type III assessments to be used.

3) The plan shall identify student growth expectations consistent with the assessments and metrics to be used, where appropriate.

4) Each plan shall identify the uniform process (to occur at the midpoint of the evaluation cycle) by which the teacher will collect interim data specific to student learning. The interim data shall not be used to
determine the performance evaluation rating and should allow for a teacher to assess his or her progress and adjust instruction, if necessary.

c) The joint committee shall consider how certain student characteristics (e.g., special education placement, English language learners, low-income populations) shall be used for each metric chosen to ensure that they best measure the impact that a teacher, school and school district have on students’ academic achievement. [105 ILCS 5/24A-7]

d) If the rating scale to be used for student growth does not correspond to the performance evaluation ratings required under Section 24A-5(e) or 34-85c of the School Code, then the plan shall include a description of the four rating levels to be used and how these are aligned to the required performance evaluation ratings.

e) School districts located outside of the city of Chicago shall not use data from any State assessment administered under Section 2-3.64 of the School Code in determining student growth.

f) CPS may adopt, when applicable, one or more State assessments administered pursuant to Section 2-3.64 of the School Code as its sole measure of student growth for purposes of teacher evaluations. (Section 24A-7 of the School Code)

Section 50.120 Professional Practice Components for Teachers

Each school district, when applicable (see Section 50.20 of this Part), shall implement the requirements of this Section regarding the evaluation of a teacher’s professional practice.

a) In order to assess the quality of the teacher’s professional practice, the evaluation plan shall include an instructional framework developed or adopted by the school district that is based upon research regarding effective instruction; addresses at least planning, instructional delivery, and classroom management; and aligns to the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards (23 Ill. Adm. Code 24).

1) The instructional framework shall align to the roles and responsibilities of each teacher who is being evaluated.

2) The evaluation plan shall contain a rubric to be used in rating professional practice that aligns to the instructional framework developed or adopted under this subsection (a).
3) If the rating scale to be used for each component of professional practice does not correspond to the performance evaluation ratings required under Section 24A-5(e) or 34-85c of the School Code, then the framework shall include a description of the four rating levels to be used and how these are aligned to the required performance evaluation ratings. In addition, the district shall quantify the relative importance of each portion of the framework to the final professional practice rating.

b) As required under Section 24A-5 of the School Code, the evaluation plan shall consider the teacher’s attendance and competency in the subject matter taught, as well as specify the teacher’s strengths and weaknesses and the reasons for identifying the areas as such.

c) Evidence of professional practice shall be collected through the use of multiple observations that include formal and informal observations. For the purpose of this subsection (c), a formal observation shall allow the qualified evaluator to acquire evidence of the teacher’s planning, instructional delivery, and classroom management skills and shall involve one of the following activities: an observation of the teacher in his or her classroom for a minimum of 45 minutes at a time; or an observation during a complete lesson; or an observation during an entire class period. The qualified evaluator may designate another person to conduct the observation in situations where he or she cannot complete all of the observations, or the observations cannot be completed in a timely manner, provided the individual so designated is a qualified evaluator, thus having completed the prequalification process and any retraining, as applicable, required under Section 24A-3 of the School Code.

1) For each tenured teacher who received either a “excellent” or “proficient” performance evaluation rating in his or her last performance evaluation, a minimum of two observations are required during the two-year cycle in which the current evaluation is conducted, one of which must be a formal observation.

2) For each tenured teacher who received a “needs improvement” or “unsatisfactory” performance evaluation rating in his or her last performance evaluation, a minimum of three observations shall be required in the school year immediately following the year in which the
“needs improvement” or “unsatisfactory” rating was assigned, of which two must be formal observations.

3) For each nontenured teacher, a minimum of three observations shall be required each school year, of which two must be formal observations.

4) Each formal observation shall be preceded by a conference between the qualified evaluator and the teacher.
   
   A) In advance of this conference, the teacher shall submit to the qualified evaluator a written lesson plan and/or other evidence of planning for the instruction that will be conducted on the day of the formal observation and make recommendations for areas on which the qualified evaluator should focus during the observation.

   B) The qualified evaluator and the teacher shall discuss the lesson plan or instructional planning and any areas on which the qualified evaluator should focus during the observation, if applicable.

5) Following either a formal or informal observation, the qualified evaluator shall discuss with the teacher the evidence collected about the teacher’s professional practice.

   A) The teacher shall consider (that is, reflect upon) his or her instruction and if applicable, provide to the qualified evaluator additional information or explanations about the presentation.

   B) The qualified evaluator shall provide feedback to the teacher about the individual’s professional practice, including data and evidence specific to areas of focus designated during the conference preceding the observation (see subsection (c)(4) of this Section).

   C) If the qualified evaluator determines that the data and evidence collected to date may result in the teacher receiving either a “needs improvement” or “unsatisfactory” performance evaluation rating, then the qualified evaluator shall notify the teacher of that determination.
D) The teacher shall work with the qualified evaluator or others (e.g., professional learning team, department head), as determined in the plan, to identify areas for improvement.

d) Evidence of Professional Practice

1) Any evidence collected during an observation shall be consistent with the rubric developed under subsection (a) of this Section.

2) The qualified evaluator shall share with the teacher any evidence collected and judgments made about the evidence during the conference held following the observation (see subsection (c)(5) of this Section).

3) The evaluation plan shall define how the evidence to be collected will be used to determine a final professional practice rating.

Section 50.140 Reporting

a) By no later than June 30 of each year, the State Board of Education shall identify the manner and timeline for the submission of data and other information relative to performance evaluations that each school district must submit. These data and information shall include, but not be limited to, data regarding the performance evaluation rating given to each tenured and nontenured teacher and data about teacher retention, as well as other information specific to the locally adopted performance evaluation plan that will assist the State Board of Education in determining whether performance evaluation systems are reliable and valid, improve student achievement, and contribute to the development of staff. [105 ILCS 5/24A-20]

b) A school district shall not be required to submit its performance evaluation plan for teachers to the State Board of Education for review, comment, or approval, unless specifically requested by the State Board of Education.

SUBPART C: STATE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION MODEL FOR TEACHERS

Section 50.200 Implementation Requirements

a) A school district, in conjunction with the joint committee established under Section 24A-4(b) of the School Code, shall be required to adopt those aspects of
the State model contained in this Subpart C regarding data and indicators of student growth about which the joint committee is unable to agree within a 180 calendar days of the date on which the joint committee held its first meeting.

b) The first meeting of a joint committee shall occur no later than November 1 of the school year immediately preceding the school district’s implementation date specified in Section 24A-2.5 of the School Code (see Section 50.20 of this Part). For purposes of this subsection (b), the 180-day deadline set forth in subsection (a) of this Section does not preclude the members of the joint committee from meeting, either as a committee or with other administrators and teachers, provided that the district representatives and the union representatives on the joint committee formally agree to the date on which the 180-day clock will begin.

c) The student growth component of the plan shall conform to the requirements of Section 50.110 of this Part and shall comprise 50 percent of the performance evaluation rating assigned (Section 24A-7 of the School Code).

d) The requirements of this Subpart C do not apply to CPS.

SUBPART D: PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PLANS: PRINCIPALS AND ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS

Section 50.300 Plan Components Required for the Evaluation of Principals and Assistant Principals

Each school district shall implement a performance evaluation plan for its principals and assistant principals no later than September 1, 2012. (Sections 24A-15 and 34-8 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/24A-15 and 34-8]) Assistant principals employed by CPS shall not be subject to the performance evaluations system established under Article 24A of the School Code and this Part.

a) A school district may choose to develop its own performance evaluation plan or adopt or adapt the State model authorized under Section 24A-7 of the School Code.

1) The plan shall consider the principal’s or, as applicable, assistant principal’s specific duties, responsibilities, management and competence as a principal or assistant principal. (Sections 24A-15(c)(1), (c-5)(1), and 34-8 of the School Code)
2) The plan shall consider *the principal’s or, as applicable, assistant principal’s strengths and weaknesses, with supporting reasons*. (Sections 24A-15(c)(2), (c-5)(2), and 34-8 of the School Code)

3) The plan shall consider the performance goals developed pursuant to Sections 10-23.8a and 34-8.1 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/10-23.8a and 34-8.1] for any principal or, as applicable, assistant principal who has a performance-based contract.

b) The plan shall identify the person who will evaluate the principal or assistant principal. For a principal who also serves as the district superintendent, the evaluator shall be appointed by the local board of education. The evaluator so appointed shall hold a current and valid administrative certificate or professional educator license endorsed for superintendent issued under Article 21 or Article 21B of the School Code, respectively, and have completed the prequalification process and any retraining, as applicable, required under Section 24A-3 of the School Code or Subpart E of this Part.

c) The plan shall provide for the completion of the evaluation (i.e., collection of data and information of student growth and conducting observations) no later than March 1 annually for a principal or assistant principal (Section 24A-15 of the School Code) for school districts located outside of the city of Chicago, or by July 1 annually for a principal employed by CPS (Section 34-8 of the School Code).

d) A written notice (either electronic or paper) of the evaluation shall be provided to each principal and, as applicable, assistant principal at the start of the school year, or if the principal or assistant principal is hired or assigned to the position after the start of the school term, then no later than 30 days after the contract is signed or the assignment is made. The written notice shall include:

1) a copy of the rubric to be used to rate student growth and professional practice of the principal or assistant principal; and

2) a summary of the manner in which student growth and professional practice measures to be used in the evaluation relate to the performance evaluation ratings of “excellent”, “proficient”, “needs improvement”, and “unsatisfactory”.

e) On or before October 1 of each year, the qualified evaluator and principal or assistant principal shall meet to set student growth metrics and targets to be used. If the qualified evaluator and principal or assistant principal fail to agree on the student growth measures and targets to be included, then the qualified evaluator shall determine the goals to be considered.

f) On or before October 1 of each year, the qualified evaluator and principal or assistant principal shall establish professional growth goals, which shall be based on the results of the performance evaluation conducted in the previous school year, if any. If the qualified evaluator and principal or assistant principal fail to agree on the professional growth goals to be included, then the qualified evaluator shall determine the goals to be considered.

g) When the performance evaluation is completed, the qualified evaluator shall meet with the principal or assistant principal to inform the principal or assistant principal of the rating given for the student growth and professional practice components of the evaluation and of the final performance evaluation rating received, and discuss the evidence used in making these determinations. The qualified evaluator shall discuss the strengths demonstrated by the principal or assistant principal and identify specific areas of growth.

Section 50.310 Student Growth Components

Each school district shall provide for the use in the performance evaluation plan of data and indicators on student growth as a significant factor in rating principal or, as applicable, assistant principal performance. (Sections 24A-15 and 34-8 of the School Code) For the purpose of this Subpart D, “significant factor” shall represent at least 30 percent of the performance evaluation rating assigned, except as otherwise provided in subsection (a) of this Section.

a) For a school district implementing a performance evaluation plan incorporating student growth in school year 2012-13 or 2013-14, student growth shall represent at least 25 percent of a principal’s or assistant principal’s performance evaluation rating in the first and second years of implementation (for example, 2012-13 and 2013-14 schools years for a school district with a 2012-13 implementation date). Thereafter, student growth shall represent at least 30 percent of the rating assigned.

b) No later than October 1 of each school year, the qualified evaluator shall inform the principal or assistant principal of the assessments and, for the assessments
identified, the metrics and targets to be used. The qualified evaluator shall specify the weights of each assessment and target to be used.

1) The school district shall identify at least two assessments either from Type I or Type II, which are able to provide data that meets the definition of student growth as set forth in Section 50.30 of this Part.

   A) A State assessment administered under Section 2-3.64 of the School Code may be one of the assessments to be used for determining student growth and shall be considered to be a Type I assessment.

   B) Type III assessments may be used for schools serving a majority of students who are not administered a Type I or Type II assessment. In these situations, the qualified evaluator and principal may identify at least two Type III assessments to be used to determine student growth.

   C) CPS may adopt the State assessments administered pursuant to Section 2-3.64 of the School Code as its sole measure of student growth for purposes of principal evaluations. (Section 24A-7 of the School Code)

2) Individual assessment results of any student shall be included in the student growth metric, provided that the student has been enrolled in the school for a period of time sufficient for him or her to have results from at least two points in time on a comparable assessment. For instance, a student would be included if he or she had results from the two most recently administered State assessments or results from an assessment administered at the beginning of a school term and again at mid-year.

3) The results from the most recent administration of a selected assessment shall be used as the ending point at which the level of student growth is calculated.

c) For an assistant principal, a qualified evaluator may select student growth measures that align to the individual’s specific duties (e.g., improvements in attendance, decrease in disciplinary referrals).
d) The school district shall consider how certain student characteristics (e.g., special education placement, English language learners, low-income populations) shall be used for each assessment and target chosen to ensure that they best measure the impact that a principal, school and school district have on students’ academic achievement. (Section 24A-7 of the School Code)

Section 50.320 Professional Practice Components for Principals and Assistant Principals

Consideration of the professional practice of a principal and, as applicable, assistant principal shall comprise a minimum of 50 percent of the performance evaluation rating and include each of the following elements.

a) Any instruments and rubric used to evaluate the professional practice of a principal’s or assistant principal’s professional practice shall align to the Illinois Standards for Principal Evaluation (see Appendix A of this Part).

1) The rubric shall state the indicators for each standard and provide a clear description of at least four performance levels to be considered for each indicator.

2) A school district may choose to adopt the rubric contained in the State performance evaluation model for principals, developed pursuant to Section 24A-7 of the School Code, or it may develop its own rubric. Any school district that uses a rubric other than the rubric contained in the State model shall establish a process to ensure that all principals, assistant principals, and principal evaluators are familiar with and understand the content of the rubric, the different levels of performance used for professional practice, and how the overall professional practice rating will be determined.

b) No later than February 1 of each year, or June 1 of each year for schools located in CPS, each principal or, as applicable, assistant principal shall complete a self-assessment that is aligned to the rubric to be used to evaluate professional practice. The self-assessment shall be used as one input in determining a principal’s or assistant principal’s professional practice rating.

c) Observations
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULES

1) The plan shall provide for a minimum of two formal observations at the school in which the principal or assistant principal is employed.

   A) The qualified evaluator shall observe school practices and may directly observe the principal’s or assistant principal’s interactions and activities during his or her work day.

   B) The formal observation shall be scheduled in advance and shall include at least one objective for the observation (e.g., reviewing classrooms, observing leadership team meetings).

   C) Feedback from the formal observations shall be provided either in writing (electronic or paper) or orally to the principal or assistant principal no later than 10 principal work days after the day on which the observation occurred. For the purpose of this subsection (c)(1)(C), a “principal work day” is any day in which the principal or assistant principal is contractually obligated to work, regardless of whether students are present.

   D) Other evidence and information received by the qualified evaluator that would have a negative impact on the evaluator’s rating of the principal (e.g., parent complaints) shall be shared with the principal within the timeline established in subsection (c)(1)(C) of this Section.

2) There is no limit on the number of informal observations that a qualified evaluator may conduct, provided that he or she deems the informal evaluations necessary to fully assess the performance of the principal or assistant principal being evaluated. Evidence gathered during informal observations may be considered in determining the performance evaluation rating, provided it is documented in writing.

d) If a district chooses to use professional practice ratings that do not correspond to the performance evaluation ratings required to be used under Section 24A-15 or 34-8 of the School Code, then it shall ensure that the four levels chosen align to the required performance evaluation ratings.
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NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULES

e) The school district or qualified evaluator shall inform the principal or assistant principal how evidence of professional practice collected will be used to determine a professional practice rating.

Section 50.330 Reporting

a) By no later than June 30 of each year, the State Board of Education shall identify the manner and timeline for the submission of data and other information relative to performance evaluations that each school district must submit. These data and information shall include, but not be limited to, data regarding the performance evaluation ratings given to each principal and, as applicable, assistant principal, as well as other information specific to the locally adopted model that will assist the State Board of Education in determining whether performance evaluation systems are reliable and valid, improve student achievement, and contribute to the development of staff (Section 24A-20 of the School Code).

b) A school district shall not be required to submit its performance evaluation plan for principals or assistant principals to the State Board of Education for review, comment, or approval, unless specifically requested by the State Board of Education.

SUBPART E: TRAINING FOR EVALUATORS

Section 50.400 School District-Developed Prequalification Process or Retraining Program

Section 24A-3 of the School Code requires that an individual who conducts evaluations of teachers, principals, or assistant principals after September 1, 2012 be prequalified before undertaking any evaluations and participates in a regularly scheduled retraining program, either of which must be developed or approved by the State Board of Education. In order to ensure that a school district-developed prequalification process or retraining program meets the rigor of the State Board of Education-developed trainings, any prequalification process or retraining program developed and used by a school district shall, at a minimum, meet the requirements of this Subpart E.

a) Prequalification Process

1) Beginning September 1, 2012, an evaluator shall not conduct a performance evaluation of a teacher, principal, or assistant principal unless he or she has successfully completed the prequalification process and
passed the State-developed assessment specific to rating professional practice.

2) Beginning on a school district’s applicable implementation date, as set forth in Section 50.20 of this Part, or by an earlier implementation date as determined by the school district and its teachers, or exclusive bargaining representative, as applicable (see Section 50.20(g) of this Part), an evaluator shall not conduct a performance evaluation of a teacher, principal, or assistant principal that addresses student growth unless he or she has successfully completed the prequalification process for student growth and passed the State-developed assessment specific to the consideration of data and indicators of student growth.

b) A school district offering its own retraining program shall ensure that each qualified evaluator completes the program at least once during each five-year certificate or licensure renewal cycle. (Section 24A-3 of the School Code)

1) An individual who has not completed the retraining program, as required, during any applicable five-year cycle shall be ineligible to conduct evaluations until the retraining program is completed.

2) An individual who will be evaluating teachers in a school district that implements a performance evaluation system beginning September 1, 2015 or later shall be required to successfully complete a retraining program specific to professional practice of teachers before conducting any performance evaluations of teachers.

c) A school district developing its own prequalification process or retraining program shall notify the State Board of Education no later than July 1 immediately preceding the school year in which the process or program will be implemented. The notification shall at least include the type of training to be offered, names of the individuals to present the training, and date upon which each school district-designated trainer completed the “train-the-trainers” program offered by, or on behalf of, the State Board of Education.

Section 50.410 Minimum Requirements for Prequalification Process and Retraining Program
A school district-developed prequalification process or retaining program shall contain each of the following elements. A school district is not required to develop both a prequalification process and retraining program nor is it required to address both teachers and principals. Similarly, a locally developed prequalification process or retaining program may address professional practice only, student growth only, or both. Any school district not offering a unified course of study (i.e., professional practice and student growth) either for teachers or principals shall ensure that those individuals successfully complete the State-developed prequalification process or retraining program in those areas not being covered by the locally developed process or program.

a) Each individual who will present a prequalification process or retraining program shall complete “train the trainer” program offered by, or on behalf of, the State Board of Education.

b) Individual course modules shall address each of the following areas:

1) Use of student growth data and indicators to evaluate teachers;
2) Use of student growth data and indicators to evaluate principals.
3) Methods and strategies for evaluating the professional practice of teachers; and/or
4) Methods and strategies for evaluating the professional practice of principals.

c) Each course module shall outline course goals, objectives, and participant outcomes and include training materials that align to the school district’s evaluation plan.

d) Each course module shall include “field practice” in a variety of virtual, simulated, or live contexts in order to allow evaluators to apply their understanding to actual situations.

e) Standards

1) Course modules for teachers shall be aligned to the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards referenced in Section 50.120 of this Part; and
2) Course modules for principals shall be aligned to the Illinois Standards for Principal Evaluation contained in Section 50. Appendix A of this Part.

f) Course Content

Course modules shall address the following content.

1) State statutory and regulatory requirements for evaluating certified staff, including the use of the required performance evaluation ratings of “excellent”, “proficient”, “needs improvement”, and “unsatisfactory”;

2) Protocols and best practices for conducting classroom observations for teachers or observations of school practices for principals;

3) Case studies that exemplify collaborative learning environments;

4) Skills for engaging teachers or principals in high-quality opening conferences, feedback sessions, and end-of-year evaluation discussions;

5) Methods for developing and supporting individualized professional development plans for tenured teachers rated as “needs improvement”;

6) Methods for developing and supporting individualized remediation plans for tenured teachers rated as “unsatisfactory”;

7) Methods for developing and supporting individual and school-level growth and development goals and plans for principals;

8) Methods for analyzing multiple measures of student growth;

9) Methods for constructing performance evaluation ratings from disparate, variously subjective indicators; and

10) Strategies for evaluating certified staff in specialized disciplines (e.g., special education; bilingual education; career and technical education; skill-based subject areas, such as art and music).

g) Any individual who completes the school district-developed prequalification process but who fails the State-developed assessment shall be required to
participate in the State-developed prequalification program before retaking the assessment.

h) A school district shall include remediation for individuals who did not successfully complete one or more courses of the retraining program. The remediation shall include content or approaches that are different than what was provided in the initial course module to assist the individual in mastering the material.

i) Course modules may be presented in-person or through distance-learning or video-conferencing technology or through a configuration that best accommodates the content.

Section 50.420 Competencies of Qualified Evaluators

Any prequalification process or retraining program shall ensure that a qualified evaluator demonstrates the competencies set forth in this Section.

a) Evaluating Student Growth for Teachers

Each qualified evaluator:

1) Uses assessments and metrics identified by the joint committee in determining the student growth attributable to individual teachers and understands how different types of assessments are used for measuring growth;

2) Uses data from the evaluation rubric, other evidence collected, and best practices relative to evaluating student growth to link teacher and school-level professional development plans to evaluation results;

3) Creates, in collaboration with teachers, supportive, targeted professional development plans that consider past results, contribute to professional growth, and assist teachers in aligning professional development and goal-setting to school improvement goals; and

4) Communicates evaluation outcomes and findings in constructive and supportive ways that enable teachers to set goals and improve practice.
b) Evaluating Professional Practice of Teachers

Each qualified evaluator:

1) Demonstrates a high rate of inter-rater reliability using the required performance evaluation ratings (i.e., “excellent”, “proficient”, “needs improvement”, and “unsatisfactory”);

2) Observes instruction competently in multiple subject areas provided to varied and multiple student populations (e.g., English language learners, students with Individualized Education Programs, students in career and technical education programs);

3) Uses data from the evaluation rubric, other evidence collected, and best practices relative to evaluating professional practice to link teacher and school-level professional development plans to evaluation results;

4) Creates, in collaboration with teachers, supportive, targeted professional development plans that consider past results, contribute to professional growth, and assist teachers in aligning professional development and goal-setting to school improvement goals;

5) Communicates evaluation outcomes and findings in constructive and supportive ways that enable teachers to set goals and improve professional practice; and

6) Understands sources of personal bias and is able to recognize and control for bias when conducting an evaluation and determining results.

c) Evaluating Principals and Assistant Principals

Each qualified evaluator:

1) Demonstrates a high rate of inter-rater reliability using the required performance evaluation ratings (i.e., “excellent”, “proficient”, “needs improvement”, and “unsatisfactory”);

2) Uses student growth measures effectively in evaluating both principals and assistant principals, including the use of multiple measures of student
growth (e.g., assessments, attendance, graduation rates) and understands how different types of assessments are used for measuring growth;

3) Understands the Illinois Standards for Principal Evaluation (see Section 50.Appendix A of this Part), including the review of evidence and its use to determine professional competence relative to each of the standards’ indicators;

4) Uses data from the evaluation rubric, other information collected, and best practices for evaluating principals or assistant principals effectively to link administrative and school-level professional development plans to evaluation results;

5) Creates, in collaboration with principals or assistant principals, supportive, targeted professional development plans that consider past results, contribute to professional and personal growth, and assist principals or assistant principals in aligning professional development and goal-setting to school improvement goals;

6) Reviews, analyzes, and incorporates into the evaluation process indicators about the instructional environment within a school;

7) Communicates evaluation outcomes and findings in constructive and supportive ways that enable principals and assistant principals to set goals and improve practice; and

8) Understands sources of personal bias and is able to recognize and control for bias when conducting an evaluation and determining results.

Section 50.Appendix A Illinois Standards for Principal Evaluation

The Illinois Standards for Principal Evaluation align to the Educational Leadership Policy Standards: Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) 2008, adopted by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration and posted at http://www.npbea.org/projects.php (no later amendments to or editions of these standards are incorporated by this Part). The Illinois Standards for Principal Evaluation are intended to guide the process used in evaluating the professional practice of principals; therefore, any rubric used to formulate a performance evaluation rating shall be aligned to the standards set forth in this Section.
Standard I: Living a Mission, Vision and Beliefs for Results

The principal works with the staff and community to build a shared mission and vision of high expectations that ensures all students are on the same path to college and career readiness and holds staff accountable for results.

Indicator a: Coordinates efforts to create and implement a vision for the school and defines desired results and goals that align to the overall school vision and lead to student improvement for all learners.

Indicator b: Ensure that the school’s identity, vision, and mission drive school decisions.

Indicator c: Conducts difficult but crucial conversations with individuals, teams, and staff based on student performance data in a timely manner for the purpose of enhancing student learning and results.

Standard II: Leading and Managing Systems Change

The principal creates and implements systems to ensure a safe, orderly, and productive environment for student and adult learning toward the achievement of school and district improvement priorities.

Indicator a: Develops, implements, and monitors the outcomes of the school improvement plan and schoolwide student achievement data results to improve student achievement.

Indicator b: Creates a safe, clean, and orderly learning environment.

Indicator c: Collaborates with staff to allocate personnel, time, materials, and adult learning resources appropriately to achieve school improvement plan targets.

Standard III: Improving Teaching and Learning

The principal works with the school staff and community to develop a research-based framework for effective teaching and learning that is refined continuously to improve instruction for all students.
Indicator a: Works with staff to develop a consistent framework for effective teaching and learning that includes a rigorous and relevant standards-based curriculum, research-based instructional practice, and high expectations for student performance.

Indicator b: Creates a continuous improvement cycle that uses multiple forms of data and student work samples to support individual, team, and schoolwide improvement goals; identify and address areas of improvement; and celebrate successes.

Indicator c: Implements student interventions that differentiate instruction based on student needs.

Indicator d: Selects and retains teachers with the expertise to deliver instruction that maximizes student learning.

Indicator e: Evaluates the effectiveness of instruction and of individual teachers by conducting frequent formal and informal observations providing timely feedback on instruction, preparation, and classroom environment as part of the district’s teacher appraisal system.

Indicator f: Ensures the training, development, and support for high-performing instructional teacher teams to support adult learning and development to advance student learning and performance.

Indicator g: Develops systems and structures for staff professional development and sharing of effective practices, including providing and protecting staff time allotted for development.

Standard IV: Building and Maintaining Collaborative Relationships

The principal creates a collaborative school community where the school staff, families, and community interact regularly and share ownership for the success of the school.

Indicator a: Creates, develops, and sustains relationships that result in active student engagement in the learning process.

Indicator b: Utilizes meaningful feedback of students, staff, families, and community in the evaluation of instructional programs and policies
Indicator c: Proactively engages families and communities in supporting their child’s learning and the school’s learning goals.

Indicator d: Demonstrates an understanding of the change process and uses leadership and facilitation skills to manage it effectively.

Standard V: Leading with Integrity and Professionalism

The principal works with the school staff and community to create a positive context for learning by ensuring equity, fulfilling professional responsibilities with honesty and integrity, and serving as a model for the professional behavior of others.

Indicator a: Treats all people fairly, equitably, and with dignity and respect.

Indicator b: Demonstrates personal and professional standards and conduct that enhance the image of the school and the educational profession. Protects the rights and confidentiality of students and staff.

Indicator c: Creates and supports a climate that values, accepts, and understands diversity in culture and point of view.

Standard VI: Creating and Sustaining a Culture of High Expectations

The principal works with staff and the community to build a culture of high expectations and aspirations for every student by setting clear staff and student expectations for positive learning behaviors and by focusing on students’ social and emotional learning.

Indicator a: Builds a culture of high aspirations and achievement for every student.

Indicator b: Requires staff and students to demonstrate consistent values and positive behaviors aligned to the school’s vision and mission.

Indicator c: Leads a school culture and environment that successfully develops the full range of students’ learning capacities—academic, creative, social and emotional, behavioral, and physical.