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

II. Closed Session – Board Self-Evaluation

III. Reconvene Open Meeting

IV. National Perspective (p. 4)
   B. ESEA
   C. Common Core Implementation/Assessments
   D. Teacher Quality
   E. District Interventions

V. District Intervention Review (pp. 5-7)
   A. Overview
   B. Local Perspective
   C. Board Discussion
   D. Action Items
      1. Modifications to 3.25 (f)
      2. Entrance Criteria
      3. Exit Criteria

VI. Discussion of Fiscal Years 2013 and 2014 Budgets (pp. 8-10)
   A. Budget Overview FY13
   B. Developing FY14
   C. EFAB
   D. Possible changes in Existing Formula
   E. Action Items
      1. Changes to existing formula
      2. Budget process for FY14

VII. Legislative Agenda (pp. 11-13)
   A. 2012 Veto Session
      1. HB 5825 (Chapa LaVia / Steans) Charter School Commission
      2. HB 5826 (Chapa LaVia / Steans) ISBE Obsolete and Duplicative Legislation
   B. 2013 Spring Session
      1. ISBE Obsolete and Duplicative Legislation
      2. Supplemental General State Aid Report
      3. Federal Grant Distribution
      4. Classrooms First Commission Recommendations
      5. SB 7 Trailer Bill
C. Action Items
   1. Direction for ISBE Staff

VIII. Recess Meeting

   Thursday, September 20, 2012
   8:45 a.m.

IX. Reconvene/Roll Call – OPEN SESSION

X. Reform Agenda Update (pp. 14-16)
   1. Implementing the Common Core
   2. PARCC
   3. ISAT Cut Scores
   4. Teacher Quality
   5. Performance Evaluations
   6. Race to the Top

XI. Retreat Debriefing

XII. Plenary Session

   A. Public Participation
   B. Resolutions & Recognition
      1. Lanita Koster Resolution (p. 17)
   C. Presentations and Updates
      1. Illinois Shared Learning Environment (pp. 18-20)
   D. Superintendent’s Report
      *Consent Agenda
         1. *Approval of Minutes: August 16, 2012 (pp. 21-25)
         2. *Rules for Initial Review
            a. Part 24 (Standards for All Teachers) (pp. 26-73)
         3. *Rules for Adoption
            a. Part 60 (The “Grow Your Own” Teacher Education Initiative) (pp. 74-89)
            b. Part 65 (New Teacher Induction and Mentoring) (pp. 90-126)
         4. *Contracts & Grants Over $1 Million
            a. Recommendation Approval: RFSP Center for School Improvement (pp. 127-130)
            b. Request to Release a Request for Sealed Proposals for Monitoring of Early Childhood Block Grant Prevention Initiative Programs (pp. 131-134)
         5. *Fall 2012 Waiver Report (pp. 135-148)
      End of Consent Agenda
   E. Approval of Closed Session Minutes
   F. Superintendent’s Contract Renewal
   G. Announcements & Reports
      1. P-20 Council Liaison Report (Joyce Karon)
   H. Information Items
      1. ISBE Fiscal & Administrative Monthly Reports (available online at http://isbe.net/board/fiscal_admin_rep.htm)
XIII. 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.
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
      Matt Vanover, Director of Public Information/Deputy Superintendent

Agenda Topic: National Perspective: Various Issues

Materials: None

Staff Contact(s): Amanda Elliott, Board Services Coordinator

Purpose of Agenda Item
Gene Wilhoit, Executive Director of the Council of Chief State School Officers will present a national overview of the following topics:

- Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)
- Common Core Implementation/Assessments
- Teacher Quality
- District Interventions

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
The presentation will support the following Board goals.

GOAL 1: Every student will demonstrate academic achievement and be prepared for success after high school.

GOAL 2: Every student will be supported by highly prepared and effective teachers and school leaders.

GOAL 3: Every school will offer a safe and healthy learning environment for all students.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
None

Superintendent’s Recommendation
None

Next Steps
None
The National Education Perspective

Gene Wilhoit
Executive Director, CCSSO
September 19, 2012
Standards and Assessments

- CCSS – 46 states and DC
- Science in the Making
- “Noise” over Federalism
- Assessments in 2014 - 2015
  - PARCC and SBAC
- Three Additional Contracts
- Comparability
- Sustainability
- Formative Work Needed
Accountability

- ESEA in Waiting
- CCSSO Task Force
- Administrative Waivers Rule
Teacher/Leader Quality

- Teachers Conflicted
- Evaluation Push
- Preparation Task Force
- CAEP
Information Systems

- Common Education Data Standards (CEDS)
- Shared Learning Collaborative (SLC)
Low Performing Schools

- Federal Focus
- Gaps/Progress/Status
- State Responsibility
  - Capacity
  - Governance
  - Networking
Time for Innovation

- Systems Approach
- Moving to Scale
- Critical Changes
- Investing in the Willing and Able
Committed to the success of every child

Gene Wilhoit
Executive Director, CCSSO
September 19, 2012
Purpose of Agenda Item
The purpose of the agenda item is to provide the Board with (a) a background on school district intervention and (b) a discussion of potential ISBE legislative proposals on school district intervention for Spring 2013.

School Intervention by ISBE
ISBE intervenes in school districts in a number of ways that differ in focus and scope including:
- school restructuring under NCLB;
- interventions utilizing Independent Authority power;
- financial oversight through Financial Oversight Panels (FOPs); and
- interventions under school recognition and special education based on noncompliance probes.

ISBE has utilized its statutory authority to intervene using FOPs, both those formed under Article 1B and 1H of the School Code, in a number of districts, including four active FOPs in Cairo Unit School District 1, Proviso Township High School District, East St. Louis District 189 and North Chicago CUSD 187.

While FOPs (and other limited interventions) can be successful in certain districts that need targeted assistance, the staff of the State Board of Education believes that for districts in more comprehensive failure often these limited interventions do not go far enough to solve the problems in the district or only solve the problems for a limited time. In these districts, only removal of the school board will facilitate real change.

The statutory authority for Independent Authorities (IA) comes from 105 ILCS 5/2-3.25(f). Currently, the only active IA in place is North Chicago CUSD 187. ISBE attempted to remove the board in anticipation of installing an IA in East St. Louis but court action prevented board removal. Although the IA in North Chicago is running smoothly, issues in its operation, the problems in East St. Louis and the impending school board elections in both districts necessitate changes in statute.
Suggested Statutory Changes

105 ILCS 5/3-14.28:

Current Statutory Language: [Duties of the Regional Superintendent] To remove any member of a school board from office upon the direction of the State Superintendent of Education pursuant to action of the State Board of Education authorized under Section 2-3.25f and to appoint individuals to fill vacancies thereby created within 30 days.

Suggested Statutory Change: Delete Section 3-14.28 in its entirety so that ROEs would no longer be involved with the removal of school board members under Section 2-3.25f and there would be no confusion as to whether a replacement school board would need to be appointed.

105 ILCS 5/2-3.25(f)(b)

Current Statutory Language:

(b) In addition, if after 3 years following its placement on academic watch status a school district or school remains on academic watch status, the State Board of Education shall take one of the following actions for the district or school:

1. The State Board of Education may authorize the State Superintendent of Education to direct the regional superintendent of schools to remove school board members pursuant to Section 3-14.28 of this Code. Prior to such direction the State Board of Education shall permit members of the local board of education to present written and oral comments to the State Board of Education. The State Board of Education may direct the State Superintendent of Education to appoint an Independent Authority that shall exercise such powers and duties as may be necessary to operate a school or school district for purposes of improving pupil performance and school improvement. The State Superintendent of Education shall designate one member of the Independent Authority to serve as chairman. The Independent Authority shall serve for a period of time specified by the State Board of Education upon the recommendation of the State Superintendent of Education.

Suggested Statutory Changes:

• Amend Section 2-3.25(f) to make ISBE actions there under permissive not mandatory. Given the number of school districts that meet the 3 year watch status and lack of agency financial resources it is not possible for ISBE to intervene in all of the districts. This statutory change would give ISBE the ability to intervene without requiring it in all cases.

• Amend Section 2-3.25(f) to include benchmarks for the establishment and dissolution of an Independent Authority. Clear standards for when ISBE can remove a board and appoint an IA would assist school districts in understanding when ISBE may intervene and would allow ISBE to more easily defend a decision to intervene. Likewise, exit criteria provide a transparency to the process, allowing school districts to know when state intervention will end. Specific exit criteria will require approval by a nationally recognized accreditation agency prior to the conclusion of state intervention.

• Amend Section 2-3.25(f) to clarify that an Independent Authority (IA) has all the same powers and duties of the school board it replaces. As it stands now, an IA has the authority to
act for the purpose of improving pupil performance and school improvement. An argument could be made that this is not the full extent of a school board’s power, creating uncertainty as to the authority of the IA. Identifying when a board can be removed and then clarifying that the IA takes the place of the school board would eliminate this confusion.

- Amend Section 2-3.25(f) to specify the number of Independent Authority members.

- Amend Section 2-3.25(f) to clarify due process rights of school board members being removed.
  This is one of the bases for the lawsuit in ESL and clarity on the due process rights would help prevent future challenges and would ensure fairness in the process.

- Amend Section 2-3.25(f) to clarify that no school board election shall be held where an Independent Authority is appointed.
  Suspending the elections is necessary so that the work of the IA is not undermined by the re-election of the previous school board members.

- Amend Section 2-3.25(f) to allow IAs to directly request emergency financial assistance loans and grants.
  Given that the districts that need intervention often are also in financial failure, it is essential that the IA has the power necessary to act to relieve some of the financial distress of the district.

105 ILCS 5/1H-30:

**Current Statutory Language:** The [Financial Oversight] Panel may employ individuals under this Section if it is so warranted. These individuals may include any of the following:

1. A chief executive officer who shall supervise the Panel's staff, including the chief educational officer and the chief fiscal officer, and shall have ultimate responsibility for implementing the policies, procedures, directives, and decisions of the Panel. The chief executive officer shall have the authority to determine the agenda and order of business at school board meetings, as needed in order to carry forward and implement the objectives and priorities of the school board and Financial Oversight Panel in the administration and management of the district. This individual is not required to hold any certificate issued under Article 21 of this Code. The chief executive officer shall have the powers and duties as assigned by the Panel in accordance with this Code.

**Suggested Statutory Changes:** Amend Section 1H-30 to clarify that a CEO shall have all the powers and duties of a superintendent, CEdO, CFO or CSBO if the functions of those positions are for any reason not being carried out.

This would allow for the continued operation of the district where district employment changes are necessary.

**Next Steps**

Governmental Relations will continue discussing the legislative needs with internal staff, the education field and the Board, and will come back before the Board later this year with a final legislative package.
SCHOOL INTERVENTIONS
Examples of School and District Interventions

Academic

• School Restructuring under NCLB
  – Reopening the school as a public charter school
  – Replacing all or most of the school staff, which may include the principal, who are relevant to the school’s inability to make AYP
  – Contracting with an entity to operate the school
  – Governance and management changes
• **NCLB requires ISBE to take one or more of the following corrective actions in a corrective action district:**
  - Defer programmatic funds or reduce administrative funds;
  - Institute and fully implement a new curriculum based on State and local content and academic achievement standards that includes appropriate, scientifically research-based professional development for all relevant staff;
  - Replace LEA personnel who are relevant to the inability of the district to make adequate progress;
  - Remove individual schools from the jurisdiction of the district and arrange for their public governance and supervision;
  - Appoint a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district in place of the superintendent and school board; and/or
  - Abolish or restructure the district.
• **State interventions under 105 ILCS 5/2-3.25f**
  - Direct Regional Superintendent to remove school board members
  - Board directs State Superintendent to appoint an Independent Authority to operate a school or district
  - Board may change the recognition status
  - Board may authorize State Superintendent to direct the reassignment or replacement of school district personnel
Noncompliance

• Nonrecognition under State recognition process
  – Unable to claim GSA
  – Possible dissolution of district

• Technical assistance for IDEA for special education noncompliance

Financial

• Withholding of federal grant funds under EDGAR regulations
• Certification of financial difficulty
• Financial Oversight Panel
Transition from Article 1B FOPs to Article 1H FOPs

• All future FOPs now will be Article 1H FOPs
• Article 1B FOPs remain but may become Article 1H FOPs upon a petition to the State Board
• Example: Proviso had a 1B in place from 12/18/08 until it became a 1H in June 2012
• Article 1H gives expanded authority
History of Financial Oversight

• Currently Certified in Financial Difficulty
  – Harrisburg 10/20/05
  – Cahokia 3/20/08
  – Lemont-Bromberek 12/17/09

• Article 1B Financial Oversight Panels
  – Mt. Morris 10/14/93 – 9/18/97
  – East St. Louis 10/20/94 – 7/1/04
  – Livingston 12/18/02 – 2/22/07
  – Cairo 2/6/03 – present
  – Venice 6/25/03 – 6/21/12
• School Finance Authorities
  – Chicago Public Schools 1/16/80 – 6/1/10
  – Round Lake 8/22/02 – 7/1/11
  – Hazel Crest 10/17/02 – present

• Article 1H Financial Oversight Panels
  – Proviso 7/1/12 - present
  – East St. Louis 4/18/12 - present
  – North Chicago 5/17/12 - present
Comprehensive oversight necessary

Financial Oversight

• Strengths
  – Corrects structural deficits
  – Models fiscally responsible decision making
  – Uses expertise from field
  – Develops good systems/processes
Comprehensive oversight necessary

Financial Oversight

• Limitations
  – Does not address local politics or ineffective leaders
  – Allows only for approval or denial of local board’s actions
  – Example: Proviso school board has not yet addressed its high legal costs; only recourse is a directive
Special Education Intervention

• Strengths
  – Assures compliance and therefore funding
  – Reduces risk of liability for district
  – Serves students

• Limitations
  – Does not address local politics or ineffective leaders
  – Needs local board approval for employments
Need for Independent Authorities

• Removes biases of past board members
• Collaborates with stakeholders
• Develops policy that moves the district forward
Statutory Authority for Independent Authorities

105 ILCS 5/2-3.25f(b)

(b) In addition, if after 3 years following its placement on academic watch status a school district or school remains on academic watch status, the State Board of Education shall take one of the following actions for the district or school:

(1)... The State Board of Education may direct the State Superintendent of Education to appoint an Independent Authority that shall exercise such powers and duties as may be necessary to operate a school or school district for purposes of improving pupil performance and school improvement. ..
Authority to Remove School Board Members

• 105 ILCS 5/3-14.28

  – [Duties of the Regional Superintendent] To remove any member of a school board from office upon the direction of the State Superintendent of Education pursuant to action of the State Board of Education authorized under Section 2-3.25f and to appoint individuals to fill vacancies thereby created within 30 days.
The History of 3.25(f) and 14.28

• Provisions were both adopted in 1991
• Unable to find any legislative history available to explain the enactment
• ISBE has intervened using the FOP model, restructuring under NCLB, and other mechanisms
• IA statute was not used by the State Board until this year.
Independent Authorities

North Chicago:
• IA appointed by the Superintendent in July 2012.

East St. Louis:
• June 2012, Board directs Superintendent to remove local school board in anticipation of appointing an IA.
• Local school board members sued ISBE and received a restraining order prohibiting their removal.
• Matter is still pending in litigation.
The North Chicago Independent Authority

The IA in North Chicago is made up of the following 5 members:

• Dora King, Chair, community member
• Graham Cook
• Jerry Hieb
• Evelyn Alexander, community member
• Shajuana Goshton, community member

• The Navy also has 2 non-voting representatives who sit on the IA: Master Chief Evans and Senior Chief Curylo
The Work of the IA

• The IA in North Chicago has met four times since its inception.

• Taken care of routine district business, including approving payroll, renewing contracts for temporary employees and approving the purchase of new textbooks.

• Has acted on a number of items of note:
  – Approved the LEARN Charter School
  – Approved the reorganization of the ELL and Special Education Departments
  – Played a role in the appointment of a CEO and the removal of the Superintendent
  – Approved agreement with City to ensure police coverage
Open Issues with the IA

1. The district will have elections in April which could potentially place former school board members back in charge of the district.

2. Lack of clarity on whether the IA is an arm of the state or should it be treated as a local entity.
Suggested Statutory Changes to Section 2-3.25

• Delete Section 3-14.28 in its entirety so that ROEs would no longer be involved with the removal of school board members under Section 2-3.25f and there would be no confusion as to whether a replacement school board would need to be appointed.

• Amend to allow independent authority members to be the same as the FOP members

• Amend to make ISBE actions permissive not mandatory.

• Amend to clarify an Independent Authority has all the same powers and duties of the school board it replaces.

• Amend to specify the number of members.
Suggested Statutory Changes

• Amend to allow State Superintendent to appoint a replacement school board as an alternative to appointment of an Independent Authority.
• Amend to clarify due process rights of school board members being removed.
• Amend to clarify no school board election shall be held where an Independent Authority or replacement school board is appointed.
• Amend Section to include benchmarks for the establishment and dissolution of an Independent Authority.
• Amend to allow IAs to directly request emergency financial assistance loans and grants.
• Amend Section 1H-30 to clarify that a CEO shall have all the powers and duties of a superintendent, CEdO, CFO or CSBO if the functions of those positions are for any reason not being carried out.
DISTRICT 189
EAST ST. LOUIS
Why State Intervention? Pre-ISBE Intervention

Instruction/Programming

- Non-compliance in Special Education
- Non-compliance in Bilingual Education
- No Standards Based Curriculum
- No Comprehensive SEL Support for Students
- Compliance Issues with State and Federal Grants
- District Failure to Achieve AYP for 9 years
- High School in Tier I Status (Persistently in Lowest Performing 5 percent of Title I Schools)
- Limited Plan to Maximize Community and Parental Involvement in Instructional Programs and Improvement Efforts
Pre-ISBE Intervention (continued)

Human Resources

• No Staffing Guidelines, Position Control, or Needs Analysis
• Limited Job Descriptions/Evaluations
• No Electronic Application Capability or Recruitment Process
• No Structured Hiring Process

Planning and Data Integrity

• No Comprehensive District Strategic Plan
• Declining Enrollment
• Inaccurate Data
Pre-ISBE Intervention (continued)

Finance

• Budget Deficit Over $11 million
• State and Federal Funding Reduced by Approximately $31 million since 2010
• Local Funds Represent less than 10% of the District’s Total Revenue
• E-Rate on Red Light Status
• Lack of Budget Control
• Excessive Service Contracts
• Out-dated Financial and Employment Software Systems
• Equalized Assessed Valuation (EAV)
  – State Average EAV is $620 million or $255,663 per Pupil
  – District 189 EAV is $105 million or $13,606 per Pupil
District Improvement Goals

• To Improve Academic Outcomes for Students
• To Improve Hiring and Staffing for Efficiency and Effectiveness
• To Establish and Maintain Financial Stability
• To Stabilize Enrollment
• To Gain Public Trust
Current Status

• Achieved Compliance (Meets Requirements) with Special Education Indicators Identified by ISBE
• Implemented Improved Registration Process for Students with Disabilities by Allowing Them to Register at the School Level Rather Than at Central Office
• Implemented Renzulli Learning K-9
• Created Bilingual Program (K-1)/Hired Highly Qualified Teacher
• Created Common Core Curriculum Maps for Math. Development of ELA Maps is in Progress
• Prepared and Submitted Federal Counseling Grant to Increase SEL Support
• Submitted Annual Performance Reports and Documents Necessary for Successful Closeout of Federal Grants
• Restructured Pre-K Program
• Won FFC Appeal E-Rate Funding Year 2000
• E-Rate 2006 Red Light Status Removed Due to Pending FCC Appeal
Current Status (continued)

• Restructured Summer School
• Implemented Freshman Transition Week
• Revised and Updated High School Curriculum Handbook
• Provided Targeted PD using Best Practice Research for Administrators and Teachers
• Implemented Early Release-Time for Sustained Professional Development PK-12
Current Status (continued)

- Restructured Building Leadership to Improve Teaching and Learning
- Awarded Over $1.0 million in Race To The Top and Lowest Performing Schools Grants
- Submitted Successful School Improvement Grant (SIG)
- Expanding Parental and Community Involvement
Current Status  (continued)

Human Resources

• Analyzed Personnel Needs, Established Position Control and Staffing Guidelines
• Created Job Descriptions for all New Positions/Audited Existing Description for Necessary Updates
• Implemented an Electronic Application System to Recruit Candidates from Outside the District
• Implemented State and National Recruitment for Hard to Fill Positions
• Established Competency Testing for all Clerical Positions
• Implemented a Structured Interview Process to Ensure Selection of Most Qualified Candidates
Current Status  (continued)

Finance

• Reduced staff by more than 400 positions since ISBE intervention
• Reduced Personnel Expenditures since ISBE intervention by $19 million
• Closed 4 Older Schools to Increase Efficiency and Reduce Cost
• Improved management controls of unemployment claims - $476,000 decrease
• Working with the District’s medical insurance broker, the district realized a cost avoidance of over $900,000 in insurance premiums
• Revenue Enhancements by more than $1.7 million
• Assess Options for Updated Finance/Human Resources Management Systems to be Implemented when Fiscally Possible
Current Status (continued)

Finance

• Eliminated Excessive Service Contracts Saving over $1.6 million
  – Lawn Maintenance Contract - $285,445;
  – Snow Removal – $16,000 per Occurrence
  – JJK Center Lease Non-Renew - $260,000
  – Modified Construction Management - $700,000
  – Insurance & Risk Management - $250,000
  – Attorney Retainers - $144,000
  – Eliminated Furniture Moving Contract Costing $88,000 (2 Schools in 2011) to New Contract for $12,000 (5 schools in 2012)
Current Status (continued)

Planning and Data Integrity

- Restructured the IT Department and Hired a Highly Competent Administrator
- Providing on-going Training for All Personnel Responsible for Data-Entry
- Strategic Planning Process Scheduled to Begin Spring 2013
- Provided Board Training Through IASB
- Created Organizational/Operational Structure
Lessons Learned

• Perform Comprehensive External Audits within First Year of ISBE Intervention
  – Curriculum
  – Human Resources
  – Finance
  – Facilities
  – Special Education
  – Transportation
  – Maintenance & Operations

• Year 2 - Use Audit Findings to Develop a Long Range Comprehensive Strategic Plan

• Develop and Implement Campus and Departmental Plans
Lessons Learned

• Develop Internal Controls in all Departments
• An ISBE Representative to Attend all School Board Meetings
• Recruit and Hire an Experienced “Turnaround” Superintendent Immediately and Allow Him/Her to Assemble Strong Team
• Void all Non-bargaining Unit Contracts and Require all employees to Reapply
• Any Legal/Audit Investigation Should Be Unannounced
Future Plans

• Develop and Implement Long Range Comprehensive Strategic Plan to Set Direction for the Future of the District
  – Instructional Improvement
  – Personnel/Staffing
  – Finance
  – Facilities
Future Plans

• Identify Short and Long-Term Revenue Sources to Allow the District to Remain Solvent

• Seek Grant Funding Through Sections 1H-65 and 1B-8 of the Illinois School Code in the Amount of $1,000 per Pupil (State Superintendent/FOP Petition)

• HB 2984 Increases the Grant Amount to $2,000 per Pupil (Approved by Senate-Needs House Approval)
Opportunity for Change

• Ultimately, Legislative Action is Required To Provide an Equitable Funding Source For Property Poor Districts
Major Occurrences in Governance and ISBE Support

• Second Year of inter-governmental agreement between ISBE and District 187, end of agreement initiated in May 2012
• Change of ISBE liaison in August 2011
• Removal of Dist. 187 Board of Education in June 2012
• Appointment of Financial Oversight Panel in June 2012 – Composition and chairman
• Appointment of Independent Authority in July 2012 – Composition and chairman
• FOP action in August 2012 to appoint a Chief Executive Officer
• Action to remove District 187 Superintendent
• Initial results and next steps
Past Year and Current Challenges

- Strength of District Leadership
- Level of respect and positive relationships
- Inconsistency of communication and follow-up, i.e. Calls, e-mails, missed meetings, frequency of re-scheduling
- Inconsistency of internal controls
- Spending habits
- Budget deficit
- Revenue challenges
- Condition of facilities
- Continued low student achievement at all grades
- Continued non-compliance in both special education and bi-lingual education
- Frequency of substitute teacher utilization
Interventions/Accomplishments

- School Improvement Grant – AUSL High School
- Governance – Board of Education
- Teaching and Learning – Data based accountability and evaluation, standards based curriculum, standards based assessments, professional development
- Educational Leadership – culture and climate, organizational structure, instructional leadership, parent and community involvement, extra-curricular activities, professional leadership
- Finance – Financial strength, budget management, long term forecasting, general procedures, grant utilization and management, external supports
- Operations – Facilities, transportation, food service, administrative technology, risk management
Suggestions

• Have a stronger presence “on the ground” sooner in districts like District 187 (full time liaison or initial FOB Board with a CEO from the beginning.  
• Have single year contracts that are renewable based upon performance  
• Utilize ISBE staff or representatives assisting in hiring of administrative staff.  
• Utilize authority for Board member reprimand or removal as soon as the need arises  
• Initiate a comprehensive needs assessment in the initial stage of oversight (conducted by outside consultants as was done in District 187)  
• Develop an exit rubric with transition goals and benchmarks in the areas of financial stability, administrative leadership, Board governance, teaching and learning, facilities management, and labor relations.  
• Discussion/development of alternative plan for District 187
• Three meetings with each, great meetings, focused, good questions, respect for each other, and an understanding of the differences in responsibilities between the two Boards

• Will schedule Board training from IASB on roles and responsibilities and relationship between CEO and Board members

• Improve quality and consistency of communication
• Position vacancies only advertised on district website
• Sharing of information – business manager certification
• No hot water in part of one school
• Payment of bills (getting better)
• Approval process for expenditures (getting better)
• All new “smart boards” in classes but not enough textbooks for students
• I-Pads for coaches and Board members
• Food and meals at most meetings
• Hundreds of thousands spent on PLC training.
• Public relations spending
Fiscal Challenges

• Budget deficit estimated to be $8.1 million in all funds next year

• Next year’s budget expenditure and revenue by fund

• Charter cost - $2.4 million this coming year rising to $4.8 million in year three
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Enrolled 6th day 8/27/2012</th>
<th>2011 - 2012 6th day figures</th>
<th>Enrolled 9/13/2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEARN</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCHS</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEAL</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVAK KING</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.J. KATZENMAIER</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORRESTAL</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENBAY</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAGER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISTRICT TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>3517</strong></td>
<td><strong>3762</strong></td>
<td><strong>3915</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enrollment figure for NCHS on 9/13/12 includes Daisy's students who started after the district.
• Impact aid reduction because of enrollment decline and possible loss of heavy impact status

• GSA adjustment of approximately $280,000 next three years

• $4.5 million debt payment each year of which $3.4 million is out of the operating fund. This continues until 2035
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011-12 Budget</th>
<th>2012-13 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budgeted</td>
<td>Budgeted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>Revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Education Fund</td>
<td>$44,818,285</td>
<td>$40,782,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Early Retirement</td>
<td>$975,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Building Improve</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Consolidation &amp;</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Tech Improvement</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Education Fund</td>
<td>$46,893,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Operations &amp;</td>
<td>$4,452,500</td>
<td>$4,255,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Debt Service</td>
<td>$4,587,683</td>
<td>$7,654,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Transportation</td>
<td>$4,200,000</td>
<td>$4,450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 IMRF</td>
<td>$944,350</td>
<td>$285,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Capital Projects</td>
<td>$340,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 Working Capital</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$122,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 Tort/Liability</td>
<td>$492,000</td>
<td>$422,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 Life Safety</td>
<td>$23,134</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$61,932,952</td>
<td>$57,914,935</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Charter School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>250 Students</th>
<th>Confirm Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>9,624</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>2,406,000</td>
<td>($2,950,405)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($7,798,391)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Life Safety costs estimated by the architect for those “most critical needs.”
- Forrestal School K-5, 429 students - $2.97 million
- Green Bay School K-5, 298 students - $3.73 million
- North School K-5, 429 students - $1.47 million
- South School K-5, 272 students - $3.01 million
- AJK School K-5, 395 students - $2.51 million
- Novak School Grade 6, 295 students - $4.21 million
- Neal School Grade 7/8, 450 students - $6.42 million
- High School Grade 9-12, 835 students - $13.36 million
- Yeager School – Pre-K, 204 students - $2.71 million
- District Office - $1.61 million
- Total - $42 million
- Architect has proposed 5 different facility consolidation plans that range in cost from $35 million to $75 million
- Architect costs for the facility study needs to be resolved ($113,000)
• Composite ACT score up from 15.5 (2011) to 15.8 (2012)
• PSAE Reading 89% does not meet in 2011 and 89% does not meet in 2012
• PSAE Math 85% does not meet in 2011 and 84% does not meet in 2012
• PSAE Science 89% does not meet in 2011 and 89% does not meet in 2012
• Grade 3 ISAT Reading/Math meets and exceeds at South School 47% and 59%, North School 40% and 59%, at AJK 49% and 66%, at Forrestal School 83% and 90%, at Green Bay School 23% and 47%
• Grade 4 ISAT Reading/Math meets and exceeds at South School 44% and 66%, at North School 48% and 68%, at AJK 50% and 71%, at Forrestal School 53% and 65%, at Green Bay School 51% and 53%
• Grade 5 ISAT Reading/Math meets and exceeds at South School 55% and 64%, at North School 51% and 61%, at AJK 61% and 69%, at Forrestal School 53% and 70%, at Green Bay School 50% and 71%
• Grade 6 ISAT Reading/Math meets and exceeds at Novak School 70% and 68%
• Grade 7 ISAT Reading/Math meets and exceeds at Neal 42% and 47%
• Grade 8 ISAT Reading/Math meets and exceeds at Neal 66% and 53%
• Inaccurate student count district shows 538 identified special education students and ISBE shows 635
• Education Environment percentages are not correct
• Additional areas of non-compliance include – special education provision of services, consent for evaluation and re-evaluation, least restrictive environment, placements, components of the IEP, referral process, development and revisions of IEP’s
• Formal complaint from January 2011 was finally resolved in June 2012
• Bilingual noncompliance includes absence of a completed program, classroom, and parent handbooks
• Frequent use of unqualified staff in bi-lingual classrooms
• Currently 9 subs in place primarily in special education and bilingual classrooms
• First year accomplishments include increasing average daily attendance from 75% in 2010-2011 to 86% in 2011-2012
• Student discipline decrease in fights from over 80 fights in 2010-2011 to less than 30 fights in 2011-2012.
• ACT scores gained from 15.5 in 2010-2011 to 15.8 in 2011-2012.
• 74% of staff reported that the AUSL work had improved their teaching effectiveness
• Established strong instructional leadership teams throughout the school
• Established a 9 period student day that provides for common staff planning and specific student intervention periods
• Hired four instructional coaches to begin this year.
• Established goal setting and constant monitoring of student data
• Two new appointed Boards
• Board packets will be received at least 5-7 days before Board meetings
• Board training will occur
• Curriculum Area Initiatives include System 44 and Read 180 reading interventions for grades 3-12, Cambridge EPAS Model 7-12, Explore Plan and ACT Prep, Scholastic Math Inventory, formation of curriculum teams in the core academic areas, IMSA partnership with a STEM program for grades 4-8 in two schools this year, In Search of Genius hands on engaging after school science program, and Schuler Scholar Program at North Chicago High School.

• Instruction Area Initiatives include Professional Learning Communities Coaching Academy

• Assessment Area Initiatives include NWEA Map assessments three times a year in grades 3-12, AIMS Web assessment in grades K-2, Scholastic Math Inventory, Scholastic Reading Inventory, Scholastic Phonics Inventory both at all schools in grades 3-12

• Professional Development Area Initiatives include PLC Coaching Academy for 75 staff members across all schools, PLC leadership training for all building administrators, Advanced Placement training (via NMSI grant) for science and math teachers at grades 7-12
• Improve relationships
• Increase leadership visibility in schools and community
• Guide and support building leaders
• Team building
• Modify organizational structure including moving technology and school safety to CEO and assigning two assistant superintendents to supervise and help evaluate the principals
• Hire assistant business manager
• Involvement of North Chicago Community Partners including after school programming for over 250 students, deployed over 1,600 volunteers who provided 11,500 hours of service in such areas as Family Health and Wellness Night, Family Reading Night, Reading Power, Chicago and Milwaukee Museum visits, Family Science Night, Guest Author Programs, cleaning, painting and remodeling of schools, Academic Lunch Bunch
• Involvement of United Way of Lake County includes Success By 6 early learning and reading clubs, book distribution, save and stable families assistance program
• Success of last year’s basketball team and this year’s football program
• Developed budget and tracking format to accurately track all expenditures correctly by object and function
• Grant management will be coordinated and communicated across all central office administrators
• PMA financial forecasts and cash flow management will be presented in late September
• Strategic Planning Process will be initiated in early January including components related to facility consolidation
• Contract negotiations will be initiated beginning in late October, early November
• Developed a focused attention to immediate building and maintenance needs including interior/exterior painting, broken window replacement and improvement of outside and inside building appearances including landscaping

• A “lunch point of sale” program will be initiated second semester to improve the accuracy of tracking food sales and improve state reporting

• New business office software package will be recommended in October

• Technology progress includes, interactive white boards installed in all classrooms in grades 3-12, new web and spam filters, new e-mail and collaboration system from Goggle Apps, new web site new web help desk system, cabling of high school to support wireless environment, replacement of all network switches, back up system deployed for critical servers and users across the district
TO: Illinois State Board of Education
FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
Robert Wolfe, Chief Financial Officer

Agenda Topic: Discussion of Fiscal Years 2013 and 2014 Budgets

Staff Contact(s): Robert Wolfe, Chief Financial Officer
Jason Hall, Senior Budget Analyst

Purpose of Agenda Item
To provide the Board with a General Revenue Funds budget history and a menu of formula changes for the development of the FY 2014 Budget Recommendation.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
The FY 2014 Budget will provide financial resources to allow the Agency to implement all three goals identified within the Board’s Strategic Plan.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
The Board will direct agency staff to develop legislative proposals and strategies for the development of the FY 2014 Budget Proposal.

Background Information

Funding History and Current Condition

From FY 2006 to FY 2009, the Board sought increases in funding and successfully grew Pre-K through 12 education spending by nearly $1.3 billion. Since FY 2009, the cumulative decrease in Pre-K through 12 education has been $869.5 million. The largest reduction occurred in FY 2011 when the agency’s General Funds Appropriation was reduced by $328.3 million as compared to the FY 2010 General Funds Appropriation. Since FY 2011, General State Aid has been cut by $313.6 million dollars. The Effective Foundation Level for FY 2013 is $5,733 which is equal to the Foundation Level for the FY 2008.

General Funds appropriations from FY 2008 to FY 2013 are shown as Exhibit A on the following page.
### ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Exhibit A

State Funds Appropriation History - FY08 - FY13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$000's</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General State Aid</td>
<td>$4,475,200</td>
<td>$4,616,366</td>
<td>$4,615,976</td>
<td>$4,600,305</td>
<td>$4,448,104</td>
<td>$4,286,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandated Categoricals</td>
<td>1,666,900</td>
<td>1,782,251</td>
<td>1,944,078</td>
<td>1,780,847</td>
<td>1,781,628</td>
<td>1,755,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>347,861</td>
<td>380,261</td>
<td>342,235</td>
<td>342,235</td>
<td>325,124</td>
<td>300,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Block Grant</td>
<td>74,841</td>
<td>74,841</td>
<td>18,710</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Improvement Block Grant</td>
<td>76,140</td>
<td>76,140</td>
<td>68,526</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>74,552</td>
<td>75,652</td>
<td>68,087</td>
<td>63,381</td>
<td>63,381</td>
<td>63,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Assistance</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>36,764</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Consolidation Costs</td>
<td>7,850</td>
<td>7,850</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>2,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Block Grant</td>
<td>74,841</td>
<td>74,841</td>
<td>18,710</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook Loans</td>
<td>42,827</td>
<td>42,827</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Grants</td>
<td>355,819</td>
<td>293,082</td>
<td>194,331</td>
<td>139,032</td>
<td>108,195</td>
<td>108,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Operations</td>
<td>23,645</td>
<td>24,251</td>
<td>26,550</td>
<td>24,424</td>
<td>22,154</td>
<td>23,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL STATE FUNDS</td>
<td>$7,150,634</td>
<td>$7,410,284</td>
<td>$7,282,193</td>
<td>$6,953,924</td>
<td>$6,750,387</td>
<td>$6,540,799</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Change $000's

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$000's</th>
<th>Change FY07-FY08</th>
<th>Change FY08-FY09</th>
<th>Change FY09-FY10</th>
<th>Change FY10-FY11</th>
<th>Change FY11-FY12</th>
<th>Change FY11-FY12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General State Aid</td>
<td>$308,870</td>
<td>$141,166</td>
<td>$391</td>
<td>$15,671</td>
<td>$152,201</td>
<td>$161,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandated Categoricals</td>
<td>185,478</td>
<td>115,351</td>
<td>161,827</td>
<td>163,232</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>25,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Block Grant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56,131</td>
<td>18,710</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Improvement Block Grant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,614</td>
<td>4,706</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>36,764</td>
<td>4,706</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Assistance</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>31,764</td>
<td>36,764</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>74,841</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Consolidation Costs</td>
<td>7,850</td>
<td>7,850</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>2,805</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Block Grant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42,827</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook Loans</td>
<td>23,645</td>
<td>24,251</td>
<td>26,550</td>
<td>24,424</td>
<td>22,154</td>
<td>23,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Grants</td>
<td>32,832</td>
<td>293,082</td>
<td>194,331</td>
<td>139,032</td>
<td>108,195</td>
<td>108,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Operations</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>2,299</td>
<td>2,125</td>
<td>2,270</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL STATE FUNDS</td>
<td>$572,558</td>
<td>$250,650</td>
<td>$128,092</td>
<td>$328,269</td>
<td>$203,537</td>
<td>$209,587</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The State of Illinois continues to struggle to pay its bills; however, progress is being made. Specifically, at the end of June, the General Funds backlog of unpaid bills and fund transfers in the Comptroller’s Office totaled $3.656 billion, compared to $3.798 billion last year.

**Options for Consideration in the Development of the FY 2014 Budget**

The following considerations are based upon the following premise:

- Prepare districts for the likelihood of a long-term state deficit environment
- Ensure students most in need are prioritized
- Ensure that funding follows students

The Board will be presented several funding formula changes to consider. Those considerations are as follows:

1. General State Aid
   
   a. Eliminate Flat Grant Districts from GSA Formula Grant and Poverty Grant Eligibility
   
   b. Possible changes to the Poverty Grant Calculations and District’s Eligibility
   
   c. Allow the Foundation Level to be set at the amount the appropriations actually support
   
   d. Impose a Floor on the Property Tax Extension Limitation Law Equalized Assessed Valuation Amounts

2. Consider revising all major funding formulas

**Next Steps**

The Board will provide agency staff with direction as to which funding formula changes are desired and legislative proposals will be developed to facilitate those changes. Additionally, FY 2014 Budget Hearings will commence in late October providing individuals the opportunity to provide input to assist the Board in developing a FY 2014 Budget Recommendation in January.
September 19 – 20, 2012 Retreat

Fiscal Year 2014 Budget/Legislative Proposal Development Discussion

• Overview of the Budgeting for Results Process

• 5 Year State Funds Appropriations History

• Discuss options for legislative changes to current funding formulas

• Discuss options for a major funding formula revision for Education
The Priority Areas for ISBE are:

- Increase the percentage of children entering kindergarten “fully ready”
- Implement Common Core Standards (including Language Arts and Math) for K-8 students
- Increase high school graduation rates and demonstrate academic achievement and preparations for success after high school for all students
- Ensure access to educational opportunities for all students who are developmentally disabled and students who are at-risk
- Support every student with highly prepared and effective teachers and school leaders
### 5 Year State Funds Appropriations History

**ISBE State Funds Appropriation History - FY08 - FY13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$000's</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General State Aid</td>
<td>$4,475,200</td>
<td>$4,616,366</td>
<td>$4,615,976</td>
<td>$4,600,305</td>
<td>$4,448,104</td>
<td>$4,286,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandated Categorical</td>
<td>1,666,900</td>
<td>1,782,251</td>
<td>1,944,078</td>
<td>1,780,847</td>
<td>1,781,628</td>
<td>1,755,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>347,861</td>
<td>380,261</td>
<td>342,235</td>
<td>342,235</td>
<td>325,124</td>
<td>300,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Block Grant</td>
<td>74,841</td>
<td>74,841</td>
<td>18,710</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Improvement Block Grant</td>
<td>76,140</td>
<td>76,140</td>
<td>68,526</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>74,552</td>
<td>75,652</td>
<td>68,087</td>
<td>63,381</td>
<td>63,381</td>
<td>63,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Assistance</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>36,764</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Consolidation Costs</td>
<td>7,850</td>
<td>7,850</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>2,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook Loans</td>
<td>42,827</td>
<td>42,827</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Grants</td>
<td>355,819</td>
<td>293,082</td>
<td>194,331</td>
<td>139,032</td>
<td>108,195</td>
<td>108,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Operations</td>
<td>23,645</td>
<td>24,251</td>
<td>26,550</td>
<td>24,424</td>
<td>22,154</td>
<td>23,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL STATE FUNDS</strong></td>
<td>$7,150,634</td>
<td>$7,410,284</td>
<td>$7,282,193</td>
<td>$6,953,924</td>
<td>$6,750,387</td>
<td>$6,540,799</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$000's</th>
<th>Change FY07-FY08</th>
<th>Change FY08-FY09</th>
<th>Change FY09-FY10</th>
<th>Change FY10-FY11</th>
<th>Change FY11-FY12</th>
<th>Change FY12-FY13</th>
<th>Change FY09-FY13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General State Aid</td>
<td>$308,870</td>
<td>$141,166</td>
<td>$391</td>
<td>$15,671</td>
<td>$152,201</td>
<td>$161,352</td>
<td>$329,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandated Categorical</td>
<td>185,478</td>
<td>115,351</td>
<td>161,827</td>
<td>163,232</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>25,680</td>
<td>26,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>29,607</td>
<td>32,400</td>
<td>30,826</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$17,112</td>
<td>(24,931)</td>
<td>$80,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Block Grant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56,131</td>
<td>18,710</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$74,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Improvement Block Grant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68,526</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$76,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>7,565</td>
<td>4,706</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$12,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Assistance</td>
<td>(6,800)</td>
<td>31,764</td>
<td>36,764</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$36,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Consolidation Costs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,150</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>1,005</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(5,045)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook Loans</td>
<td>13,700</td>
<td>(42,827)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(42,827)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Grants</td>
<td>32,832</td>
<td>(62,737)</td>
<td>98,751</td>
<td>55,299</td>
<td>30,836</td>
<td>(129)</td>
<td>(185,016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Operations</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>2,299</td>
<td>2,125</td>
<td>2,270</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>(597)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL STATE FUNDS</strong></td>
<td>$572,558</td>
<td>$259,650</td>
<td>$128,092</td>
<td>$328,269</td>
<td>$203,537</td>
<td>$209,587</td>
<td>$869,485</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 Year State Funds Appropriations History

ISBE General Funds Appropriations
FY 08 - FY 13
Dollars in Millions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Appropriations (in Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>$7,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>$7,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>$7,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>$6,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY12</td>
<td>$6,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>$6,541</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 Year State Funds Appropriations History

General Funds Appropriations
Net Change by FY (07 - 13)
Dollars in Millions
5 Year State Funds Appropriations History

State of Illinois Allocation of General Fund Appropriations

Note: All Other Spending is a combination of Public Safety, Human Service, Governmental Service, Constitutional Officer Spending, Higher-Education, and Economic Development Spending
Variances in Local Property Wealth is a component that should be considered in any State Funding Formula Revisions

- The 2007 Original Equalized Assessed Valuation (EAV) for the entire state
  
  $343.1$ Billion Total EAV  
  $235.0$ Billion Residential EAV  
  $108.1$ Billion Non-Residential EAV (Farm, Commercial, Industrial, Railroad & Mineral)

- Mean EAV per Pupil  
  
  $112,415$ Total EAV per Pupil  
  $69,202$ Residential EAV per Pupil  
  $43,213$ Non-Residential EAV per Pupil

- Revenue Per Pupil (Ed Fund-Statutory Rate)
  
  $2,068$  
  $1,273$  
  $795$
Variances in Local Property Wealth is a component that should be considered in any State Funding Formula Revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest EAV Per Pupil</th>
<th>Compared to Mean</th>
<th>Revenue (Ed Fund Statutory Rate)</th>
<th>Lowest EAV Per Pupil</th>
<th>Compared to Mean</th>
<th>Revenue (Ed Fund Statutory Rate)</th>
<th>Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total EAV</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>$11,376</td>
<td>Total EAV</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>$263</td>
<td>$11,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential EAV</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>$9,868</td>
<td>Residential EAV</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>$48</td>
<td>$9,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>$5,455</td>
<td>Non-Residential</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>$86</td>
<td>$5,369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How do we Redistribute Available Resources in an Equitable and Efficient Manner

Formula Changes for Consideration:

– General State Aid
– Overall State Funding Formula Change

The changes being presented for consideration are being presented in an ascending order commencing with relatively small adjustments and ending with a major overhaul of the state funding formulas.

The following underlying goals were weighed as we approach solutions:

– Prepare districts for likely long-term state deficit environment
– Ensure students most in need are prioritized
– Ensure funding follows students
Considerations to Alter Current Formulas

Goal is to Redistribute Existing Funds to Districts with the Greatest Needs

*These Proposals are Not Mutually Exclusive*

**General State Aid (GSA)**

- **Consideration 1** Eliminate Flat Grant Districts from GSA Formula Grant and Poverty Grant Eligibility

- **Consideration 2** Possible Changes to the Poverty Grant Calculations and Eligibility

- **Consideration 3** Allow the Foundation Level to be Set at the Amount the Appropriations Actually Support

- **Consideration 4** Impose a Floor on Property Tax Extension Limitation Law (PTELL) EAV Amounts
Consideration #1: Eliminate Flat Grant Districts from GSA Formula Grant and Poverty Grant Eligibility

• Districts with more than 175% of the Foundation Level (F Level) in local wealth per pupil are considered the wealthiest districts in the Formula Grant and receive a flat amount per pupil, currently set at $218 per pupil. Flat Grant Districts are also eligible for Poverty Grant entitlements.

• There are 79 Flat Grant districts in the FY 13 GSA claim. If the claim were fully funded, they would receive $23.5 million from the Formula Grant and $22.4 million from the Poverty Grant.

• Eliminating these districts from all GSA eligibility would allow for the redistribution of approximately $46 million to those students with the greatest needs.
Consideration #2: Possible Changes to the Poverty Grant Calculations and Eligibility

- In addition to the equalized Foundation Formula Grant, GSA also pays districts an additional amount for their low-income students. This Poverty Grant formula does not consider local wealth in its calculations.

- The formula pays districts an amount based on the % of low-income pupils in their total student population.

- As the % of low-income students increases, the amount paid per low-income pupil increases as well.

- All districts receive some amount of Poverty Grant funding, regardless of wealth.

- The current formula was first implemented in FY 04.
Consideration #2: Possible Changes to the Poverty Grant
Calculations and Eligibility

Poverty Payment Per Student Based on District Poverty Concentration Ratio

Poverty Payment Per Student

- $355.00 at 15%
- $402.25 at 20%
- $537.25 at 30%
- $726.25 at 40%
- $969.25 at 50%
- $1,266.25 at 60%
- $1,617.25 at 70%
- $2,022.25 at 80%
- $2,481.25 at 90%
- $2,994.25 at 100%
Consideration #2: Possible Changes to the Poverty Grant Calculations and Eligibility

The Poverty Grant Claim Has Grown by Double Digits from FY 06 – FY 13

Growth in the Poverty Grant in General State Aid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Total State Poverty Grant Claim</th>
<th>% Change Over Prior Year</th>
<th>Chicago Poverty Grant Claim</th>
<th>Chicago Claim as a % of Total Claim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$265,462,700</td>
<td></td>
<td>$179,027,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$294,887,763</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>$202,300,736</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$301,966,521</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>$207,183,296</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$375,286,755</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>$216,948,416</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$388,216,297</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>$221,668,224</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$418,385,465</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>$235,432,304</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$459,473,640</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>$254,127,771</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$532,623,199</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>$285,525,517</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$675,371,947</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>$354,765,361</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$785,423,578</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>$413,797,787</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$941,353,936</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>$496,592,290</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$1,119,251,838</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>$581,603,377</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$1,349,108,591</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>$667,030,405</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$1,567,330,043</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>$740,907,776</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$1,773,722,953</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>$796,081,105</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consideration #2: Possible Changes to the Poverty Grant Calculation and Eligibility

Growth in the Poverty Grant is Exceeding Growth in the Equalized Formula Grant

- All the growth in the GSA claim since FY 08 has come from the Poverty Grant. FY 08 was the last year that saw an increase in the Formula Grant claim over the prior year.

- Since that time, the cost of the Formula Grant has declined by $617 million, or 17%. During that same time, the cost of the Poverty Grant increased. From FY 08 to FY 13, the cost of the Poverty Grant increased by $988 million, or 126%.

- If annual progress is not made in raising the F Level, the cost of the Formula Grant will likely continue to decline as the Poverty Grant continues to increase. Eventually, the state could find itself in a position of paying more through the unequalized Poverty Grant than it pays out through the equalized Formula Grant.
Consideration #2: Possible Changes to the Poverty Grant
Calculations and Eligibility
Comparison of the Equalized GSA Formula Grant to the Unequalized Supplemental Poverty Grant
Dollars in Millions
Consideration #2: Possible Changes to the Poverty Grant Calculations and Eligibility

• With limited state resources, it is likely GSA will not receive additional funding for several years.

• With the cost of the Poverty Grant growing dramatically, it is appropriate to ask whether the formula is the correct one.

• It is also appropriate to ask if all districts, especially the wealthiest, warrant this additional funding.

• Poverty Grant eligibility could be eliminated for more than the Flat Grant districts or the amount moderately wealthy districts receive per pupil could be reduced.

• The entire Poverty Grant formula could be altered to relax the slope of the curve and reduce the amount per low-income pupil paid to all districts.
Consideration #3: Allow the Foundation Level to be Set at the Amount the Appropriations Actually Support

• Currently, the Foundation Level of $6,119 is set in statute and will remain at that amount until lawmakers pass a statutory change.

• Prior to the implementation of the current GSA funding formula in FY 99, the General Assembly and the Governor would appropriate an amount for GSA and once all claim data was finalized, we would announce what F Level that appropriation supported.

• The F Level would fluctuate according to funding amounts. This would allow for the equalization portion of GSA to be fully funded.
Consideration #3: Allow the Foundation Level to be Set at the Amount Appropriations Actually Support

Impact of Lowering the Foundation Level Compared to Making Prorated or Reduced Payments

• Advance Illinois performed an analysis of a May proposal to reduce the GSA appropriation by $258 million. Using the preliminary GSA data set, they found that districts in the lowest 25% of local wealth per pupil would receive $46 million less if payments were prorated than they would if the F Level was lowered.

• Similarly, those districts with 60%-100% of their students qualifying as low-income lost approximately $46 million when prorating rather than lowering the F Level.

• This makes a compelling argument for lowering the F Level. Such action must also be accompanied by a change to the Flat Grant amount. The wealthiest districts are unaffected by a lower F Level alone.
Consideration #3: Allow the Foundation Level to be Set at the Amount Appropriations Actually Support

- Purpose is to concentrate the available dollars on those districts with the greatest needs

- Some districts that were previously Foundation districts would flip to the Alternate Method formula and some previously Alternate Method districts would flip to the Flat Grant formula.

- In a world of limited resources, that is how the formula should work. If the state can only afford so much funding, then districts that previously appeared moderately wealthy become wealthy for purposes of the formula.
Comparison of Select Districts if Total GSA is Prorated or the Foundation Level is Lowered to Match Appropriations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formula Type</th>
<th>Chicago Public Schools Unit 299</th>
<th>East St. Louis Unit 189</th>
<th>North Chicago Unit 187</th>
<th>Sparta Unit 140</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Concentration</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 13 Net Prorated Payment</td>
<td>$1,094,731,715</td>
<td>$49,806,132</td>
<td>$17,802,557</td>
<td>$4,774,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 13 Net GSA Claim @ $5,734 F Level</td>
<td>$1,091,168,352</td>
<td>$53,304,749</td>
<td>$18,635,627</td>
<td>$4,890,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit / (Loss) if Foundation Level is Lowered Compared to Prorated Total Payments</td>
<td>$ (3,563,363)</td>
<td>$3,498,617</td>
<td>$833,070</td>
<td>$115,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change from Prorated Payment</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The PTELL Adjustment in GSA

• The PTELL adjustment is the requirement that we use the lesser of a district’s Real Adjusted or its PTELL EAV. The PTELL EAV is the amount used in the prior year GSA calculations indexed by a ratio.

• The ratio is the annual rate of growth possible in a district’s tax extension. Actual EAV growth in the past decade has been greater than this index, resulting in a spread between Real EAV amounts and the EAV used in GSA.

• Over time, the spread between these two EAV amounts has widened for many PTELL districts. That gap, coupled with considerable increases in the Foundation Level from FY 04 through FY 10, resulted in a growing cost of the PTELL adjustment.
Comparison of Real Adjusted Equalized Assessed Value (EAV) to the EAV Used in General State Aid

Statutory Foundation Level set at $6,119 for the 4-year period of FY 10 - FY 13
Gap Between Real EAV and EAV Used in GSA
Dollars in Billions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 00</th>
<th>FY 01</th>
<th>FY 02</th>
<th>FY 03</th>
<th>FY 04</th>
<th>FY 05</th>
<th>FY 06</th>
<th>FY 07</th>
<th>FY 08</th>
<th>FY 09</th>
<th>FY 10</th>
<th>FY 11</th>
<th>FY 12</th>
<th>FY 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$4,550</td>
<td>$9,191</td>
<td>$9,349</td>
<td>$17,522</td>
<td>$31,988</td>
<td>$37,937</td>
<td>$56,068</td>
<td>$74,889</td>
<td>$85,778</td>
<td>$113,224</td>
<td>$124,165</td>
<td>$120,732</td>
<td>$95,383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Cost of the PTELL Adjustment Has Been Declining as EAV Amounts for PTELL Districts Increase Compared to a Static Foundation Level

- Actual EAV amounts statewide are flat or declining, but the PTELL EAV used in GSA is indexed annually.

- For PTELL districts, their local wealth has grown, resulting in less state aid paid to those districts. The PTELL EAV amounts grew by 6% in FY 11, by 1% in FY 12 and by 2% in FY 13. Every year these districts appear wealthier.

- Compared to an unchanged Foundation Level, PTELL districts will appear wealthier each year, lowering the cost of the Formula Grant and lowering the cost of the PTELL adjustment.

- Please Note: We expect the cost of the PTELL adjustment to begin increasing again once the economy improves, EAV amounts begin to grow and progress is made in increasing the F Level.
PTELL Districts' Median Local Wealth Per Pupil Has Been Increasing Compared to the Foundation Level

FY 11: $5,046
FY 12: $5,236
FY 13: $5,298

Median Local Wealth Per Pupil
Foundation Level
Linear (Median Local Wealth Per Pupil)
Consideration #4: Impose a Floor on PTELL EAV Amounts

• For many districts, the PTELL EAV is much lower than their Real Adjusted EAV. For example, in the FY 12 GSA claim we used the PTELL EAV for Chicago Public Schools, which was 57% of the amount we would have used if there were no PTELL adjustment.

• One idea is to still make the comparison between the two EAV amounts, but to limit how far apart those amounts may be. We could impose a floor and require that the EAV used must be, at a minimum, some percentage of the actual EAV.

• The next slide provides an example of how this would work and the funding that would be available for redistribution by imposing this floor. This example assumes full funding.
Consideration #4: Impose a Floor on PTELL EAV Amounts

General State Aid Funding Available from Setting CPS 299 Property Value
Used in GSA Calculations at 60% of CPS Real Adjusted EAV

- $39.4 Million Change in Claim
- $81.2 Million Change in Claim
- 60.0%
- 58.5%
- 58.0%
- 56.9%

Floor Set as % of Adjusted EAV
% of Adjusted EAV Used in FY 11
% of Adjusted EAV Used in FY 12
Consideration #4: Impose a Floor on PTELL EAV Amounts
Potential Funds Available for Redistribution with a PTELL Floor

• We modeled the results of a PTELL Floor with FY 12 claim data and produced the following results:
  
  o At a 60% floor, 23 districts received less from the Formula Grant, reducing the cost of GSA by $94 million.
  
  o At a 70% floor, 57 districts received less from the Formula Grant, reducing the cost of GSA by $328 million.
  
  o At an 80% floor, 129 districts received less from the Formula Grant, reducing the cost of GSA by $378 million.
  
• It is important to note that in FY 12 the cost of the PTELL adjustment was $628 million and in FY 13 it dropped to $502 million. The savings from imposing a floor in FY 14 would be less than these amounts.
Consider Revising All Major Grant Programs

• Currently, the Formula Grant in GSA is equalized while the Poverty Grant in GSA and other Categorical grants are unequalized. With the exception of the Regular Transportation Reimbursement, there are no other grant programs that weigh grant award amounts against local wealth.

• The goal would be to calculate all costs for basic education, special education, bilingual education and additional costs of students at-risk. This cost would be multiplied by student population and compared to local wealth.

• Create a “Foundation Level” for most education needs, rather than a level for base needs and addressing all other populations through separate categorical grants.
Current Funding Compared to Possible Consolidated Equalization Funding Formula

**Illinois State Education Funding**

- Foundation Level equalized:
  \[(F\ Level - \text{Local Wealth per Pupil}) \times \text{Pupils}\]

- All other grants unequalized:
  - Poverty Formula in GSA
  - Special Education Mandated Categorical Grants for Personnel, Private Tuition, Transportation, Summer School, Wards of the State and Base Extraordinary Costs
  - Early Childhood Education
  - Bilingual Education

**Alternate Method of Determining State Funding**

- Combine most state grants into a formula that equalizes against local wealth

- District Foundation Costs = (Base Cost + Low-Income Cost + Bilingual Cost + Special Education Cost)

- Revised GSA = (District Foundation Costs) - (Local Wealth)
Revising the Majority of State Grants Requires Time and Input from Multiple Groups

- Any such revision would require years of studying the education needs of school districts and determining both standard costs and regional cost differences. There are multiple approaches for gathering this data:
  - **Successful Schools Model** – This is used by the Education Funding Advisory Board (EFAB). Identify schools that meet or exceed test standards (successful) and achieve those results at a low cost (efficient).
  - **Professional Judgment Panel** – Education experts discuss cost factors and determine reasonable funding amounts for education.
  - **Evidence-Based Analysis** – Study and determine best practices and then assign a cost for those best practices to determine an amount that funds them.
Pursuing This Option Requires Greater Resources to Prepare the Model and to Fund the Model

• ISBE would need to seek an appropriation to provide the research to develop the details of such a model.

• Equalizing the majority of state grants should shift existing funding to the districts with the greatest needs.

• Like all grants based on a formula, the calculations using this model may require more funding than ISBE currently receives.

• This formula may be viewed as more equitable; however, if it is not fully funded by our policy makers, it may fall short of that goal.
TO: Governmental Relations Committee of the Whole

FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
Nicki Bazer, General Counsel

Agenda Topic: 2012 Veto Session and 2013 Legislative Agenda

Staff Contact(s): Nicole Wills, Governmental Relations
Cynthia Riseman, Governmental Relations

Purpose of Agenda Item
The purpose of the agenda item is to provide the Board with (a) a summary of items that may be addressed in the Fall Veto Session and (b) a discussion of potential ISBE legislative proposals for Spring 2013.

2012 Veto Session
The General Assembly will return to Springfield for the Fall Veto Session November 27-29 and December 4-6.

In addition to action on bills that the Governor vetoed or amendatorily vetoed over the summer, there are two bills that ISBE staff will be monitoring for potential action during the Veto Session:

- HB 5825 (Chapa LaVia/Steans) moves the Illinois Charter School Commission under the Illinois State Board of Education for administrative purposes only. The Commission will maintain its decision-making autonomy but would rely on ISBE to process payroll, assist in procurement related duties and other administrative tasks. HB 5825 has been passed by the Senate, but must still be passed by the House.

- HB 5826 (Chapa LaVia/Steans) - ISBE has one remaining legislative initiative from the Spring Session. HB 5826 has been passed by the Senate, but must still be passed by the House. This bill contains repeals and modifications of obsolete and duplicative statutes (see Attachment A).

2013 Spring Session
Over the past several months, the Agency’s Governmental Relations staff has been working with Agency divisions to develop legislative proposals for the spring 2013 legislative session. In addition to potential initiatives concerning school district reorganizations and school funding that will be addressed during different discussions, staff has three additional legislative initiatives for the Board’s consideration:

Obsolete/Duplicative Bill: This initiative would be a continuation of ISBE’s efforts to streamline the School Code provisions and amend or repeal outdated or otherwise problematic provisions of the School Code. ISBE has introduced similar pieces of legislation over the last several years.
Elimination of the Supplemental General State Aid (SGSA) report: School districts with an Average Daily Attendance of more than 1,000 but less than 50,000 students and that receive SGSA are required to submit an annual report to ISBE on how the funds will be spent.

The proposal to eliminate the SGSA report is due to an ongoing review of agency critical functions and duties. Most districts receiving large amounts of SGSA funding have a very high percentage, 90+%, of low income students so the funding naturally is expended to benefit those students. Original legislation was flawed in that it required districts with over 1,000 ADA to submit an SGSA plan (which is currently approximately 600 of the 870 districts). In many cases these districts may only receive a small amount of SGSA funding due to the affluence of their student populations while some poor small districts may receive hundreds of thousands of dollars in SGSA funding and do not have to file a SGSA plan. It has been determined that this report does not bring significant benefit to the agency or to districts and it would be preferable to allow the districts to use this time to fulfill more important mandates such as providing special education and transportation services. Elimination of the report reduces time and effort for the ISBE employee responsible for this report. Several months of effort are required to assure that the SGSA plans are filed and are in compliance with the law.

Federal Grant Distribution: This proposal would add explicit authority in the State Finance Act [30 ILCS 105] for State Board of Education to process payments for federal grants provided primarily by the United States Department of Education, Agriculture or any other federal agency in subsequent state fiscal year(s). In general, federal grants are awarded and made available for obligation for a 27 month period of time. State Board of Education reimbursement of eligible federal expenditures to local education agencies extend past the confines of the 14 month state fiscal year (i.e. July 1 – August 31) due to the extended life of the federal grant. This statutory change would not require any changes to agency policy but will allow our Funding and Disbursements Division to process grants in a manner that comports with the law and avoid potential audit findings in the future.

Classrooms First Commission: In addition to agency initiatives, staff expects various initiatives to be introduced by the Governor and Lt. Governor’s offices as a result of recommendations from the Classrooms First Commission that was chaired by Lt. Governor Simon. Three particular recommendations that the Commission made are highlighted below that the Board may wish to actively support in the Spring. The final report can be found at: Classrooms First Commission Final Report.

1. Allow non-contiguous but compact school districts to reorganize if contiguous school districts reject reorganization.

Currently, only districts that share a border are allowed to reorganize into a new school district. As such, several districts in Illinois have experienced difficulty attempting to reorganize with contiguous school districts though the need to reorganize has been apparent and could help to maintain instructional quality and financial viability. Under current law, if a district wants to consolidate with a non-contiguous district, the General Assembly has to pass special legislation, which can be a long, labor-intensive process that may be a deterrent to this type of reorganization. Eliminating this barrier to the types of districts that can reorganize potentially increases the options for districts and could lead to increased voluntary reorganizations.

2. Create a reorganization school construction program.
Creation of a separate, distinct school construction program that would have funds available for construction for consolidating and reorganizing districts could potentially eliminate one of the barriers to reorganization. Under the current school construction program, projects are being funded from the FY 2003 school construction list. Some districts contemplating reorganization need additional or more centralized school buildings to make the reorganization viable and the reality that their projects will have to wait several years before being funded can create a barrier to reorganization. By developing a new construction program dedicated to reorganizations, more districts may be willing to pursue consolidation knowing that facility funding would be available within a shorter time frame. Creation of such a program has been suggested in the past by the Education Funding Advisory Board (EFAB).

3. **Permit districts under 750 student enrollment to dissolve with or without a referendum.**

Under current law, districts under 5,000 residents have an option to dissolve the district without a referendum by utilizing a shorter process established in the School Code. However, some districts with a small student enrollment exceed 5,000 residents. This proposal would allow those districts with a student enrollment of under 750 to dissolve without referendum even if the residential population exceeds 5,000 in total population. This expansion would streamline the reorganization process for these districts and could lead to additional reorganizations. The Classrooms First Commission report indicated that 53 school districts would potentially be affected under this change.

**SB7 Trailer Bill:** The Illinois Association of School Administrators, the Illinois Education Association and other stakeholders have begun work on a trailer bill that will provide clarification to Senate Bill 7; at this point, language remains in development and encompasses technical drafting error clean-ups, corrections to issues identified during implementation, and some statutory clarification language. It is anticipated that the Senate sponsor will move forward with a bill during the Spring 2013 session.

**FY 14 Budget:** Governmental Relations will work with the Budget Staff to develop the FY 14 board recommended budget as well as any substantive funding formula changes requested by the Board.

**Next Steps**

We anticipate the Board will provide direction on legislative initiatives discussed above at today’s meeting. In addition, Governmental Relations will continue discussing the legislative needs with internal staff, the education field and the Board, and will come back before the Board later this year with a final legislative package.
Fall Veto Session

**HB 5825** (Chapa LaVia/Steans) moves the Illinois Charter School Commission under ISBE for administrative purposes only. The Commission will maintain its decision-making autonomy but would rely on ISBE to process payroll, assist in procurement related duties and other administrative tasks. HB 5825 has been passed by the Senate, but must still be passed by the House.

**HB 5826** (Chapa LaVia/Steans) - ISBE has one remaining legislative initiative from the Spring Session. HB 5826 has been passed by the Senate, but must still be passed by the House. This bill contains repeals and modifications of obsolete and duplicative statutes.
2013 Spring Session

– Obsolete/Duplicative Bill

– Elimination of the Supplemental General State Aid (SGSA) report

– Federal Grant Distribution
Initiatives To Support

Classrooms First Commission

- Allow non-contiguous but compact school districts to reorganize if contiguous school districts reject reorganization.
- Create a reorganization school construction program.
- Permit districts under 750 student enrollment to dissolve with or without a referendum.
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
Susan Morrison, Deputy Superintendent/Chief Education Officer

Agenda Topic: Update on Education Reform Initiatives

Staff Contact(s): Susan Morrison, Deputy Superintendent/Chief Education Officer

Purpose of Agenda Item
To provide an update on the Illinois Education Reform initiatives.

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

GOAL 1: Every student will demonstrate academic achievement and be prepared for success after high school.

GOAL 2: Every student will be supported by highly prepared and effective teachers and school leaders.

GOAL 3: Every school will offer a safe and healthy learning environment for all students.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
This agenda item will provide information regarding the current status of the Educational Reform initiatives for the board members.

Background Information
The State of Illinois has long recognized that its education system must prepare each and every child for success in postsecondary education and employment. Over the past several years, Illinois has exhibited its deep commitment to College and Career Readiness through bold education reforms. The Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) moved the state aggressively toward College and Career Readiness through the adoption of the Common Core State Standards in mathematics and English language arts. In addition, with the passage of Senate Bill 7, major reforms were enacted for teacher and leader evaluation and changes were made to the Illinois School Code revising the Illinois Teaching Standards. The ISBE submitted, and was awarded, a competitive Race to the Top grant which confirmed the state’s reform agenda. The Statewide System of Support has been focused to support the lowest performing schools using evidence-based strategies. In addition, using federal grant funds, the ISBE has been building its capacity to assess the effectiveness of its program investments by collaborating with other state agencies to build a longitudinal data system that will track students from pre-kindergarten through college and the workforce.

Status Update
Implementation of Common Core State Standards and new assessments
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• Four content specialist teams; mathematics, English/language arts, data specialists, and learning supports have been established
• Common core professional learning series including presentations, facilitator guides and accompanying resources targeting classroom teachers has been developed
• Common core website has been redesigned to highlight primary resources nationwide and Illinois items
• Resources including: Glossary, Professional Learning Needs Assessment, Implementation Rubric, webinar series for Mathematics, English/language arts, and data, online learning progressions tool, reading informational text strategies K-12, reading literature K-12 strategies, Math Tasks, and A Teacher’s Guide to PARCC Model Content Frameworks for Mathematics and English/language Arts have been developed
• Alignment of units and lessons to the common core through use of a rubric developed in conjunction with Achieve and other states
• Through the ongoing collaboration with ICCB and the IBHE, a series of regional workshops were held for secondary and postsecondary partners to focus on alignment among high schools and postsecondary institutions followed by a statewide Common Core Summit for individuals from Teacher Preparation and the Arts and Sciences Programs
• 26 educators were identified to participate in the PARCC Educator Leader Cadre
• New performance levels for ISAT accountability have been developed
• Finalizing value tables for use to measure growth in grades 3-8
• A communication plan for the PARCC implementation is being developed

Teacher and Leader Effectiveness
• Webinars have been provided to Higher Education Certification Officers
• The electronic certification system has been redesigned aligning to the new licensure system and will be launched February 1, 2013
• New principal preparation programs are being reviewed and approved with intensive and extensive requirements focusing on instructional leadership
• Stakeholder meetings have been held to redefine preparation requirements for elementary teachers, middle grade teachers, early childhood teachers, gifted teachers, and superintendents
• New training for prequalification of evaluators was developed and approximately 13,000 evaluators of teachers and principals have begun training
• New rules on teacher induction and mentoring have been developed
• Teacher licensure has been redesigned
• Teacher preparation unit and program review processes have been developed and refined
• Contracts for PEAC, Survey of Learning Conditions, and induction and mentoring of teachers and principals have been enacted
• Two nonprofit organizations offering teacher preparation programs have been approved
• Two teacher preparation programs were placed on probation by the State Educator Preparation and Licensure Board

Statewide System of Support
• Request for Sealed Proposal was developed and let for solicitation in June, 2012 for the development of the Center for School Improvement
• Staff from Innovations and Improvement will work with staff from the Center to identify and hire highly qualified professionals to support low performing schools, priority schools, and high priority districts
• Six new School Improvement Grant 1003(g) awardees have been identified bringing the total number of SIG schools to 26
• Data from 2012 reveals that 11 out of 20 cohort 1 and cohort 2 schools increased the number of students meeting and exceeding standards on the PSAE reading test
• Data from 2012 indicates that 9 out of 20 schools from cohort 1 and 2 demonstrated improvement in mathematics scores

Race to the Top 3
• Race to the Top (RTTT) work was launched at the start of 2012. Key staff including the Director of Policy & Program Implementation, the Director of Performance Management, Deputy General Counsel (Race to the Top Counsel), and Professional Development Coordinator dedicate time to the initiative.
• 36 districts agreed to participate in RTTT
• A variety of supports including eight webinars have been provided for the districts
• Districts have been matched with a Statewide System of Support Coach to assist implementation activities.
• Three agreements have been finalized: PERA Prequalification, Survey of Learning Conditions, and Performance Evaluation Advisory Council Supports
• Agreements currently being negotiated: State Report Card Redesign, STEM Learning Exchanges, Pathways Resource Center, College and Career Readiness, and Illinois Collaborative for Education Policy Research
• Two proposals are let for solicitation: Local Assessment Support, Performance Evaluation Reform Act Research Based Study

Longitudinal Data System (LDS)
• The Center for Performance was created and a Chief Performance Officer hired with the aim of using data compiled in the LDS to evaluate program effectiveness, inform policy making and support strategic planning and management throughout the agency.
• Supported by Race to the Top funds, the Illinois Consortium for Education Policy Research has been established. This consortium will leverage LDS data to provide insight on key policy questions that require more in depth study then can be addressed internally.
• The design of the K-12 component of the longitudinal data system is complete and work is underway to build it with an anticipated completion date of October 15, 2012.
• Data governance processes have been adopted to investigate and resolve data quality issues as they arise.
• This fall, for the second year, Illinois high schools will receive a High School to College Success Report providing feedback to high schools about the success of their graduates in college.
• ISBE is now collecting grades data for middle and high school students and the capacity for linking teachers to students has been established.
• The Illinois High Education Consortium was created and is integrating data for Illinois colleges and universities.

Superintendent’s Recommendation

There is no recommendation for action
Recognizing the Challenges

Celebrating the Accomplishments

2012
Enlisting An Army

Common Core Standards and Assessment

Resources and Support

- Professional Learning Series
- Needs Assessments
- Facilitator Guides and accompanying materials for principals and teacher leaders
- Classroom Resources
- Regional Workshops

Content Specialists
Learning Supports Team (6)
English Language Arts Team (6)
Math Team (3)
Data and Assessment Team (3)
Every Student Deserves

Effective Teachers and Leaders
Every Student Deserves Effective Teachers and Leaders

Aligning teacher preservice to common core

10,000 Evaluators

New Licensure System

TAP - Reset Scores

Approved 2 non profits for teacher prep

15 new principal prep programs

Stakeholder Groups
NEW TOOLS

Rising Star
The Illinois Tool for District and School Continuous Improvement Planning

Illinois State Board of Education
Eight Essential Elements For Effective Education
Without data, I’m just another opinion.

Consortium for Education Policy Research
K-12 design completed for LDS
Adopted data governance policies
High School to College Feedback Report
Illinois Higher Education Consortium
NEW TOOLS

New Report Card
Survey of Learning Conditions
State Intervention and Support

Re-vision Statewide System of Support

26 School Improvement Grantees

Two State Interventions
Next Generation Accountability

Waiver
Race to the Top
2.1 Million
Every Student Every Day
Illinois State Board of Education

Resolution

Honoring

Lanita J. Koster

September 2012

WHEREAS, Lanita began her career as a School Social Worker, a position she held for more than twenty years; and

WHEREAS, in tandem with her career, Lanita has been an active participant in numerous educational entities and has served on a variety of boards and committees including the Governor’s Early Learning Council, the Illinois Commission on the Elimination of Poverty, the Grown Your Own Illinois Project, the State Working Group on Improving Teacher Quality, a former member of the State Teacher Certification Board and a cabinet member for the Illinois Learning Partnership; and

WHEREAS, in 2008, Lanita was appointed to the Illinois State Board of Education and served as Chair of the ISBE Governmental Relations Committee; and

WHEREAS, Lanita has been a tireless advocate for students and educators as demonstrated by her many years of educational labor experience with both the IFT and the AFT where she held various offices; and

WHEREAS, Lanita has been an invaluable member of the Illinois State Board of Education whose keen insight, varied areas of expertise and thoughtful consideration of issues has been greatly appreciated; and

WHEREAS, Lanita has decided it is time to step down from the Board and pursue other areas of interest.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Illinois State Board of Education extends its sincere appreciation and gratitude to Lanita Koster for her commitment to the Board and her numerous contributions to the field of education.

_______________________    __________________________     _______________________
Gery J. Chico, Chairman  Steven R. Gilford, Vice Chairman  Vinni M. Hall, Secretary

_______________________     ___________________________     _______________________
James W. Baumann, Member      Andrea S. Brown, Member  David L. Fields, Member

___________________________
Melinda A. LaBarre, Member
TO: Illinois State Board of Education
FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Schools
Peter Godard, Chief Performance Officer

Agenda Topic: Action Item: Illinois Shared Learning Environment (ISLE)

Staff Contact(s): Brandon Williams, Projects Administrator, Center for Performance

Purpose of Agenda Item(s)

The purpose of this agenda item is to present the current plan for the implementation of the Illinois Shared Learning Environment (ISLE) and illustrate the services and value this system will ultimately provide to educators and policymakers in Illinois. This agenda item was tabled by the board at the May 17, 2012 meeting.

Relationship to Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan

GOAL 1: Every student will demonstrate academic achievement and be prepared for success after high school. The Illinois Shared Learning Environment (ISLE) will provide an online platform that directs curricular resources, online content and other tools to teachers and students based specifically on the unique needs of individual students, all tied to common core standards. This leap in facilitating personalized instruction will help ensure the next generation of Illinois students is achieving greater success, exceeding common core standards, and better prepared for college and careers.

GOAL 2: Every student will be supported by highly effective teachers and school leaders. The ISLE platform will link a wide variety of student assessments with resources for educators – performance dashboards, online content, learning resources, etc. – to give educators a more comprehensive view of the specific needs of each student, even before that student sets foot into the classroom. This depth of visibility to student performance will help teachers and school leaders work much more efficiently.

GOAL 3: Every school will offer a safe and healthy learning environment for all students. ISLE will provide a platform that uses technology to enable a much greater personalized focus on each student and a more holistic view of many variables that contribute to a student’s performance, beyond standardized test scores. This significant shift should ultimately help schools serve all their students’ needs in a more effective manner.

Background Information

Over the last decade, technology has allowed school districts and the state to collect large amounts of data on student performance. But while education is “data rich,” it remains “information poor” because of the inefficiencies in analyzing and using that data to inform policy and influence practice in the classroom. Although technology has redefined the way industry works and people manage their daily lives, education in America has yet to experience such a revolution; today the classroom looks strikingly similar to the classroom of 1900.
In 2011 a major multi-state initiative, the Shared Learning Collaborative (SLC), was launched to address this exact problem. The SLC was formed by CCSSO, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation with the goal of creating a shared technology infrastructure to support the implementation of the Common Core State Standards and help states and districts provide teachers with the instructional data and tools they need. Five states – Illinois, Colorado, Massachusetts, New York, and North Carolina – were selected to be first to pilot this exciting new technology. Several years prior to the creation of the SLC, Illinois had created a plan to develop a similar platform statewide to use technology to better enable personalized instruction across the entire P20 spectrum. This plan was put on hold when Illinois was not awarded the first two rounds of Race to the Top; however, the planning the state had already put into deploying such a technology made Illinois a logical choice to pilot the SLC.

“ISLE” is the name of Illinois’ roll-out of this SLC technology. ISLE will build upon this core foundation provided by SLC, bringing the advantages of a standards-based, open-source, multi-state collaborative to Illinois, while still providing a platform to add Illinois-specific resources and applications that will ultimately address the needs of students and educators across the entire P20 spectrum in Illinois.

The goal of ISLE is simple: to provide a major leap forward in improving student outcomes by enabling more personalized instruction. ISLE will provide a common language that links assessments, courses, content, and applications together and to common core standards; and it will offer a common platform that directs teachers and students to a world of digital content based on the very specific needs of the individual student.

The first phase of ISLE is well underway. Two districts, Bloomington District 87 and McLean County Unit 5, are now piloting the core SLC technology. This pilot, which lasts through the end of 2012, will allow us to learn how to connect districts to ISLE, how to train teachers on its use, and what specific needs users have above and beyond the core SLC technology. In 2013, we will begin rolling ISLE out to the remaining 34 Race to the Top districts.

**Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item:** Board members will have a greater knowledge of the contribution that ISLE will provide to the students and educators in participating districts.

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

**Policy Implications:** None

**Budget Implications:** Currently no ISBE budget implications; funding for ISLE is being provided in part through the multi-state Shared Learning Collaborative initiative funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation, and in part through a capital grant from the Governor’s Office of Management and Budget.

**Legislative Action:** None

**Communications:** Information regarding the development of ISLE is being communicated to the field (primarily RttT districts) and further communication to districts and the public is forthcoming.

**Pros and Cons of Various Actions:**
Superintendent’s Recommendations:

Next Steps:
Currently, ISLE is being piloted in District 87 and Unit 5, giving us the first chance to see ISLE at work in the classroom and plan for its broader roll-out. Over the next several months, ISBE and other ISLE project partners (including NIU and SIU) will be conducting focus groups to assess needs of other P20 stakeholders that will shape the requirements for ISLE moving forward. In early 2013, we will begin expanding infrastructure to scale ISLE to a total of 36 Race to the Top districts (and potentially more), and will also start developing and procuring additional applications to round out the offering for educators. By 2015-2016 we hope to see much wider adoption by districts throughout the state of ISLE in order to bring the tools, resources, and content needed to help enable personalized learning into the classroom in the most efficient and educator-friendly way possible.
Illinois Shared Learning Environment

Making Personalized Learning a Reality

Peter Godard, Chief Performance Officer
Brandon Williams, Projects Administrator
It’s not about technology, but what technology can allow us to do differently – and better.

Transportation in...

1900 2012
It’s not about technology, but what technology can allow us to do differently – and better.

Communication in...

1900 2012
It’s not about technology, but what technology can allow us to do differently – and better.

Information in...

1900  2012
It’s not about technology, but what technology can allow us to do differently – and better.

The Classroom in...

1900  2012
Illinois Shared Learning Environment

What is the Shared Learning Collaborative (SLC)?

The first wide-scale, coordinated effort to make technology the disruptive, revolutionary force in education it has been in almost all other industries.

Consortium of Nine States Organized by CCSSO

Funded by the Gates Foundation and Carnegie Corporation

SLC is working to make personalized learning a reality for every U.S. student by improving the **usefulness, variety** and **affordability** of education technology.
Illinois Shared Learning Environment

What will SLC offer Illinois?

A set of technology services that will allow districts to safely and securely provide teachers with the instructional data and tools they need to help make personalized learning a reality for all students.

The SLC is the foundation for the Illinois Shared Learning Environment (ISLE).
Key Challenges Facing Educators

With increasing external pressures and declining resources available, educators find themselves facing a number of challenges in the workplace.

- **Lack of Time**: “Just give us time to do some of the things we don’t have time to do”
- **Limited Opportunity for Collaboration**: “Any time we want to collaborate it’s after school on our own time.”
- **Changing Expectations**: “For new initiatives, you need to get teacher buy-in and involve them in the front line.”
- **Decreasing Resources**: “$80 measly bucks for me to meet with other professionals and they won’t cover it?”
- **Increasing Data Demands**: “It’s frustrating trying to figure out how to take data and do something with it to help students advance.”
- **Limited capacity for personalized learning**: “What’s broken? The idea that ‘one size fits all.’ We aren’t meeting the learning needs of each student.”

ISLE
Create specific needs...

Greater differentiation in instruction to ensure all students demonstrate proficiency regardless of where they start from
Common Core Standards

... and present new opportunities

Common standards provide a foundation for a common platform for delivering content, resources & tools

- States & districts benefit from economies of scale
- Content & application providers can shift from BREADTH to DEPTH
- Teachers & students have simplified access to a world of resources based on their specific needs
Shared Learning Collaborative

Learning Map: The Key to Personalization
So what does this mean for teachers?
Ms. Harrison

175 Students
Ms. Harrison chooses the best option based on John’s prior record to determine his Reading Comprehension. The Recommendation Engine filters by age, effectiveness rating, etc. From multiple sources, such as the LRMI and Data Store, SLC technology sends data to the Recommendation Engine, which recommends an assignment to John. Ms. Harrison rates the assignment, and John’s experience becomes one more useful data point to inform learning for students like him.
The SLC technology collects and enables data from millions of Ms. Harrisons and Johns across districts... states... and most importantly, multi-state.
# Illinois Shared Learning Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLC Technology’s Value for Key Stakeholders</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students</strong></td>
<td><strong>Teachers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Better understand own academic needs</td>
<td>• Clearer understanding of each student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Easily find content that meets their needs</td>
<td>• Easy access to content that is relevant, aligned to standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More personalized support from teachers</td>
<td>• Presentation of information in ways that are useful and actionable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education leadership</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ed tech and content providers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Better visibility of programs &amp; content that work</td>
<td>• Common needs to help go deep, not wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More efficient use of resources</td>
<td>• Decreased integration costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collaboration across LEAs and SEAs</td>
<td>• More robust marketplace that lowers barriers for application developers and publishers of all sizes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Illinois Shared Learning Environment

Early Learning

K12 (Driven by SLC)
- Dashboards, Portals
- Learning Map Tools
- Standards-based content discoverability
- 3rd Party App Ecosystem

K12 (Other)
- Illinois Priority Apps
- Vendor-provided Apps
- District-created Apps

Post Secondary

Work Force

P-20 Alignment Using Longitudinal Data
Illinois Shared Learning Environment

Who is ISLE?

- State Agencies: ISBE, DCEO, ICCB, IBHE
- IlliniCloud
- National Center for Supercomputing Applications at U of I; Illinois Interactive Report Card and NIU; Center for Workforce Development at SIU
- Representatives of small rural school districts, large districts, and Chicago Public Schools
- Regional offices of education/LTCs
- P-20 Council
- Early Learning Council
- Representatives of workforce development interests
Illinois Shared Learning Environment

What comes next?

- **Pilot** in Bloomington (D87) and McLean County (U5) of basic SLC functionality
  - SLC Technology Alpha Release – Now
- **ISLE Focus Groups** and Requirements Development – Fall 2012
- **Expansion** to RttT Districts – Starting in 2013
- **Build ISLE P20** Components – Starting in 2013
- **Statewide** Implementation – 2014-15 and beyond
Thank You!
Illinois State Board of Education Meeting
via video conference
August 16, 2012

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

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

ROLL CALL

Mr. Gery Chico, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 10:12 a.m. Chairman Chico asked Ms. Amanda Elliott to call the roll. Dr. Christopher Koch, State Superintendent of Education, was in attendance in Springfield. A quorum was present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members Present in Springfield</th>
<th>Members Present in Chicago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Andrea Brown</td>
<td>Mr. Gery Chico, Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. David Fields</td>
<td>Dr. Vinni Hall, Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Melinda LaBarre</td>
<td>Mr. Steven Gilford, Vice Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(joined meeting at 10:54 a.m.)</td>
<td>(joined meeting at 10:54 a.m.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members Absent

Mr. James Baumann

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Chairman Chico announced that fellow board member Lanita Koster requested Governor Quinn not reappoint her to the Board. Chairman Chico thanked Ms. Koster for her service to the children of Illinois, her contribution to the Board, and wished her the best.

Superintendent Koch stated that a new organizational chart has been distributed, and welcomed new staff to the board: Amanda Elliott, Board Services Coordinator; Nicki Bazer, General Counsel; Ajay Tungare, Special Assistant, Office of the Superintendent; Mary O’Brian, Director of Assessment (Acting); and, Peter Godard, Chief Performance Officer. Other staff adjustments include: Monique Chism, Assistant Superintendent of Innovation and Improvement; Robert Wolfe, Chief Financial Officer; Susie Morrison, Chief Education Officer; and Matt Vanover, Deputy Superintendent who will now be overseeing the Board Services staff,. Don Evans, Chief Operating Officer and Director of Human Resources and Labor Relations will now also oversee information technology and facility management.

Bridget Murphy, Education Organizer and Adam Little, Parent Leader from the Logan Square Neighborhood Association shared information with the board regarding the Parent Mentor Program.

Jill Gottfred, Policy Manager for the Illinois Network of Charter Schools (INCS) attended the meeting to express INCS’s support for the proposed amendments to Part 650.

Patricia Rivera from Chicago HOPES for Kids thanked the Board for including $1.0 million for homeless education in the Board’s FY 13 budget recommendation. Ms. Rivera requested continued support for homeless education in Illinois and recommended an appropriation level of $3.0 - $10.0 million.

Superintendent Koch recognized and welcomed Jane Quinlan from Regional Office of Education #9 Champaign–Ford Counties and Julie Smith, Deputy Chief of Education for the Governor.

CONSENT AGENDA

Motion:
Dr. Fields moved that the State Board of Education hereby approves the consent agenda, as presented. Dr. Andrea Brown seconded the motion and it passed with a unanimous roll call vote.

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 August 16, 2012, board meeting.

Rules for Initial Review
Part 25 (Certification)

Part 75 (Agricultural Education Program)

Part 140 (Calculation of Excess Cost Under Section 18-3 of the School Code)

Rules for Adoption
Part 475 (Contested Cases and other Formal Hearings) NEW PART

Part 475 (Contested Cases and other Formal Hearings) REPEAL

Part 485 (Appeal Proceedings before the State Teacher Certification Board)

Part 650 (Charter Schools)

Contracts and Grants Over $1 Million
Contract Renewal
Request to amend contract with Franczek Radelet PC
The State Board hereby authorizes the State Superintendent to amend the contract with Franczek Radelet to increase the contract’s amount by $100,000, so that the total amount of the contract shall be $1,099,075. This contract is for representation in the Corey H. litigation.

Request to Extend
Agreement with Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin-SALSA Grant
The State Board hereby authorizes the Agency staff to extend through August 30, 2013, the intergovernmental agreement with the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin (Wisconsin Center for Educational Research) without any increase in the funding amount of $1,918,845. This contract is for the creation of Spanish language development standards of grades PreK-12 and will develop technology mediated assessments for grades K-2, disseminate information on the project and collaborate with other institutions in the research, development, and administration of the assessments.

Approve NASBE Dues for 2013
The State Board of Education authorizes renewal of NASBE membership for 2013, including the middle-ranged professional development account for use by Illinois members.
Statewide Single Audit Report

END OF THE CONSENT AGENDA

APPOINTMENT OF STATE EDUCATOR PREPARATION LICENSURE BOARD MEMBERS

Ms. LaBarre moved that the State Board of Education hereby approves the following recommended appointments to the Illinois State Educator Preparation and Licensure Board:

- Kathleen Valenta  Second Appointment/Term Expires 6-30-15
- Francesco Borull  Second Appointment/Term Expires 6-30-15
- Rebecca Nelson  First Appointment/Term Expires 6-30-15
- Leon Scarlett  First Appointment/Term Expires 6-30-15
- Tammy Knippenberg  First Appointment/Term Expires 6-30-15
- Elysa Pike  First Appointment/Term Expires 6-30-15
- Mark Doan  First Appointment/Term Expires 6-30-15
- Bobbi Mattingly  Appointment/Term Expires 6-30-13
- Julie Harris  Appointment/Term Expires 6-30-14
- Naseem Alibhai  Appointment/Term Expires 6-30-13

Mr. Gilford seconded the motion and it passed with a previous unanimous roll call vote. 6-0

PARENT MENTOR PROGRAM / ILLINOIS COALITION FOR IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE RIGHTS

Dr. Hall moved that the State Board hereby authorizes the State Superintendent to award a grant to the Illinois Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights for an initial period beginning September 1, 2012, through June 30, 2013, with permission given to the State Superintendent to extend expenditure availability of the grant for a period not to exceed 2 years if needed to complete grant activities as provided in Section 5 of the Illinois Grant Funds Recovery Act [30 ILCS 705/5], in the amount of $1,000,000.

Dr. Fields seconded the motion and it passed with a previous unanimous roll call vote. 6-0

SUPERINTENDENT CONTRACT RENEWAL

Moved to Closed Session

BUDGET UPDATE

Chairman Chico stated that he is currently reviewing the Board’s FY 13 budget which includes a $210.0 million General Revenue Fund reduction from FY 12. Chairman Chico indicated a desire to advocate for additional education funding in FY 14.

DISTRICT OVERSIGHT

Superintendent Koch announced that the Independent Authority (IA) in North Chicago has been appointed and will be meeting during the week of August 20.

Dr. Koch reported meetings with the East St. Louis FOP, Senator Clayborne, and district leadership to examine the financial status and essential staff positions needed to continue improvement efforts. According to Dr. Koch, it was difficult to begin the school year given the financial situation of the district.

Dr. Koch informed the Board that he along with Chairman Chico, Nicki Bazer and Renee Vilatte attended a meeting with the Illinois Association of School Boards (IASB) regarding district interventions. The IASB is interested in East St. Louis and North Chicago resuming local elections as soon as possible. Dr. Koch is currently developing criteria for a return to self-governance, and will bring the
Chairman Chico directed members to review the written update from the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) provided by Dr. Proshanta Nandi. The last IBHE meeting was held on August 7, 2012 at Chicago State University, Chicago.

The written update included the IBHE board initiatives, designed to close the educational and prosperity achievement gaps and increase college and career readiness.

The Board’s next meeting will be September 25 at Waubonsee Community College, Sugar Grove.

No report at this time.

Dr. Koch noted that he and Gery Chico have had conversations with the U.S. Department of Education on the Elementary Secondary Education Act (ESEA) waiver status which we have not been granted. Dr. Koch said with the start of the school year he did request to freeze the Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) so districts will not have the higher threshold. This request was approved by the U.S. Department of Education. The only issue now outstanding is the timeline for teacher performance evaluation implementation. We will continue to move ahead with many key components of the waiver request including growth metrics, Explore and Plan and third component of WorkKeys.

Ms. Morrison reported that the Center for School Improvement Request for Sealed Proposals (RFSP) has closed and are being reviewed. Ms. Morrison stated that they will be coming before the board in September with a recommendation to fund an entity for the Center for School Improvement.

Superintendent Koch reminded board members that the Board Retreat will be held in Bloomington on September 19-20.

Chairman Chico announced that board members Andrea Brown, Vinni Hall and David Fields have been reappointed by Governor Quinn to the Illinois State Board of Education.

Dr. Brown attended the Governor's Rural Affairs Council Meeting on July 26, 2012 at Western Illinois University Quad-Cities Campus in Rock Island.

Ms. LaBarre attended the Illinois State Fair with Amanda Elliott on Tuesday, August 14, 2012 to take part in the “Fuel Up to Play 60 Program.” The program encourages children to stay active and make healthy food decisions.

Dr. Hall moved that the Board enter into closed session under the exceptions set forth in the Open Meetings Act of the State of Illinois as follows:

Section c 1 for the purpose of considering the appointment,
employment, compensation, performance or dismissal of an employee;

Section c 11 for the purpose of considering pending or probable litigation against or affecting the Board, and

Section c 21 for the purpose of discussing minutes of meetings lawfully closed under the Open Meetings Act.

Dr. Hall further moved that the Board may invite anyone they wish to have included in this closed session.

Ms. LaBarre seconded the motion and it passed with a unanimous roll call vote.

The Board entered into closed session at 12:05 p.m. and reconvened from closed session at 1:00 p.m.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

Dr. Hall moved that the meeting be adjourned. Mr. Gilford seconded the motion and it passed with a unanimous voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 1:05 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dr. Vinni Hall
Board Secretary

Mr. Gery J. Chico
Chairman
Illinois State Board of Education Meeting  
September 19-20, 2012

To: Illinois State Board of Education

From: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
      Linda Tomlinson, Assistant Superintendent
      Nicki Bazer, General Counsel

(Standards for All Illinois Teachers)

Materials: Recommended Rules

Staff Contacts: Vicki Phillips, Division Administrator

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

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
This agenda item links to Strategic Goal 2, as it addresses the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards that guide programs that prepare highly qualified and effective teachers.

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

Background Information
Part 24, Standards for All Illinois Teachers, is one of five sets of the agency’s administrative rules that establish the framework for the following:

- improvement of teaching and learning;
- foundation for the design of educator preparation programs at colleges and universities;
- criteria for the approval of preparation programs at colleges and universities;
- basis for state licensure tests;
- guidelines for the induction of novice teachers; and
- foundation for ongoing professional development.

Further, the rules define the overall knowledge and skills that teachers must have in their professional roles to ensure that Illinois students meet or exceed the expectations defined by the Illinois Learning Standards.

Part 24 was promulgated in 2002 and amended in 2010 to update its provisions. The revised rules became effective July 26, 2010, and allowed existing educator preparation programs three years (until July 1, 2013) to realign their curricula and instruction to the new standards. Staff now recommend that any applications for new programs submitted on or after February 1, 2013,
provide evidence of this alignment, as well. Further, the Assessment of Professional Teaching (APT) required of candidates for licensure must be based on the standards beginning with test administrations starting September 1, 2014.

Finally, nonsubstantive, technical changes are being made as a result of P.A. 97-607, effective August 26, 2011, which changes the current process of certification to a licensure system.

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

Policy Implications: Please see “Background” above.

Budget Implications: None.

Legislative Action: None needed.

Communication: Please see “Next Steps” below.

**Pros and Cons of Various Actions**

Delaying the implementation of the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards will enable new educator preparation programs ample time to ensure that their curricula and instruction comprehensively and effectively incorporate the new teaching standards. Further, candidates’ exposure in current programs beginning in next year to the new standards should ensure their successful completion of the APT.

If the effective dates currently in the rules are not delayed, new programs will have difficulty showing standards’ alignment and candidates may have insufficient experience with the new standards to pass the APT.

**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:

- Standards for All Teachers (23 Illinois Administrative Code 24),

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.
Section 24.10 Purpose

This Part establishes certain standards that shall apply to the issuance of all Illinois professional educator licenses endorsed in a teaching field initial teaching certificates. The standards set forth in this Part shall apply both to candidates for licensure certification and to the programs that prepare them. That is:

- approval of any preparation program or course of study in any teaching field pursuant to the State Board’s rules for Licensure Certification (23 Ill. Adm. Code 25, Subpart C) shall be based on the congruence of that program’s or course’s content with the applicable standards identified in this Part; and

- the examinations required for issuance of a professional educator license under Article 21B of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/21B] an initial teaching certificate shall be based on the applicable standards set forth in this Part.

(Source: Amended at 36 Ill. Reg. ______, effective ____________)

AUTHORITY: Implementing Articles 21 and 21B and authorized by Section 2-3.6 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/Art. 21 and 21B and 2-3.6].

Section 24.100 The Illinois Professional Teaching Standards Through June 30, 2013

Beginning July 1, 2013, the provisions of this Section are replaced by Section 24.130 of this Part as the minimum requirements both for the approval of any teacher preparation program or course of study in any teaching field pursuant to the State Board’s rules for Licensure Certification (23 Ill. Adm. Code 25.Subpart C) and the basis of the examinations required for issuance of a professional educator license endorsed in a teaching field or an initial teaching certificate. Further limitations on institutions submitting applications for approval of new teacher preparation programs or courses of study are described in Section 24.130 of this Part.

   a) Content Knowledge - The competent teacher understands the central concepts, methods of inquiry, and structures of disciplines and creates learning experiences that make the content meaningful to all students.

   1) Knowledge Indicators – The competent teacher:

      A) Understands major concepts, assumptions, debates, principles, and theories that are central to the disciplines in which licensure certification is sought.

      B) Understands the processes of inquiry central to the discipline.

      C) Understands how students’ conceptual frameworks and their misconceptions for an area of knowledge can influence their learning.

      D) Understands the relationship of knowledge within the discipline to other content areas and to life and career applications.

      E) Understands how a student’s disability affects processes of inquiry and influences patterns of learning.

   2) Performance Indicators – The competent teacher:

      A) Evaluates teaching resources and curriculum materials for their comprehensiveness, accuracy, and usefulness for representing particular ideas and concepts.
B) Uses differing viewpoints, theories, “ways of knowing” and methods of inquiry in teaching subject matter concepts.

C) Engages students in generating and testing knowledge according to the process of inquiry and standards of evidence of the discipline.

D) Designs learning experiences to promote student skills in the use of technologies appropriate to the discipline.

E) Anticipates and adjusts for common misunderstandings of the disciplines that impede learning.

F) Uses a variety of explanations and multiple representations of concepts that capture key ideas to help students develop conceptual understanding.

G) Facilitates learning experiences that make connections to other content areas and to life and career experiences.

H) Designs learning experiences and utilizes adaptive devices/technology to provide access to general curricular content to individuals with disabilities.

b) Human Development and Learning – The competent teacher understands how individuals grow, develop, and learn and provides learning opportunities that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of all students.

1) Knowledge Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) Understands how students construct knowledge, acquire skills, and develop habits of mind.

B) Understands that students’ physical, social, emotional, ethical, and cognitive development influences learning.

C) Understands human development, learning theory, neural science, and the ranges of individual variation within each domain.

D) Understands that differences in approaches to learning and performance interact with development.
E) Understands how to include student development factors when making instructional decisions.

F) Knows the impact of cognitive, emotional, physical, and sensory disabilities on learning and communication processes.

2) Performance Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) Analyzes individual and group performance in order to design instruction that meets learners’ current needs in the cognitive, social, emotional, ethical, and physical domains at the appropriate level of development.

B) Stimulates student reflection on prior knowledge and links new ideas to already familiar ideas and experiences.

C) Introduces concepts and principles at different levels of complexity so that they are meaningful to students at varying levels of development and to students with diverse learning needs.

c) Diversity – The competent teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

1) Knowledge Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) Understands the areas of exceptionality in learning as defined in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and the State Board’s rules for Special Education (23 Ill. Adm. Code 226).

B) Understands the process of second language acquisition and strategies to support the learning of students whose first language is not English.

C) Understands how students’ learning is influenced by individual experiences, talents, and prior learning, as well as language, culture, family, and community values.
D) Understands and identifies differences in approaches to learning and performance, including different learning styles, multiple intelligences, and performance modes.

E) Understands cultural and community diversity through a well-grounded framework and understands how to learn about and incorporate students’ experiences, cultures, and community resources into instruction.

F) Understands personal cultural perspectives and biases and their effects on one’s teaching.

2) Performance Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) Facilitates a learning community in which individual differences are respected.

B) Makes appropriate provisions (in terms of time and circumstances for work, tasks assigned, communication, and response modes) for individual students who have particular learning differences or needs.

C) Uses information about students’ families, cultures, and communities as a basis for connecting instruction to students’ experiences.

D) Uses cultural diversity and individual student experiences to enrich instruction.

E) Uses a wide range of instructional strategies and technologies to meet and enhance diverse student needs.

F) Identifies and designs instruction appropriate to students’ stages of development, learning styles, strengths and needs.

G) Identifies when and how to develop and implement strategies and interventions within the classroom and how to access appropriate services or resources to assist students with exceptional learning needs.
H) Demonstrates positive regard for individual students and their families regardless of culture, religion, gender, sexual orientation, and varying abilities.

d) Planning for Instruction – The competent teacher understands instructional planning and designs instruction based upon knowledge of the discipline, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

1) Knowledge Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) Understands the Illinois Learning Standards, curriculum development, content, learning theory, and student development and knows how to incorporate this knowledge in planning instruction.

B) Understands how to develop short- and long-range plans consistent with curriculum goals, learner diversity, and learning theory.

C) Understands how to take the contextual considerations of instructional materials, individual students’ interests, and career needs into account in planning instruction that creates an effective bridge between students’ experiences and career and educational goals.

D) Understands when and how to adjust plans based on students’ responses and other contingencies.

E) Understands how to integrate technology into classroom instruction.

F) Understands how to review and evaluate educational technologies to determine instructional value.

G) Understands how to use various technological tools to access and manage information.

H) Understands the uses of technology to address students’ needs.

2) Performance Indicators – The competent teacher:
A) Establishes expectations for students’ learning.

B) Applies principles of scope and sequence when planning curriculum and instruction.

C) Creates short-range and long-term plans to achieve the expectations for students’ learning.

D) Creates and selects learning materials and learning experiences appropriate for the discipline and curriculum goals, relevant to the students, and based on students’ prior knowledge and principles of effective instruction.

E) Creates multiple learning activities that allow for variation in students’ learning styles and performance modes.

F) Incorporates experiences into instructional practices that relate to the students’ current life experiences and to future career and work experiences.

G) Creates approaches to learning that are interdisciplinary and that integrate multiple content areas.

H) Develops plans based on students’ responses and provides for different pathways based on students’ needs.

I) Uses teaching resources and materials which have been evaluated for accuracy and usefulness.

J) Accesses and uses a wide range of information and instructional technologies to enhance students’ learning.

K) Uses individualized education program (IEP) goals and objectives to plan instruction for students with disabilities.

e) Learning Environment – The competent teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.
1) Knowledge Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) Understands principles of and strategies for effective classroom management.

B) Understands how individuals influence groups and how groups function in society.

C) Understands how to help students work cooperatively and productively in groups.

D) Understands factors that influence motivation and engagement and how to help students become self-motivated.

E) Knows procedures for inventorying the instructional environment to determine when and how best to meet a student’s individual needs.

F) Knows applicable statutes, rules and regulations, procedural safeguards, and ethical considerations regarding planning and implementing behavioral change programs for individuals with disabilities.

G) Knows strategies for intervening in situations to prevent crises from developing or escalating.

H) Knows environmental arrangements that promote positive behavior and learning for students with diverse learning characteristics.

2) Performance Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) Maintains proper classroom decorum.

B) Maximizes the amount of class time spent in learning by creating expectations and processes for communication and behavior along with a physical setting conducive to achieving classroom goals.

C) Uses strategies to create a smoothly functioning learning community in which students assume responsibility for themselves and one another, participate in decision-making, work
collaboratively and independently, use appropriate technology, and engage in purposeful learning activities.

D) Analyzes the classroom environment and makes decisions to enhance social relationships, students’ motivation and engagement in productive work through mutual respect, cooperation, and support for one another.

E) Organizes, allocates, and manages time, materials, and physical space to provide active and equitable engagement of students in productive tasks.

F) Engages students in and monitors individual and group learning activities that help them develop the motivation to achieve.

G) Demonstrates a variety of effective behavior management techniques appropriate to the needs of all students, including those with disabilities (including implementing the least intrusive intervention consistent with the needs of these students).

H) Modifies the learning environment (including the schedule and physical arrangement) to facilitate appropriate behaviors and learning for students with diverse learning characteristics.

I) Uses a variety of approaches to promote social interaction between students with disabilities and students without disabilities.

J) Uses effective methods for teaching social skill development in all students.

Instructional Delivery – The competent teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students’ development of critical thinking, problem-solving, and performance skills.

1) Knowledge Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) Understands the cognitive processes associated with various kinds of learning and how these processes can be stimulated.
B) Understands principles and techniques, along with advantages and limitations, associated with various instructional strategies.

C) Knows how to enhance learning through the use of a wide variety of materials as well as human and technological resources.

D) Understands the disciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches to learning and how they relate to life and career experiences.

E) Knows techniques for modifying instructional methods, materials, and the environment to facilitate learning for students with disabilities and/or diverse learning characteristics.

2) Performance Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) Evaluates how to achieve learning goals, choosing alternative teaching strategies and materials to achieve different instructional purposes and to meet students’ needs.

B) Uses multiple teaching and learning strategies to engage students in active learning opportunities that promote the development of critical thinking, problem-solving, and performance capabilities and that help students assume responsibility for identifying and using learning resources.

C) Monitors and adjusts strategies in response to learners’ feedback.

D) Varies his or her role in the instructional process as instructor, facilitator, coach, or audience in relation to the content and purposes of instruction and the needs of students.

E) Develops a variety of clear, accurate presentations and representations of concepts, using alternative explanations to assist students’ understanding and presenting diverse perspectives to encourage critical thinking.

F) Uses a wide range of instructional technologies to enhance students’ learning.
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G) Develops curriculum that demonstrates an interconnection between subject areas that will reflect life and career experiences.

H) Uses strategies and techniques for facilitating meaningful inclusion of individuals with disabilities.

I) Uses technology appropriately to accomplish instructional objectives.

J) Adapts the general curriculum and uses instructional strategies and materials according to characteristics of the learner.

K) Implements and evaluates individual learning objectives.

g) Communication – The competent teacher uses knowledge of effective written, verbal, non-verbal, and visual communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

1) Knowledge Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) Understands communication theory, language development, and the role of language in learning.

B) Understands how cultural and gender differences can affect communication in the classroom.

C) Understands the social, intellectual, and political implications of language use and how they influence meaning.

D) Understands the importance of audience and purpose when selecting ways to communicate ideas.

2) Performance Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) Models accurate, effective communication when conveying ideas and information and when asking questions and responding to students.

B) Uses effective questioning techniques and stimulates discussion in different ways for specific instructional purposes.
C) Creates varied opportunities for all students to use effective written, verbal, non-verbal, and visual communication.

D) Communicates with and challenges students in a supportive manner and provides students with constructive feedback.

E) Uses a variety of communication modes to effectively communicate with a diverse student population.

F) Practices effective listening, conflict resolution, and group-facilitation skills as a team member.

G) Communicates using a variety of communication tools to enrich learning opportunities.

h) Assessment – The competent teacher understands various formal and informal assessment strategies and uses them to support the continuous development of all students.

1) Knowledge Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) Understands assessment as a means of evaluating how students learn, what they know and are able to do in meeting the Illinois Learning Standards, and what kinds of experiences will support their further growth and development.

B) Understands the purposes, characteristics, and limitations of different kinds of assessments.

C) Understands measurement theory and assessment-related issues such as validity, reliability, bias, and scoring.

D) Understands how to use the results of assessment to reflect on and modify teaching.

E) Understands how to select, construct, and use assessment strategies and instruments for diagnosis and evaluation of learning and instruction.
F) Knows legal provisions, regulations, and guidelines regarding assessment (and inclusion in statewide assessments) of individuals with disabilities.

G) Knows methods for monitoring progress of individuals with disabilities.

H) Knows strategies that consider the influence of diversity and disability on assessment, eligibility, programming, and placement of students with disabilities.

2) Performance Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) Uses assessment results to diagnose students’ learning needs, align and modify instruction, and design teaching strategies.

B) Appropriately uses a variety of formal and informal assessments to evaluate the understanding, progress, and performance of the individual student and the class as a whole.

C) Involves students in self-assessment activities to help them become aware of their strengths and needs and encourages them to establish goals for learning.

D) Maintains useful and accurate records of students’ work and performance and communicates students’ progress knowledgeably and responsibly to students, parents, and colleagues.

E) Uses appropriate technologies to monitor and assess students’ progress.

F) Collaborates with families and other professionals involved in the assessment of individuals with disabilities.

G) Uses various types of assessment procedures appropriately, including the adaptation of procedures for individual students in specific contexts.

H) Uses technology appropriately in conducting assessments and interpreting results.
I) Uses assessment strategies and devices which are nondiscriminatory and take into consideration the impact of disabilities, methods of communication, cultural background, and primary language on measuring knowledge and performance of students.

i) Collaborative Relationships – The competent teacher understands the role of the community in education and develops and maintains collaborative relationships with colleagues, parents/guardians, and the community to support students’ learning and well-being.

1) Knowledge Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) Understands schools as organizations within the larger community context.

B) Understands the benefits, barriers, and techniques involved in parent/family relationships.

C) Understands school- and work-based learning environments and the need for collaboration with business organizations in the community.

D) Understands the collaborative process.

E) Understands collaborative skills which are necessary to carry out the collaborative process.

F) Understands concerns of parents of individuals with disabilities and knows appropriate strategies to collaborate with parents in addressing these concerns.

G) Understands roles of individuals with disabilities, parents, teachers, and other school and community personnel in planning individualized education programs for students with disabilities.

2) Performance Indicators – The competent teacher:
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A) Initiates collaboration with others and creates situations where collaboration with others will enhance students’ learning.

B) Works with colleagues to develop an effective learning climate within the school.

C) Participates in collaborative decision-making and problem-solving with other professionals to achieve success for students.

D) Develops relationships with parents and guardians to acquire an understanding of the students’ lives outside of the school in a professional manner that is fair and equitable.

E) Works effectively with parents/guardians and other members of the community from diverse home and community situations and seeks to develop cooperative partnerships in order to promote students’ learning and well-being.

F) Identifies and uses community resources to enhance students’ learning and to provide opportunities for students to explore career opportunities.

G) Collaborates in the development of comprehensive individualized education programs for students with disabilities.

H) Coordinates and/or collaborates in directing the activities of a classroom para-educator, volunteer, or peer tutor.

I) Collaborates with the student and family in setting instructional goals and charting progress of students with disabilities.

J) Communicates with team members about characteristics and needs of individuals with specific disabilities.

K) Implements and monitors individual students’ programs, working in collaboration with team members.

L) Demonstrates the ability to co-teach and co-plan.
Reflection and Professional Growth – The competent teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates how choices and actions affect students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community and actively seeks opportunities to grow professionally.

1) Knowledge Indicators – The competent teacher:
   
   A) Understands that reflection is an integral part of professional growth and improvement of instruction.

   B) Understands methods of inquiry that provide for a variety of self-assessment and problem-solving strategies for reflecting on practice.

   C) Understands major areas of research on the learning process and resources that are available for professional development.

   D) Understands teachers’ attitudes and behaviors that positively or negatively influence behavior of individuals with disabilities.

2) Performance Indicators – The competent teacher:

   A) Uses classroom observation, information about students, pedagogical knowledge, and research as sources for active reflection, evaluation, and revision of practice.

   B) Collaborates with other professionals as resources for problem-solving, generating new ideas, sharing experiences, and seeking and giving feedback.

   C) Participates in professional dialogue and continuous learning to support his/her own development as a learner and a teacher.

   D) Actively seeks and collaboratively shares a variety of instructional resources with colleagues.

   E) Assesses his or her own needs for knowledge and skills related to teaching students with disabilities and seeks assistance and resources.
k) Professional Conduct and Leadership – The competent teacher understands education as a profession, maintains standards of professional conduct, and provides leadership to improve students’ learning and well-being.

1) Knowledge Indicators – The competent teacher:
   
   A) Understands the unique characteristics of education as a profession.
   
   B) Understands how school systems are organized and operate.
   
   C) Understands school policies and procedures.
   
   D) Understands legal issues in education.
   
   E) Understands the importance of active participation and leadership in professional organizations.
   
   F) Is familiar with the rights of students with disabilities.
   
   G) Knows the roles and responsibilities of teachers, parents, students, and other professionals related to special education.
   
   H) Knows identification and referral procedures for students with disabilities.

2) Performance Indicators – The competent teacher:

   A) Contributes knowledge and expertise about teaching and learning to the profession.
   
   B) Follows codes of professional conduct and exhibits knowledge and expectations of current legal directives.
   
   C) Follows school policy and procedures, respecting the boundaries of professional responsibilities, when working with students, colleagues, and families.
   
   D) Initiates and develops educational projects and programs.
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E) Actively participates in or leads in such activities as curriculum development, staff development, and student organizations.

F) Participates, as appropriate, in policy design and development at the local level, with professional organizations, and/or with community organizations.

G) Demonstrates commitment to developing the highest educational and quality-of-life potential of individuals with disabilities.

H) Demonstrates positive regard for individual students and their families regardless of culture, religion, gender, and sexual orientation.

I) Promotes and maintains a high level of integrity in the practice of the profession.

J) Complies with local, State, and federal monitoring and evaluation requirements related to students with disabilities.

K) Complies with local, State, and federal regulations and policies related to students with disabilities.

L) Uses a variety of instructional and intervention strategies prior to initiating a referral of a student for special education.

(Source: Amended at 36 Ill. Reg. _______, effective ____________)

Section 24.110 Language Arts Standards for All Illinois Teachers Through June 30, 2013

Beginning July 1, 2013, the provisions of this Section are replaced by Section 24.130 of this Part as the minimum requirements both for the approval of any teacher preparation program or course of study in any teaching field pursuant to the State Board’s rules for Licensure Certification (23 Ill. Adm. Code 25.Subpart C) and the basis of the examinations required for issuance of a professional educator license endorsed in a teaching field or an initial teaching certificate. Further limitations on institutions submitting applications for approval of new teacher preparation programs or courses of study are described in Section 24.130 of this Part.

a) All teachers must know a broad range of literacy techniques and strategies for every aspect of communication and must be able to develop each student’s ability
to read, write, speak, and listen to his or her potential within the demands of the discipline.

1) Knowledge Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) Understands and can articulate the needs for literacy development in general and in specific disciplines or at specific grade levels.

B) Understands effective literacy techniques to activate prior student knowledge and build schema to enhance comprehension of “text”.

C) Knows strategies and techniques for teaching communication skills to those students whose first language is not English.

2) Performance Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) Practices effectively the language processes of reading, writing, and oral communication in the daily classroom exchange between student and teacher, between student and student, between teacher and “text,” and between student and “text”.

B) Practices effective literacy techniques to make reading purposeful and meaningful.

C) Practices effective questioning and discussion techniques to extend content knowledge acquired from “text”.

D) Uses a variety of “text” and research resources with students in an attempt to enhance students’ learning from reading, learning from writing, and learning from oral communication.

b) All teachers should model effective reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills during their direct and indirect instructional activities. The most important communicator in the classroom is the teacher, who should model English language arts skills.

1) Knowledge Indicators – The competent teacher:
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A) Knows and understands the rules of English grammar, spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and syntax for both written and oral contexts.

B) Understands how to communicate ideas in writing to accomplish a variety of purposes.

2) Performance Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) Models the rules of English grammar, spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and syntax in both written and oral contexts.

B) Reads, understands, and clearly conveys ideas from texts or other supplementary materials.

C) Writes and speaks in a well-organized and coherent manner that adapts to the individual needs of readers/listeners.

D) Expresses ideas orally with explanations, examples, and support in a clear, succinct style.

E) Helps students understand a variety of modes of writing (persuasive, descriptive, informative, and narrative).

F) Listens well.

c) All teachers should give constructive instruction and feedback to students in both written and oral contexts while being aware of diverse learners’ needs. Teachers should effectively provide a variety of instructional strategies, constructive feedback, criticism, and improvement strategies.

1) Knowledge Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) Understands how to analyze an audience to determine culturally appropriate communication strategies to share ideas effectively in both written and oral formats with students and their families, other faculty and administrators, and the community and business in general.
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B) Understands how to use diverse instructional strategies and assessments that include an appropriate balance of lecture, discussion, activity, and written and oral work.

2) Performance Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) Analyzes content materials to determine appropriate strategies and techniques to create successful learning through reading, writing, speaking, and listening.

B) Assists students whose communication skills may be impeded by learning, language, and/or cultural differences, especially those whose first language is not English.

C) Conducts effective classroom discussions by managing groups, asking questions, eliciting and probing responses, and summarizing for comprehension.

D) Uses a variety of media to enhance and supplement instruction.

E) Uses multi-disciplinary instructional approaches.

(Source: Amended at 36 Ill. Reg. ______, effective ____________)

Section 24.120 Technology Standards for All Illinois Teachers Through June 30, 2013

Beginning July 1, 2013, the provisions of this Section are replaced by Section 24.130 of this Part as the minimum requirements both for the approval of any teacher preparation program or course of study in any teaching field pursuant to the State Board’s rules for Licensure Certification (23 Ill. Adm. Code 25.Subpart C) and the basis of the examinations required for issuance of a professional educator license endorsed in a teaching field an initial teaching certificate. Further limitations on institutions submitting applications for approval of new teacher preparation programs or courses of study are described in Section 24.130 of this Part.

a) The competent teacher will have, and continually develop, the knowledge and skills in learning technologies to be able to appropriately and responsibly use tools, resources, processes, and systems to retrieve, assess, and evaluate information from various media. The competent teacher will use that knowledge, along with the necessary skills and information, to assist Illinois learners in solving problems, in communicating clearly, in making informed decisions, and
in constructing new knowledge, products, or systems in diverse, engaged learning environments.

b) Basic Computer/Technology Operations and Concepts – The competent teacher will use computer systems to run software; to access, generate, and manipulate data; and to publish results. He or she will also evaluate performance of hardware and software components of computer systems and apply basic trouble-shooting strategies as needed.

1) Knowledge Indicator – The competent teacher understands how to run computer software; access, generate, and manipulate data; and publish results.

2) Performance Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) Operates a multi-media computer system with related peripheral devices to successfully install and use a variety of software packages.

B) Uses appropriate terminology related to computers and technology in written and oral communications.

C) Describes and implements basic trouble-shooting techniques for multi-media computer systems with related peripheral devices.

D) Uses imaging devices such as scanners, digital cameras, and/or video cameras with computer systems and software.

E) Demonstrates knowledge of uses of computers and technology in education, business and industry, and society.

c) Personal and Professional Use of Technology – The competent teacher will apply tools for enhancing personal professional growth and productivity; will use technology in communicating, collaborating, conducting research, and solving problems and will promote equitable, ethical, and legal use of computer/technology resources.

1) Knowledge Indicator – The competent teacher understands how to use technology in communicating, collaborating, conducting research, and solving problems.
2) Performance Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) Identifies computer and other related technology resources for facilitating life-long learning and emerging roles of the learner and the educator in engaged, collaborative learning environments.

B) Uses computers and other learning technologies to support problem-solving, data collection, information management, communications, presentations, and decision-making.

C) Uses productivity tools for word processing, database management, and spreadsheet applications, and basic multi-media presentations.

D) Uses computer-based technologies including telecommunications to access information and enhance personal and professional productivity.

E) Demonstrates awareness of resources for adaptive/assistive devices for students with special needs.

F) Demonstrates knowledge of ethical and legal issues concerning use of computers and technology.

G) Adheres to copyright laws and guidelines in the access and use of information from various technologies.

H) Demonstrates knowledge of broadcast instruction, audio/video conferencing, and other distant learning applications.

I) Ensures policies and practices are in place to provide equal access to media and technology resources for students regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, religion, or socio-economic status.

d) Application of Technology in Instruction – The competent teacher will apply learning technologies that support instruction in his or her grade level and subject areas. He or she must plan and deliver instructional units that integrate a variety of software, applications, and learning tools. Lessons developed must reflect effective grouping and assessment strategies for diverse populations.
1) Knowledge Indicator – The competent teacher understands how to apply learning technologies that support instruction in his or her grade level and subject areas.

2) Performance Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) Explores, evaluates, and uses computer/technology resources, including applications, tools, educational software, and associated documentation.

B) Describes current instructional principles, research, and appropriate assessment practices as related to the use of computers and technology resources in the curriculum.

C) Designs, implements, and assesses student learning activities that integrate computers/technology for a variety of student grouping strategies and for diverse student populations.

D) Practices socially responsible, ethical, and legal use of technology, information, and software resources.

E) Designs student learning activities that foster equitable, ethical, and legal use of technology by students.

e) Social, Ethical, and Human Issues – The competent teacher will apply concepts and skills in making decisions concerning the social, ethical, and human issues related to computing and technology. The competent teacher will understand the changes in information technologies, their effects on workplace and society, their potential to address life-long learning and workplace needs, and the consequences of misuse.

1) Knowledge Indicator – The competent teacher understands the social, ethical, and human issues related to computing and technology.

2) Performance Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) Describes the historical development and important trends affecting the evolution of technology and its probable future roles in society.
B) Describes strategies for facilitating consideration of ethical, legal, and human issues involving school purchasing and policy decisions.

f) Productivity Tools – The competent teacher will integrate advanced features of technology-based productivity tools to support instruction, extend communication outside the classroom, enhance classroom management, perform administrative routines more effectively, and become more productive in daily tasks.

1) Knowledge Indicator – The competent teacher knows advanced features of technology-based productivity tools.

2) Performance Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) Uses advanced features of word processing, desktop publishing, graphics programs, and utilities to develop professional products.

B) Uses spreadsheets for analyzing, organizing, and displaying numeric data graphically.

C) Designs and manipulates databases and generates customized reports.

D) Uses teacher utility and classroom management tools to design solutions for a specific purpose.

E) Identifies, selects, and integrates video and digital images in varying formats for use in presentations, publications, and/or other products.

F) Applies specific-purpose electronic devices (such as a graphing calculator, language translator, scientific probeware, or electronic thesaurus) in appropriate content areas.

G) Uses features of applications that integrate word processing, database, spreadsheet, communication, and other tools.

g) Telecommunications and Information Access – The competent teacher will use telecommunications and information-access resources to support instruction.
1) Knowledge Indicator – The competent teacher knows how to access telecommunications resources to support instruction.

2) Performance Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) Accesses and uses telecommunications tools and resources for information-sharing, remote information access and retrieval, and multi-media/hypermedia publishing.

B) Uses electronic mail and web browser applications for communications and for research to support instruction.

C) uses automated, on-line search tools and intelligent agents to identify and index desired information resources.

h) Research, Problem Solving, and Product Development – The competent teacher will use computers and other technologies in research, problem solving, and product development. The competent teacher will appropriately use a variety of media, presentation, and authorizing packages; plan and participate in team and collaborative projects that require critical analysis and evaluation; and present products developed.

1) Knowledge Indicator – The competent teacher understands how to use computers and other technologies in research, problem solving, and product development.

2) Performance Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) Identifies basic principles of instructional design associated with the development of multimedia and hypermedia learning materials.

B) Develops simple hypermedia and multimedia products that apply basic instructional design principles.

C) Selects appropriate tools for communicating concepts, conducting research, and solving problems for an intended audience and purpose.
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D) Identifies examples of emerging programming, authoring, or problem solving environments.

E) Collaborates with on-line workgroups to build bodies of knowledge around specific topics.

F) Uses a computer projection device to support and deliver oral presentations.

G) Designs and publishes simple on-line documents that present information and include links to critical resources.

H) Develops instructional units that involve compiling, organizing, analyzing, and synthesizing of information, and uses technology to support these processes.

I) Conducts research and evaluates on-line sources of information that support and enhance the curriculum.

J) Makes use of development readings and other resource materials from professional and trade organizations to improve teaching learning.

K) Participates in courses and other professional development activities to enhance teaching and learning.

i) Information Literacy Skills – The competent teacher will develop information literacy skills to be able to access, evaluate, and use information to improve teaching and learning.

1) Knowledge Indicator – The competent teacher understands how to access, evaluate, and use information to improve teaching and learning.

2) Performance Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) Models evaluation and use of information to solve problems and make decisions.
B) Expects students to intellectually access, evaluate, and use information to solve problems and make decisions in all subject areas.

C) Structures instruction and designs learning tasks and assignments to reflect higher-level thinking skills.

D) Structures and/or facilitates cooperative learning groups as part of students’ tasks and assignments.

(Source: Amended at 36 Ill. Reg. _____, effective ____________)

Section 24.130 The Illinois Professional Teaching Standards Beginning July 1, 2013

No later than July 1, 2013, all approved teacher preparation programs shall submit the course of study for that program with evidence that the program’s or course’s content is congruent with the standards identified in this Section. An application for approval of a new preparation program or course of study submitted on or after February 1, 2013 November 1, 2010, shall provide evidence of congruence with the standards identified in this Section. No later than September 1, 2014 September 1, 2013, the assessment of professional teaching (APT) required for the issuance of a professional educator license endorsed in an initial teaching field certificate under 23 Ill. Adm. Code 25.720 (Applicability of Testing Requirements and Scores Certification) shall be based on the standards set forth in this Section.

a) Teaching Diverse Students – The competent teacher understands the diverse characteristics and abilities of each student and how individuals develop and learn within the context of their social, economic, cultural, linguistic, and academic experiences. The teacher uses these experiences to create instructional opportunities that maximize student learning.

1) Knowledge Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) understands the spectrum of student diversity (e.g., race and ethnicity, socioeconomic status, special education, gifted, English language learners (ELL), sexual orientation, gender, gender identity) and the assets that each student brings to learning across the curriculum;
B) understands how each student constructs knowledge, acquires skills, and develops effective and efficient critical thinking and problem-solving capabilities;

C) understands how teaching and student learning are influenced by development (physical, social and emotional, cognitive, linguistic), past experiences, talents, prior knowledge, economic circumstances and diversity within the community;

D) understands the impact of cognitive, emotional, physical, and sensory disabilities on learning and communication pursuant to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (also referred to as “IDEA”) (20 USC 1400 et seq.), its implementing regulations (34 CFR 300; 2006), Article 14 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/Art.14] and 23 Ill. Adm. Code 226 (Special Education);

E) understands the impact of linguistic and cultural diversity on learning and communication;

F) understands his or her personal perspectives and biases and their effects on one’s teaching; and

G) understands how to identify individual needs and how to locate and access technology, services, and resources to address those needs.

2) Performance Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) analyzes and uses student information to design instruction that meets the diverse needs of students and leads to ongoing growth and achievement;

B) stimulates prior knowledge and links new ideas to already familiar ideas and experiences;

C) differentiates strategies, materials, pace, levels of complexity, and language to introduce concepts and principles so that they are meaningful to students at varying levels of development and to students with diverse learning needs;
D) facilitates a learning community in which individual differences are respected; and

E) uses information about students’ individual experiences, families, cultures, and communities to create meaningful learning opportunities and enrich instruction for all students.

b) Content Area and Pedagogical Knowledge – The competent teacher has in-depth understanding of content area knowledge that includes central concepts, methods of inquiry, structures of the disciplines, and content area literacy. The teacher creates meaningful learning experiences for each student based upon interactions among content area and pedagogical knowledge, and evidence-based practice.

1) Knowledge Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) understands theories and philosophies of learning and human development as they relate to the range of students in the classroom;

B) understands major concepts, assumptions, debates, and principles; processes of inquiry; and theories that are central to the disciplines;

C) understands the cognitive processes associated with various kinds of learning (e.g., critical and creative thinking, problem-structuring and problem-solving, invention, memorization, and recall) and ensures attention to these learning processes so that students can master content standards;

D) understands the relationship of knowledge within the disciplines to other content areas and to life applications;

E) understands how diverse student characteristics and abilities affect processes of inquiry and influence patterns of learning;

F) knows how to access the tools and knowledge related to latest findings (e.g., research, practice, methodologies) and technologies in the disciplines;
G) understands the theory behind and the process for providing support to promote learning when concepts and skills are first being introduced; and

H) understands the relationship among language acquisition (first and second), literacy development, and acquisition of academic content and skills.

2) Performance Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) evaluates teaching resources and materials for appropriateness as related to curricular content and each student’s needs;

B) uses differing viewpoints, theories, and methods of inquiry in teaching subject matter concepts;

C) engages students in the processes of critical thinking and inquiry and addresses standards of evidence of the disciplines;

D) demonstrates fluency in technology systems, uses technology to support instruction and enhance student learning, and designs learning experiences to develop student skills in the application of technology appropriate to the disciplines;

E) uses a variety of explanations and multiple representations of concepts that capture key ideas to help each student develop conceptual understanding and address common misunderstandings;

F) facilitates learning experiences that make connections to other content areas and to life experiences;

G) designs learning experiences and utilizes assistive technology and digital tools to provide access to general curricular content to individuals with disabilities;

H) adjusts practice to meet the needs of each student in the content areas; and

I) applies and adapts an array of content area literacy strategies to make all subject matter accessible to each student.
c) Planning for Differentiated Instruction – The competent teacher plans and designs instruction based on content area knowledge, diverse student characteristics, student performance data, curriculum goals, and the community context. The teacher plans for ongoing student growth and achievement.

1) Knowledge Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) understands the Illinois Learning Standards (23 Ill. Adm. Code 1. Appendix D), curriculum development process, content, learning theory, assessment, and student development and knows how to incorporate this knowledge in planning differentiated instruction;

B) understands how to develop short- and long-range plans, including transition plans, consistent with curriculum goals, student diversity, and learning theory;

C) understands cultural, linguistic, cognitive, physical, and social and emotional differences, and considers the needs of each student when planning instruction;

D) understands when and how to adjust plans based on outcome data, as well as student needs, goals, and responses;

E) understands the appropriate role of technology, including assistive technology, to address student needs, as well as how to incorporate contemporary tools and resources to maximize student learning;

F) understands how to co-plan with other classroom teachers, parents or guardians, paraprofessionals, school specialists, and community representatives to design learning experiences; and

G) understands how research and data guide instructional planning, delivery, and adaptation.

2) Performance Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) establishes high expectations for each student’s learning and behavior;
B) creates short-term and long-term plans to achieve the expectations for student learning;

C) uses data to plan for differentiated instruction to allow for variations in individual learning needs;

D) incorporates experiences into instructional practices that relate to a student’s current life experiences and to future life experiences;

E) creates approaches to learning that are interdisciplinary and that integrate multiple content areas;

F) develops plans based on student responses and provides for different pathways based on student needs;

G) accesses and uses a wide range of information and instructional technologies to enhance a student’s ongoing growth and achievement;

H) when planning instruction, addresses goals and objectives contained in plans developed under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 USC 794), individualized education programs (IEP) (see 23 Ill. Adm. Code 226 (Special Education)) or individual family service plans (IFSP) (see 23 Ill. Adm. Code 226 and 34 CFR 300.24; 2006);

I) works with others to adapt and modify instruction to meet individual student needs; and

J) develops or selects relevant instructional content, materials, resources, and strategies (e.g., project-based learning) for differentiating instruction.

d) Learning Environment – The competent teacher structures a safe and healthy learning environment that facilitates cultural and linguistic responsiveness, emotional well-being, self-efficacy, positive social interaction, mutual respect, active engagement, academic risk-taking, self-motivation, and personal goal-setting.

1) Knowledge Indicators – The competent teacher:
A) understands principles of and strategies for effective classroom and behavior management;

B) understands how individuals influence groups and how groups function in society;

C) understands how to help students work cooperatively and productively in groups;

D) understands factors (e.g., self-efficacy, positive social interaction) that influence motivation and engagement;

E) knows how to assess the instructional environment to determine how best to meet a student’s individual needs;

F) understands laws, rules, and ethical considerations regarding behavior intervention planning and behavior management (e.g., bullying, crisis intervention, physical restraint);

G) knows strategies to implement behavior management and behavior intervention planning to ensure a safe and productive learning environment; and

H) understands the use of student data (formative and summative) to design and implement behavior management strategies.

2) Performance Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) creates a safe and healthy environment that maximizes student learning;

B) creates clear expectations and procedures for communication and behavior and a physical setting conducive to achieving classroom goals;

C) uses strategies to create a smoothly functioning learning community in which students assume responsibility for themselves and one another, participate in decision-making, work
collaboratively and independently, use appropriate technology, and engage in purposeful learning activities;

D) analyzes the classroom environment and makes decisions to enhance cultural and linguistic responsiveness, mutual respect, positive social relationships, student motivation, and classroom engagement;

E) organizes, allocates, and manages time, materials, technology, and physical space to provide active and equitable engagement of students in productive learning activities;

F) engages students in and monitors individual and group-learning activities that help them develop the motivation to learn;

G) uses a variety of effective behavioral management techniques appropriate to the needs of all students that include positive behavior interventions and supports;

H) modifies the learning environment (including the schedule and physical arrangement) to facilitate appropriate behaviors and learning for students with diverse learning characteristics; and

I) analyzes student behavior data to develop and support positive behavior.

e) Instructional Delivery – The competent teacher differentiates instruction by using a variety of strategies that support critical and creative thinking, problem-solving, and continuous growth and learning. This teacher understands that the classroom is a dynamic environment requiring ongoing modification of instruction to enhance learning for each student.

1) Knowledge Indicators – The competent teacher:

   A) understands the cognitive processes associated with various kinds of learning;

   B) understands principles and techniques, along with advantages and limitations, associated with a wide range of evidence-based instructional practices;
C) knows how to implement effective differentiated instruction through the use of a wide variety of materials, technologies, and resources;

D) understands disciplinary and interdisciplinary instructional approaches and how they relate to life and career experiences;

E) knows techniques for modifying instructional methods, materials, and the environment to facilitate learning for students with diverse learning characteristics;

F) knows strategies to maximize student attentiveness and engagement;

G) knows how to evaluate and use student performance data to adjust instruction while teaching; and

H) understands when and how to adapt or modify instruction based on outcome data, as well as student needs, goals, and responses.

2) Performance Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) uses multiple teaching strategies, including adjusted pacing and flexible grouping, to engage students in active learning opportunities that promote the development of critical and creative thinking, problem-solving, and performance capabilities;

B) monitors and adjusts strategies in response to feedback from the student;

C) varies his or her role in the instructional process as instructor, facilitator, coach, or audience in relation to the content and purposes of instruction and the needs of students;

D) develops a variety of clear, accurate presentations and representations of concepts, using alternative explanations to assist students’ understanding and presenting diverse perspectives to encourage critical and creative thinking;
E) uses strategies and techniques for facilitating meaningful inclusion of individuals with a range of abilities and experiences;

F) uses technology to accomplish differentiated instructional objectives that enhance learning for each student;

G) models and facilitates effective use of current and emerging digital tools to locate, analyze, evaluate, and use information resources to support research and learning;

H) uses student data to adapt the curriculum and implement instructional strategies and materials according to the characteristics of each student;

I) uses effective co-planning and co-teaching techniques to deliver instruction to all students;

J) maximizes instructional time (e.g., minimizes transitional time); and

K) implements appropriate evidence-based instructional strategies.

f) Reading, Writing, and Oral Communication – The competent teacher has foundational knowledge of reading, writing, and oral communication within the content area and recognizes and addresses student reading, writing, and oral communication needs to facilitate the acquisition of content knowledge.

1) Knowledge Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) understands appropriate and varied instructional approaches used before, during, and after reading, including those that develop word knowledge, vocabulary, comprehension, fluency, and strategy use in the content areas;

B) understands that the reading process involves the construction of meaning through the interactions of the reader's background knowledge and experiences, the information in the text, and the purpose of the reading situation;
C) understands communication theory, language development, and the role of language in learning;

D) understands writing processes and their importance to content learning;

E) knows and models standard conventions of written and oral communications;

F) recognizes the relationships among reading, writing, and oral communication and understands how to integrate these components to increase content learning;

G) understands how to design, select, modify, and evaluate a wide range of materials for the content areas and the reading needs of the student;

H) understands how to use a variety of formal and informal assessments to recognize and address the reading, writing, and oral communication needs of each student; and

I) knows appropriate and varied instructional approaches, including those that develop word knowledge, vocabulary, comprehension, fluency, and strategy use in the content areas.

2) Performance Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) selects, modifies, and uses a wide range of printed, visual, or auditory materials, and online resources appropriate to the content areas and the reading needs and levels of each student (including ELLs, and struggling and advanced readers);

B) uses assessment data, student work samples, and observations from continuous monitoring of student progress to plan and evaluate effective content area reading, writing, and oral communication instruction;

C) facilitates the use of appropriate word identification and vocabulary strategies to develop each student’s understanding of content;
D) teaches fluency strategies to facilitate comprehension of content;

E) uses modeling, explanation, practice, and feedback to teach students to monitor and apply comprehension strategies independently, appropriate to the content learning;

F) teaches students to analyze, evaluate, synthesize, and summarize information in single texts and across multiple texts, including electronic resources;

G) teaches students to develop written text appropriate to the content areas that utilizes organization (e.g., compare/contrast, problem/solution), focus, elaboration, word choice, and standard conventions (e.g., punctuation, grammar);

H) integrates reading, writing, and oral communication to engage students in content learning;

I) works with other teachers and support personnel to design, adjust, and modify instruction to meet students’ reading, writing, and oral communication needs; and

J) stimulates discussion in the content areas for varied instructional and conversational purposes.

g) Assessment – The competent teacher understands and uses appropriate formative and summative assessments for determining student needs, monitoring student progress, measuring student growth, and evaluating student outcomes. The teacher makes decisions driven by data about curricular and instructional effectiveness and adjusts practices to meet the needs of each student.

1) Knowledge Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) understands the purposes, characteristics, and limitations of different types of assessments, including standardized assessments, universal screening, curriculum-based assessment, and progress monitoring tools;
B) understands that assessment is a means of evaluating how students learn and what they know and are able to do in order to meet the Illinois Learning Standards;

C) understands measurement theory and assessment-related issues, such as validity, reliability, bias, and appropriate and accurate scoring;

D) understands current terminology and procedures necessary for the appropriate analysis and interpretation of assessment data;

E) understands how to select, construct, and use assessment strategies and instruments for diagnosis and evaluation of learning and instruction;

F) knows research-based assessment strategies appropriate for each student;

G) understands how to make data-driven decisions using assessment results to adjust practices to meet the needs of each student;

H) knows legal provisions, rules, and guidelines regarding assessment and assessment accommodations for all student populations; and

I) knows assessment and progress monitoring techniques to assess the effectiveness of instruction for each student.

2) Performance Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) uses assessment results to determine student performance levels, identify learning targets, select appropriate research-based instructional strategies, and implement instruction to enhance learning outcomes;

B) appropriately uses a variety of formal and informal assessments to evaluate the understanding, progress, and performance of an individual student and the class as a whole;
C) involves students in self-assessment activities to help them become aware of their strengths and needs and encourages them to establish goals for learning;

D) maintains useful and accurate records of student work and performance;

E) accurately interprets and clearly communicates aggregate student performance data to students, parents or guardians, colleagues, and the community in a manner that complies with the requirements of the Illinois School Student Records Act [105 ILCS 10], 23 Ill. Adm. Code 375 (Student Records), the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) (20 USC 1232g) and its implementing regulations (34 CFR 99; December 9, 2008);

F) effectively uses appropriate technologies to conduct assessments, monitor performance, and assess student progress;

G) collaborates with families and other professionals involved in the assessment of each student;

H) uses various types of assessment procedures appropriately, including making accommodations for individual students in specific contexts; and

I) uses assessment strategies and devices that are nondiscriminatory, and take into consideration the impact of disabilities, methods of communication, cultural background, and primary language on measuring knowledge and performance of students.

h) Collaborative Relationships – The competent teacher builds and maintains collaborative relationships to foster cognitive, linguistic, physical, and social and emotional development. This teacher works as a team member with professional colleagues, students, parents or guardians, and community members.

1) Knowledge Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) understands schools as organizations within the larger community context;
B) understands the collaborative process and the skills necessary to initiate and carry out that process;

C) collaborates with others in the use of data to design and implement effective school interventions that benefit all students;

D) understands the benefits, barriers, and techniques involved in parent and family collaborations;

E) understands school- and work-based learning environments and the need for collaboration with all organizations (e.g., businesses, community agencies, nonprofit organizations) to enhance student learning;

F) understands the importance of participating on collaborative and problem-solving teams to create effective academic and behavioral interventions for all students;

G) understands the various models of co-teaching and the procedures for implementing them across the curriculum;

H) understands concerns of families of students with disabilities and knows appropriate strategies to collaborate with students and their families in addressing these concerns; and

I) understands the roles and the importance of including students with disabilities, as appropriate, and all team members in planning individualized education programs (i.e., IEP, IFSP, Section 504 plan) for students with disabilities.

2) Performance Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) works with all school personnel (e.g., support staff, teachers, paraprofessionals) to develop learning climates for the school that encourage unity, support a sense of shared purpose, show trust in one another, and value individuals;

B) participates in collaborative decision-making and problem-solving with colleagues and other professionals to achieve success for all students;
C) initiates collaboration with others to create opportunities that enhance student learning;

D) uses digital tools and resources to promote collaborative interactions;

E) uses effective co-planning and co-teaching techniques to deliver instruction to each student;

F) collaborates with school personnel in the implementation of appropriate assessment and instruction for designated students;

G) develops professional relationships with parents and guardians that result in fair and equitable treatment of each student to support growth and learning;

H) establishes respectful and productive relationships with parents or guardians and seeks to develop cooperative partnerships to promote student learning and well-being;

I) uses conflict resolution skills to enhance the effectiveness of collaboration and teamwork;

J) participates in the design and implementation of individualized instruction for students with special needs (i.e., IEPs, IFSP, transition plans, Section 504 plans), ELLs, and students who are gifted; and

K) identifies and utilizes community resources to enhance student learning and to provide opportunities for students to explore career opportunities.

i) Professionalism, Leadership, and Advocacy – The competent teacher is an ethical and reflective practitioner who exhibits professionalism; provides leadership in the learning community; and advocates for students, parents or guardians, and the profession.

1) Knowledge Indicators – The competent teacher:
A) evaluates best practices and research-based materials against benchmarks within the disciplines;

B) knows laws and rules (e.g., mandatory reporting, sexual misconduct, corporal punishment) as a foundation for the fair and just treatment of all students and their families in the classroom and school;

C) understands emergency response procedures as required under the School Safety Drill Act [105 ILCS 128/1], including school safety and crisis intervention protocol, initial response actions (e.g., whether to stay in or evacuate a building), and first response to medical emergencies (e.g., first aid and life-saving techniques);

D) identifies paths for continuous professional growth and improvement, including the design of a professional growth plan;

E) is cognizant of his or her emerging and developed leadership skills and the applicability of those skills within a variety of learning communities;

F) understands the roles of an advocate, the process of advocacy, and its place in combating or promoting certain school district practices affecting students;

G) understands local and global societal issues and responsibilities in an evolving digital culture; and

H) understands the importance of modeling appropriate dispositions in the classroom.

2) Performance Indicators – The competent teacher:

A) models professional behavior that reflects honesty, integrity, personal responsibility, confidentiality, altruism and respect;

B) maintains accurate records, manages data effectively, and protects the confidentiality of information pertaining to each student and family;
C) reflects on professional practice and resulting outcomes; engages in self-assessment; and adjusts practices to improve student performance, school goals, and professional growth;

D) communicates with families, responds to concerns, and contributes to enhanced family participation in student education;

E) communicates relevant information and ideas effectively to students, parents or guardians, and peers, using a variety of technology and digital-age media and formats;

F) collaborates with other teachers, students, parents or guardians, specialists, administrators, and community partners to enhance students’ learning and school improvement;

G) participates in professional development, professional organizations, and learning communities, and engages in peer coaching and mentoring activities to enhance personal growth and development;

H) uses leadership skills that contribute to individual and collegial growth and development, school improvement, and the advancement of knowledge in the teaching profession;

I) proactively serves all students and their families with equity and honor and advocates on their behalf, ensuring the learning and well-being of each child in the classroom;

J) is aware of and complies with the mandatory reporter provisions of Section 4 of the Abused and Neglected Child Reporting Act [325 ILCS 5/4];

K) models digital etiquette and responsible social actions in the use of digital technology; and

L) models and teaches safe, legal, and ethical use of digital information and technology, including respect for copyright, intellectual property, and the appropriate documentation of sources.
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TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
Linda Tomlinson, Assistant Superintendent
Nicki Bazer, Deputy General Counsel

Agenda Topic: Action Item: Repealer for Adoption: Part 60 (The “Grow Your Own” Teacher Education Initiative)

Materials: Recommended Rules

Staff Contacts: Vicki Phillips, Division Administrator

Purpose of Agenda Item
The purpose of this agenda item is to present the proposed repealer for adoption.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
The proposed repealer does not directly relate to any of the Board’s Strategic Goals since responsibility for the oversight of The “Grow Your Own” Teacher Education Initiative has been transferred to the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE).

Expected Outcome of Agenda Item
The Board will be asked to adopt the repealer to Part 60.

Background Information
P.A. 96-1393, effective July 1, 2010, transferred the authority of The “Grow Your Own” Teacher Education Initiative to IBHE, which now is responsible for rulemaking. Under the legislation, the rules of the State Board of Education remained in force until IBHE could promulgate its own rules to govern the program.

In June, IBHE’s board approved the release of proposed rules for public comment. The repeal of Part 60; therefore, will run parallel to the promulgation of IBHE’s rulemaking, and the repealer will be filed once those new rules are in effect.

The proposed repealer was published July 6, 2012, in the Illinois Register to elicit public comment. None was received, and the version of the rules being presented for adoption is identical to the version the Board reviewed in June.

Analysis and Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action and Communications
Policy Implications: Please see “Background” above.
Budget Implications: None.
Legislative Action: None needed.
Communication: Please see “Next Steps” below.

**Pros and Cons of Various Actions**
IBHE has begun the process to promulgate rules to govern the administration of grants under The “Grow Your Own” Teacher Education Initiative; therefore, Part 60 will no longer be needed.

Continuing to have two sets of rules in effect will be confusing for eligible applicants for and grantees under this program.

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

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

The “Grow Your Own” Teacher Education Initiative (23 Illinois Administrative Code 60),

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

**Next Steps**
Notice of the adopted rules will be submitted to the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules to initiate JCAR’s review. When that process is complete, the rules will be filed with the Secretary of State and disseminated as appropriate.
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TITLE 23: EDUCATION AND CULTURAL RESOURCES
SUBTITLE A: EDUCATION
CHAPTER I: STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
SUBCHAPTER b: PERSONNEL

PART 60
THE “GROW YOUR OWN” TEACHER EDUCATION INITIATIVE

Section
60.10 Purpose
60.20 Definitions
60.30 Eligible Applicants
60.40 Implementation Grants – Procedure and Content of Proposals
60.50 Implementation Grants – Criteria for the Review of Proposals
60.60 Implementation Grants – Allocation of Funds
60.70 Continuation of Implementation Funding
60.80 Implementation Funding for “Transitional Projects” (Repealed)
60.90 Planning Grants
60.100 Loans; Waiver or Deferral of Repayment

AUTHORITY: Implementing the Grow Your Own Teacher Education Act [110 ILCS 48] and authorized by Section 90 of the Act [110 ILCS 48/90].


Section 60.10 Purpose

This Part establishes the procedure and criteria for approval of proposals for grants to support teacher preparation initiatives under the Grow Our Own Teacher Education Act [110 ILCS 48].

Section 60.20 Definitions

“Act” means the Grow Your Own Teacher Education Act [110 ILCS 48].

“Applicant” means a consortium or a potential consortium, as applicable, as described in Section 60.30 of this Part.
“Candidate” means a person working toward a bachelor’s degree qualifying that individual for a teaching certificate who is assisted under a grant awarded to a consortium pursuant to this Part.

“Cohort” means a group of candidates preparing for a teaching certificate who, pursuant to Sections 20 and 25 of the Act, begin receiving assistance under this Part together. No member of any cohort may hold a bachelor’s degree at the time of entry into the program, provided that this restriction shall not apply to members of cohorts for whose preparation funding was granted during Fiscal Year 2006.

“Consortium” means an entity to which the State Board can issue grants under this Part. A consortium shall be comprised of at least one 4-year institution of higher education with an accredited teacher education program, at least one school district or group of schools, and one or more community organizations. The consortium may also include a 2-year institution of higher education and/or a school employee union. Eligible consortia are further defined in Section 20 of the Act. A consortium shall implement a program of forgivable loans to cover any portion of tuition and direct expenses of students preparing for teaching certificates in excess of grants-in-aid and other forgivable loans received.

“Direct expenses” are an individual’s tuition for coursework required for completion of the preparation program in which the candidate is or will be enrolled, fees related to participation in the preparation program or required coursework, and expenses for books and other necessary instructional materials.

“Eligible school” is an Illinois public elementary or secondary school that serves a substantial percentage of low-income students and either is hard to staff or has hard-to-staff teaching positions (see Section 10 of the Act).

“Institution” means an institution of higher education.

“Potential consortium” is a group of entities that is eligible to submit a proposal for a planning grant in response to an RFP issued under this Part.

“Student with a non-traditional background” is either one who begins a baccalaureate program at a point in time other than immediately following graduation from high school or one who began a baccalaureate program after high school, did not complete it, and re-enters a baccalaureate program after some passage of time.

“Year of service” means full-time employment for at least half a school year, or an equivalent amount of part-time employment, in:
a public school that, at the time the individual becomes employed, is either one of the schools targeted by the program completed by the individual with assistance under this Part or another school that is defined as hard to staff pursuant to this Section; or

a teaching position that, at the time the individual becomes employed, is hard to staff as defined in this Section.

Section 60.30 Eligible Applicants

a) Only consortia whose membership meets the requirements of Section 20(1) and (2) of the Act shall be eligible to apply for implementation grants to cover expenditures discussed in Section 25 of the Act.

b) Pursuant to Section 30 of the Act, potential consortia shall be eligible for grant funds for planning purposes under the Act. A “potential consortium” will be considered eligible to submit a proposal if it includes a four-year institution of higher education and at least one community organization and if its proposal:

1) provides evidence that at least a subset of the teachers typically prepared by the institution seeks employment in communities where hard-to-staff schools are located; and

2) demonstrates that the institution is not applying for funding on behalf of an existing consortium that is currently serving a group of candidates under a model substantially similar to that described in the Act and that further information is needed about the specific barriers that exist with respect to enabling individuals with a long-term commitment to those communities to complete teacher preparation; and

3) includes:

A) letters of interest from one or more school districts or schools indicating willingness to collaborate in offering opportunities for candidates in the program to complete pre-student teaching clinical experiences in hard-to-staff schools or positions; and

B) if additional community organizations are being considered for membership in the consortium, letters of invitation that the
applicant has sent to one or more relevant community organizations proposing a role for the organizations in the proposed consortium, along with a rationale provided by the applicant for inclusion of these organizations.

Section 60.40 Implementation Grants –Procedure and Content of Proposals

New implementation grants shall be offered in years when the level of available funding is such that one or more new programs or cohorts of candidates can be supported given the requirements of Section 25 of the Act for ongoing support of cohorts that have begun their preparation in previous years. (See Section 60.70 of this Part.)

a) When sufficient funding is available, the State Superintendent of Education will issue an RFP specifying the information that proposals must include and specifying a deadline for their submission, which shall provide at least 45 calendar days in which to submit proposals.

b) Each RFP shall specify the descriptive information that applicants will be required to provide, which shall be designed to permit comparative judgments of the degree to which each program will address the requirements of Section 20 of the Act and shall address:

1) the teacher preparation programs involved and their qualifications relevant to the requirements of the Act, including specific information on the institution’s success in preparing teachers for positions in schools that serve a substantial percentage of low-income students;

2) the consortium’s plans for recruiting and providing support to participants, including information that demonstrates that potential or existing members of the cohort are paraeducators or parent and community leaders as defined in the Act;

3) the preparation status of existing candidates, if a cohort is already engaged in the program;

4) the hard-to-staff schools and positions that are targeted; and

5) the demographic make-up of the area served by the targeted schools.
Each RFP shall describe the required proposal format, if any (e.g., cover page, proposal abstract, proposal narrative, letters of intent to participate, etc.).

d) Each RFP shall identify the categories of allowable expenditures and require the submission of a budget summary and payment schedule, completed on the forms provided, as well as a narrative budget breakdown that provides a detailed explanation of each line item of expenditure and covers the entire period of time during which the identified cohort is expected to be enrolled in the teacher preparation program.

1) Applicants shall be required to demonstrate that grant funds will supplement and not supplant amounts typically devoted by the institution of higher education to, and other resources available for, assisting teacher candidates.

2) Applicants shall be required to describe the steps that will be taken to decrease the need for external financial support for the consortium and its program over time.

e) Each RFP shall identify the information that consortia will be required to collect and furnish to the entity that conducts the evaluation required by Section 35 of the Act, including but not limited to zip codes of the candidates, the racial/ethnic make-up of the candidate cohort, the percentage of candidates who progress at the expected rate through the preparation program, the percentage who complete the program, and information on the positions eventually taken by these candidates.

f) Each RFP shall identify the assurances and certifications that entities receiving funding must furnish.

Section 60.50 Implementation Grants – Criteria for the Review of Proposals

Proposals for implementation grants shall be evaluated in accordance with the following criteria:

a) Feasibility, Impact, and Cost-Effectiveness (40 points)

1) The proposal identifies a need for teachers in hard-to-staff schools and hard-to-fill positions and describes either a cohort that is available to enroll in the identified preparation program or time-specific plans for identifying and attracting the members of such a cohort.
2) The proposal describes strategies that will be used to reach members of underrepresented groups that reflect the diversity of the students enrolled in the participating schools and outlines plans for serving additional cohorts in future years.

3) The proposal demonstrates that:
   A) coursework and experiences required for certification will be scheduled and located to be accessible to members of the cohort; and
   B) supportive services (e.g., child care, counseling, tutoring) that have been identified as necessary will be offered to enable candidates to progress through the program and attain certification.

4) The proposal establishes a timetable or performance level for candidates as a condition for their continued receipt of assistance under this program.

5) The evaluation plan is designed to yield information that can be used both in judging the program’s qualitative and quantitative impact and in identifying changes or new approaches that will improve the program’s outcomes.

6) The proposal describes commitments on the part of all the consortium’s members that will enable the consortium to sustain the program over time with a reduction in the need for external resources.

b) Quality of the Plan (30 points)

1) The proposal describes the role of each entity that is a member of the consortium, including the resources each entity will devote to this initiative, the major areas requiring collaboration among the members, and how decisions will be made with input from the members and the participants.

2) The proposal includes plans for assisting candidates in tapping sources of financial aid beyond those made available under this Part and by the members of the consortium.
3) The proposal demonstrates that the institution of higher education has the capacity (i.e., faculty and other resources) to serve the cohort in its approved teacher preparation program. If a two-year institution is involved in the consortium, the proposal delineates how coursework, other requirements, and services will be coordinated between the institutions.

4) The proposal describes the needs of the participating schools and demonstrates that the consortium’s plan for certification under the program is relevant to those needs and will have an impact on the availability of qualified staff.

5) The plan of work for the program includes specific strategies for overcoming known barriers faced by the participating schools in retaining qualified teachers as well as barriers faced by the individuals who make up the cohort to be enrolled in the program.

6) The proposal describes the consortium’s plans for extending support to candidates for at least two years after they attain certification, including such activities and services as mentoring and group meetings of the cohort.

c) Experience and Qualifications (20 points)

1) The proposal provides evidence that faculty and relevant staff of the institution are knowledgeable regarding the needs of hard-to-staff schools and the specific issues that candidates from non-traditional backgrounds encounter when attempting to complete preparation for teaching careers.

2) The proposal demonstrates that the community organization that is a member of the consortium has conducted projects or initiatives with a specific focus on involving parents and others in school improvement, either in the participating schools or schools with similar characteristics, and has the capacity to recruit candidates for and support them as they progress through the program.

3) The individual who is identified as coordinator for the cohort has experience in education and/or community organizing and in supporting individuals in the collegiate environment and is knowledgeable about group dynamics, support services, and cultural issues relevant to the cohort.
d) Evaluation Plans (10 points)

1) The proposal relates plans for the evaluation of candidates’ teaching skills to the relevant portions of the institution’s educational unit assessment system (see 23 Ill. Adm. Code 25.140) and demonstrates that candidates in the program will be expected to meet the standards applicable to the approved program.

2) The proposal includes a plan for the evaluation of the program by or on behalf of the members of the consortium that will provide:

   A) information on the progress of candidates within the preparation program; and

   B) when applicable, information on this initiative’s outcomes in terms of candidates’ placement into hard-to-staff teaching positions or hard-to-staff schools and their retention in those positions.

Section 60.60 Implementation Grants - Allocation of Funds

The State Superintendent of Education shall approve proposals for funding and make final determinations regarding the amounts to be provided based upon:

a) the total funds appropriated for this initiative;

b) the needs and resources described and the amounts requested in the top-ranked proposals identified in accordance with the criteria set forth in Section 60.50 of this Part; and

c) the need to make programs under this Part accessible on a statewide basis in a manner that will increase the availability of candidates to serve in hard-to-staff schools and positions.

Section 60.70 Continuation of Implementation Funding

a) A consortium that has received implementation funding for a cohort of candidates shall be subject to the requirements of this Section with respect to continued funding for that cohort in subsequent years.
1) The consortium shall submit an application for continued funding for the cohort, using a format specified by the State Superintendent of Education.

2) Each application shall contain a mid-year report on the current status of the program and the cohort, documenting the activities and support provided to date and describing the degree to which candidates are achieving the program’s objectives.

3) Each application shall provide an updated narrative description of the objectives, activities, timelines, and evaluation procedures for the renewal year, relating the proposed plan of work to the results that have been achieved to date.

4) Each application shall include an updated budget summary and payment schedule for the renewal year, including a narrative budget breakdown that describes any needed variances from the budget proposed in the initial year of funding.

5) Each application shall include such certifications and assurances as the State Superintendent of Education may require.

b) The State Board shall, contingent upon appropriation of funds for this initiative, provide continuation funding to consortia that:

1) demonstrate that:

   A) a majority of the candidates in the cohort served have completed coursework or other requirements for certification during at least one semester of the preceding year; or

   B) funds will be used to support only those candidates who have progressed toward certification and/or have identified steps to be taken toward certification in the academic year in which funding is requested; and

2) demonstrate success in providing the supports necessary to retain candidates in the program.

Section 60.90 Planning Grants
In order to identify potential consortia with a substantial likelihood of establishing additional Grow Your Own programs, the State Superintendent of Education will issue an RFP for planning grants. The RFP may be issued repeatedly, contingent upon the availability of funding. Each RFP shall indicate the maximum amount to be reserved for planning grants and the maximum available amount per grant. The RFP shall specify the information that proposals must include and a deadline for their submission, which shall provide no fewer than 30 calendar days in which to submit proposals.

a) Eligible applicants for planning grants shall be as set forth in Section 60.30 of this Part.

b) Allowable uses of planning grant funds shall include:

1) activities that are designed to secure the participation and commitment of the required members and the optional members of a consortium; and

2) activities that are designed to attract or identify potential candidates for teacher preparation who are paraeducators or parent and community leaders as contemplated by the Act, including assistance that will permit potential candidates to complete developmental coursework that will verify their academic readiness for enrolling in teacher preparation; and

3) activities that are designed to identify barriers to teacher certification for potential members of a given cohort and to identify strategies and resources for mitigating those barriers.

c) Each proposal shall describe a plan of work for developing a consortium and a Grow Your Own program that will be eligible for an implementation grant under this Part. Each proposal shall include a budget for the planned activities, provided in a format specified in the RFP.

d) Applicants may be asked to clarify aspects of their proposals.

e) Each proposal that is submitted by an eligible applicant and meets the requirements of this Section shall be considered qualified for funding. Funding decisions shall be made in each cycle by balancing the goals of geographic distribution and accessibility with the level of need and the potential number of candidates to be served by the potential consortia.
Any candidate in a program administered under this Part may receive a forgivable loan for direct expenses associated with completion of the teacher preparation program, provided those expenditures are not otherwise paid for through grants-in-aid, other forgivable loans, or other resources of the consortium. Any amount expended for an individual’s direct expenses shall be considered a part of that individual’s loan, regardless of how the payment is administered and regardless of whether the individual receives any actual payment of funds. The total amount of any candidate’s loan shall not exceed $25,000.

a) Pursuant to Section 25 of the Act, loan funds provided to candidates as part of this program shall be fully forgiven if a graduate completes five years of service in hard-to-staff schools or hard-to-staff teaching positions, with partial forgiveness for shorter periods of service. Forgiveness and repayment of loans shall be determined as provided in this Section.

b) An individual may accrue the service required for forgiveness of loans under this Part in one or more eligible schools or positions.

c) If an individual has not assumed employment in an eligible school or position within two years after receiving a teaching certificate, the individual shall be required to begin the repayment of amounts loaned under this Part. No interest shall apply. An individual who drops out of the program shall be required to begin repaying the amounts loaned in the month following the month when it becomes evident that he or she will not be completing any of the program’s requirements for two consecutive semesters.

d) If an individual has not completed five years of service within 10 years after receiving a teaching certificate, the individual shall be required to begin the repayment of amounts loaned under this Part. The amount due shall be the total amount borrowed, less a percentage reflecting the relationship that any time taught by the individual in eligible schools or positions bears to the total five-year commitment. Loan amounts shall be reduced in increments of 10 percent for each semester completed.

e) Repayment of loans shall be made in no more than 60 equal installments. The minimum monthly payment will be determined by dividing the total amount due by 60. An individual may prepay the balance due on the loan in its entirety at any time or make payments in addition to the minimum amount owed each month without penalty.
f) In addition to the loan forgiveness permitted under Section 25 of the Act, the State Superintendent may defer or waive an individual’s obligation to repay an amount due as provided in this subsection (f).

1) The State Superintendent shall waive the repayment obligation for an individual who is counseled out of a preparation program or found ineligible to continue, provided that the individual’s exit from the program is not due to a violation of law or of applicable institutional policies.

2) The State Superintendent shall waive the repayment obligation for an individual who drops out of a preparation program or demonstrates that he or she is unable to complete a portion of the required teaching service due to:
   A) the onset or exacerbation of a disability;
   B) the need to care for an immediate family member during serious illness or disability;
   C) destruction of the individual’s residence; or
   D) other circumstances that require the individual to assume responsibilities that cannot be avoided without serious financial hardship or other family disruption (e.g., death of a spouse that results in the need to take a second job or assume operation of a business).

3) The State Superintendent shall waive the repayment obligation for a candidate who does not complete a preparation program due to the unavailability of a State appropriation for this initiative for at least two consecutive years.

4) The State Superintendent shall defer the repayment obligation for a period of time specifically related to the circumstances when an individual:
   A) is unemployed or is working for fewer than 30 hours per week;
   B) is experiencing a financial hardship (e.g., receiving public assistance, earning an amount per month that is no greater than 200 percent of the amount of the loan payment, or experiencing
circumstances such as those outlined in subsection (f)(2) of this Section; or

C) has re-enrolled as a full-time student in an institution of higher education or in a program under this Part.

5) Each request for a waiver or deferral of repayment shall be submitted in a format specified by the State Superintendent. The affected individual shall describe the specific circumstances that apply. This description shall be accompanied by evidence such as a physician’s statement, insurance claim, or other documentation of the relevant facts.

g) When a teaching certificate is issued to an individual who received assistance under this Part, the certificate shall be accompanied by:

1) a statement indicating the total amount of the loan received by the individual and identifying the dates applicable to repayment under this Section; and

2) a claim form that the individual may use to claim forgiveness of the loan amount, which shall require the individual to identify the periods of service completed in eligible schools or positions and the school administrators who can verify the individual’s service.

h) Management of Loans

1) It shall be the responsibility of each four-year institution of higher education, and of any two-year institution that participates in a consortium, to assist the State Board of Education with the forgivable loan process in the following manner:

A) by keeping records of the amounts provided to or on behalf of each individual for direct expenses;

B) by keeping up-to-date contact information regarding the address and telephone number of each individual during the individual’s preparation at that institution; and

C) by notifying the State Superintendent within 30 days after a candidate fails to enroll in coursework as expected or otherwise
ceases to participate in the program and informing the State Superintendent of the total amount of the candidate’s loan for direct expenses as of that point in time.

2) When a candidate leaves a two-year institution and enters a four-year institution to continue in a program under this Part, the two-year institution shall inform both the State Superintendent and the four-year institution of the total amount of the candidate’s loan for direct expenses as of that point in time. Each two-year institution shall ensure that the affected four-year institution continues to receive any information that subsequently affects the amount of a candidate’s loan.

3) Each institution shall notify the State Superintendent as to who will be responsible for this information and shall provide contact information for the responsible individual within the institution.

i) It shall be the responsibility of the State Superintendent to take such actions as may be necessary to secure repayment when necessary.
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Purpose of Agenda Item
The purpose of this agenda item is to present the proposed amendments for adoption.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
This agenda item relates to Strategic Goals 1 and 2, in that the rules propose standards and improvements to the state-funded Beginning Teacher Induction Grant Program (Subpart B of the rules), which has as its goal the provision of assistance and support for new teachers by high-quality and experienced mentors to ensure that each teacher is effective and highly prepared and able to contribute to the academic growth of his or her students.

Expected Outcome of Agenda Item
The Board will be asked to adopt amendments to Part 65.

Background Information
The New Teacher Induction and Mentoring program (Article 21A of the School Code) was put in place effective January 1, 2004, and first funded in school year 2006-2007 as a limited pilot program. The purpose of the pilot program was to support and study induction program models that provided for intensive interaction between new teachers and the mentors with whom they are paired. In 2009, based on the experience of the pilot programs up until that time, several changes were made in Part 65 that focused on expanding the number of approved programs by eliminating the three-year pilot limitation and encouraging highly skilled and effective teachers to share their knowledge and experience with those new to the field by requiring grantees to provide a minimum stipend for each participating mentor.

Staff believe that it is again time to update the rules to better reflect the best practices of induction and mentoring programs and incorporate important current research and advances in the field, namely the development of program standards and a program continuum to be used for ongoing improvement, support and evaluation (see Appendices A and B of the proposed amendments). The standards were adopted by the then-State Teacher Certification Board in December 2008 and a year later, a task force completed its work on the induction continuum.
The standards have served as guidance for induction and mentoring programs but program alignment to the standards has not been a requirement of funding. Once the standards are placed in the rules, they will become an integral part of each grantee’s implementation of an induction and mentoring program, providing consistency among programs across the state.

Briefly, the other modifications proposed would accomplish the following.

- Clarify that the requirements contained in Part 65 are applicable to induction and mentoring programs funded both on a competitive basis (i.e., when funding is insufficient to provide grants to all eligible entities), as well as to programs established through a statewide implementation should sufficient funds become available. (See Section 65.20.)
- Require that each funded program serve a minimum number of beginning teachers. Applicants with less than the minimum required under the rules could partner with other eligible entities to offer a joint program. This change is being recommended to ensure that induction and mentoring programs are established on a strong footing and remain part of the culture of the school in the event that outside resources for their administration are either reduced or eliminated. The proposed rule also allows for consideration of a smaller program when an applicant can provide evidence that it has the resources (both financial and human) to locally implement and sustain the program. (See Sections 65.120 and 65.130.)
- Provide for local flexibility in determining the amount of time that the beginning teacher and mentor would spend in face-to-face contact by reducing the current requirement of 60 hours – which became a ceiling that programs would not go beyond – to 40 hours for first-year teachers and at least 30 hours for those in their second year. The 40 hours are intended to be a starting point that can be increased depending on the goals and needs of each beginning teacher. (See Section 65.130.)
- Flesh out the requirements for the receipt of funding in years two and beyond and tying receipt of continuation funding to the program’s continuous improvement based on the Illinois Induction Program Continuum. (New Section 65.155 and Appendix B.)
- Remove a funding priority for “hard to staff” schools, since the focus of a high-quality proposal should be on its alignment with the Illinois Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Beginning Teacher Induction Programs (see Appendix A).
- Strengthen the criteria used to evaluate proposals to align to the Illinois Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Beginning Teacher Induction Programs and reflect the best practices of high-quality induction and mentoring programs.

The proposed rules were published in the Illinois Register July 6, 2012, to elicit public comment; six were received. A summary and analysis of the public comment, and any recommendations for changes as a result, is attached.

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

Policy Implications: Please see “Background” above.

Budget Implications. While the Beginning Teacher Induction Grant Program was not funded in FY 2012 and the State Board failed to receive an appropriation for FY 2013, teacher induction and mentoring will be a central activity for school districts participating in the federal Race to the Top 3 (RTTT 3) program. Under this grant program, participating school districts must implement a two-year induction program for new teachers no later than the 2013-14 school year. RTTT 3 budgets $3 million for this effort over the course of the grant. Therefore, it is
appropriate to move forward with the rulemaking at this time so that the new requirements can be in place and used to align the induction and mentoring activities of the RTTT 3 participating schools to those required under the state program.

Legislative Action. None.

Communication. Please see “Next Steps” below.

Pros and Cons of Various Actions
As noted under “Budget Implications” above, moving forward with the proposed amendments now ensures that the new requirements will be in place for RTTT 3 grant recipients. The proposed changes will strengthen the provision of induction and mentoring at the local level and ensure continuity among programs so that the agency can evaluate and improve the program.

Without changing the rules, the agency would be unable to require that beginning teacher induction programs align their efforts to the induction standards or to provide the flexibility needed at the local level to design and implement meaningful and effective programs that address the particular needs of the grantee’s beginning teachers.

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

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

    New Teacher Induction and Mentoring (23 Illinois Administrative Code 65),

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

Next Steps
Notice of the adopted rules will be submitted to the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules to initiate JCAR’s review. When that process is complete, the rules will be filed with the Secretary of State and disseminated as appropriate.
Summary and Analysis of Public Comment
23 Ill. Adm. Code 65 (New Teacher Induction and Mentoring)

Comment

One commenter asked that the State Board consider “making accommodations” for applicants that propose to offer induction and mentoring programs for only one year, particularly during “periods of severe budget shortages”.

This same commenter asked the agency to modify the provision addressing a mentor’s participation in a beginning teacher’s evaluation conducted under Article 24A of the School Code to allow the mentor latitude to participate in the evaluation of those beginning teachers for whom he or she is not providing mentoring and support.

Analysis

Section 65.20(b)(1) of the proposed amendments repeats the statutory requirement found in Section 21A-20 of the School Code that each plan for an induction and mentoring program “(assign) a mentor teacher to each new teacher for a period of at least 2 school years”. Similarly, Section 21A-20 also prohibits a mentor from participating in a beginning teacher’s evaluation or in the evaluation procedure of the public school. It is this second phrase that strengthens staff’s interpretation that a mentor cannot be involved in the evaluation of teachers who they are not mentoring.

In order for the agency to make the suggested modifications to the rules, Article 21A of the School Code would need to be amended, and the commenter is encouraged to work with his legislators in this regard.

Recommendation

No changes are recommended in response to these comments.

Comment

Three commenters discussed the meaning of Section 65.120(d) of the rules, which clarifies the participation in induction and mentoring programs of entities other than “public schools” (as defined in the law) via contracts entered into between the public school and other entity. The first commenter asked that the agency include “designing and planning” as allowable activities to be conducted by contracted entities. The other two organizations asked that the proposed amendments explicitly authorize collaboration among, and the provision of induction and mentoring programs by, regional offices of education, postsecondary institutions, unions and other service providers.

Analysis

The introduction to Section 65.120, as originally written, stated that partnerships of “public schools” and other entities were eligible to apply for funding under Article 21A of the School Code and Part 65. The law, however, provides that funding is to go to “public schools”, which are defined as any school district, charter school, special education or vocational education cooperative, or schools operated by a regional office of education or a State agency. The law
Additionally authorizes “public schools” to “contract with an institution of higher education or other independent party to assist in implementing the program”. For this reason, the introduction to 65.120 was modified and new subsection (d) added to align the rules to the requirements of the statute.

It should be noted that under the rules, as proposed, regional offices of education are eligible to apply for induction and mentoring grants on behalf of schools that they operate. Additionally, a grantee may contract with postsecondary institutions and other parties to assist it in any number of induction and mentoring services and activities.

Recommendation

No changes are recommended in response to these comments.

Comment

Two commenters asked that the requirement in Sections 65.120(c) and 65.130(b) for programs to serve at least 20 beginning teachers (either in a single school district or in multiple districts) be reduced to 10 for programs serving only first-year teachers. First-year teachers, one argued, need more orientation and support, thus justifying the smaller program size. Additionally, they said even multi-district programs serving only first-year teachers tend to have fewer than 20 participants, as do programs in many smaller districts. They agreed, however, that the 20-teacher minimum is not unreasonable if programs include both first- and second-year teachers.

Related to the comments above, an organization suggested that the State Board consider a separate application process for small districts to “ensure support to small districts which are not part of a consortium”. By way of an example, the commenter said the agency could provide funding, via a competitive process, to an entity that would establish “induction networks of small districts across Illinois”. Another commenter noted that requiring programs to have at least 20 beginning teachers “could be difficult”; however, he also acknowledged that the participation minimum had the potential to improve programs through networking and/or collaboration, resulting in a “solid foundation (upon which) to build resources”.

A commenter said he believed a proposed rule to exempt an applicant from the 20-teacher minimum under certain circumstances would instead discourage small districts from applying for funding, thus contributing to the “current induction disparities between large and small districts”.

Finally, a commenter suggested a wording change in the second sentence in Section 65.120(c) to reference “Eligible entities” rather than “Eligible applicants”.

Analysis

As the commenters noted, the rule does not prohibit applicants with a fewer than 20 beginning teachers to apply for induction and mentoring grants. An applicant that does not have a sufficient number of beginning teachers either could choose to partner with other eligible entities to offer a joint program or it could provide evidence of having sufficient resources (both financial and human) to locally implement and sustain the program. The rule’s intent is not to deter small school districts from applying for a grant but rather to ensure that induction and mentoring programs are established on a strong footing and remain part of the culture of the school in the event that outside resources for their administration are either reduced or eliminated.
With that being said, staff acknowledge that it may be unusual for smaller schools and those in more rural, sparsely populated areas of the state to employ 20 or more first- or second-year teachers in a given grant period. It is important that induction and mentoring continues after state support ends but a middle ground can be found to lower the required number of participants while still ensuring that the grantee is committed to program implementation for the long term.

Since Section 65.120(c) addresses eligibility terms for the induction and mentoring program, the correct term to use is “applicant”; however, for consistency in this section, the term “entity” in subsection (d) should be changed.

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that Sections 65.120 and 65.130 be modified as follows.

- **Section 65.120(c)** Each eligible applicant shall propose to serve at least 10 beginning teachers. Eligible applicants with fewer than 10 beginning teachers may participate as part of a joint application. (See Section 65.130(b) of this Part.)

- **Section 65.120(d)** An eligible applicant may contract with one or more institutions of higher education, professional associations, regional offices of education, or not-for-profit providers of educational services to assist in implementing the program. (See Section 21A-15 of the School Code.)

- **Section 65.130(b)** Each program shall serve no fewer than 10 beginning teachers. If fewer than 10 teachers are proposed to be served, the applicant may either:
  1) participate in a beginning teacher induction program as part of a joint application; or
  2) provide in its application a specific rationale for the reduction that demonstrates that the applicant has sufficient resources, in addition to funding received under this Subpart B, and adequate personnel to continue the program and provide each beginning teacher with adequate attention and support comparable to what would be provided in a larger program.

**Comment**

Several commenters supported the reduction from 60 to 40 hours of face-to-face contact between the mentor and the beginning teacher (Section 65.130(d)). But each asked that the contact between the pair not be limited to only contact that is face to face. Suggestions in this regard included requiring anywhere from 20 to 30 hours of face-to-face interaction, with the remaining hours comprising contact through electronic means, such as web-based applications, telephone or video.
As a rationale for the suggested revision, one of these individuals noted that the full-time schedules of mentors and beginning teachers and the inadequate stipends paid to mentors tend to discourage experienced teachers from becoming mentors. The others noted that 40 hours of face-to-face contact may be difficult to achieve in small districts. They also indicated that 40 hours of face-to-face contact may be “too much” for beginning teachers in their second year of mentoring programs, suggesting instead that a minimum of 20 hours be required. Finally, they asked that the 40-hour requirement be “prorated” for beginning teachers who are hired after the start of a school year.

Analysis

When the agency amended Part 65 in 2009, it modified this section of the rules to specifically require that the contact between the mentor and beginning teacher be “face to face” contact. This change was based upon evaluations conducted of the teacher mentoring pilot programs that revealed wide variations in the type of contact that different programs considered to be “face to face”. This requirement is supported by research that shows that successful mentoring programs employ opportunities for the mentor to observe, assess and interact directly with a new teacher or a group of teachers.

Additionally, the criteria used to identify high-quality proposals for State induction and mentoring grants acknowledge the need for programs to employ strategies, such as reduced course loads, release time, substitute teachers and the like, to “permit the participants to devote the time necessary to reach the goals of the program”.

Staff do not believe that a minimum of 40 hours of face-to-face contact – whether one on one with the teacher and mentor or in group situations – is overly difficult to achieve for either the mentor or teacher over the course of the school year (which could include time before and after school or before the first day of classes begins). The commenters make a good point, however, that electronic contact has the potential be an equally effective way for the mentor to connect with the new teacher. Staff also acknowledge that the interaction between a mentor and a second-year teacher need not be as intense as that provided in the teacher’s first year.

Recommendation

It is recommended that Section 65.130(d) be modified as follows.

d) Subject to the exceptions of this subsection (d), each program shall be designed to ensure that each beginning teacher spends no less than 40 hours in face-to-face contact with the mentor assigned, either one on one or in another configuration, including both classroom observation of the beginning teacher by the mentor and other interactions between these individuals.

1) During a teacher’s first year of the program, at least 30 hours of contact between the teacher and mentor shall be face to face, either one on one or in another configuration, and the remaining interactions may be through electronic means, such as web-based applications, telephone or video.

2) During a teacher’s second year of the program, a minimum of 30 hours of contact is required, of which at least 20 hours shall be face to face.
Comment

A commenter noted the use of the term “RFP” in Section 65.140(d).

Analysis

The proposed amendments rely on the use of the phrase “application materials” since these materials will be used for both competitive grants where a Request for Proposal or RFP is usually released, as well as for statewide implementation purposes where all eligible entities will receive funding.

Recommendation

It is recommended that Section 65.140(d) be modified as follows.

\[d\] The application materials shall indicate the amount or expected amount of the appropriation for the program and shall describe the allowable expenditures and the basis for awarding grants. If matching funds or resources will be required of applicants, the application materials \text{ RFP} shall describe these requirements.

Comment

Several commenters noted elements of the criteria used for reviewing proposals about which they had concerns (Section 65.150). One person expressed confusion about the process a program would use during the recruitment process to document a potential mentor’s “record” of effective teaching practice and professional conduct.

She and two other commenters also questioned the advisability of requiring monthly mentor meetings, saying that that level of frequency may be “onerous” for small districts. They suggested requiring that the meetings be held quarterly instead.

Likewise, one of the commenters said that providing professional development for beginning teachers on a quarterly basis, while “optimal”, was not realistic given the workload of both mentors and beginning teachers and the travel time required for personnel participating in multi-district programs. She proposed that the rules provide for four professional development opportunities during the two-year program rather than four each year.

Analysis

School districts seeking induction and mentoring funding could propose a variety of ways in which their programs could document strong teaching skills and professionalism of the individuals recruited to serve as mentors. These methods could include recommendations from colleagues, supervisors or parents; student assessment results; performance evaluations; and the recruit’s participation on school committees or in other activities or professional organizations. The selection criteria outlined in the applicant’s proposal will be reviewed to determine their likelihood of identifying individuals with the skills and experiences necessary to be effective mentors. Limiting through rulemaking the type of documentation that a district might use for recruitment purposes would be too restrictive and fail to recognize the unique characteristics of and processes operating in individual school districts.
Stipulating the frequency of mentor meetings and professional development opportunities for beginning teachers in the criteria for proposal review suggests that successful and effective induction and mentoring programs provide at least this level of interaction and training among and between mentors and beginning teachers. While these criteria are not absolute requirements that would result in an applicant’s not receiving funding, proposing a reduced number of opportunities for these activities could result in an applicant’s receiving a lower score for this criterion. That is, an applicant that fails to provide for these components in its program may still qualify for funding if the other elements of the proposed program are superior.

Recommendation

No changes are recommended in response to these comments.

Comment

A commenter expressed disappointment that the “eight written reflections and the formal observation cycles” are not required components of an induction and mentoring program. These activities, she said, are “a critical part of providing the beginning teacher with data to make quality self-reflections on their practice”.

Analysis

Observations of the beginning teacher by the mentor and reflection on practice are inherent elements in induction and mentoring programs. As such, these elements are included as part of the Illinois Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Beginning Teacher Induction Programs to which each program funded under Part 65 must align. In particular, Standard 7 ensures that the professional development for beginning teachers is “rooted in formative assessment, in which the beginning teacher and mentor collaboratively collect and analyze multiple sources of data and use structured reflection, in an ongoing process, to focus on classroom practice and meeting students’ individual needs”. Standard 8 emphasizes programs’ responsibility to provide “time to ensure that the quality of the process (e.g., analysis of student work, data collection, observations and reflective conversations) is supported”.

Staff are assuming that the commenter is referring to the process established by the Induction for the 21st Century Educator (ICE 21) program, which provides just one approach to induction and mentoring. As noted above, any program funded under Part 65 will include time for observations and opportunities for both mentors and beginning teachers to reflect on their practice and growth. The number and type of these observations or reflections will depend on the needs of the grantee’s schools and their beginning teachers. Programs should not be restricted by the rules to using only one approach that may not adequately address the unique characteristics of the district, schools and teachers being served.

Recommendation

No change is recommended in response to this comment.

Comment

Two submissions asked that the rules reference the “common core standards” and require teachers to be able to “know and be able to use” those standards.
Analysis

What is known as the common core standards are set forth in the Illinois Learning Standards and these can be found in rules governing Public Schools Evaluation, Recognition and Supervision at 23 Ill. Adm. Code 1.Appendix D. Additionally, these learning standards, including the common core, are incorporated into both the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards and content-area standards developed by the State Board, relative to a teacher’s ability to use the learning standards to inform curriculum development and for content, learning theory, assessment, and student development purposes. Under Section 65.20(b)(2), each induction and mentoring program must align to both the professional teaching standards and the content-area standards applicable to the participating teacher. For these reasons, separate references to the Illinois Learning Standards in Part 65 are not necessary.

Recommendation

No changes are recommended in response to these comments.

Comment

A commenter disagreed with the removal in the introduction of Section 65.150 of the funding priority for hard-to-staff schools. The group said when two applications are of equal merit, the one that includes hard-to-staff schools should continue to receive priority consideration.

Analysis

This provision was removed for two reasons. First, the agency did not have a process for tracking “hard-to-staff” schools, i.e., one in which the school ranked in the upper third of its type in terms of attrition among teachers. For this reason, it was likely that the priority was applied unevenly. Second, staff believe that grant funds should go to those applications that best meet the induction and mentoring standards set forth in Section 65.Appendix A.

Recommendation

No change is recommended in response to this comment.

Comment

A submission addressed the criteria in Section 65.155(b) for approval of continuation grants, stating that the cost-effectiveness criterion should look at both the cost per beginning teachers as well as the “demonstrated benefits”. The commenter said that this criterion could “(handicap) more costly programs … that achieve better outcomes”.

Analysis

While criteria for continuation funding include an examination of a program’s cost-effectiveness, they also consider whether the program elements proposed for the continuation period “will be effective in assisting and improving the practice of beginning teachers”. In this way, the cost is weighed against the potential of the program to contribute to a new teacher’s success in the classroom and is not used as the sole indicator for awarding continuation funding.

Recommendation
No change is recommended in response to this comment.

Comment

A commenter noted that the standards found in Appendix A are “actually the criteria” of the Illinois Induction Program Continuum.

Analysis

We invite the commenter to review the standards at http://www.isbe.net/certification/pdf/induction_mentoring_stds.pdf; these standards, and criteria for each, are reproduced in Section 65.Appendix A of the rules. The commenter’s confusion may stem from the fact the continuum, as noted in Section 65.Appendix B, provides benchmarks for programs to use in ascertaining the degree to which they have fully implemented each of the criteria included in the standards. For that reason, the continuum reiterates these criteria in communicating the four levels of program implementation against which a program can measure its progress.

Recommendation

No change is recommended in response to this comment.

Comment

A commenter asked two questions:

1. Whether the four hours of professional development required of the person serving as the site administrator for a induction and mentoring program is to be provided only once or every year; and
2. If the use of an electronic tracking system, such as the Teaching Induction Mentoring System (TimsWeb), would be an allowable expense under the grant program.

Analysis

A program must ensure that a site administrator participate in the professional development at least once. If a new site administrator is assigned after the start of a program, then the program must provide additional professional development for that individual.

Reasonable costs associated with a grantee’s use of TimsWeb would be considered an allowable use of grant funds.

Recommendation

No changes are recommended in response to these comments.

Comment

One commenter, whose district has offered a teacher mentoring program since 2004, volunteered to assist the State Board in its efforts to implement induction and mentoring
programs. She also indicated that the requirements of her district’s program align with the proposed amendments.

Several other commenters expressed support of key elements of the proposed amendments, including data collection, mentor selection criteria, site administrator training and professional development for beginning teachers.

**Analysis**

Staff have noted the commenter’s offer of assistance and appreciate her and the other commenters’ support of the agency’s efforts to improve induction and mentoring programs.

**Recommendation**

No changes are recommended in response to these comments.
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SUBPART A: GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 65.10 Purpose and Scope

This Subpart A establishes the fundamental requirements that shall apply to each program of induction for new teachers for which approval or grant funds pursuant to Article 21A of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/Art. 21A] are sought. For the purposes of this Part, “beginning teacher” shall have the same meaning as that set forth for “new teacher” in Section 21A-5 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/21A-5].

(Source: Amended at 36 Ill. Reg. _____, effective ____________)

Section 65.20 Requirements of the Plan; Program Specifications

a) When State funding is available to support new proposals for any initiative under Article 21A of the School Code, the State Superintendent of Education shall issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) (or, in the case of noncompetitive funding, other application materials) in order to solicit applications from eligible entities. As used in this Part, a “proposal” or “application” means relevant portions of a plan for an induction and mentoring program that meets the requirements of Section 21A-20 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/21A-20], accompanied by the additional materials applicants will be required to submit, as described in Subpart B of this Part.

1) When the level of funding is insufficient to provide grants to each eligible entity in the State, a Request for Proposals (RFP) will be issued to solicit applications from eligible entities, and applications will be considered for funding based on the extent to which they meet the criteria set forth in Section 65.150 of this Part.

2) When the level of funding is sufficient to fund all eligible entities in the State, a Request for Applications will be issued and each school district whose plan meets the requirements of Article 21A of the School Code and this Part will receive a grant in an amount equal to at least the amount specified in Section 21A-25 of the School Code.

b) In accordance with Section 21A-20 of the School Code, each plan approved for a beginning teacher induction grant shall conform to the requirements of Section 21A-20 of the School Code.
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1) assign a mentor teacher to each beginning teacher for a period of at least 2 school years, providing sufficient time for the beginning teacher and mentor to engage in mentoring activities;

2) align with the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards, content area standards and the employing entity’s existing local school improvement and professional development plans, if any. In order to demonstrate the alignment required by this subsection (b)(2) Section 21A-20(2) of the School Code, each plan shall discuss the relationship among the services and experiences that will be available to beginning new teachers, the content-area standards applicable to their respective fields of certification or licensure endorsement, as applicable, or assignment (see 23 Ill. Adm. Code 26 and 27), and the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards (see 23 Ill. Adm. Code 24), and the employing entity’s existing plans for school improvement and professional development;

3) address all of the following elements and how they will be provided:

A) mentoring and support of the beginning teacher;

B) professional development specifically designed to ensure the growth of the beginning teacher’s knowledge and skills and accelerate the beginning teacher’s practice; and

C) formative assessment designed to ensure feedback and reflection, which must not be used in any evaluation of the beginning teacher; and

4) describe the role of mentor teachers, the criteria and process for their selection, and how they will be trained, provided that each mentor teacher shall demonstrate the best practices in teaching his or her respective field of practice. A mentor teacher may not directly or indirectly participate in the evaluation of a new teacher pursuant to Article 24A of the School Code or the evaluation procedure of the public school.

c) Each plan shall meet the Illinois Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Beginning Teacher Induction Programs set forth in Appendix A of this Part and further amplified in Section 65.150 of this Part.

(Source: Amended at 36 Ill. Reg. _______, effective ____________)
SUBPART B: BEGINNING TEACHER INDUCTION GRANT PILOT PROGRAM

Section 65.110 Purpose and Applicability

This Subpart B establishes the application procedure and criteria for selection by the State Board of Education of the applicants that will receive grant funds under the Beginning Teacher Induction Grant Pilot Program as authorized by Section 21A-25 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/21A-25]. The purposes of the grant program shall be to provide support for programs of intensive support and mentoring for beginning new teachers as specified in Section 65.130 of this Part and to gather information that will permit evaluation of the effects of these programs and provide for ongoing improvement and support of each program funded.

(Source: Amended at 36 Ill. Reg. _____, effective ____________)

Section 65.120 Eligible Applicants

Eligible applicants for grant funding under this Subpart B shall be the entities identified in Section 21A-5 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/21A-5], as well as public university laboratory schools approved by the State Board of Education pursuant to Section 18-8.05(K) of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/18-8.05(K)] (see Section 2-3.109a of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/2-3.109a]).

a) An eligible applicant may also be a partnership of eligible entities or a partnership of one or more eligible entities and one or more institutions of higher education, professional associations, regional offices of education, or not-for-profit providers of educational services.

1) If a joint application is submitted, then an administrative agent shall be designated and the application shall be signed by the authorized official of each entity that is a participant.

2) A school district or other eligible entity shall only participate in one proposal for a specific program.

b) No application shall be considered unless it includes a written statement by the authorized representative of the collective bargaining unit, if any, of each participating entity concurring with its submission.
c) Each eligible applicant shall propose to serve at least 10 beginning teachers. Eligible applicants with fewer than 10 beginning teachers may participate as part of a joint application. (See Section 65.130(b) of this Part.)

d) An eligible applicant may contract with one or more institutions of higher education, professional associations, regional offices of education, or not-for-profit providers of educational services to assist in implementing the program. (See Section 21A-15 of the School Code.)

(Source: Amended at 36 Ill. Reg. ______, effective ____________)

Section 65.130 Program Specifications

a) Each program supported with grant funds under this Subpart B shall incorporate:

1) mentoring for beginning new teachers that is provided by experienced teachers who have received training to equip them for this role;

2) professional development for recipient teachers, mentors, and administrators who have roles in the program; and

3) formative assessment of beginning new teachers’ practice with respect to the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards and the content-area standards relevant to their respective fields of assignment; and

4) the Illinois Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Beginning Teacher Induction Programs. (See Appendix A of this Part.)

b) Each program shall serve no fewer more than 10 beginning new teachers. If fewer than 10 teachers are proposed to be served, the applicant may either:

1) participate in a beginning teacher induction program as part of a joint application; or

2) provide in its application unless a specific rationale for the reduction is provided that demonstrates that the applicant has sufficient resources, in addition to funding received under this Subpart B, and adequate personnel to continue the program and provide how each beginning new teacher will receive comparable and adequate attention and support comparable to what would be provided in a larger program.
c) Each **beginning new** teacher shall **have**, at the time he or she begins the program, **have** less than two years’ teaching experience and hold an initial or a provisional early childhood, elementary, secondary, special K-12, or special preschool-age 21 certificate issued pursuant to Article 21 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/Art. 21] or a professional educator license issued pursuant to Article 21B of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/Art. 21B], as applicable. An individual seeking a professional educator license under the provisions of Section 21B-35 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/21B-35] and holding an educator license with stipulations endorsed for provisional educator also may participate if he or she has less than two years’ teaching experience.

d) **Subject to the exceptions of this subsection (d), each** program shall be designed to ensure that each **beginning new** teacher spends no less than **40 to 60 hours in face-to-face contact** with the mentor assigned, **either one on one or in another configuration**, including both classroom observation of the **beginning new** teacher by the mentor and other interactions between these individuals. **Each mentor who provides at least 60 hours of mentoring service in a grant year shall be paid $1,200 from grant funds awarded pursuant to this Part.**

1) **During a teacher’s first year of the program, at least 30 hours of contact between the teacher and mentor shall be face to face, either one on one or in another configuration, and the remaining interactions may be through electronic means, such as web-based applications, telephone or video.**

2) **During a teacher’s second year of the program, a minimum of 30 hours of contact is required, of which at least 20 hours shall be face to face.**

e) **Each program shall provide for the development of an individual learning induction plan for each beginning new teacher served and for the provision of professional development that is directly related to the needs identified in the individual learning plan.**

(Source: Amended at 36 Ill. Reg. _____, effective ____________)

**Section 65.140 Initial Application Procedure**

Each applicant that is proposing a program that has not received funding in the year previous to the current application, to include all applications from eligible entities that received funding under this Part previous to FY 2012, shall submit to the State Board of Education an application
that includes the components specified in this Section. For purposes of this Subpart, the terms “proposal” shall have the same meaning.

a) Grants for initial programs shall be offered in years in which the level of available funding is such that one or more new programs can be supported, along with those currently funded programs that seek continuation funding in accordance with Section 65.155 of this Part.

b) When State funding is available for new grants under this Subpart, the State Superintendent of Education shall issue the applicable application materials (see Section 65.20(a) of this Part a Request for Proposals (RFP) in order to solicit applications from eligible entities.

c) The application materials RFP shall describe the format that applicants will be required to follow and the information they will be required to submit, including a description of the proposed program, identification of the specific schools in which the induction program will be conducted, and the number of beginning new teachers and mentors involved. (Also see Section 65.150 of this Part for information relative to the contents of the proposal.)

d) The application materials RFP shall indicate the amount or expected amount of the appropriation for the program and shall describe the allowable expenditures and the basis for awarding grants. If matching funds or resources will be required of applicants, the application materials RFP shall describe these requirements.

e) The application materials RFP shall include a budget summary and payment schedule, as well as a narrative budget breakdown, i.e., a detailed explanation of each line item of expenditure.

f) The application materials RFP shall identify the data recipients will be required to collect and report regarding the activities conducted with grant funds and the results of those activities, as well as the timelines for reporting.

1) The applicant shall propose a specific method for collecting and maintaining data specific to program implementation and the induction program’s impact on beginning teachers’ performance, based on the induction program standards and continuum (see Appendices A and B of this Part), for the purpose of program improvement and evaluation.

A) Program records shall at least include a roster of mentors and
beginning teachers that includes the frequency (number of interactions) and duration (number of hours) of contact between each mentor and beginning teacher.

B) Program records shall at least include information about each beginning teacher's performance evaluation rating awarded pursuant to Section 24A-5 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/24A-5] and 23 Ill. Adm. Code 50 (Evaluation of Certified Employees under Articles 24A and 34 of the School Code) and retention status of each beginning teacher during his or her participation and after completion of the program.

2) The applicant shall describe a process that is consistent with continuous program improvement for using any data collected under subsection (f)(1) of this Section.

g) The application materials RFP shall include such certifications and assurances and program-specific terms of the grant as the State Superintendent may require, to be signed by each applicant that is a party to the application and submitted with the proposal. (Also see Section 65.170 of this Part.)

h) The application materials RFP shall specify the deadline for submission of proposals, which shall provide potential applicants with at least 30 days to respond.

h) Separate applications shall be required for renewal of grant funding. Each application for renewal shall include at least:

1) a description of expenditures and activities during the year just concluded, demonstrating that the project has been implemented in conformance with the approved grant agreement and that the recipient continues to exhibit need for grant funds for this purpose; and

2) an updated budget summary and payment schedule for the renewal year, including a narrative budget breakdown.

i) Incomplete proposals shall not be considered.

(Source: Amended at 36 Ill. Reg. ______, effective ____________)
Section 65.150 Criteria for the Review of Initial Applications

Applications for initial funding shall be evaluated to determine the extent to which each meets in accordance with the criteria set forth in this Section. When considering substantially equal proposals, the State Superintendent of Education shall give preference to programs that will take place in hard-to-staff schools, i.e., Illinois public schools that rank in the upper third among public schools of their type (e.g., elementary, middle, secondary) in terms of the rate of attrition among teachers.

a) Program Goals and Design and Resources (20 points)

1) The proposal articulates goals for the program that focus on the improvement of beginning teacher practice, retention, and student achievement as well as the continuous improvement of the program.

2) The proposal articulates the requirements for beginning teachers to successfully complete the program.

3) The proposal contains a plan for effective communication among all stakeholders.

4) The proposal articulates how the program is aligned with school and district improvement plans, other teaching effectiveness initiatives, and other professional learning opportunities.

5) The proposal identifies and allocates adequate resources to ensure the successful implementation of the program design.

6) The proposal provides for specific practices and policies, such as reduced course load for mentors, reduced course load for beginning teachers, release time, substitute pay, mentor stipends and access to resources, that will permit the participants in the program to devote the time necessary to reach the goals of the program.

b) Induction Program Leadership, Administration and Support (15 points)

1) The proposal identifies the individuals who will lead the program and clearly delineates their roles in planning, implementing, evaluating and refining the program. The roles and responsibilities of the program leaders are appropriate for the scope and complexity of the proposed
program.

2) The proposal includes strategies that will be used in providing oversight for the program to permit ongoing analysis of its effectiveness, allow for necessary programmatic modifications and provide communication with all stakeholders.

3) The proposal identifies how the induction program leadership will encourage and facilitate communication and collaboration among all stakeholders to ensure support of the program.

c) Site Administrator’s Roles and Responsibilities (15 points)

1) The detailed description of the role and responsibilities of the program’s site administrator (e.g., principal) suggests that each administrator will have ongoing participation in and provide leadership for the program so as to engender positive teaching and learning conditions for beginning teachers.

2) The proposal presents a plan for professional development for site administrators that provides a minimum of at least four hours of training specific to the site administrator’s role in understanding, designing and implementing high-quality beginning teacher induction programs.

d) Mentor Selection, Assignment, Training and Ongoing Development (20 points)

1) The proposal describes a comprehensive strategy for recruiting teachers who are suited to the role of mentor.

2) The proposal describes the criteria for mentor selection, which shall include at least the following:

A) a record of the mentor’s effective teaching practice and professional conduct, including at least three years of teaching experience and a performance evaluation rating of “proficient” or “excellent” from each of the mentor’s last two performance evaluations conducted pursuant to Section 24A-5 of the School Code and 23 Ill. Adm. Code 50 (Evaluation of Certified Employees under Articles 24A and 34 of the School Code);
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B) demonstrated commitment of the mentor to his or her own professional growth and learning, including the ability to be reflective and articulate about his or her teaching practice;

C) ability of the mentor to relate and communicate effectively with colleagues;

D) the mentor’s professional commitment to improving the induction of beginning teachers; and

E) knowledge of effective professional development for beginning teachers and effective adult learning strategies.

3) The proposal describes the foundational training for mentors, which shall include or incorporate at least the following topics:

A) adult learning theory and/or instruction relative to the implementation of the Standards for Professional Learning (2011) published by Learning Forward, 504 South Locust Street, Oxford, Ohio 45056 and posted at http://www.learningforward.org/standards/index.cfm; no later amendments to or editions of these standards are incorporated by this Section;

B) foundations of mentoring;

C) formative assessment;

D) coaching and observation strategies; and

E) analysis of student work and data.

4) The proposal provides a plan for mentor training that is ongoing, with at least monthly opportunities for mentors to interact with other mentors via a mentor learning community to build mentors’ skills through problem-solving and reflection so that they can better assist beginning teachers in the development of their teaching skills and professional practices. The sessions will enable participating mentors to share experiences and strengthen their ability to employ mentoring tools, protocols and formative assessment to support mentoring effectiveness.
5) The proposal provides a detailed description of the process to be used for assessment of mentor practice and mentor accountability.

e) Beginning Teacher Development and Formative Assessment (15 points)

1) The proposal describes plans for the timely orientation of the beginning teachers to the induction program before the start of their teaching assignments and for a formal network to provide novice colleagues with at least quarterly learning opportunities and ongoing support.

2) The proposal provides for the professional development of beginning teachers, which includes at least the development of an individual learning plan for each beginning teacher served and for the provision of professional development that is directly related to the needs identified in the individual learning plan.

3) The proposal clearly articulates a method for the formative assessment of beginning teachers’ practice and describes how that information will be used in the individual learning plan.

4) The proposal includes quarterly plans for incorporating issues of pedagogy, classroom management and content knowledge into professional development for beginning teachers and for ensuring alignment of this material with the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards, the participants’ specific identified needs and local instructional priorities.

5) The program is designed to afford at least one opportunity during each semester to observe teaching practices modeled by experienced teachers and discuss selected aspects of teaching practice with these teachers.

f) Program Impact and Implementation (Evaluation) (15 points)

1) The proposal identifies information to be collected and reported on the performance and retention of beginning teachers that will add to an understanding of the effects of more intensive induction programs as compared to the results of more typical models.
2) The evaluation is designed to assess the effectiveness of particular initiatives or components of the program and will likely produce data that can be used to improve the program.

3) The applicant identifies a method for tracking the continued service of the teachers served after the project ends so that longitudinal data can be compiled.

a) Program Design (45 points)

1) The proposal identifies specific practices and policies such as reduced course load for mentors, release time, and access to resources that will permit the participants in the program to devote the necessary time to induction and mentoring.

2) The proposal describes plans for timely orientation of the new teachers to the induction program and for a formal network of the novice colleagues that will provide them with ongoing learning opportunities and support.

3) The proposal clearly articulates methods for collecting evidence related to the new teachers’ practice and describes how that information will be used in planning for professional development and other support for the new teachers.

4) The proposal includes specific plans for incorporating issues of pedagogy, classroom management, and content knowledge into professional development for the new teachers and for ensuring alignment of this material with the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards, the participants’ specific identified needs, and local instructional priorities.

5) The proposal presents coherent allocation and scheduling of the participants’ time and is cost-effective in light of the level of resources requested and the number of new teachers to be served.

b) Mentor Recruitment and Support (25 points)

1) The proposal describes a comprehensive strategy for recruiting experienced teachers who are suited to the role of mentors, including:
A) the involvement of parties with an interest in teacher quality and retention;
B) thorough outreach and communication regarding the availability of positions for mentors;
C) clear criteria for the skills and experience sought; and
D) consideration of multiple sources of information in identifying the candidates to be selected.

2) The proposal provides for formal orientation of the mentors selected, for fundamental training of these individuals at the beginning of the program, and for professional development during the course of the program that is designed to strengthen their ability to employ mentoring tools, protocols, and formative assessment in response to the needs of beginning teachers.

3) The proposal describes a systematic approach to establishing a "community of mentoring practice" that will enable the participating mentors to share experiences and strategies and support each other's work within the induction program.

e) Evaluation Design (20 points)

1) The proposal identifies information to be collected and reported on the performance and retention of new teachers that will add to an understanding of the effects of more intensive induction programs as compared to the results of more typical models.

2) The proposal suggests how the effects of particular initiatives or components of the program will be measured.

3) The applicant proposes a method for tracking the continued service of the teachers served after the project ends so that longitudinal data can be compiled.

d) Leadership and Direction (10 points)

1) The proposal demonstrates that the individuals who will direct or coordinate the induction program have experience in this endeavor or a
commitment to it, as evidenced by their history of involvement or professional development.

2) The management structure described is appropriate to the scope and complexity of the program, the specific responsibilities of the on-site administrator are evident, and the roles and contributions of collaborating entities, if any, are clearly delineated.

3) The proposal includes strategies that will be used in providing oversight for the program to permit ongoing analysis of its effectiveness, necessary programmatic modifications, integration of various relevant professional development plans, and communication structures that respect the need for confidentiality when applicable.

(Source: Amended at 36 Ill. Reg. _____, effective ____________)

Section 65.155 Application Content and Approval for Continuation Programs

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

a) In order to continue to operate a Beginning Teacher Induction Grant Program, a grantee each year shall submit an application for continuation. The application shall include at least the following:

1) a description of expenditures and activities conducted during the year just concluded, demonstrating that the project has been implemented in conformance with the approved grant agreement and that the recipient continues to exhibit a need for grant funds for this purpose (i.e., the expected number of beginning teachers to be served);

2) an overview of the program to be conducted in the continuation period, addressing the program components outlined in Section 65.130 of this Part;

3) a summary of progress the applicant has made in implementing the standards and criteria listed in Appendix A of this Part during the previously funded grant period. The summary shall:
A) be based on the induction program continuum contained in Appendix B of this Part; and

B) list any strategies to be employed during the continuation period to improve the induction program and advance the applicant along the induction program continuum for one or more standards or criteria;

4) budget summary and payment schedule as well as a budget breakdown, i.e., a detailed explanation of each line item of expenditure; and

5) the certifications and assurances and program-specific terms of the grant referred to in Section 65.140(f) of this Part applicable to the continuation period.

b) A Beginning Teacher Induction Grant Program shall be approved for continuation provided that:

1) a need continues to exist for the program, as evidenced by the number of beginning teachers to be served;

2) the program components proposed will be effective in assisting and improving the practice of beginning teachers and are based on the areas identified for program improvement pursuant to subsection (a)(3) of this Section;

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

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

(Source: Added at 36 Ill. Reg. _____, effective ____________)

Section 65.160 Allocation of Funds

a) The State Superintendent of Education shall approve initial applications for competitive funding and make final determinations regarding the amounts to be
provided based upon the total funds appropriated for this initiative, the amounts necessary to fund the top-ranked proposals, and the need to distribute the benefits of innovative induction models on a statewide basis. The minimum grant to be awarded will range from $1,200 to $1,500 for each teacher served in a program that has been approved for funding under this Part.

b) It is the intention of the State Board of Education to approve continuation funding for projects under this Part prior to providing funding for new applicants. Funding for existing grantees for each year shall be contingent upon the availability of funds for the program and evidence presented in renewal proposals that the projects have been implemented in accordance with the approved grant agreements and that the recipients continue to need additional State resources in order to implement their programs. If funds remain available for new programs, an RFP shall be issued as provided in Section 65.140 of this Part.

c) In accordance with Section 21A-25 of the School Code, in years when sufficient funding is available for a statewide implementation of the beginning teacher induction grant program, the minimum grant to be awarded will be $1,200 for each teacher served in a program approved for funding under this Part.

(Source: Amended at 36 Ill. Reg. ______, effective ____________)

Section 65.170 Terms of the Grant

a) The grantee shall participate in external reviews and statewide data collection, as determined by the State Superintendent of Education, to be used to assess the overall effectiveness of induction and mentoring in the State and understand the effects of intensive induction programs on beginning teacher practice and effectiveness.

b) The grantee shall participate in State-provided technical assistance activities and State-developed trainings related to the use of the Illinois Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Beginning Teacher Programs and the Illinois Induction Program Continuum. (See Appendix A and Appendix B of this Part.)

c) Reporting. The grantee shall submit data and information about the beginning teacher induction program each year to the State Superintendent of Education in a format specified by and according to the timeline set forth by the State Superintendent. The report shall include, at a minimum, an assessment of the grantee’s progress towards meeting any locally established goals for the program.
as set forth in the approved application, and the number of beginning teachers and mentors served during the grant period.

d) Each grantee shall submit to the State Board of Education by December 31 of each grant year a final count of the teachers to be served in the beginning teacher induction program for the respective grant period. In instances in which the final count is less than the number of teachers proposed to be served in the approved application, the State Board of Education shall reduce grant proceeds not yet received by an amount equal to the difference between the proposed and actual number of teachers served multiplied by the per teacher amount awarded pursuant to either Section 65.160(a) or (c) of this Part, as applicable.

(Source: Added at 36 Ill. Reg. ______, effective ____________)

Section 65.ANDIX A  Illinois Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Beginning Teacher Induction Programs

This Appendix A set forth a clear framework to assist in the development of research-based programs that meet local needs and are responsive to local contexts. The standards are broad and interdependent, describing a vision of a comprehensive and dynamic program for beginning teachers and those who support them. The intent of these standards is to foster thoughtful, high-quality growth and development. Each program funded under this Part shall meet the standards set forth in this Section.

Standard 1: Induction Program Leadership

The induction program has an administrative structure with specified leaders who plan, implement, evaluate and refine the program through data analysis, program evaluation and stakeholder communication linked to relevant standards.

Criterion 1.1: Program leadership is selected and the leaders’ role is clearly defined to include being responsible for program planning, operation, oversight and use of data.

Criterion 1.2: Program leadership, program partners and all stakeholders have the time, fiscal resources and authority to implement and support the program.

Criterion 1.3: Program leadership, program partners and all stakeholders create a culture of commitment to beginning teacher induction and improving student achievement.
Criterion 1.4: Program leadership engages in initial and ongoing professional development to understand, design and implement high-quality induction and mentoring.

Standard 2: Program Goals and Design

Local program design is focused on beginning teacher development, support and retention and improved student learning. The goals are guided by current induction research, effective practices, standards contained in this Section, the district and school improvement plans and local concerns and context.

Criterion 2.1: Program design includes learning outcomes for beginning teacher participants that recognize a continuum of teacher development and a focus on student learning with clearly defined participant expectations for program completion.

Criterion 2.2: Program design provides for effective communication among program leadership, mentors, beginning teachers and site administrators and is consistently integrated into district and school improvement goals and ongoing professional development initiatives.

Criterion 2.3: Program design includes high-quality mentor selection, training, assessment and evaluation, and ongoing support in a mentor learning community.

Criterion 2.4: Program design defines essential activities, including beginning teacher formative assessment, written documentation of beginning teacher and mentor work, analysis of beginning teacher instruction and student learning, and professional development for all stakeholders.

Criterion 2.5: Program goals and outcomes for teacher development, retention and support and student learning are reviewed and revised as necessary by designated program leaders and stakeholders based on the analysis of multiple sources of program evaluation data.

Standard 3: Resources

Program leadership allocates and monitors sufficient resources to meet all goals and deliver program components to all participants.
Criterion 3.1: Program leadership, program partners and all stakeholders allocate adequate resources to ensure an appropriate distribution of funds to support components defined in the program design and in alignment with the district’s improvement plan.

Criterion 3.2: Program leadership, program partners and all stakeholders access and coordinate existing professional development resources to effectively align and coordinate those resources with the induction program.

Criterion 3.3: Program leadership, program partners and all stakeholders allocate sufficient, sanctioned, protected time for mentoring to foster high-quality mentoring for beginning teachers.

Criterion 3.4: Formative program leadership, program partners and all stakeholders monitor resource allocations on a regular basis in order to make necessary adjustments as needed during the year.

Criterion 3.5: Summative program leadership, program partners and all stakeholders support the development of fiscal reports to document allocations of resources as necessary for accountability and to promote ongoing program improvement.

Standard 4: Site Administrators Roles and Responsibilities

Site administrators lead efforts to create a positive climate for the delivery of all essential program components. Site administrators and program leadership collaborate to ensure that they are well-prepared to assume their responsibilities for supporting beginning teachers in the induction program.

Criterion 4.1: Program leadership, program partners and all stakeholders collaborate to design effective professional development for site administrators and promote their full involvement in program operations to maximize ongoing program improvement.

Criterion 4.2: Program leadership, program partners and all stakeholders collaborate with site administrators to ensure positive working environments for beginning teachers.
Criterion 4.3: Program leadership, program partners and all stakeholders collaborate with site administrators to foster the development of collaborative learning communities to promote a program of support for all staff.

Criterion 4.4: Program leadership, program partners and all stakeholders support site administrators to provide ongoing high-quality communications regarding induction program design and implementation.

Criterion 4.5: Program leadership, program partners and all stakeholders engage with site administrators to ensure positive mentoring experiences and to uphold the relationship between mentor and beginning teacher as confidential.

Criterion 4.6: Program leadership, program partners and all stakeholders collaborate with the site administrator to align their work in support of beginning teachers with the standards for administrators.

Standard 5: Mentor Selection and Assignment

Mentors are recruited, selected and assigned using a comprehensive strategy that includes a clearly articulated, open process and specific criteria that are developed by and communicated to all stakeholder groups.

Criterion 5.1: Program leadership, program partners and all stakeholders are guided by clear rigorous selection criteria and processes to ensure that beginning teachers will receive high-quality mentoring throughout their participation in the induction program.

Criterion 5.2: Program leadership, program partners and all stakeholders ensure that the matching of beginning teachers and mentors is based on multiple relevant factors to establish effective pairing of mentors with beginning teachers.

Criterion 5.3: Program leadership, program partners and all stakeholders define and implement a process to address changes or make necessary adjustments in mentor and beginning teacher matches.

Standard 6: Mentor Professional Development

Mentor professional development provides a formal orientation and foundational mentor training before they begin their work with beginning teachers and should continue over the course of the mentor’s work with beginning teachers. Mentors have time, supported
by the program, to engage in this mentor learning community and are consistently supported in their efforts to assist beginning teachers in their development, with a focus on student learning.

Criterion 6.1: Program leadership, program partners and all stakeholders collaborate to provide foundational training for mentors to develop basic knowledge, skills and attitudes for high-quality mentoring.

Criterion 6.2: Program leadership, program partners and all stakeholders facilitate the development of a professional learning community for mentors to regularly reflect on, improve and refine their practice.

Criterion 6.3: Program leadership, program partners and all stakeholders collaborate to provide ongoing professional development for mentors to advance induction practice and promote beginning teacher development.

Standard 7: Development of Beginning Teacher Practice

Beginning teachers have regularly scheduled time, provided during the two-year program, to participate in ongoing professional development that is focused on their professional growth to support student learning.

Criterion 7.1: Program leadership, program partners and all stakeholders collaborate to provide beginning teacher orientation to clarify district school and induction programs and ensure high levels of beginning teacher participation.

Criterion 7.2: Program leadership, program partners and all stakeholders collaborate to design and implement formal support of networking opportunities for beginning teachers to ensure their participation in collaborative cultures focused on professional learning and ongoing support.

Criterion 7.3: Program leadership, program partners and all stakeholders implement ongoing professional development to ensure high-quality beginning teacher development.

Criterion 7.4: Program leadership, program partners and all stakeholders provide and support sanctioned time for induction and mentoring processes to ensure sufficient support for high-quality professional development experiences for beginning teachers.
Standard 8: Formative Assessment

Beginning teachers and mentors participate in formative assessment experiences, collaboratively collecting and analyzing measures of teaching progress, including appropriate documentation, mentor observations and student work, to improve classroom practices and increase student achievement. The formative assessment is an ongoing, non-evaluative, evidence-based measurement of growth over time, involving a variety of sources of data, that is used to inform ongoing professional development.

Criterion 8.1: Program leadership, program partners and all stakeholders ensure that mentors use formative assessment tools collaboratively with beginning teachers for initial self-assessments and development of individual learning plans to guide weekly visits and determine the scope, focus, and content of professional development activities.

Criterion 8.2: Program leadership, program partners and all stakeholders ensure that mentors utilize a wide range of formative assessment tools in order to establish multiple measures of teaching from which to promote further professional development.

Criterion 8.3: Program leadership, program partners and all stakeholders establish and maintain procedures for documenting confidential use of formative assessment to gather evidence of reflective processes that impact student learning and practice.

Criterion 8.4: Program leadership, program partners and all stakeholders develop and follow policy regarding use of formative assessment and documentation to protect their use for program purposes only and not for evaluation of beginning teachers or for employment decisions.

Standard 9: Program Evaluation

Programs operate a comprehensive, ongoing system of program development and evaluation that involves all program participants and other stakeholders.

Criterion 9.1: Program leadership, program partners and all stakeholders develop and implement an ongoing process for program evaluation based on multiple internal and external sources with formal and informal measures to ensure ongoing program improvement.
Criterion 9.2: Program leadership, program partners and all stakeholders analyze multiple sources of data and share results with stakeholders in a systematic way.

Criterion 9.3: Program leadership, program partners and all stakeholders implement a process for mentor accountability in a supportive environment through a defined process of communication and documentation.

Criterion 9.4: Program leadership, program partners and all stakeholders participate in external reviews and statewide data collection designed to examine and improve program quality and effectiveness and to inform policymakers and stakeholders.

(Source: Added at 36 Ill. Reg. ______, effective ____________)

Section 65. APPENDIX B Illinois Induction Program Continuum

a) The Illinois Induction Program Continuum describes four levels of program implementation for each criterion of the standards set forth in Appendix A of this Part. The levels outline the progress of improvement new induction programs are expected to make and provide the basis for the development, support and evaluation of induction programs. The levels of program implementation are as follows.

1) Establishing Programs are learning about the induction program standards and establishing program components. Limited involvement of all stakeholders occurs at this level.

2) Applying Programs have some experience and are applying knowledge of induction program standards and moving toward full implementation of program components. The program is shared with additional stakeholders.

3) Integrating Programs are more experienced with induction program standards and accomplished in implementation of program components. They are working collaboratively with an expanded group of stakeholders on a regular basis.

4) Systematizing Programs collaborate regularly with all stakeholders to integrate induction program standards and program components throughout the district or consortia. The program is beyond compliance
b) The Illinois Induction Program Continuum assists with continuous program improvement through:

1) the provision of a common language to describe and discuss program development and ongoing improvement;

2) assistance to program leadership and partners to collaboratively design, implement and assess the quality and effectiveness of their programs;

3) assistance to program leadership in setting clear, evidence-based goals and planning for program development and improvement; and

4) identification of program needs for resources and supports.

(Source: Added at 36 Ill. Reg. ______, effective ____________)
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
       Susan Morrison, Deputy Superintendent/Chief Education Officer

Agenda Topic: Request for RFSP– Center of School Improvement

Staff Contact(s): Monique M. Chism, Ph.D., Assistant Superintendent Center for Innovation and Improvement

Purpose of Agenda Item
The Center for Innovation & Improvement requests the Board to authorize the State Superintendent to enter into a contract for the provision of the Center for School Improvement with the American Institutes for Research in an amount not to exceed $10,000,000 during the initial contract period (i.e., execution of contract to June 30, 2013) with annual amounts ranging from $10,000,000 to $14,000,000 anticipated for the four subsequent renewal periods.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
The following action will support Goals 1 & 2 in the Board’s Strategic Plan.

  GOAL 1: Every student will demonstrate academic achievement and be prepared for success after high school;

  GOAL 2: Every student will be supported by highly prepared and effective teachers and school leaders.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
It is expected that the Board will authorize the State Superintendent to execute the requested contract and establish the Center for School Improvement, better coordinating and providing more consistency to the state’s regional delivery systems to support school improvement.

Background Information
In order to bring coherence and coordination to the various regional delivery systems in the state, ISBE will establish The Center for School Improvement to provide high-quality, coordinated, and consistent support to the current Statewide System of Support (SSOS) and other regional assistance centers to ensure that school districts and schools receive expert, timely, and relevant assistance. The Center will be operated as a partnership between ISBE and the American Institutes for Research, which has a proven track record of effectively and efficiently providing high-quality, research-based services and resources that improve education outcomes for students.

By establishing The Center, ISBE will make several modifications to the current SSOS to ensure that the state can effectively meet the needs of school districts and support meaningful interventions to improve the performance of students who are the furthest behind, including the following:

  • Hiring regional assistant directors, content area specialists, coaches, and turnaround specialists with specific expertise in working with English Language Learners (ELLs), low-income students, racial and ethnic minority students, and Students with Disabilities (SWDs).
• Providing continuous professional development to SSOS staff to improve their capacity to effectively meet the needs of school districts with ELLs, low-income students, racial and ethnic minority students, and SWDs.

• Coordinating existing state resources to support teachers, administrators, and parents to better meet the needs of ELLs, low-income students, racial and ethnic minority students, and SWDs.

• Developing a robust systemwide evaluation processes for SSOS to promote its continuous improvement to better serve school districts and schools.

Additionally, one primary responsibility of The Center will be to hire and train turnaround specialists and rapid response teams to work with High Priority Districts identified for state level intervention.

On June 7, 2012, ISBE issued a Request for Sealed Proposals (RFSP) for the Center for School Improvement with a submission deadline of July 13, 2012. Eligible bidders included institutions of higher education (IHE), regional offices of education (ROEs); intermediate service centers (ISCs), private entities, or non-profit organizations that have extensive experience with comprehensive school and district improvement initiatives. Two (2) applications were received.

A team comprised of five (5) external and (1) ISBE reviewers was identified through a national search that yielded over 300 applicants. After individual interviews with the top12 finalists, ISBE staff selected reviewers with extensive experience in developing and implementing standards-aligned instructional systems, analyzing data to inform strategic decision-making in the eight essential elements identified for effective school districts and schools, implementing interventions in, and providing intensive supports for low-performing schools and districts. Selected reviewers engaged in web-based training sessions to ensure inter-rater reliability. Reviewers engaged in an independent review of all proposals from July 25, 2012, through August 13, 2012, using the scoring criteria and rubrics provided by ISBE staff and described in the RFSP. The reviewers included (3) three in-state and (3) out-of-state education experts.

A face-to-face consensus session was conducted on August 14, 2012, with one ISBE representative, an external facilitator, and the reviewers, to discuss each proposal, individual reviewer's scores, and to arrive at an averaged consensus score for each proposal. The readers' comments are on file in the Statewide System of Support and District Intervention Division in the Springfield office. A process is in effect for interested applicants to request the readers' comments.

After the initial review and scoring process, those bidders whose proposals earned at least (600) points on the narrative description were deemed as finalists and required to deliver a proposal presentation to ISBE representatives. Each proposal presentation was evaluated and ranked independently of the narrative description and cost proposal and the bidder's presentation was evaluated against the scope of work outlined in the Request for Proposals. Finalist could receive up to (250) points for the presentation portion of the review process.

The criteria for review were addressed in the Work Plan Requirements defined in the RFSP and were used to determine the quality and comprehensiveness of each proposal. The scoring rubrics were used to assess the individual applicant’s capacity to deliver the required services and supports (Work Plan) and the evidence presented to describe the qualifications of the bidder’s proposed staff, including their education, work experience, knowledge, and skills, and were judged against the qualification requirements outlined in the RFSP(Required Qualifications). A total of 1000 points were possible with 550 points being assigned to the Work
Plan components, 200 to the Required Qualifications components, and 250 points to the final presentation to the ISBE Roundtable.

ISBE seeks through this procurement to establish The Center for School Improvement. The Center will be operated as a partnership between ISBE and the recommended contractor. Additionally, The Center will be supported by guidance from the ISBE Roundtable, a cross-divisional leadership team responsible for oversight of the SSOS, to identify targeted assistance for schools and districts and help prioritize resources based on identified needs.

**Financial Background**

The Illinois State Board approved a request to issue a request for sealed proposal on March 21, 2012, to contract with a vendor to create the Center for School Improvement. The 2 proposals received were from American Institutes for Research and the Regional Office of Education #9/Champaign- Ford. The Division of Innovation and Improvement seeks to enter into a contract with the vendor with the highest evaluation scores, American Institutes for Research.

The anticipated amount for the initial term is $9,999,935 with 4 possible one-year renewals. The total contract with all possible renewals will not exceed $65,868,443. This contract will be supported by federal school improvement funds allocated to ISBE under Title I, Part A and Title I, Part G of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, as amended 20 U.S.C. 6821.

The table below illustrates the contract funding for the initial year and all possible renewals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal year</th>
<th>State Funding</th>
<th>Federal Funding</th>
<th>Total Contract Award Per Fiscal Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>$9,999,935</td>
<td>$9,999,935</td>
<td>$9,999,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>$13,879,031</td>
<td>$13,879,031</td>
<td>$13,879,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>$13,997,012</td>
<td>$13,997,012</td>
<td>$13,997,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16</td>
<td>$13,994,697</td>
<td>$13,994,697</td>
<td>$13,994,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>$13,997,768</td>
<td>$13,997,768</td>
<td>$13,997,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$65,868,443</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effectiveness**

This is a new contract therefore, no previous effectiveness measure exists. The most recent evaluation of the current Statewide System of Support was completed in April 2012 by Western Illinois University’s Department of Educational Leadership. The Western Illinois study consisted of survey responses submitted by school and district administrators, SSOS Area Coordinators, and SSOS Coaches, as well as a series of recommendations based on data collected. As part of the contract deliverables The Center is responsible for implementing a performance management system that provides frequent, formative and summative reports on The Center’s effectiveness and its regional impact on improving student achievement. In addition, The Center is required to work with an independent evaluator contracted by ISBE to assess the overall effectiveness of the SSOS as well as levels of service delivery. The precise performance measure will be determined during the start-up of the contract and will include metrics that focus on closing the achievement gap, service delivery, and improving student outcomes.

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

Policy Implications: The Center for School Improvement was proposed as part of our Race to the Top application.
Budget Implications: This will be paid with Title I 1003 (a) and (g) funds and any state funds if they become available.

Legislative Action: None

Communication: Please see next steps.

**Superintendent’s Recommendation**

I recommend that the following motion be adopted:

The State Board hereby authorizes the State Superintendent to enter into a contract with American Institutes for Research the successful bidder for the Center for School Improvement. The initial contract term is from contract execution to June 30, 2013 with 4 possible renewal terms. The initial contract term will not exceed $9,999,935, and the total contract and all renewals will not exceed $65,868,443.

**Next Steps**

Upon approval, the notice of contract award will be posted on the Illinois Procurement Bulletin website. When all the posting requirements have been met the State Superintendent will enter into a contract with the successful bidder in accordance with Board approval.
TO: Illinois State Board of Education
FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
Susie Morrison, Deputy Superintendent and Chief Education Officer
Reyna Hernandez, Assistant Superintendent

Agenda Topic: Contract Exceeding $1 Million: Request to Release a Request for Sealed Proposals for Monitoring of Early Childhood Block Grant Prevention Initiative Programs (Birth to Age Three)

Materials: None

Staff Contact(s): Cindy Zumwalt, Division Administrator, Early Childhood Education

Purpose of Agenda Item
The Division of Early Childhood Education requests the Board to authorize the State Superintendent to release a Request for Sealed Proposals (RFSP) whereby one eligible entity will receive a contract to provide monitoring and evaluation of the Early Childhood Block Grant Prevention Initiative (Birth to Age Three) programs. The amount of the contract will not exceed $2,400,000 over the five-year term of the contract.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
The contract will support the following Board goals.

GOAL 1: Every student will demonstrate academic achievement and be prepared for success after high school.

GOAL 2: Every student will be supported by highly prepared and effective teachers and school leaders.

GOAL 3: Every school will offer a safe and healthy learning environment for all students.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
The Board will authorize the State Superintendent to release the RFSP.

Background Information
The Prevention Initiative (PI) program, which was established in 1988, is authorized by Sections 1C-2 and 2-3.89 of the School Code. It is one of two programs currently funded under the Early Childhood Block Grant (ECBG). The ECBG is a birth to age 5 grant program that includes PI and the Preschool for All program. The ECBG's purpose is to provide early, continuous, intensive, and comprehensive evidence-based child development and family support services to help families prepare their young children for later school success.

The PI program is funded with an Infant/Toddler Set-Aside from the ECBG. Under Section 1C-2(c) of the School Code, not less than 11% of the money appropriated for the ECBG must be used to fund programs for children ages 0-3. The law further provides that this percentage will increase to at least 20% by FY 2015. The State Board is exempted from meeting these minimum percentages when, in a given fiscal year, the amount appropriated for the ECBG is insufficient to increase the PI allocation without reducing the amount of the ECBG for existing providers of preschool education programs. Currently, the ECBG Infant/Toddler Set-Aside for PI is 14%.
PI funds are distributed to eligible applicants, including school districts, social service agencies and other entities, on a competitive basis. Section 2-3.89 of the School Code requires PI grantees to implement research-based, comprehensive and intensive prevention services to expecting parents and families with children birth to age 3 who are at-risk of academic failure. Examples of the research-based models currently receiving PI funding are center-based services that adhere to the requirements of Early Head Start or the National Association of the Education of Young Children Standards, Healthy Families Illinois, Parents as Teachers, Baby Talk, and Nurse Family Partnership. All the program models share common components, such as home/personal visits, links to community resources, group connections, screening, and individual family service planning/goal-setting processes. PI programs may be center-based (daycare settings, family literacy programs) or provide home visitation services only.

The PI program is intended for children who have been determined to be at risk for school failure as indicated by their families’ high levels of poverty, illiteracy, unemployment, limited-English proficiency, or other need-related indicators (e.g., school district’s rate of dropouts, retention, truancy, teenage pregnancies and homeless students; high rates of infant mortality, birth trauma, low birth weight or prematurity; and high rates of child abuse or neglect).

The Illinois Early Learning Council provided recommendations to ISBE for the development of an enhanced and coordinated system for monitoring programs serving children birth to age three and their families. The recommendations suggest the monitoring system should be designed to monitor the quality of programs which include:

a. Fidelity to the program model;
b. Fulfilling productivity expectations;
c. Ensuring staff are appropriately qualified, trained, credentialed and supervised;
d. Ensuring that outcome goals are met and that programs are having a positive impact on children and families. Specific areas of focus are: child growth and development, parent/child bonding, family wellness and parent self sufficiency.

The recommendations regarding the monitoring system include drawing data from three sources of program level data:

a. Reporting/data collection;
b. Program self-assessments;
c. On-site monitoring visits.

A Statewide System Evaluation of the Early Childhood Block Grant (Birth to Age 5 Years) was contracted and completed by the Erikson Institute/Herr Research Center for the Children and Social Policy. The final segment of the project was an evaluation measuring the quality of PI programs. The preliminary findings of the study were presented to ISBE in June and included a recommendation to establish standard methods to be used across the system to collect information from multiple programs and models for an ongoing monitoring and evaluation system to systematically track changes over time across different areas of program quality and provide feedback to programs regarding quality improvement.

Currently the Preschool for All (3-5) programs funded through the ECBG are being monitored and assessed on a three year cycle. ISBE contracts with National Louis University to implement a monitoring and assessment system that ensures compliance and continuous program improvement by providing comprehensive reports to ISBE. The reports inform technical assistance and training as needed.

**Financial Background**

The contract will be awarded for five fiscal years, to extend from the execution date of the contract until June 30, 2017 (FYs 2013-2017). Renewal in each fiscal year of the contract will be contingent upon a sufficient appropriation for the program and satisfactory performance of the contractor in the preceding contract year. The total contract will not exceed $2,400,000.

**Effectiveness**

The contract will require quarterly reporting to ensure that deliverables are performed in a timely manner in accordance with the contract. Satisfactory performance under the contract will require completion of all
deliverables, including utilizing multiple research-based monitoring instruments. Evaluators will be required to undergo reliability analysis for each instrument.

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

Policy Implications: The purpose of the RFSP is to select a contractor to conduct program monitoring and evaluations of PI programs using research-based tools to collect information from multiple programs and models across the system to assess areas of program quality and a compliance checklist identified by the Illinois State Board of Education to ensure compliance. At least, three research-based evaluation tools will be required to complete a thorough evaluation of PI programs. These include instruments to evaluate the program, the home visit and the center based classroom. These evaluation tools and compliance checklist incorporate the requirements for the PI program as set forth in the agency's rules governing the Early Childhood Block Grant (see 23 Illinois Administrative Code 235.Subpart A and Appendix B (Illinois Birth to Five Program Standards) at [http://www.isbe.net/rules/archive/pdfs/235ARK.pdf](http://www.isbe.net/rules/archive/pdfs/235ARK.pdf)). Tools and checklists will need to assess both center-based and home visitation programs.

The ECBG funds 158 PI programs throughout the State of Illinois that are located outside the City of Chicago. (NOTE: A separate appropriation has been awarded to City of Chicago School District 299 for the initiatives funded under the Preschool for All initiative and the PI program.) PI grantees represent a variety of entities, including school districts, social service agencies, faith-based organizations, health departments, regional offices of education, higher education institutions, community-organizations and child care centers. The contractor will implement a pilot to test the monitoring system in FY 2013 with a limited number of PI programs. In FY 2014, the contractor will conduct limited statewide implementation. Beginning in FY 2015, each program will receive an on-site monitoring visit at least once during a three-year cycle. Programs may receive a program assessment more frequently than every three years based on their need for follow-up, as identified by the team of ISBE consultants assigned to review monitoring reports.

Budget Implications: Please see "Financial Background" above.

Legislative Action: None needed.

Communication: Please see “Next Steps” below.

**Pros and Cons of Various Actions**

Pros: The on-site monitoring and evaluation services to be provided under the contract will assist program staff in ensuring that PI programs are in compliance with the School Code and the administrative rules. The data and information collected about the programs will enable State Board staff to provide continued support, including targeted technical assistance, to improve the quality of the services available for at-risk children and their families.

Cons: Failure of the agency to issue the contract will result in agency staff being unable to provide the type of on-site monitoring and evaluation necessary to ensure that PI programs are of high quality and in compliance with ISBE rules, policies, and grant agreements.

**Superintendent’s Recommendation**

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

> The State Board hereby authorizes the State Superintendent to release a Request for Sealed Proposals (RFSP) for the purpose of entering into a contract for the provision of on-site monitoring and evaluation of programs funded under the Early Childhood Block Grant’s Prevention Initiative (Birth to Age Three). The contract will extend from the date of the contract’s execution until June 30, 2017 and will not exceed $2,400,000.

**Next Steps**

Upon Board authorization, agency staff will release the RFSP for Monitoring of Early Childhood Block Grant Prevention Initiative Programs (Birth to Age Three). The Board will then be provided with an
opportunity to approve the entity recommended, as a result of the proposal review process, to provide the services before the State Superintendent enters into a contract with that entity.
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
Nicki Bazer, General Counsel

Agenda Topic: Waiver Report to the General Assembly

Materials: Waiver Report

Staff Contact: Winnie Tuthill, Principal Rules Consultant

Purpose of Agenda Item
The purpose of the agenda item is to inform the Board about requests for waivers and modifications received since the last report in February 2012; to consider whether the Board should recommend the General Assembly disapprove certain requests; and to secure approval of the Fall 2012 Waiver Report for submission to the General Assembly before October 1, as required by law.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
The waiver report is linked to Goal 1 in that applicants may request waivers and modifications of the School Code or of agency rules in order to improve student performance.

Expected Outcomes of Agenda Item
The Board will be asked to adopt motions recommending to the General Assembly that it disapprove two requests contained in the report. In addition, the Board will be asked to authorize submission of the Fall 2012 Waiver Report to the General Assembly.

Background Information
The Fall 2012 Waiver Report is the thirty-fifth report to be submitted to the General Assembly pursuant to Section 2-3.25g of the School Code. This report contains 44 requests that seek to waive mandates of School Code provisions upon which the General Assembly must act. These requests address daily physical education (16 requests), nonresident tuition (15 requests); limitation of administrative costs (seven requests); school improvement (4 requests); and use of other practice driving methods in lieu of the required six hours of behind-the-wheel instruction in a dual control car on public roadways (2 requests).

Since the Spring 2012 waiver report, the State Superintendent has approved four requests that waive State Board rules pertaining to driver’s education; two requests pertaining to administrative certification for directors of area vocational systems; and one request for a waiver of rules governing school food service programs. (Note: Unlike requests for waivers of School Code provisions—which must go to the General Assembly, requests for waivers of State Board rules can be granted by the State Superintendent).

Analysis and Policy Implications

ISBE staff recommendation that the State Board forward two (2) waiver requests with a recommendation for legislative disapproval.
Staff are recommending the State Board suggest the General Assembly disapproval recommendations on two waiver requests contained in the report. Both requests, from Bureau Valley CUSD 340 and Marshall CUSD C-2, address non-resident tuition for children of full-time employees in the respective districts.

When the State Board voted in December of 2007 to discontinue its informal practice of making recommendations on individual waiver requests to the Illinois General Assembly, it did so with the understanding that such recommendations could be made in the future under exceptional circumstances. The requests from Bureau Valley and Marshall present such a circumstance.

Both districts have asked for a waiver of Section 10-20.12a of the School Code (105 ILCS 5/10-20.12a) (Tuition for non-resident pupils). Since 1995, the General Assembly has approved 148 requests on this topic, and denied one. Of the 868 school districts in Illinois, 114, or 13.1 percent, have received a waiver from the General Assembly for this purpose (several districts have renewed their original waivers). The majority of such requests are written on behalf of nonresident students whose parents are employed in the district, with the understanding that such students shall be charged no tuition but the district will instead count their attendance when filing its claim for General State Aid (GSA). In a minority of cases, waivers are requested on behalf of students in neighboring districts, without the requirement that their parents be employed by the petitioning district. Most of those waivers do charge tuition to students but at a lesser rate than the 100-110% of the per capita cost of maintaining the schools in the district required under the law.

The requests from Bureau Valley 340 and Marshall C-2 both ask to charge some amount of tuition to eligible students while at the same time counting their attendance for GSA. Section 18-8.05(F)(1)(c) of the School Code states that “days of attendance for tuition pupils shall be accredited only to the districts that pay the tuition to a recognized school.” ISBE staff consider that charging tuition to students while at the same time collecting GSA for their attendance is neither based upon sound educational practice, nor can it be considered to have improved student performance as a primary goal. For these reasons, both waiver requests are recommended for legislative denial.

Discussion of categories of requests for which ISBE staff recommends the State Board forward to the General Assembly without comment

The section includes a discussion of waiver requests for driver’s education and for daily physical education.

Driver’s Education – Behind-the-Wheel Instruction. Two districts have requested renewals of their waivers from Section 27-24.3 of the School Code that requires the provision of six hours of behind-the-wheel instruction in a dual controlled car on public roadways. Both requests (New Trier 203 and Glenbard 87) ask to use 12 hours of practice driving in a computerized simulator in lieu of three of the required six hours of behind-the-wheel instruction.

Physical Education. The report contains 16 waiver requests from school districts seeking relief from the mandate to provide physical education on a daily basis. Of these 16 petitions, seven affect students in kindergarten through grade 8; six affect high school students only; and three affect students in both elementary and high school grades. Thirteen of the 16 requests are renewals.
The waiver law was amended in 2008 (P.A. 95-223) to limit all future physical education waivers to an initial, 2-year request with the possibility of no more than two renewals, each for a period of two years, after which time the petitioning district could no longer seek a waiver for daily physical education. Of the 16 waiver requests submitted in this report, four districts are requesting the final of the two renewals possible to them under the waiver law. If the renewal requests are approved, when these waivers expire in the spring of 2015 the districts will no longer be eligible to reapply and will need to offer daily physical education to all students in accordance with Section 27-6 of the School Code (105 ILCS 5/27-6). The four districts are:

- El Paso – Gridley CUSD 11 (100-5630);
- Montmorency CCSD 145 (100-5644);
- Wauconda CUSD 118 (100-5667); and
- Warren THSD 121 (100-5678).

**Superintendent’s Recommendation**

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

The State Board of Education hereby forwards the following waiver requests to the General Assembly with recommendations for legislative disapproval:

- The request from Bureau Valley CUSD 340 (WM100-5656) to admit nonresident students whose parents are full-time district employees, at a tuition rate of $250-$1,000, such rate to be set annually by the board, and with the board also claiming the average daily attendance of such students on the State Aid Claim.
- The request from Marshall CUSD C-2 (WM100-5671) to admit nonresident students whose parents are full-time district employees at a tuition rate of $3,000 (such rate representing the difference between the State Aid per student rate and the district’s per capita tuition charge), and with the board also claiming average daily attendance of such students on the State Aid Claim.

The State Board of Education hereby forwards the remaining 42 waiver requests summarized in the Fall 2012 Waiver Report to the General Assembly without comment.

**Next Steps**

Staff will submit the Fall 2012 Waiver Report as presented to the General Assembly before October 1.
MEMORANDUM

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

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

DATE: October 1, 2012

RE: Waivers of School Code Mandates: Fall 2012 Waiver Summary Report

As required by Section 2-3.25g of the School Code (105 ILCS 5/2-3.25g), the following report provides summaries of requests for waivers of School Code mandates being transmitted to the Illinois General Assembly for its consideration. The report concludes with a database listing all of the requests received, organized by Senate and House districts, including those requests for waivers and modifications acted on by the State Superintendent of Education in accordance with Section 1A-4 of the School Code (105 ILCS 5/1A-4) and applications that have been returned to school districts or other eligible applicants.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact Nicki Bazer, General Counsel, at (217) 782-8535.

cc: The Honorable Pat Quinn, Governor
    Tim Mapes, Clerk of the House
    Tim Anderson, Secretary of the Senate
    Legislative Research Unit
    State Government Report Center
Executive Summary

The following report outlines waivers of School Code mandates that school districts, regional offices of education, or special education or vocational education cooperatives have requested since the last report, which was transmitted in March 2012. Pursuant to Section 2-3.25g of the School Code (105 ILCS 5/2-3.25g), these requests must be sent to the General Assembly for its consideration before October 1, 2012.

The report is organized by subject area and by school district, regional office, or special education or vocational education cooperative. The General Assembly may disapprove the report in whole or in part within 60 calendar days after each chamber next convenes once the report is filed. This is done by a joint resolution. If either chamber fails to reject a waiver request, then that request is deemed granted.

Section I summarizes the 44 requests received for waivers of School Code mandates for consideration by the General Assembly, which are presented alphabetically by topic area. The largest number of applications received (16 requests) seeks waivers from the requirement for daily physical education. There are 15 requests for non-resident tuition, seven requests for limitation of administrative costs, four requests for school inservice training, and two requests for the use of other practice driving methods in lieu of the required six hours of behind-the-wheel instruction in a dual control car on public roadway.

Public Act 95-223, passed early in 2008, limited the number of waivers of daily physical education that could be requested by school districts and other eligible applicants to an initial, 2-year request, with the possibility of no more than two additional, 2-year renewal requests. Of the 16 waiver request renewals for physical education contained in this report, four districts are requesting their second and final renewal.

This document also contains one other section beyond what is required under Section 2-3.25g of the School Code. Section II is a database with listings of modifications or waivers of State Board of Education rules and modifications of School Code mandates upon which the State Superintendent of Education has acted in accordance with Section 1A-4 of the School Code (105 ILCS 5/1A-4). The database also includes listings of requests that have been returned to or withdrawn by the petitioning entities. In addition, the database includes the 44 waiver requests for the General Assembly’s consideration and is organized by Senate and House districts.

Complete copies of the waiver requests for the General Assembly’s consideration have been made available to legislative staff.

This is the thirty-fifth report submitted pursuant to Section 2-3.25g of the School Code, which requires that the State Board of Education through agency staff compile and submit requests for waivers of School Code mandates to the General Assembly before March 1 and October 1 of each year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Denied by SBE</th>
<th>Transmitted to GA</th>
<th>Withdrawn or Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Certification</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal School Holidays</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitation of Administrative Costs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident Tuition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Food Program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Improvement/Inservice Training</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Petition Summary</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS:** 71
SECTION I
Applications Transmitted to the General Assembly

Driver Education

Behind-the-Wheel Instruction

New Trier THSD 203 – Cook (SD 9/HD 17) / Expiration: 2017-18 school year
WM100-5640 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code (Section 27-24.3) request to allow the district to use computerized simulators for 12 hours of practice driving in lieu of three hours of behind-the-wheel instruction in a car with dual operating controls operated on public roadways. The district states that its simulators are able to create a progressive learning experience that is less stressful since it allows students to learn from early mistakes in a risk-free environment. If approved, this waiver would take effect in the 2013-14 school year.

Glenbard SD 87 – DuPage (SD 21/HD 42) / Expiration: 2017-18 school year
WM100-5665 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code (Section 27-24.3) request to allow the district to use computerized simulators for 12 hours of practice driving in lieu of three hours of behind-the-wheel instruction in a car with dual operating controls operated on public roadways. The district states that its simulators are able to create unusual and dangerous conditions from which students can learn without their safety being threatened, and that students develop skills through practice/review/repetition procedures available to them through the program. If approved, this waiver would take effect in the 2013-2014 school year.

Limitation of Administrative Costs

Irvington CCSD 11 – Washington (SD 58/HD 115) / Expiration: 2011-12 school year
WM100-5648 – Waiver of School Code (Section 17-1.5) request to allow the district to waive the limitation of administrative costs due to circumstances beyond its control. During FY 2012, the costs of the health benefits provided to the superintendent increased by 12.5 percent. In lieu of a raise in salary, the superintendent had requested the year previous to this cost change that his family’s health insurance be paid. The increased premiums caused the district’s administrative costs for FY 2012 to exceed the 5 percent limitation.

Wood River – Hartford SD 15 – Madison (SD 56/HD 111) / Expiration: 2012-13 school year
WM100-5652 – Waiver of School Code (Section 17-1.5) request to allow the district to waive the limitation of administrative costs due to circumstances beyond its control. For the FY 2012 school year, the district employed an interim superintendent. The hiring of a full-time superintendent with paid benefits for the 2012-2013 school year caused the district’s administrative costs to exceed the 5 percent limitation.

A-C Central CUSD 262 – Cass (SD 47/HD 93) / Expiration: 2011-12 school year
WM100-5653 – Waiver of School Code (Section 17-1.5) request to allow the district to waive the limitation of administrative costs due to circumstances beyond its control. The district added an in-house prekindergarten program through a state grant during the FY
2012 school year, with grant management provided by the elementary school principal. The compensation received by the principal to handle the increased duties contingent on the grant caused the district's administrative costs to exceed the 5 percent limitation.

Laraway CCSD 70C – Will (SD 43/HD 86) / Expiration: 2011-12 school year
WM100-5658 – Waiver of School Code (Section 17-1.5) request to allow the district to waive the limitation of administrative costs due to circumstances beyond its control. In the summer of 2011 the superintendent was reassigned as a principal in a new building, retaining his previous salary and benefits. The district hired an interim (retired) superintendent to fill the vacant position. At the conclusion of his 100-day contract, an additional interim superintendent had to be hired. A new vacancy in an existing principal position was filled by one interim superintendent; the other suspended his retirement status and worked full-time as superintendent for the remainder of the year. The combined effect of these personnel changes caused administrative expenses for the district to exceed the 5 percent limitation.

Posen – Robbins SD 143.5 – Cook (SD 15/HD 30) / Expiration: 2011-12 school year
WM100-5679 – Waiver of School Code (Section 17-1.5) request to allow the district to waive the limitation of administrative costs due to circumstances beyond its control. The district needed to improve its tracking system for special education funds to ensure that students were efficiently served. It made the necessary improvement by moving the position of secretary to the director of special education into the district's administrative cost calculations. This accounting adjustment caused administrative expenses for the district to exceed the 5 percent limitation.

Sandoval CUSD 501 – Marion, Clinton (SD 54/HD 107) / Expiration: 2011-12 school year
WM100-5680 – Waiver of School Code (Section 17-1.5) request to allow the district to waive the limitation of administrative costs due to circumstances beyond its control. The district received a federal School Improvement Grant to improve student achievement in language arts and mathematics. The district chose one of the models mandated for this grant, which required the housing and administration of a lead partner, and the purchase of necessary office equipment and supplies. The expenses associated with the new grant caused the district’s administrative costs to exceed the 5 percent limitation.

Chaney – Monge SD 88 – Will (SD 43/HD 85) / Expiration: 2012-13 school year
WM100-5683 – Waiver of School Code (Section 17-1.5) request to allow the district to waive the limitation of administrative costs due to circumstances beyond its control. For the 2011-2012 school year, the district employed two interim superintendents. The hiring of a full-time superintendent with paid benefits for the 2012-2013 school year caused the district’s administrative costs to exceed the 5 percent limitation.

Nonresident Tuition

Dodds CCSD 7 – Jefferson (SD 54/HD 107) / Expiration: 2016-17 school year
WM100-5625 – Waiver of School Code (Section 10-20.12a) request to enable the district to allow non-resident students whose parents are full-time employees of the district to attend its schools free of charge.

Herrin CUSD 4 – Williamson (SD 59/HD 117) / Expiration: 2016-17 school year
WM100-5631 – Waiver of School Code (Section 10-20.12a) request to enable the
district to allow non-resident students whose parents are full-time employees of the district to attend its schools free of charge.

_La Harpe CSD 347 – Hancock (SD 47/HD 94) / Expiration: 2016-17 school year_
_WM100-5645 – Waiver of School Code (Section 10-20.12a) request to enable the district to allow non-resident students whose parents are certified employees of the district to attend its schools free of charge._

_ROWVA CUSD 208 – Knox (SD 37/HD 74) / Expiration: 2016-17 school year_
_WM100-5647 – Waiver of School Code (Section 10-20.12a) request to enable the district to allow non-resident students whose parents are employees of the district to attend its schools free of charge._

_Lena Winslow CUSD 202 – Stephenson (SD 45/HD 89) / Expiration: 2017-18 school year_
_WM100-5649 – Waiver of School Code (Section 10-20.12a) request to enable the district to allow non-resident students whose parents are full-time employees of the district to attend its schools free of charge. If approved, this waiver would take effect in the 2013-14 school year._

_Avon CUSD 176 – Warren, Fulton, Knox (SD 47/HD 94) / Expiration: 2016-17 school year_
_WM100-5654 – Waiver of School Code (Section 10-20.12a) request to enable the district to allow non-resident students whose parents are full-time certified employees of the district to attend its schools free of charge._

_Bureau Valley CUSD 340 – Bureau, Lee, Whiteside (SD 37/HD 74) / Expiration: 2017-18 school year_
_WM100-5656 – Waiver of School Code (Section 10-20.12a) request to enable the district to allow non-resident students whose parents are full-time employees of the district to attend its schools at a rate set annually by the board of education, with a range from $250 to $1,500. In addition, the district would claim the average daily attendance of such students on the State Aid Claim. If approved, this waiver would take effect in the 2013-14 school year._

_Ana-Jonesboro CHSD 81 – Union (SD 59/HD 118) / Expiration: 2016-17 school year_
_WM100-5657 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code (Section 10-20.12a) request to enable the district to allow non-resident students whose parents are full-time employees of the district to attend its schools free of charge._

_Waltham CCSD 185 – LaSalle (SD 38/HD 76) / Expiration: 2013-14 school year_
_WM100-5664 – Waiver of School Code (Section 10-20.12a) request to enable the district to allow non-resident students whose parents are full-time certified employees of the district to attend its schools at a yearly rate of $1,500._

_Summersville SD 79 – Jefferson (SD 54/HD 107) / Expiration: 2017-18 school year_
_WM100-5668 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code (Section 10-20.12a) request to enable the district to allow non-resident students whose parents are full-time employees of the district to attend its schools free of charge. If approved, this waiver would take effect in the 2013-14 school year._
Marshall CUSD C-2 – Clark (SD 55/HD 109) / Expiration: 2016-17 school year
WM100-5671 – Waiver of School Code (Section 10-20.12a) request to enable the district to allow non-resident students whose parents are full-time employees of the district to attend its schools at a reduced tuition rate of $3,000, representing the difference between the General State Aid per student rate and the district’s per capita tuition charge. The district would claim the average daily attendance of such students on the State Aid Claim.

Johnston City CUSD 1 – Williamson (SD 59/HD 117) / Expiration: 2016-17 school year
WM100-5673 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code (Section 10-20.12a) request to enable the district to allow non-resident students whose parents are full-time employees of the district to attend its schools free of charge.

Odell CCSD 435 – Livingston (SD 53/HD 105) / Expiration: 2016-17 school year
WM100-5675 – Waiver of School Code (Section 10-20.12a) request to enable the district to allow non-resident students whose parents are full-time employees of the district to attend its schools free of charge.

Hamilton County CUSD 10 – Hamilton (SD 59/HD 117) / Expiration: 2016-17 school year
WM100-5681 – Waiver of School Code (Section 10-20.12a) request to enable the district to allow non-resident students whose parents are full-time employees of the district to attend its schools free of charge.

Marion CUSD 2 – Williamson, Johnson (SD 59/HD 117) / Expiration: 2016-17 school year
WM100-5682 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code (Section 10-20.12a) request to enable the district to allow non-resident students whose parents are full-time employees of the district to attend its schools free of charge.

Physical Education

Indian Prairie SD 204 – DuPage (SD 48/HD 96) / Expiration: 2014-15 school year
WM100-5624 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code (Section 27-6) request to allow the district to permit students in kindergarten through grade 5 to participate in physical education three times a week for 25 minutes each session due to inadequate facilities. The district states that students receive more daily physical activity under this schedule than what is mandated. In addition to formal classes, students have daily supervised recess sessions with activities such as football, kickball, races, softball, and soccer. If approved, this waiver would take effect in the 2013-14 school year.

Plainfield CCSD 202 – Will (SD 42/HD 84) / Expiration: 2013-14 school year
WM100-5629 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code (Section 27-6) request to allow the district to permit students in kindergarten through grade 5 to participate in physical education two times a week for 35 minutes each session due to inadequate facilities. Students also will receive supplemental instruction one day a week covering a health and wellness curriculum.

WM100-5630 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code (Section 27-6) request to allow the district to permit students in kindergarten through grade 3 to participate in physical education three times a week for one semester and two times a week for the other semester, with each session lasting 30 minutes. This schedule would allow for music instruction on the days in which the students are not in physical education classes. Students also have two, 15-minute activity sessions each day. The district also requests to be allowed to exempt students in grades 11 and 12 from daily physical education while they participate in show choir. Such students will receive daily dance practices before school. If approved, this waiver would take effect in the 2013-14 school year. If granted, this is the last physical education waiver the district will be permitted to request under the law.

Wilmington SD 209-U – Will (SD 38/HD 75) / Expiration: 2014-15 school year
WM100-5636 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code (Section 27-6) request to allow the district to excuse students in grades 6 through 12 from the physical education requirement for a variety of reasons: those who have failed an academic course needed for promotion or graduation; and those who elect to take a course other than physical education and have permission from their principals to do so. In addition, the district asks to excuse students in grades 9 through 12 from daily physical education if they participate in two or more interscholastic athletic programs. The waiver, if approved, will allow the district to use the instructional day in the “most beneficial manner to students.” If approved, this waiver would take effect in the 2013-14 school year.

East Aurora SD 131 – Kane (SD 42/HD 83) / Expiration: 2013-14 school year
WM100-5637 – Waiver of School Code (Section 27-6) request to allow the district to excuse students in grades 6 through 8 from the physical education requirement if they are in need of intense reading interventions and not able to participate in an elective academic class after school or during the summer. Such students will be given additional reading instruction to better prepare them for high school reading. The district states that it is important to give each student an enriching educational experience that builds skills for reading, writing, and math, through an exploratory academic class offered either after school or during the summer.

WM100-5639 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code (Section 27-6) request to allow the district to permit students in kindergarten through grade 6 to participate in physical education for a minimum of twice a week for 25 minutes each session rather than daily. Classroom teachers will determine whether additional physical education activities will be offered, based on balancing students’ physical and intellectual needs. The request is being made due to inadequate facilities. If approved, this waiver would take effect in the 2013-14 school year.

Collinsville CUSD 10 – Madison (SD 56/HD 112) / Expiration: 2013-14 school year
WM100-5643 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code (Section 27-6) request to allow the district to excuse students in grades 11 and 12 from the daily physical education requirement to enable those students to enroll in additional academic classes, including a variety of AP courses and a vocational program offered in conjunction with the local community college. Over 500 students participate in interscholastic athletic programs or band in the district, and many others also join non-school–sponsored athletic programs.

WM100-5644 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code (Section 27-6) request to allow the district to permit students in kindergarten through grade 8 to participate in physical education twice a week for 40 minutes each session due to inadequate facilities. Students receive recess periods totaling 225 minutes per week of physical activity, in addition to physical education classes, and students in grades 5 through 8 have the opportunity to participate in after-school sports programs. If approved, this waiver would take effect in the 2013-14 school year. If granted, this is the last physical education waiver the district will be permitted to request under the law.

Morris CHSD 101 – Grundy (SD 38/HD 75) / Expiration: 2013-14 school year
WM100-5646 – Waiver of School Code (Section 27-6) request to allow the district to excuse students in grade 10 from nine weeks of daily physical education in order to be enrolled in driver’s education. The 200 students affected by this waiver, if approved, will be able to enroll in a foreign language, fine arts, or a second math or science class, thereby completing all necessary college entrance requirements.

Sterling CUSD 5 – Whiteside, Lee (SD 45/HD 90) / Expiration: 2014-15 school year
WM100-5651 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code (Section 27-6) request to allow the district to permit students in kindergarten through grade 5 to participate in physical education twice a week for 25 minutes each session due to inadequate facilities. Students will also have 20 minutes of recess each day, structured physical activities in the classroom and opportunities to participate in the park district’s athletic programs after school. If approved, this waiver would take effect in the 2013-14 school year.

Lake Villa CCSD 41 – Lake (SD 31/HD 62) / Expiration: 2013-14 school year
WM100-5660 – Waiver of School Code (Section 27-6) request to allow the district to permit students in kindergarten through grade 6 to participate in physical education once a week for 35 minutes. Students will also have daily recess, and teachers will provide structured classroom activities requiring movement and fitness. The district states that the waiver will allow additional classroom time to implement the Common Core Standards.

Wauconda CUSD 118 – Lake (SD 26/HD 52) / Expiration: 2014-15 school year
WM100-5667 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code (Section 27-6) request to allow the district to excuse students in grades 9 through 12 from the daily physical education requirement for ongoing participation in cheerleading, pom-pons, dance programs, or swing choir (if credit is provided). In addition, the district requests that students in grades 9 and 10 be excused for ongoing participation in an interscholastic athletic program. The district’s goal is to complement the exercise such students are receiving with coursework in core academic areas, career preparation and the fine arts. If approved, this waiver would take effect in the 2013-14 school year. If granted, this is the last physical education waiver the district will be permitted to request under the law.

Ridgeview CUSD 19 – McLean (SD 53/HD 105) / Expiration: 2014-15 school year
WM100-5670 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code (Section 27-6) request to allow the district to excuse students in grades 6 through 10 from the daily physical education requirement for ongoing participation in an interscholastic athletic program, and students in grades 9 through 12 from the daily physical education requirement for ongoing participation in cheerleading, pom-pons or marching band. If granted, the waiver will enable high school students to take additional academic classes and for those in middle
school, to schedule a supervised study session if they are also enrolled in band or music. If approved, this waiver would take effect in the 2013-14 school year.

**Crete – Monee CUSD 201U – Will (SD 40/HD 80) / Expiration: 2014-15 school year**

**WM100-5449 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code** (Section 27-6) request to allow the district to excuse students in grades 9 through 12 from the daily physical education requirement for ongoing participation in show choir or for participation in academic intervention courses designed to assist students in passing content-area courses. The waiver, if granted, will enable students to take additional academic and elective courses. If approved, this waiver would take effect in the 2013-14 school year.

**Mundelein CHSD 120 – Lake (SD 26/HD 51) / Expiration: 2014-15 school year**

**WM100-5676 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code** (Section 27-6) request to allow the district to excuse students in grades 11 and 12 from the daily physical education requirement for ongoing participation in cheerleading, pom-poms, or show choir. The district states that students eligible for this waiver have rigorous daily practice sessions and that the waiver, if approved, would allow these students to schedule a study hall or enroll in other academic courses. If approved, this waiver would take effect in the 2013-14 school year.


**WM100-5678 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code** (Section 27-6) request to allow the district to permit students in grades 9 through 12 to take physical education as a summer school course in order to schedule additional academic courses during the regular school year. The district hopes the summer school option will spur students to enroll in more English and math classes, a goal articulated in its plan for “corrective action.” In addition, the district wants to excuse students in grades 11 and 12 from physical education for ongoing participation in varsity hockey and varsity lacrosse. If approved, this waiver would take effect in the 2013-14 school year. If granted, this is the last physical education waiver the district will be permitted to request under the law.

**School Improvement/Inservice Training**

**Carthage ESD 317 – Hancock (SD 47/HD 94) / Expiration: 2016-17 school year**

**WM100-5544 – Waiver of School Code** (Section 18-8.05(F)(2)(d)(2)) request to allow the district to hold five full-day teacher inservice sessions instead of ten half days, and to count the days among the 176 days of actual pupil attendance required by Section 10-19. The district will accumulate sufficient time beyond the five-clock-hour requirement to apply towards these days.

**City of Chicago SD 299 – Cook (SD 3/HD 5) / Expiration: 2016-17 school year**

**WM100-5662 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code** (Section 18-8.05(F)(2)(d)(2)) request to allow the district to hold four full-day teacher inservice sessions instead of eight half days, and to count the days among the 176 days of actual pupil attendance required by Section 10-19. The district will accumulate sufficient time beyond the five-clock-hour requirement to apply towards these days.

**Prairie Hill CCSD 133 – Winnebago (SD 35/HD 69) / Expiration: 2016-17 school year**

**WM100-5669 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code** (Section 18-8.05(F)(2)(d)(2)) request to allow the district to hold two full-day teacher inservice sessions instead of four half days, and to count the days among the 176 days of actual pupil attendance required by
Section 10-19. The district will accumulate sufficient time beyond the five-clock-hour requirement to apply towards these days.

*Blue Ridge CUSD 18 – DeWitt, McLean, Livingston (SD 44/HD 87) / Expiration: 2017-18 school year*

**WM100-5677 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code** (Section 18-8.05(F)(2)(d)(2)) request to allow the district to hold two full-day teacher inservice sessions instead of four half days, and to count the days among the 176 days of actual pupil attendance required by Section 10-19. The district will accumulate sufficient time beyond the five-clock-hour requirement to apply towards these days. If approved, this waiver would take effect in the 2013-14 school year.