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

II. Public Participation

III. Presentations and Updates
   A. Making Assessments Work: Supporting Teaching and Learning in the Common Core Era – Advance Illinois
   B. Teacher Performance Assessment – edTPA

IV. Closed Session (as needed)

V. Superintendent's Report – Consent Agenda
   A. *Approval of Minutes
      1. Plenary Minutes: January 22-23, 2014 pp. 3-7
   B. *Rules for Initial Review
   C. *Rules for Adoption
      1. Part 227 (Gifted Education) pp. 8-22
         Addresses technical changes to update terminology from "certification" to "licensure" and updates an incorporation of standards to reflect the most current available. Two comments received, and a change is recommended in response to the comments.
      2. Part 232 (Summer Bridges Program) pp. 8-22
         Addresses technical changes to update terminology from "certification" to "licensure". No public comment was received.
         Addresses technical changes to update terminology from "certification" to "licensure" and responds to legislation regarding the placement of certain suspended and expelled students in programs. No public comment was received.
      4. Part 265 (Grants for Arts Education and for Foreign Language Education) pp. 8-22
         Addresses technical changes to update terminology from "certification" to "licensure". No public comment was received.
   D. *Contracts & Grants over $1 Million
      1. Request to Award Contract: edTPA Sole Source pp. 41-99
      2. Approval of Intergovernmental Agreement: The Gateways to Opportunity Scholarship Program pp. 95-97
      3. Approval of Intergovernmental Agreement: Illinois Department of Human Services FY 2014 pp. 98-100
4. Request for RFSP: QRIS Validation and Child Outcomes Study pp. 101-104
5. Approval of Intergovernmental Agreement: Summer Food Program Service pp. 105-107

E. *Targeted Initiatives Grants
   1. Request to Award Grant: Austin Childcare Providers Network pp. 108-110
   2. Request to Award Grant: Chicago Public Schools District 299 for Spencer Technology Academy pp. 111-113


G. *FY13 Financial Audit Report p. 136

End of Consent Agenda

VI. Discussion Items
   A. District Oversight – Monthly Update
   B. E-rate and Technology Funding Update
   C. Legislative Update pp. 137-141
   D. Other Items for Discussion

VII. Announcements & Reports
   A. Superintendent’s/Senior Staff Announcements
   B. Chairman’s Report
   C. Member Reports

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

IX. 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.
Supporting Teaching and Learning in the Common Core Era
February 2014
Illinois adopted rigorous standards for students that serve as the bedrock of the public education system.

The state’s comprehensive plan to improve public schools and raise student performance builds upon these high-quality standards.
With new standards in place, Illinois needs an assessment system that measures whether students have the knowledge, skills and understanding to succeed in an ever-changing world.

Such assessments should reflect student progress at all performance levels with results reported in weeks, not months.
Advance Illinois partnered with our Educator Advisory Council to examine current challenges with assessments and opportunities to improve.

For more than a year, we interviewed educators, observed classroom instruction, consulted assessment experts and identified school districts with an aligned system of instruction and assessment.
Challenges with Current Assessments

• Much of the unease surrounding current assessments stems from the disconnect between what’s taught and what’s tested.

• If instruction and assessments are not rooted in the same academic standards, then test prep can interfere with authentic teaching and learning.

• Across the nation, most state assessments focus on skills that are easily measured, but not most meaningful for student success.
Illinois Educators Are Rethinking How to Instruct and Assess Students

• Research shows students learn deeply when challenged to think in new, complex ways.

• Such rigorous, authentic instruction prepares students to perform well on any assessment.

• We see evidence of how this works when instruction and assessment stem from the same academic standards that make clear what is expected, and what knowledge is foundational for student progress.

• The Common Core provides this starting point.

Schaumburg Elementary D54 and Township High School D214 created an aligned system of instruction & assessment during the past decade.

- **Set clear expectations for student performance and stay the course.**
  - Districts created three ambitious goals for student performance that targeted raising student performance and narrowing the achievement gap.
  - Districts did not change these expectations for more than five years.

- **Provide teachers the time needed to do this work well.**
  - Districts dedicate time during the school day for teachers to collaboratively develop instruction and assessments aligned to the district goals for student performance.
  - District 214 calls this “sacred” time.

- **Create a balanced system of assessments to measure progress.**
  - Districts create an assessment system that includes a mix of standardized assessments and teacher-created formative assessments.
  - The combination provides a window into teaching and learning.
  - The results drive decisions at the classroom, school and district level.

- **Our schools, our students.**
  - Educators in both districts describe how a shared vision for student performance lays the groundwork for educators to pull in a common direction.
  - Educators can support all students to improve when there is an understanding of what good instruction looks like, an expectation that all students experience rigorous curriculum and an awareness of how learning will be measured.
Initial analysis suggests most questions on the new Common Core assessments will measure higher-order thinking through performance tasks and open-ended prompts that delve deeper than fill-in-the-bubble tests.

Investing In New Assessments

- **ISBE recently requested $54.5 million for the state’s assessment budget next year.**
- **This represents less than one percent of the state’s overall education budget.**
- **This marks an important investment for our state if the new assessments capture students’ deeper learning and provide richer information about teaching and learning for students, educators and families.**
This is the Right Move for Illinois Students, But A Transition Plan Is Needed

The shift to new standards and assessments represents a fundamental change in how teachers teach and students learn. This is the right move for Illinois students.

There inevitably will be bumps along the road of implementation, and the state would be wise to develop and publish a three-to-five year transition plan to get from here to there.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Transition Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Create an aligned assessment system that measures higher-order thinking across grades 3 through 12.</td>
<td>1. Create a process to ensure the continuous improvement of new assessments and thoughtful implementation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Make clear how the state plans to support school districts during this transition.
- Determine whether Illinois will make available PARCC diagnostic assessments to inform instruction.
- Create a transition timeline that conveys how the state intends to handle the ACT and Work Keys and, more broadly, a universal college entrance exam and workforce readiness credential moving forward.
- Identify the resources needed to help all students – specifically, English Language Learners and students with special needs – access the Common Core.
Key Principles To Guide Assessment Decisions

For now, we offer several principles to frame the conversation about the next generation of assessments:

- **Support educators to implement the Common Core well. This is the best approach to perform well on any assessment.**

- **Provide a balanced assessment system that more fully measures students’ higher-order thinking.**

- **Upgrade technology to support a 21st century education and the computer-based assessments that come with it.**

- **Place educators in a leading role with the development of new Common Core assessments.**

- **Create a process to ensure the continuous improvement of new assessments and their thoughtful implementation.**

- **Administer the ACT and Work Keys while determining how best to implement aligned assessments across K-12.**
The Illinois P-20 Council, in partnership with ISBE, plans to convene 18 focus groups with educators statewide during the coming months to help inform decisions.

Creating a process to gather educator input from Alton to Zion bodes well for the caliber and care of the decisions.

This work is being led by the Consortium for Educational Change and the Center for the Study of Education Policy at Illinois State University.
Stay the Course

• Four years ago, Illinois adopted the new, rigorous Illinois Learning Standards based upon the Common Core. New assessments soon will come with them.

• To undertake this work in a single district would be a challenge, let alone in all of Illinois’ 862 districts.

• The scale of the change requires support. The Illinois legislature should address how the state provides resources to improve teaching and learning in all school districts.
Wednesday, January 22, 2014

ROLL CALL

Mr. Gery Chico, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m. Dr. Koch was in attendance and a quorum was present.

Members Present

Mr. Gery Chico, Chairman
Mr. Steven Gilford, Vice Chairman (arrived 10:35 a.m.)
Dr. Vinni Hall, Secretary
Mr. James Baumann
Mr. Curt Bradshaw
Dr. Andrea Brown
Dr. David Fields
Ms. Melinda LaBarre

DISCUSSION ITEMS

USDA Smart Snacks in Schools

Mark Haller, Division Administrator for Nutrition and Wellness Programs lead the Board through a discussion about the USDA’s recently released Interim Final Rules on Nutrition Standards for all food and beverages sold in schools participating in the National School Lunch Program. On July 1, 2014, the Federal Interim Final Rules on Nutrition Standards will take effect and will require Board action in order for districts to have flexibility. Mr. Haller stated that nutrition staff will update the Illinois School Food Service Rules (Part 305) for action at a future board meeting. The Board articulated a desire for flexibility and wanted staff to further investigate the possibility of allowing districts to incorporate the frequency of such sales in their wellness plans.

Legislative Update

Nicki Bazer, Nicole Wills and Amanda Elliott provided the Board with a summary of legislation that has been filed in advance of the Spring 2014 legislative session and an update on the Board’s 2014 legislative agenda.

RESOLUTIONS & RECOGNITION

Dr. Hall moved that the Illinois State Board of Education adopt the resolution recognizing Dr. Harry Berman, who will retire as Executive Director of the Illinois Board of Higher Education in February. Dr. Fields seconded the motion and it passed with a unanimous voice vote.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Judy Hackett from the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education and Tim Thomas from the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA) thanked Superintendent Koch and the Board for their effort to reach a logical outcome to the Part 226 Class Size/Ratio Regulations.

Jim Nelson, Vice President of the Illinois Manufactures Association (IMA) and Executive Director of the IMA Education Foundation spoke in support of ACT Work Keys. Superintendent Koch reassured Mr. Nelson that the proposed ISBE budget includes the ACT Work Keys.

Twelve people spoke in opposition to the Denial of the Certification for Tomorrow’s Builders Charter School in East St. Louis.

Patricia Nix-Hodes from the Law Project of the Chicago Coalition for the Homeless acknowledged and thanked the Board for including a budget recommendation of $3 million for homeless education.
Jean Korder Director of Curriculum Assessment at Urbana School District #116 and Tom Farquer, Superintendent/Principal of Williamsfield School spoke in support of the new Illinois learning Standards and the use of PARCC.

BREAK/RECONVENE

Chairman Chico announced that the Board would break at 12:15 p.m. for lunch. The Board reconvened the open meeting at 1:05 p.m.

FY15 BUDGET DISCUSSION

Mr. Bauman introduced the FY15 State General Funds budget of $7.8 billion dollars. The budget is an increase of $1.08 billion dollars. Of the proposed increase, $879 million dollars is budgeted for General State Aid and would fully fund a foundation level of $6119 based upon the January forecast; $56.97 million of the overall increase is attributable to MCATS. These two lines comprise 91.7% of our budget.

Mr. Robert Wolfe, Chief Financial Officer, shared with the Board a Power Point presentation that included the detailed breakdown of Fiscal Year 2015 Superintendent’s Budget Recommendation (See Plenary Packet, Pages 13-1 thru 13-32, Exhibits A- K).

FY15 FUNDING DISCUSSION

Mr. Wolfe discussed funding proposals for the East St. Louis and North Chicago school districts. Although, the funding would provide financial support and stability to the districts for the next school year, the districts deficits continue to grow each year.

Chairman Chico announced that the Board would be entering into closed session and will only reconvene the meeting to recess the meeting until tomorrow, January 23, 2014 at 8:30 a.m.

Mr. Gilford 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 2 c 1 to discuss the appointment, employment, compensation, performance or dismissal of an employee and c 11 for the purpose of discussing litigation.

Mr. Gilford further moved that the Board may invite anyone they wish to be included in the closed session. Dr. Hall seconded the motion and it passed with a unanimous roll call vote.

The Board entered into closed session at 4:10 p.m. The Board ended closed session at 5:10 p.m. and recessed the meeting at 5:15 p.m. until Thursday, January 23, 2014, at 8:30 a.m.
Chairman Chico reconvened the meeting at 8:35 a.m. Dr. Koch and all Board members were in attendance and a quorum was present.

Student Advisory Council Chair, Austin Hansen, Co-Chair, Danielle Segerstrom and their fellow Student Advisory Council members updated the Board on the statewide grading scale project they are working on that will be presented to the Board in June.

Motion:
Mr. Bradshaw moved that the State Board of Education hereby approves the consent agenda as presented. Dr. Hall seconded the motion and it passed with a unanimous voice 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 January 22-23, 2014, board meeting.

Rules for Adoption

Part 1 (Public Schools Evaluations, Recognition and Supervision)
Part 22 (Code of Ethics for Illinois Educators)
Part 23 (Standards for the School Service Personnel Certificate)
Part 28 (Standards for Certification in Special Education)
Part 29 (Standards for Administrative Certification)
Part 226 (Special Education) (class size/composition)

Proposed amendments to Parts 22, 23, 28 and 29 make technical changes to align terminology in the rules to the new licensure system, which took effect July 1, 2013. Additional changes in Part 23 update incorporations to various national standards to reflect the most current available and in Part 29 align the standards to those incorporated in Part 30 (Programs for the Preparation of Principals in Illinois). One comment each was received for Part 23 and Part 28; no changes were made in response to these comments and the versions presented for action were identical to those considered by the Board in October 2013.

The State Board of Education adopted the proposed rulemakings and authorized 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.

Contracts and Grants Over $1 Million

Request for Grant Approval: North Lawndale Eagles
The State Board of Education hereby authorizes the State Superintendent to award a grant to Chicago Public Schools District 229 for the North Lawndale
Eagles youth football team for an initial period beginning December 10, 2013, through June 30, 2014, with permission given to the State Superintendent to extend expenditure availability of the grant for a period not to exceed two years, if needed, to complete grant activities as provided in Section five of the Illinois Grant Funds Recovery Act [30 ILCS 705/5], in the amount of $10,000.

Approval of Intergovernmental Agreement
Illinois State University for Administration of Illinois National Board Professional Preparation

The State Board of Education hereby authorizes the State Superintendent to renew the agreement through June 30, 2015, for an additional $298,000 with Illinois State University to administer the Illinois National Board Professional Preparation and Support System (subject to appropriation). The total contract will not exceed $1,678,726.

END OF THE CONSENT AGENDA

DENIAL OF CERTIFICATION FOR TOMORROW'S BUILDERS CHARTER SCHOOL

Nicki Bazer, General Counsel, Jennifer Saba, Assistant General Counsel, Debbie Vespa, Division Administrator for School Business Services and Sarah McCusker, Principal Consultant in the Division of College and Career Readiness reviewed the criteria set forth in the School Code required of all charter schools and provided the support for denial of certification of the Tomorrow's Builders YouthBuild Charter School. The concerns included serious operational deficiencies, including lack of properly certified teachers for subject taught and failure to maintain accurate enrollment data, serious financial problems, persistent noncompliance with special education law, and concerns about the lack of a viable education plan and progress on meeting educational and operational performance standards in the charter contract.

East St. Louis Superintendent Art Culver, accompanied by several of his staff, provided a description of both high school and alternative programs where youth could be transitioned in the event the State Board would withhold certifying the charter causing the school to close.

Vickie Kimmel Forby, Chief Executive Officer from Tomorrow's Builders YouthBuild Charter School, accompanied by the principal of Tomorrow's Builders and an attorney representing the school, presented in opposition to ISBE staff recommendation.

Chairman Chico announced that the Board would take a recess. The Board recessed at 11:35 a.m. and returned to the open meeting at 12:05 p.m.

MOTION
Dr. Brown moved that the State Board of Education hereby authorizes the State Superintendent to withhold certification of Tomorrow’s Builders YouthBuild Charter School and orders District 189 to close the charter school at the end of the 2013-2014 school year.

Dr. Fields seconded the motion and it passed with a unanimous roll call vote.
Superintendent Koch notified that Board that after yesterday’s discussion on East St. Louis and North Chicago there has been an additional $8.3m added to the budget for East St. Louis and $4.7m for North Chicago. Superintendent Koch also pointed out that the budget did not specify an amount for Teach for America and the amount he is recommending is $1.95m. The total additions to the budget equal $14.00m.

**MOTION**

Mr. Bauman commented that Article X, Section 1 of the Illinois State Constitution states in part, “The State has the primary responsibility for financing the system of public education.”

Therefore I move, that the Illinois State Board of Education hereby recommends an increase of $1.0839 Billion (16.2%) in General Funds appropriations for FY 2015. The increase will provide a sufficient appropriation to fund General State Aid at the Statutory Foundation Level of $6,119, which is $286 less than the FY 2006 Education Funding Advisory Board Recommended Foundation level and is $2,553 less than the (current) recommended Foundation Level of $8,672.

I further move that Illinois State Board of Education hereby authorizes the State Superintendent to make changes to the “Other State Funds” and “Federal Funds” as appropriate pending actions during the legislative session. The full recommendation for the FY 2015 State Board of Education Budget is outlined in the budget handout dated January 23, 2014.

Dr. Hall seconded the motion and it passed with a unanimous roll call vote.

**INFORMATION ITEMS**

ISBE Fiscal & Administrative Monthly Reports *(available online at http://isbe.net/board/fiscal_admin_rep.htm)*

**MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman Chico moved that the meeting be adjourned. Dr. Fields 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
February 19, 2014

TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
Susie Morrison, Deputy Superintendent and Chief Education Officer
Nicki Bazer, General Counsel

Agenda Topic: Action Item: Proposed Amendments for Initial Review:
Part 227 (Gifted Education)
Part 232 (Summer Bridges Program)
Part 265 (Grants for Arts Education and for Foreign Language Education)

Materials: Recommended Rules

Staff Contacts: Amy Jo Clemens, Assistant Superintendent

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
None of these sets of proposed amendments relates directly to the Board’s Strategic Goals since they are technical changes to align the wording of the rules to the terminology used in the licensure system.

Expected Outcome of Agenda Item
The Board will be asked to adopt amendments to Parts 227, 232 and 265.

Background
P.A. 97-607, effective August 26, 2011, changed the current system of teacher, administrator and school service personnel certification set forth in Article 21 of the School Code to a licensure system (Article 21B of the School Code). More than a dozen sets of the agency’s rules refer to “certification” in some manner. References to certification and related terms will need to be changed to align each of these sets of rules to the licensure system, which became effective July 1, 2013. Further, an incorporation in Part 227 to an assessment of the Illinois Association for Gifted Children is being updated to reflect the most current version of the standards upon which the assessment is based.

These proposed changes are being brought to the Board as a group since they contain technical changes only. Staff will bring additional sets of rules to the Board over the next several months, as other modifications to those rules become necessary or as staff's work load permits.

The proposed amendments were published in the Illinois Register December 6, 2013, to elicit public comment; two comments were received addressing Part 227. A summary and analysis of the comments, along with any recommendations for changes in the proposed amendments as a result, is attached.
**Analysis and Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action and Communications**

Policy Implications: A brief description of the purpose of each of the rules is provided below.

Part 227, promulgated in 2007, sets forth requirements for receipt of competitive grants for the establishment of gifted education programs under Article 14A of the School Code. Article 14A of the School Code, which originally provided funding on a formula basis to school districts for gifted programming, was repealed in July 2003. Two years later in 2005, Article 14A was reinstated; however, the program has not been funded. For this reason, school districts are not obligated to comply with the provisions of Part 227 in establishing local gifted education programming.

Part 232 provides opportunities for summer learning for students who, as determined by the school district, do not qualify for promotion to the next grade. The rules implement Section 10-20.9a of the School Code. School districts receiving funding under this program must provide at least 90 hours of instruction, based upon a literacy framework described in Appendix A of the rules, as well as contribute a funding match of at least 20 percent of the total grant received. The program was last funded in FY 2010.

Part 265 establishes program specifications for the receipt of competitive grants to expand arts education or to improve or establish programs in foreign languages. Since FY 2009, funding for the program has been reduced significantly, dropping from $4 million in that fiscal year to $500,000 in FY 2013. For FY 2014, the arts and foreign language program has not been funded, but the agency is requesting $500,000 for the program for FY 2015.

Budget Implications: None.
Legislative Action: None needed.
Communication: Please see “Next Steps” below.

**Pros and Cons of Various Actions**
The proposed changes will align the rules to current statute by eliminating references to the certification process.

Not proceeding with the amendments will result in the rules conflicting with statute.

**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 rulemakings for:

- Gifted Education (23 Illinois Administrative Code 227),
- Summer Bridges Program (23 Illinois Administrative Code 232), and
- Grants for Arts Education and Foreign Language Education (23 Illinois Administrative Code 265),

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 227 (Gifted Education)

Comment

The two comments submitted both addressed the various options provided in Section 227.20 that teachers employed in state-funded gifted education programs may use to demonstrate that they understand the characteristics and educational needs of gifted children and have the instructional knowledge and skills to meet their needs. The first commenter asked that the rules require teachers to exhibit the skills and knowledge reflected in the standards developed by the National Association for Gifted Children. This recommended change would replace the option in Section 227.20(b)(1) for teachers to complete a self-assessment developed by the Illinois Association for Gifted Children (IAGC). This self-assessment is aligned to the IAGC's standards. The commenter argues that the national standards are "more current and research based" than the standards developed by IAGC and should be used instead.

Similarly, another commenter indicated that an option in Section 227.20(c)(3) to complete the Gifted Education Seminar is confusing. The commenter noted that the professional development opportunity is now called the Gifted Education Seminar and represents an "updated version of the institute", and teachers who have completed the institute while it was offered are still qualified.

Analysis

IAGC is an affiliate of the National Association of Gifted Children. In developing its standards, the IAGC was informed by the work of the national association but designed the gifted education standards to align to the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards. In this way, the standards become more relevant to the knowledge and skills expected of educators who hold Illinois licensure. IAGC updated both its performance standards and the knowledge standards in 2012 through a standard-setting process that included Illinois teachers, administrators, coordinators, parents, consultants from regional offices of education and university faculty.

It is not apparent whether the national association also provides a tool, similar to the self-assessment now required, that gauges the skills and knowledge against the national standards. The commenter also did not suggest a tool that could be used in place of the self-assessment, which is based on the IAGC standards (and hence, the reason for their incorporation into the rules). For these reasons, further consideration and study of the suggestion should be undertaken by agency staff, in consultation with the Illinois Advisory Council on the Education of Gifted and Talented Children, to determine whether the recommended change is relevant to the purpose of the rule.

Staff support the suggestion made by the second commenter and are proposing that the rules be updated to accept completion of both the gifted institute or the seminar, as applicable, as a for a gifted teacher to demonstrate that he or she understands the characteristics and educational needs of gifted children and has the instructional knowledge and skills to meet their needs.

Recommendation
It is recommended that Section 227.20(c)(3) and (e) be amended as follows.

3) the applicable gifted education course of instruction Gifted Education Seminar offered by the State Board of Education in cooperation with IAGC:

A) for those successfully completing the course before October 1, 2009, the Gifted Education Institute; or

B) for those successfully completing the course on October 1, 2009, or thereafter, the Gifted Education Seminar; or

e) The Gifted Education Institute or Seminar, as applicable, referred to in subsection (c)(3) of this Section and any two of the additional choices listed in subsection (c) of this Section.
Section 227.25 Required Qualifications

As a means of demonstrating that he or she understands the characteristics and educational needs of children and is able to differentiate the curriculum and apply instructional methods to meet the needs of the children as required by Section 14A-30(16) of the School Code [105 ILCS 14A-30(16)], and subject to the provisions of Section 227.20(a)(6) of this Part, each teacher who is assigned to provide instruction in a program funded pursuant to this Part shall have completed, or shall be required to complete:

a) Nine semester hours of college credit from a regionally accredited institution of higher education and demonstrably related to the education of gifted and talented students; or

b) Both the State and national assessment instruments, namely:

1) the self-assessment developed by the Illinois Association for Gifted Children (IAGC) (which shall be based on the "Professional Teaching Standards for Educators Working with Gifted/Talented Learners" (2012
NOTICE OF ADOPTED AMENDMENT

2002), published by IAGC, 800 E. Northwest Highway, Suite 610, Palatine, Illinois 60074 and posted at www.iagcgifted.org; no later editions of or revisions to these standards are incorporated) with a rating of "experienced" or "expert"; and

2) the PRAXIS examination for gifted education (Test Code 0357, Educational Testing Service, Rosedale Road, Princeton, New Jersey 08541 (2006)); or

   c) Six semester hours of college credit from a regionally accredited institution of higher education and demonstrably related to the education of gifted and talented students and any one of the following additional choices:

      1) the self-assessment referred to in subsection (b)(1) of this Section; or

      2) the PRAXIS examination referred to in subsection (b)(2) of this Section; or

      3) the applicable gifted education course of instruction provided by the State Board of Education in cooperation with IAGC:

         A) for those successfully completing the course before October 1, 2009, the Gifted Education Institute; or

         B) for those successfully completing the course on October 1, 2009, or thereafter, the Gifted Education Seminar; or

      4) two years of experience teaching in, coordinating, or directing a program for gifted students; or

      5) participation in no fewer than two state or national conferences on gifted education, such as those offered by IAGC or the National Association for Gifted Children (NAGC); or

      6) professional development activities demonstrably related to the education of gifted and talented students that are sufficient to generate 30 continuing professional development units (CPDUs), as defined and quantified in the rules for educator licensure certificate renewal (see 23 Ill. Adm. Code 25, Subpart J 25.875); or
d) Three semester hours of college credit from a regionally accredited institution of higher education and demonstrably related to the education of gifted and talented students and any two of the additional choices listed in subsections (c)(1) through (6) of this Section; or

e) The Gifted Education Institute or Seminar, as applicable, referred to in subsection (c)(3) of this Section and any two of the additional choices listed in subsection (c) of this Section.

(Source: Amended at 38 Ill. Reg. ______, effective _____________)
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TITLE 23: EDUCATION AND CULTURAL RESOURCES
SUBTITLE A: EDUCATION
CHAPTER I: STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
SUBCHAPTER f: INSTRUCTION FOR SPECIFIC STUDENT POPULATIONS

PART 232
SUMMER BRIDGES PROGRAM

Section
232.10 Purpose and Applicability
232.20 Eligible Applicants
232.30 Application Procedure
232.40 Allocation of Funds
232.50 Program Specifications
232.60 Local Match; Use of State Funds
232.70 Reporting Requirements

232.APPENDIX A Curriculum and Instruction Frameworks
232.APPENDIX B Required Materials for the Program

AUTHORITY: Implementing Section 10-20.9a of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/10-20.9a] and authorized by Section 2-3.6 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/2-3.6].


Section 232.60 Local Match; Use of State Funds

The Summer Bridges Program is typically operated in the very late portion of one fiscal year and sometimes concludes in the early weeks of the subsequent fiscal year. The required components of each year's program (e.g., instructional materials, staff time, professional development) shall be paid for out of the later fiscal year's appropriation.

a) Each district that receives funding pursuant to this Part shall be required to contribute a matching share equivalent to 20 percent of the amount awarded by the State Board of Education (ISBE). The district's share may consist of funds, in-kind contributions, or a combination of these, provided that all amounts are related to delivery of the program (e.g., transportation expenses, janitorial services, expenditures for utilities, salary and benefits for an administrator or coordinator, or food service).
b) Each district shall allocate the State funds provided for the program within the range specified in this subsection (b) unless an exception is granted as discussed in subsection (c) of this Section.

1) It is expected that between 45 and 55 percent of the funds provided by ISBE will be used for salaries and benefits related to the employment of instructional and support personnel for the program.

2) It is expected that approximately 20 percent of the funds provided by ISBE will be needed for supplies and materials directly related to the curriculum delivered and not otherwise readily available within the district. Each district shall use no less than $1,000 of its grant allocation per classroom for this purpose.

3) It is expected that approximately 20 percent of the funds provided to each recipient will be used for professional development of staff holding educator licensure, including the certified and paraprofessional educators, who provide instruction and instructional support in the program. All professional development shall be delivered by providers approved for purposes of educator licensure certificate renewal (see 23 Ill. Adm. Code 25, Subpart J).

4) Up to ten percent of the funds provided to each recipient may be used to offset expenses for administration or program coordination, provided that no support under this program shall be provided for personnel expenditures relative to any staff member employed on an 11- or 12-month contract with the recipient district.

c) A district may expend more than 55 percent of the funds provided under this Part for personnel-related costs only if approved by the State Superintendent of Education based upon evidence of other resources that will be used to ensure the availability of the materials required under Appendix B of this Part and the provision of the professional development required under Section 232.50(f) of this Part.

d) Limitations on Specific Expenditures

1) Grant funds shall not be used to provide more than 130 hours' compensation for any teacher in the program.
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2) Grant funds shall not be used for costs associated with employing more than one support staff member (clerical or paraprofessional educator) for each four teachers in the program.

3) A full-time program coordinator shall be supported only for programs enrolling at least 1,000 students.

4) Grant funds may be used only to support classroom-based instruction and shall not be used for field trips or experiences.

5) No food or food service expenditures shall be supported with funds provided under this Part.

6) No equipment, software, or software licenses shall be purchased with funds provided under this Part.

(Source: Amended at 38 Ill. Reg. _____, effective _____________)
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TITLE 23: EDUCATION AND CULTURAL RESOURCES
SUBTITLE A: EDUCATION
CHAPTER I: STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
SUBCHAPTER g: SPECIAL COURSES OF STUDY

PART 265
GRANTS FOR ARTS EDUCATION AND FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION

SUBPART A: GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 265.10 Purpose and Applicability
265.20 Eligible Applicants
265.30 Application Procedure
265.40 Allocation of Funds

SUBPART B: PLANNING GRANTS

Section 265.110 Program Specifications
265.120 Criteria for the Review of Proposals

SUBPART C: IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS

Section 265.210 Program Specifications
265.220 Criteria for the Review of Initial Proposals

AUTHORITY: Implementing Section 2-3.65a of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/2-3.65a] and authorized by Section 2-3.6 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/2-3.6].

SOURCE: Adopted at 30 Ill. Reg. 17464, effective October 23, 2006; amended at 38 Ill. Reg. _____, effective ____________.

SUBPART C: IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS

Section 265.210 Program Specifications

a) Implementation grant funds provided under this Subpart C shall be used for the purpose of introducing or expanding instruction in the fine arts or foreign
language, as applicable, and for developing means of perpetuating the funded program with local resources after the conclusion of the grant period.

b) If an implementation grant is received after use of planning grant funds under this Part, the implementation grant funds shall be used to support the specific program to which the planning grant pertained.

c) Receipt of a planning grant shall not be a prerequisite to eligibility for implementation funding. However, each applicant not having received a planning grant under this Part shall demonstrate that a comprehensive planning process conforming to the requirements of Section 265.110(b) of this Part occurred with respect to the program for which funding is sought. Each such applicant shall present a plan as discussed in Section 265.110(d) of this Part.

d) Grant funds provided under this Subpart C shall generally be used for expenditures directly related to the delivery of the instructional program, including salaries, professional development, curriculum planning and development, supplies and materials, and necessary technology or equipment.

1) No more than five percent of the grant funds may be used for general administrative expenses.

2) No more than 50 percent of the salaries of certified staff members who hold educator licensure and who are involved in the program shall be paid out of funds under this grant program. Salaries of nonlicensed noncertificated personnel shall not be allowable.

3) At least 10 percent of the grant funds shall be used for professional development of the certified staff who hold educator licensure and who are associated with the program, which may include the services of "teaching artists".

4) Grant funds may be expended in connection with the utilization of community resources to the extent that these directly affect the delivery of instruction or the availability of resources for the instructional program.

(Source: Amended at 38 Ill. Reg. _____, effective ____________)

Section 265.220 Criteria for the Review of Initial Proposals
a) Applications for implementation grants shall be evaluated in accordance with the following criteria:

1) Quality of the Plan (40 points)
   A) The proposal demonstrates that the program to be implemented is based on information derived from the planning process.
   B) The proposal identifies the aspects of the program that cannot currently be implemented in the absence of grant funding and demonstrates that plans exist to ensure the availability or redeployment of resources to sustain the program with declining reliance on State funding.
   C) The proposal demonstrates that appropriately certified teachers with the appropriate educator licensure are available to deliver instruction in the program and that their specific needs are reflected in the professional development that has been chosen.
   D) The proposal demonstrates that the affected students will have systematic access to relevant linguistic, artistic, or cultural resources as an integral part of their participation in the instructional program.

2) Sustainability (30 points)
   The proposal presents a portfolio of available local resources for which commitments have been secured so that the program can be sustained in future years when no further State funding will be provided.

3) Need (20 points)
   A) The proposal describes the status of the applicant's instructional programs in the arts or foreign languages, as applicable, and demonstrates that students' access to educational opportunities in this curricular area is limited to an undesirable degree.
   B) The proposal demonstrates that other sources of funding are limited to such an extent that the applicant is unable to conduct or expand the program as proposed without funding under this Part.
4) Cost-Effectiveness (10 points)

The scope of the proposed activities is reasonable in light of the amount of funding to be provided, and the project will be cost-effective considering the number of students to be served.

b) The rankings of all implementation proposals will form one distribution.

(Source: Amended at 38 Ill. Reg. _______, effective _________)
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
       Susie Morrison, Deputy Superintendent/Chief Education Officer
       Nicki Bazer, General Counsel

               (Alternative Learning Opportunities Program)

Materials: Recommended Rules

Staff Contacts: Beth Hanselman, Assistant Superintendent

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
None of these sets of proposed amendments relates directly to the Board’s Strategic Goals since they are technical changes to align the wording of the rules to the terminology used in the licensure system.

Expected Outcome of Agenda Item
The Board will be asked to adopt amendments to Part 240.

Background
P.A. 97-495, effective January 1, 2012, amended Sections 10-22.6 and 13B-20.25 of the School Code (105 ILCS 5/10-22.6 and 13B-20.25) to authorize school districts to "administratively transfer" students who have been expelled or suspended “in excess of 20 school days” to an Alternative Learning Opportunities Program (ALOP). The law further requires that a school district may not deny a “transfer” of a suspended or expelled student to the ALOP program except in cases in which that student's enrollment in the ALOP "is deemed to cause a threat to the safety of students or staff".

Under Article 13B of the School Code, school districts are authorized to establish ALOPs as a way in which to broaden the academic, behavioral and social/emotional supports available to a student who is at risk of academic failure or who may fail to graduate from elementary or high school. ALOPs may be operated by a single school district or in collaboration with other districts, regional offices of education or intermediate service centers.

Proposed new Section 240.20(p) acknowledges that a school district may enroll a student who has been suspended or expelled from one of the district's schools into its ALOP and that the provision of both educational and other support services must meet the requirements of Article 13B and Part 240. Additional changes in Sections 240.20(p), and 240.30(d) and (e) further recognize that while a parent of the suspended or expelled student may withdraw consent for the child's enrollment in the ALOP or the ALOP may determine the student has met the goals of his or her student success plan, that student cannot be returned to or be re-enrolled in his or her home school until the term of the suspension or expulsion is completed.
Finally, a change is being proposed in Section 240.30(a)(4), which defines a "recognized entity" for purpose of a non-profit or for-profit educational entity providing an instructional program for an ALOP. This change is needed since approval of private business and vocational schools and of state-chartered charter schools is no longer the responsibility of the State Board of Education but rather of the Illinois Board of Higher Education and the State Charter School Commission, respectively.

The proposed amendments also respond to P.A. 97-607, effective August 26, 2011, which changed the current system of teacher, administrator and school service personnel certification set forth in Article 21 of the School Code to a licensure system (Article 21B of the School Code). References to certification and related terms are being changed to align Part 240 rules to the licensure system, which became effective July 1, 2013.

The proposed amendments were published in the Illinois Register December 6, 2013, to elicit public comment; none was received. The version presented for adoption is identical to the version the Board considered in November 2013.

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
Not proceeding with the changes will mean that agency policy relative to the enrollment of suspended or expelled students in an ALOP is not stated in administrative rules, as is required under the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. Additionally, failure to update the rules to conform to statute would result in confusion among those being regulated by these requirements. The proposed changes both align the rules to current statute by eliminating references to the certification process, as well as recent changes elsewhere in the School Code.

Not proceeding with the amendments will result in the rules conflicting with statute.

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 rulemakings for:

    Alternative Learning Opportunities Program (23 Illinois Administrative Code 240).

    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 f: INSTRUCTION FOR SPECIFIC STUDENT POPULATIONS

PART 240
ALTERNATIVE LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM

SUBPART A: PROGRAM APPROVAL

Section
240.10 Purpose
240.20 Requirements for Student Participation
240.25 Enrollment of Students with Individualized Education Programs
240.30 Program Requirements
240.40 Student Success Plan
240.50 Requirements for Returning the Student to the Regular School Program
240.60 Supplemental Services and Instructional Time
240.70 Application for Program Approval
240.75 Program Approval Criteria
240.80 Application for Program Continuation
240.90 Program Funding
240.100 Suspension and Revocation of Program Approval
240.110 Terms and Conditions of Approval

SUBPART B: ALTERNATIVE LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM GRANTS

240.200 Purpose (Repealed)
240.210 Eligible Applicants (Repealed)
240.220 Planning Grants (Repealed)
240.230 Implementation Grants (Repealed)
240.240 Supplemental Grants (Repealed)
240.250 Grant Awards (Repealed)
240.260 Terms of the Grant (Repealed)

AUTHORITY: Implementing and authorized by Article 13B of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/Art. 13B].
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amended at 33 Ill. Reg. 9427, effective June 22, 2009; amended at 38 Ill. Reg. ______, effective ____________.

SUBPART A: PROGRAM APPROVAL

Section 240.20 Requirements for Student Participation

Students in grades 4 through 12 who meet enrollment criteria established by the school district and who meet the definition of "at risk of academic failure" are eligible to participate in an Alternative Learning Opportunities Program approved under this Part.

a) A student shall be considered "at risk of academic failure" if he or she:

1) is at risk of failing to meet the Illinois Learning Standards or failing to graduate from elementary or high school; and

2) demonstrates a need for educational support or social services beyond those provided by the regular school program.

b) For purposes of this Section, "poor academic performance" is defined as the student's:

1) scoring in the 50th percentile or below on district-administered standardized tests; or

2) receiving a score on the State assessment that does not meet standards in one or more of the fundamental learning areas defined in Section 27-1 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/27-1], as applicable for the student's grade level; or

3) not meeting grade-level expectations on a district-designed assessment.

c) In determining whether a particular student is at risk of academic failure, a school district shall at least consider whether any of the following applies.

1) The student demonstrates poor academic performance lasting for more than a semester, which has not responded to interventions routinely employed by the school.
2) The student exhibited poor academic performance on district and State assessments in the previous school year that may be due to factors other than the student's academic ability (e.g., social, emotional, or behavioral problems; substance abuse; poor health and/or nutrition; changes in life circumstances that affect the student's ability to succeed or motivation to participate in the educational program).

3) The student's poor academic performance has resulted in his or her not meeting district requirements for promotion in the current school year; however, the student could meet these requirements with modifications made to the instructional program that would include the provision of educational supports and/or other support services not currently available in the regular school program.

4) The student's poor academic performance has resulted in the student's lacking sufficient high school credits for his or her grade level to such a degree that he or she is likely to drop out of high school or otherwise fail to graduate as a consequence of this credit deficiency.

d) Each district's specific admission criteria shall conform to the following requirements.

1) The criteria used to determine a student's need for an Alternative Learning Opportunities Program shall be nondiscriminatory in purpose and effect (i.e., without regard to race, national origin, gender, religion or disability).

2) The performance of a student recommended for enrollment in the program must be deficient in one or more of the fundamental learning areas (see Section 27-1 of the School Code) and not have shown improvement with interventions currently available at the student's school or within the student's school district. The district shall document the interventions that it employed and the results of those interventions before determining that the student would be served best in the Alternative Learning Opportunities Program.

3) Indicators in addition to academic performance (e.g., family stress, problems with classmates, teachers' evaluations, excessive absences, information received from family members and other school personnel) should be considered when assessing the student's inability to successfully
complete school work and achieve learning objectives for his or her grade level.

4) The home school must be unable to provide, as part of its regular program, the educational supports and/or other support services (as identified by a review of evidence pursuant to subsection (c)(2) of this Section) needed by the student to improve his or her academic achievement. (See Section 240.70(c)(6) of this Part.)

5) In instances where the student considered for enrollment in the program has an Individualized Education Program (IEP), the district has followed the procedures specified in Subpart E of the State Board of Education's rules for Special Education (23 Ill. Adm. Code 226, Subpart E).

e) Each school district that establishes an Alternative Learning Opportunities Program shall provide information about the program to the parents or guardians of all students enrolled in grades 4 through 12 and shall identify a staff member who may be contacted for information or assistance.

f) When school district personnel believe that a student is eligible for and would benefit from enrollment in an Alternative Learning Opportunities Program, the district shall send a written notification to the student and the student's parent or guardian to attend a conference about the program (see 105 ILCS 5/13B-60.10). This notification also shall contain a statement of the rights of the parent or guardian (e.g., requirement for written parental permission to enroll in the program, ability to withdraw consent for enrollment, participation in development of the Student Success Plan).

1) The conference shall be designed to help the parent or guardian determine whether the student's participation in the Alternative Learning Opportunities Program would be beneficial.

2) Relevant educational records and information yielded by diagnostic assessments (e.g., academic, behavioral, risk) shall be available at the time of the conference.

3) The district shall provide documentation identifying the interventions available in the school district and demonstrate that these have already been provided to the student.
If the parent or guardian fails to participate in the conference (i.e., either attendance at the conference or participation through a telephone conference call), the student shall not be enrolled in the program (see 105 ILCS 5/13B-60.5).

If the parent or guardian attends the conference and determines that the program would be beneficial to the student, the parent or guardian may request the student's enrollment by providing written consent.

If a student's parent or guardian believes that the student is eligible for and would benefit from enrollment in an Alternative Learning Opportunities Program, the parent or guardian may initiate the conference described in subsection (f) of this Section by sending a written request to the contact person identified by the district pursuant to subsection (e) of this Section.

The district shall conduct the conference requested by a parent or guardian no later than ten school days after receipt of the written request.

The requirements of subsection (f) of this Section shall apply to any conference held pursuant to this subsection (g).

The district may limit the frequency with which a parent or guardian may request a conference in a given school year, provided that the limit imposed does not exceed 45 calendar days.

No student shall be enrolled in the Alternative Learning Opportunities Program without the consent of the student's parent or guardian (Section 13B-60.10 of the School Code). In the case of an existing alternative education program that receives approval to operate as an Alternative Learning Opportunities Program, the program shall provide written notification to the parent or guardian of each student enrolled in the existing program that:

1) the program has been changed to an Alternative Learning Opportunities Program;

2) the parent or guardian has a right to attend a conference about the program, held pursuant to the requirements of subsection (f) of this Section;
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3) consent for the student's continued participation in the program shall be deemed granted unless the parent or guardian requests, within ten school days after receiving notification, that the student be returned to the regular school program; and

4) the parent or guardian has a right to participate in the development of the Student Success Plan (see Section 240.40 of this Part).

i) In no instance shall a student in grade 4 or 5 who is enrolled in an Alternative Learning Opportunities Program participate in that program or receive services outside of his or her home school. Every effort should be made to ensure that the educational supports and other services are provided to the student as part of his or her activities in the classroom(s) to which he or she is originally assigned, unless the nature of the services dictates otherwise (e.g., due to a need for privacy, services would cause a disruption for other students or interrupt instruction, one-on-one intervention is required).

j) A student enrolled in an Alternative Learning Opportunities Program shall be returned to the regular school program no later than ten school days after the district receives a written request to that effect from the parent or guardian (see 105 ILCS 5/13B-60.15). If notice is received within two weeks before the end of a grading period (i.e., a quarter or semester), then the student shall remain in the Alternative Learning Opportunities Program until the start of the next grading period.

k) A student may be enrolled both in an Alternative Learning Opportunities Program and in the regular school program (see 105 ILCS 13B-20.20).

l) A student enrolled in an Alternative Learning Opportunities Program with the intention of graduating from high school or qualifying to participate in the High School Equivalency Testing Program pursuant to Section 3-15.12 of the School Code (see [105 ILCS 5/3-15.12]) may receive services up to the age of 21 (see Section 13B-15.10 of the School Code).

m) An approved Alternative Learning Opportunities Program may enroll nonresident students in accordance with Section 13B-55 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/13B-55].
n) The enrollment of students with Individualized Education Programs in Alternative Learning Opportunities Programs shall be subject to the additional requirements set forth in Section 240.25 of this Part.

o) In accordance with Section 13B-20.25 of the School Code, all rights granted under Article 13B of the School Code and this Part to the student's parent or guardian shall become those of the student once the student reaches 18 years of age, subject to the provisions of the Emancipation of Mature Minors Act [750 ILCS 5/Art. 11a].

p) Notwithstanding the eligibility criteria stated in Section 13B-20.25 of the School Code, a school district may enroll in its Alternative Learning Opportunities Program any student it has suspended or expelled, in accordance with the provisions of Section 10-22.6(b) or 34-19 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/10-22.6(b) or 34-19].

1) The enrolling school district shall ensure that the educational program and other services provided for the suspended or expelled student meet each of the requirements set forth in this Part.

2) A suspended or expelled student shall not be permitted to return to or re-enroll in his or her home school pursuant to subsection (j) of this Section until the term of the suspension or expulsion is completed.

(Source: Amended at 38 Ill. Reg. ______, effective ____________)

Section 240.30 Program Requirements

Each Alternative Learning Opportunities Program approved by the State Board of Education shall conform to the following program requirements.

a) The program of instruction of an Alternative Learning Opportunities Program shall be consistent with State standards and provide innovative and varied instructional strategies designed to improve the educational achievement of the students enrolled in the program (see 105 ILCS 5/13B-20).

1) Instructional programs shall offer services and activities that provide educational options, such as evening high school, in-school tutoring or mentoring, and high school completion programs (see 105 ILCS 5/13B-20.5), to improve the student's academic performance and facilitate the
student's successful completion of an elementary school program or graduation from high school. These services and activities may be in addition to and/or vary in sequence, pace or mode of delivery from what is currently offered in the regular school program.

2) The curriculum shall enable a student to receive credit towards completion of required courses and/or promotion to the next grade level in accordance with the criteria of the student's resident district.

3) School districts must award academic credit for work completed in accordance with Section 13B-80 of the School Code [(see 105 ILCS 5/13B-80)].

4) If the instructional program is provided by a non-profit or for-profit educational entity, then that entity shall be recognized by the State Board of Education (see 105 ILCS 5/13B-75). A recognized entity is one that:

   A) is established by the State to provide education-related services or instruction (e.g., Regional Offices of Education, Intermediate Service Centers, public community colleges or universities); or

   B) is a nonpublic elementary or secondary school recognized by the State Board of Education pursuant to 23 Ill. Adm. Code 425 (Voluntary Registration and Recognition of Nonpublic Schools); or

   C) is designated for operation through a standardized approval process administered by the State Board of Education (e.g., public university laboratory schools, private business and vocational schools, alternative schools, charter schools, area vocational centers); or

   D) is designated for operation through a standardized approval process administered by another State entity (e.g., private business and vocational schools, charter schools); or

   E) meets the requirements of a national or regional accrediting body (e.g., private colleges and universities, nonpublic elementary or secondary schools).
b) Support services shall be provided for each student enrolled in the Alternative Learning Opportunities Program (see 105 ILCS 5/13B-15.20). The particular services provided shall be those that are determined to be necessary for the student's academic success.

c) A Student Success Plan shall be developed for each student enrolled in the Alternative Learning Opportunities Program in accordance with Section 240.40 of this Part. Existing alternative education programs that receive approval pursuant to Sections 240.70 and 240.75 of this Part to become an Alternative Learning Opportunities Program shall develop a Student Success Plan for each student enrolled.

d) Progress reports for students enrolled in the Alternative Learning Opportunities Program shall be provided at least in the same manner and with the same frequency as progress reports that are sent to parents and guardians of students enrolled in the regular school program (see 105 ILCS 5/13B-60.15).

1) The school district operating the program shall establish procedures for reviewing the progress of each student enrolled.

   A) If the review determines that the student has met all of the objectives established in his or her Student Success Plan, then the district shall begin the process of transferring the student back to the regular school program (see Section 240.50 of this Part), except that a suspended or expelled student shall not be permitted to return to or re-enroll in his or her home school pursuant to this subsection (d)(1)(A) until the term of the suspension or expulsion is completed.

   B) If the district determines that the student has met all of the identified objectives but should continue to be enrolled in the Alternative Learning Opportunities Program, then it shall:

   i) provide to the student and his or her parent or guardian a written rationale as to why the student should remain in the program;

   ii) project the length of time the student would be expected to remain in the program before returning to the regular school program; and
iii) amend the student's Student Success Plan to include revised goals and objectives that address the reasons why the district recommended the student's continuation in the program.

2) A student's parent or guardian may request a meeting anytime during the school year to review the student's progress, in accordance with procedures developed by the district (see 105 ILCS 5/13B-60.15). The school district shall respond to this type of request within seven school days after the parent or guardian submits the request.

e) Each Alternative Learning Opportunities Program shall have in place procedures, developed in accordance with Section 240.50 of this Part, to provide for the transition of students enrolled in the program back to the regular school program.

f) Each Alternative Learning Opportunities Program shall employ staff who hold the appropriate educator licensure are appropriately certified.

1) Teachers shall hold a valid and active Illinois professional educator license with the endorsement (i.e., elementary, secondary, special K-12 or special preschool-age 21) teaching certificate required for the grade levels to which they will be assigned (see 105 ILCS 5/13B-65).

2) Professional personnel who provide other services for students enrolled in the program shall hold the professional educator license endorsed in the area certificates appropriate to their roles pursuant to State Board of Education rules for Educator Licensure Certification (23 Ill. Adm. Code 25), except that:

A) personnel providing professional nursing services shall meet the requirements of Section 10-22.23 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/10-22.23],

B) personnel providing school counseling services shall meet the requirements of Section 10-22.24b of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/10-22.24b],
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C) personnel providing noninstructional services shall meet the requirements of Section 10-22.34 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/10-22.34],

D) personnel providing school psychological services shall meet the requirements of Section 14-1.09.1 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/14-1.09.1], and

E) personnel providing school social work services shall meet the requirements of Section 14-1.09.2 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/14-1.09.2].

(Source: Amended at 38 Ill. Reg. ______, effective ____________)

Section 240.50 Requirements for Returning the Student to the Regular School Program

a) It shall be the goal of the Alternative Learning Opportunities Program (ALOP) to assist students in successfully completing their education, including, but not limited to, returning to the regular school program, or to a postsecondary or adult education program, as soon as appropriate. In establishing procedures for the transition of students to the regular school program or another program, districts shall ensure that:

1) an assessment is conducted prior to the student's leaving the Alternative Learning Opportunities Program (ALOP) to identify the educational supports and/or other support services the student would need to successfully progress in the regular school curriculum; and

2) a staff member is assigned to monitor the student's progress in the regular school program for not less than two semesters after the student leaves the Alternative Learning Opportunities Program (ALOP); and

3) for a student who has been suspended or expelled from his or her home school and enrolled by a district in its ALOP, the student shall not be permitted to return to or re-enroll in his or her home school until the term of the suspension or expulsion is completed.

b) The requirements of subsection (a) of this Section apply in instances where a student is removed from the Alternative Learning Opportunities Program (ALOP)
by his or her parent or guardian before completion of the objectives stated in his or her Student Success Plan.

(Source: Amended at 38 Ill. Reg. _____, effective ____________)

Section 240.60 Supplemental Services and Instructional Time

The proposed calendar for the program shall be in conformance with the requirements of Section 13B-45 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/13B-45]. A calendar that varies in the number of days or length of the instructional day (i.e., five clock-hours of school work) from those requirements shall be approved under the following conditions.

a) The calendar meets all of the exceptions enumerated in Section 13B-45(1) through (4) of the School Code.

b) The supplemental services, provided pursuant to Section 13B-45(3) of the School Code, that are noninstructional in nature (e.g., student assistance programs, counseling services, case management, life skills or conflict resolution training, career counseling, community service) shall be:

1) directly linked to a need identified in the student's Student Success Plan developed pursuant to Section 240.40 of this Part and necessary to remove barriers to learning for that student (see 105 ILCS 5/13B-15.15(ii));

2) provided by qualified personnel with the experience and skills appropriate to the service being provided; and

3) monitored by Alternative Learning Opportunities Program staff to ensure that the services provided are effective in improving the student's academic achievement, as specified in his or her Student Success Plan, so that the student can be returned to the regular school program.

c) Activities that are instructional in nature (e.g., work-based learning activities, service learning, physical fitness and health programs) shall not be considered supplemental services for the purposes of this Section. These shall be considered to be part of the five clock-hours of school work required under Section 18-8.05 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/18-8.05], provided that:
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1) the activity is an integral and regular part of the academic instruction that the student is receiving and is tied to one or more of the fundamental learning areas (see Section 27-1 of the School Code);

2) the student receives academic credit, in accordance with his or her district's policies for awarding such credit, upon successful completion of the activity; and

3) the activity is provided under the direction of a certified teacher who holds the appropriate educator licensure (see Section 240.30(f)(1) of this Part).

(Source: Amended at 38 Ill. Reg. ______, effective ____________)

Section 240.100 Suspension and Revocation of Program Approval

a) The State Board of Education shall investigate an Alternative Learning Opportunities Program when any of the following occurs:

1) the school district fails to receive approval to continue operating the program, in accordance with the requirements of Section 240.80 of this Part;

2) a parent or guardian files a written complaint with the school district or State Board of Education alleging that the program meets one or more of the conditions set forth in Section 13B-30.20 of the School Code for suspension or revocation of program approval;

3) the State Board receives information or becomes aware of allegations that the program meets one or more of the conditions set forth in Section 13B-30.20 of the School Code for suspension or revocation of program approval; or

4) for programs serving minority students, low-income students, or students with IEPs, a review of the continuation application shows a disproportionate number of these types of such students being served in the program.

b) If the State Board of Education, at the conclusion of the investigation, identifies deficiencies in the program that meet any of the conditions specified in Section 13B-30.20 of the School Code, then it shall provide to each the school district
1) The school district(s) shall submit to the State Board of Education, within 30 calendar days after receiving the notification, a time-specific plan that addresses the specific steps to be taken and staff responsible to remedy each of the deficiencies cited. In no case shall the time needed to correct deficiencies exceed 120 days.

2) The State Board shall approve the corrective action plan no later than 15 days after receiving the plan if it meets all of the following requirements.

   A) The timeframe is reasonable to correct the cited deficiencies.

   B) The proposed steps to be taken to remedy the problems have a high likelihood of correcting the cited deficiencies.

   C) A sufficient number of staff are proposed to implement the corrective action plan, and their expertise relates to the areas in which the deficiencies were found.

3) The school district shall provide a copy of the deficiencies and of the approved corrective action plan to any entity with which it has entered into a cooperative agreement, intergovernmental agreement, contract or subcontract in order to operate the program or to provide services for students enrolled.

4) If the school district provides evidence that it has corrected the deficiencies within the timeframe specified in the corrective action plan approved pursuant to subsection (b)(2) of this Section, then no change in the program's approved status shall be made.

e) A school district that is unable to correct all of the deficiencies within the timeframe specified in its corrective action plan and after the provision of technical assistance by the State Board of Education may submit to the State Board an amended corrective action plan.

    1) The amended corrective action plan shall be submitted no later than 30 calendar days prior to the time the affected deficiencies were to be corrected.
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2) The amended plan shall identify the deficiencies that are still unresolved, specifying the reasons for the delay and describing the steps to be taken to remedy the problems and the timeline for completing each. In no case shall the time needed to correct the remaining deficiencies exceed 30 additional calendar days.

3) The State Board of Education will accept the amended corrective action plan, provided the remaining deficiencies can be corrected within 30 calendar days and that none of the deficiencies:

A) presents an immediate health hazard or danger to students and staff;

B) severely affects the program's ability to provide a program appropriate to the needs of the students enrolled (i.e., addresses the Illinois Learning Standards, employs certified staff with the appropriate educator licensure, provides the services identified as necessary to assist with students' academic improvement); and

C) represents prolonged or repeated problems to a degree that indicates the program's intention not to correct the deficiencies.

d) If the school district fails to demonstrate that all of the deficiencies have been corrected within the timeframe specified in the amended corrective action plan, or fails to submit an amended corrective action plan that meets the requirements of subsection (c) of this Section, then approval to operate the program shall be suspended upon written notification from the State Board of Education.

1) The program may serve the students enrolled in the program during the time of its suspension, provided it continues to make progress as specified in its plan and no additional students are enrolled in the program.

2) The school district shall provide a copy of the notice of suspension to any entity with which it has entered into a cooperative agreement, intergovernmental agreement, contract or subcontract in order to operate the program or to provide services for students enrolled.
3) If the school district fails to correct all remaining deficiencies within 30 calendar days after receiving the notice of suspension, then approval to operate the program shall be revoked.

e) Notification to revoke program approval shall be sent by certified mail, return receipt requested, to each school district(s) that established the program. A school district shall have ten calendar days after receipt of this notice of revocation to submit a written request for a hearing pursuant to the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act [5 ILCS 100] and Subpart B of the State Board of Education's rules for Contested Cases and Other Formal Hearings (23 Ill. Adm. Code 475). The receipt of notification shall be determined by the date of receipt shown on the return receipt form.

f) Once approval for a program has been revoked:

1) a school district, or a regional office of education operating a program on behalf of a school district, shall be ineligible to file any claim upon the common school fund with regard to the program;

2) a school district shall not collect any tuition from another school district for students enrolled in the program or receive the remaining payments of a grant awarded pursuant to Subpart B of this Part;

3) pursuant to Section 13B-30.35 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/13B-30.35], the State Board of Education shall recover grant funds from a school district in accordance with the provisions of the Illinois Grant Funds Recovery Act [30 ILCS 705]; and

4) all students enrolled in the program shall be returned to the regular school program no later than ten school days following receipt of the notification that approval has been revoked.

g) Compliance with the requirements of Article 13B of the School Code and this Part shall be a factor in determining a school district's recognition status pursuant to 23 Ill. Adm. Code 1 (Public Schools Evaluation, Recognition and Supervision).

(Source: Amended at 38 Ill. Reg. _______, effective ___________)
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

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

Materials: 2013 edTPA Field Test Summary Report
ISBE edTPA Information Letter to School Districts
edTPA Fact Sheet

Agenda Topic: Sole Source Contract - edTPA

Staff Contact(s): Jason Helfer Ph.D., Assistant Superintendent Teacher and Leader Effectiveness

Purpose of Agenda Item
The Licensure Division requests the Board to authorize the State Superintendent to enter into a sole source contract with NCS Pearson Inc. for the purpose of administering the edTPA™ assessment (“edTPA”). Pursuant to 105 ILCS 5/21B-30(f) and 23 Ill. Admin. Code 25.720(e), beginning September 1, 2015, all teacher candidates completing an educator preparation program in a teaching field shall be required to pass a teacher performance assessment.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
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 the Board will authorize the State Superintendent to enter into a sole source contract with NCS Pearson Inc. for the administration and evaluation of edTPA required for initial licensure.

Background Information
Section 21B-30(f) of the School Code, effective July 1, 2013, requires the following: “Beginning on September 1, 2015, all candidates completing teacher preparation programs in this State are required to pass an evidence-based assessment of teacher effectiveness approved by the State Board of Education, in consultation with the State Educator Preparation and Licensure Board. All recognized institutions offering approved teacher preparation programs must begin phasing in the approved teacher performance assessment no later than July 1, 2013.” In order to meet this statutory mandate, ISBE promulgated rules describing how this will be accomplished. Specifically, 23 Ill. Admin. Code 25.720(e) addresses the required evidence-based assessment of teacher effectiveness, also referred to as a “teacher performance assessment” or “TPA”.

The Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) is requesting that NCS, Pearson, Inc. provide edTPA for teacher candidates as a requirement of teacher licensure. edTPA, developed by Stanford University and supported by NCS Pearson Inc., is the only product on the market that both assesses a candidate’s ability to plan, deliver, and assess student instruction and has been field tested for reliability and validity.
In addition to allowing ISBE to comply with its statutory mandate to approve the required evidence-based assessment of teacher effectiveness, edTPA supports Goal 2 of the State Board of Education’s strategic plan which states, “Every student will be supported by highly prepared and effective teachers and school leaders.” To that end, ISBE has a vested interest in selecting a teacher performance assessment that helps to ensure that teacher candidates are prepared for service in the classroom on day one of their careers. ISBE requires a performance assessment that has undergone field testing for reliability and validity and that is able to provide evidence-based data on which evaluators can determine a candidate’s readiness for classroom instruction. The teacher performance assessment is completed during the student teaching experience. As such, it aims to capture the culmination of skills and experiences gained by the candidate throughout the program of study as well as the ability of a candidate to put those skills and experiences into practice in the classroom. Implementing a teacher performance assessment is also important because, unlike simple “tests”, the edTPA incorporates observation of a teacher candidate’s performance by way of video recorded during student teaching as well as submission of authentic teaching materials, including lesson planning materials and student work.

edTPA has been field tested for reliability and validity. In 2012, edTPA was field tested in 21 states, including Illinois, by more than 9,000 teacher candidates. In 2013, more than 3,000 teacher candidates participated in further field testing. Data from this field test was used to set a passing score for the edTPA. Currently, 34 states, including Illinois, and the District of Columbia are participating in edTPA at some level. edTPA is evaluated by trained, qualified scorers who use rubrics to evaluate candidate submissions consistently and fairly. Scorers must meet rigorous qualifications, including subject-matter experience, recent teaching experience, and experience mentoring or supporting beginning teachers.

The edTPA standard-setting conference was held in August 2013. The purpose of this conference was to identify the performance expectation of an initially licensed, classroom-ready teacher. The results of this work were released in November 2013.

A practitioner panel (higher education faculty and P-12 teachers) and policy panel (NEA, AFT, and state departments of education) independently examined edTPA field test data and, from this, suggested a professional performance standard. The practitioner panel and policy panel independently recommended the same PPS score of no greater than 42. In order to avoid erroneous decisions in scoring, developers also applied a half standard error of measurement to the PPS that resulted in a cut score range between 39 and 42. Illinois was represented on both panels. Using the data from the field test summary document, input from stakeholders in Illinois, and guidance from staff at the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity, agency staff sent out a survey in February 2014 to ascertain the best approach to setting a cut

---

1 Illinois College, Illinois State University, and The University of Illinois at Chicago have participated in various phases of field testing since 2010. The following Illinois programs participated in and received performance information from the spring 2012 field test of the edTPA: Concordia University – Chicago, Illinois College, Illinois State University, Knox College, Lewis University, National – Louis University, Northern Illinois University, Southern Illinois University Carbondale, Southern Illinois University Edwardsville, Trinity Christian College, University of Illinois Chicago, University of St. Francis, and Western Illinois University. Data from these institutions was used to refine the scoring rubrics and the prompts to which candidates respond in preparation for the 2013 field test.

2 Amee Adkins from Illinois State University served on the practitioner panel and State Superintendent Koch served on the policy panel.
score for teacher candidates in Illinois.

edTPA also provides the opportunity for common expectations and reciprocity across states for teachers who are educated out-of-state or relocate. Moreover, edTPA enables institutions of higher education that offer teacher preparation programs to continuously improve their programs to train and support effective and prepared teachers.

ISBE has provided resources to institutions and school districts with the implementation of the edTPA such as permission forms translated into French, Japanese, Polish, and Spanish, webinars that explain the edTPA, and guidance documents developed upon questions from the legal departments of school districts. Additionally, in order to best ensure ISBE can assist institutions, staff in the Educator Preparation Division have been given access to the training modules that edTPA scorers must successfully complete prior officially scoring edTPA submissions. Staff meet monthly with the edTPA advisory group, comprised of faculty from colleges and universities to hear concerns and, if necessary craft materials to continue to support the roll out of edTPA in Illinois.

Financial Background
There is no cost to ISBE to provide edTPA to teacher candidates. Teacher candidates bear the cost of the assessment. The cost to submit and have a candidate portfolio scored is $300. Due to the amount of infrastructure necessary for electronic submission of edTPA by teacher candidates and the necessity of training and payment of scorers, content specialists, and scoring supervisors, ISBE has determined $300 per submission to be a reasonable cost. This cost was determined based upon the necessity for infrastructure so candidates can submit edTPA portfolios, support the development and delivery of online training materials, payment to trained scorers, content specialists, and scoring specialists. During the Fall 2014 NCS Pearson Inc. is providing educator preparation programs in Illinois vouchers to offset the cost of scoring. The data from these submissions will assist institutions and ISBE in refining additional supports for candidates and institutions.

ISBE is not purchasing edTPA and there is no cost to the State of Illinois for providing edTPA. However, Illinois law requires that teacher candidates participate in such an assessment in order to receive an Illinois teaching license. Thus, ISBE will continue to need edTPA to be provided so that ISBE can meet its statutory mandate and candidates can meet the requirements for licensure unless and until other comparable products are commercially available.

The contract period for the use of edTPA will begin on September 1, 2014 and end on August 31, 2019. If, during this time frame, additional teacher performance assessments are developed, tested for reliability and validity, and made commercially available, ISBE will reevaluate the sole source contract.

Business Enterprise Program (BEP)
The BEP goal is not part of this award requirement because the teacher candidates are directly paying NCS Pearson, Inc.

3 Content and scoring specialists are individuals who back-check edTPA submissions. They help ensure accurate scoring of individual edTPA portfolios as well as ensuring the validity of the edTPA.
Analysis and Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action, and Communications

**Policy Implications**: N/A

**Budget Implications**: N/A

**Legislative Action**: N/A

**Communication**: ISBE has developed and shared a variety of resources with institutions of higher education and school districts. Staff meet monthly with the edTPA advisory group, comprised of faculty from colleges and universities to hear concerns and, if necessary craft materials to continue to support the roll out of edTPA in Illinois.

**Pros and Cons of Various Actions**

**Pros**: Approving the Sole Source contract for edTPA allows ISBE to comply with its statutory mandate to approve the required evidence-based assessment of teacher effectiveness. Further approval provides the state and institutions of higher education with an important measures of teacher readiness, thus responding to requests from the field for both performance measures as well as multiple measures of teacher readiness that are comparable among states.

**Cons**: Faculty from colleges and universities have expressed concern regarding the reliability and validity of the edTPA, cost to teacher candidates, and remediation policies for candidates who are do not successfully complete the edTPA. Additionally, since institutions have only been required to phase in the edTPA beginning on September 1, 2013, there are general questions about process and purpose from those institutions that have yet to work directly and deeply with the edTPA.

**Superintendent's Recommendation**

I recommend that the following motion be adopted:

The State Board of Education hereby authorizes the State Superintendent to enter into a sole source contract with NCS Pearson, Inc. for the purpose of administering edTPA.

**Next Steps**

Upon Board authorization, Agency staff will update administrative rules to reference edTPA and a cut score required for licensure. Draft rules will be shared with SEPLB prior to rules being approved and released for public comment. Agency staff shall contact NCS Pearson, Inc. to finalize a contract for the use of edTPA by teacher candidates in Illinois.
Preface and Acknowledgements

This report summarizes key data and information from technical reports that developers of edTPA, a performance assessment for beginning teachers, have prepared based on several years of development and field testing.

These reports are shared with state education agencies and institutions of higher education that are considering adoption of edTPA, with the understanding that they should decide whether and how to use edTPA based on their own review of the available information. A full version of the edTPA Technical Report will be published later this academic year. The edTPA Technical Advisory Committee will continue its review of the edTPA data from both the development and operation phases and make recommendations for future research.

This summary report was authored by Raymond L. Pecheone, Executive Director, Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity (SCALE); Benjamin Shear, Research Assistant, SCALE; Andrea Whittaker, Director, Teacher Performance Assessment, SCALE; and Linda Darling-Hammond, Charles E. Ducommun Professor of Education at the Stanford Graduate School of Education.

The analyses contained in this summary report were reviewed by technical committee members and advisors Lloyd Bond, Professor of Educational Research Methodology (emeritus), University of North Carolina, Greensboro; Edward Haertel, Jacks Professor of Education (emeritus), Stanford University Graduate School of Education; Stuart Kahl, Founding Principal, Measured Progress; and Catherine Taylor, Professor of Psychology: Measurement, Statistics, and Research, University of Washington and chair of the Washington State Technical Advisory Committee.

We are grateful to them for their advice and recommendations, which strengthened the development and analyses of edTPA. We also are grateful to the funders of the research and development process, including the Ford Foundation, the MetLife Foundation, the Morgan Family Foundation, the Stuart Foundation and NCS Pearson Corporation.

SCALE is the lead developer for edTPA, and Stanford University is the sole owner of edTPA. The university has an agreement with Evaluation Systems, a unit of Pearson, licensing it to administer and distribute edTPA.

The developers of edTPA will continue to study data about edTPA; they welcome comments regarding this report and its data and will carefully consider such comments as they continue to update and improve edTPA.
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Executive Summary

“The content of edTPA is related to the content of the job of a teacher and fits the requirements for the job. Most stakeholders in public education—including legislators, policymakers, philanthropists, and the general public—are demanding teacher accountability for student learning outcomes. The same stakeholders are demanding that teacher educators are held accountable for certifying that completers of preservice teacher preparation programs have developed entry level competence for classroom teaching. The edTPA is designed to meet these new demands for on-the-job teaching performance accountability.”

Etta R. Hollins, Ph.D., Professor and Kauffman Endowed Chair for Urban Teacher Education, University of Missouri, Kansas City

Overview: This report provides a summary of the design, development process, and validation results for a new performance assessment for beginning teachers: edTPA. edTPA is the first nationally available, educator-designed performance assessment for teachers entering the profession. It provides a measure of teacher candidates’ readiness to teach that can inform program completion, licensure, and accreditation decisions, while supporting candidate learning and preparation program improvement.

Subject-Specific and Performance-Based: edTPA is a subject-specific assessment, which includes versions for 27 different teaching fields. The assessment systematically examines an authentic cycle of teaching aimed at specific learning goals, using evidence about 1) planning, 2) instruction, and 3) student assessment derived from candidates’ practice in their student teaching or internship placement. This evidence includes lesson plans, instructional materials, student assignments and assessments, feedback on student work, and unedited video recordings of instruction. Also assessed through these three tasks are candidates’ abilities to develop academic language and to analyze teaching.

Aligned to Standards: edTPA is aligned with the newly revised Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards for beginning teacher licensing, as well as the Common Core State Standards. edTPA also shares key points of alignment with the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) standards.

Developed by the Profession: Modeled after the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards’ assessments of accomplished veteran teachers, edTPA was created with input from teachers and teacher educators across the country in a process led by Stanford University’s Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity and supported by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. More than 1,000 educators from 29 states and the District of Columbia and more than 430 institutions of higher education participated in the design, development, piloting, and field testing of edTPA.

Scored by the Profession: An additional 650 teachers and teacher educators have served as scorers of the assessments for the 12,000 plus candidates who participated in the field tests. Scorers must be P-12 or higher education educators with significant pedagogical content knowledge in the field in which they score, as well as experience in working as instructors or mentors for novice teachers. In the field test, about half of the scorers were teacher educators and about half were practicing classroom teachers, many of whom are National Board certified.

1 The analyses contained in this summary report, which are drawn from the full edTPA Technical Report, were reviewed by technical advisors Lloyd Bond, Professor of Educational Research Methodology (emeritus), University of North Carolina, Greensboro; Edward Haertel, Jacks Professor of Education (emeritus), Stanford University Graduate School of Education; Stuart Kahl, Founding Principal, Measured Progress; and Catherine Taylor, Professor of Psychology: Measurement, Statistics, and Research, University of Washington and chair of the Washington State Technical Advisory Committee.
Scorer training and certification is a rigorous process that takes about 20 hours to complete. Scoring is conducted using 15 analytic rubrics applied to the three major tasks in the assessment, each evaluated on a five-point scale. Thus total scores on the assessment can range from 15 to 75. The scoring process and reporting is coordinated by Evaluation Systems, a division of Pearson, which distributes the assessments and manages the electronic platform on which they sit.

**Valid and Reliable:** A set of validation studies was conducted to confirm the content validity, job relevance, and construct validity of the assessments. In combination, these studies documented that the assessment is well-aligned to the professional standards it seeks to measure, reflects the actual work of teaching, and that the score measures a primary characteristic of effective teaching. Inter-rater reliability was evaluated using several different statistical tests. edTPA reliabilities reported here range from .83 to .92 (indicating the percentage of scorer agreement).

**Score Distributions:** This report analyzes more than 4,000 submissions from the 2013 field test by content field, area of teaching, and candidate group. Score differentials across fields were relatively small. The scores were generally higher in secondary teaching fields than in most elementary and middle childhood fields. Candidates varied in their mastery of different teaching skills. As might be expected of pre-service teachers, candidates performed most highly on the planning task, followed by the instruction task, and then the assessment task. This conforms with other studies that have found that learning to evaluate and respond to students’ learning is one of the more challenging elements of teaching, one that eludes even some veteran teachers.

No noticeable differences were found across different genders or for the small number of candidates whose primary language was not English. Comparatively small differences were obtained across ethnic subgroups, given the standard deviation of mean scores. In other words, there was greater variation in scores within subgroups than there was variation across subgroups. Because many of these comparisons are based on unequal sample sizes, and some subgroup sample sizes are quite small, differences should be interpreted cautiously.

**Standard Setting:** Standard setting was conducted in August 2013 through a data-informed, standards-based consensus process featuring three separate panels of experts. These included teachers and teacher educators with relevant subject matter expertise, education organization representatives, and state education policymakers from across the nation. The three panels independently agreed on a score target of no more than 42 to which developers applied lower bounds based on the standard error of measurement in order to minimize erroneous decisions. Using a half standard error of measurement results in a cut-score band ranging from a total score of 39 to 42. States set their own passing scores based on state standard setting that takes into account state-specific data, measurement data, and policy considerations. As discussed by the standard-setting committee members, states may consider setting their initial cut score lower than the committee-suggested cut score to give programs time as they learn to deliver and support edTPA activities and to support candidates’ preparation of their submissions. As warranted, the cut score can be raised over time.

Based on the 2013 field test data, at a cut score of 42, 58% of candidates would have “passed” edTPA on their first attempt. Field test data, of course, do not fully reflect operational results for several reasons: 1) Candidates are a voluntary sample of prospective teachers who take the assessment in a non-consequential context; 2) Many programs using the assessment for the first time have little experience designing support systems, coursework, or clinical experiences to enable students to demonstrate the targeted skills. Under actual testing circumstances with programs that have become experienced in supporting the assessment, pass rates would be expected to increase.

In the operational phase, all scores on or near the cut score are read and scored by two independent certified scorers. If there are differences in the scores, a third reader independently scores the submission to adjudicate discrepancies in scores. Candidates who do not pass on their initial attempt may retake one edTPA task or the entire edTPA assessment, with advice and counsel of faculty from their teacher preparation program.

**Conclusion:** There is growing agreement that individuals entering teaching must be prepared to meet the academic needs of all students. With new, higher standards and greater diversity among students, teachers must develop more sophisticated teaching skills and be able to use them from the first day they enter the classroom. Preparation programs must also learn how to cultivate this kind of practice, with useful tools to develop and assess new teachers’ abilities to put their growing knowledge into action. The edTPA may be one component of a system that helps to accomplish these goals.
Introduction

“edTPA taught me to reflect, analyze, and examine where students were at that moment, so I could understand what I was doing, how students were progressing, and adjust instruction accordingly. At the end of the process, I submitted my video, work samples, and responses to prompts that required me to justify and explain my teaching....More than ever, I agree that we need a classroom-based pre-service assessment that focuses on pedagogy, not just content. The field needs it and students deserve it.”

**Stephanie Wittenbrink**, Special Education Learning Support Biology Teacher and Learning Support English Teacher, Mountlake Terrace High School; former Washington Education Association Student Board Member

One of the most important challenges facing public education is to ensure that the nation’s teacher workforce is prepared to meet the academic needs of all students. From the first day they enter the classroom, teachers must be ready to teach with the necessary skills to support students’ learning. Moreover, while preparing their candidates to enter the classroom, teacher preparation programs also need actionable information about their candidates’ performance and data to support program renewal.

The development of edTPA follows the seminal work of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards® (NBPTS®) in its efforts to support professional practice. The hallmark of professionalizing teaching rests on three foundational principles:

1. Teachers are morally committed to the health and welfare of all children.
2. Professions share a common body of knowledge and skills.
3. Professional practice is clearly defined, transmitted, and enforced based on common “standards of practice.”

Like other professions, teacher preparation programs make a compact with the public that allows for professional governance over the design and management of programs in exchange for holding themselves accountable for preparing candidates with the knowledge and skills that they need to practice safely and effectively. Teacher preparation programs are tasked with meeting parallel goals—preparing candidates to meet the learning needs of all students and informing their own practices as teacher educators. edTPA is designed to be a common measure to assess a candidate’s readiness to teach, and to assure the public that preparation programs are accountable for candidate performance.

**edTPA: Assessing Readiness to Teach**

edTPA is the first nationally available, educator-designed performance assessment for new teachers entering the profession. It provides a measure of teacher candidates’ readiness to teach that informs program completion and licensure decisions while supporting candidate learning and preparation program growth and renewal. edTPA is designed to:

- Strengthen beginning teaching and teacher education
- Inform teacher licensure, in combination with other state and program requirements
- Provide actionable evidence that can guide program improvement
- Strengthen the information base to support accreditation and program evaluation
- Guide the support and induction of new teachers
- Improve P–12 student outcomes
edTPA provides an opportunity for candidates to demonstrate their ability to effectively teach subject matter to all students. It consists of 27 separate subject-specific assessments, each one representing a major teaching licensure/credential field. The assessment systematically examines evidence derived from candidates’ clinical practice in their student teaching or internship placement. These include lesson plans, instructional materials, student assignments and assessments, feedback on student work, and unedited video recordings of instruction.

**edTPA: Developed by the Profession for the Profession**

Modeled after the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards' path-breaking assessments of accomplished veteran teachers, edTPA was created with input from teachers and teacher educators across the country in a process led by Stanford University’s Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity and supported by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.¹

**edTPA Developers and Partners**

More than 1,000 educators from 29 states and the District of Columbia, and more than 430 institutions of higher education participated in the development of edTPA.

An extensive, multi-year development process involved teachers and teacher educators in the assessment’s design, review, piloting, and field tests. edTPA design and review team members included a wide range of university faculty, P–12 teachers, and representatives of national subject-matter organization, such as the Specialized Professional Associations associated with the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. Involvement with edTPA is supported by the Teacher Performance Assessment Consortium, a professional learning community of preparation programs, faculty and state agency leaders.

With these educators, SCALE has developed the edTPA assessments and is responsible for scorer training materials, including benchmarks and training curriculum. AACTE and SCALE collaborate with the field to develop the resources that support educative implementation. Evaluation Systems of Pearson provides the infrastructure needed to deliver assessment materials, including the electronic portfolio platform for candidate registration and submission, digital distribution of submissions to scorers, scoring services, and score reporting.
The map above shows the states currently participating in edTPA, signaling those with implementation policy in place and those expecting to have an edTPA implementation policy in place soon. Visit edTPA online at edtpa.aacte.org for up-to-date information.

**edTPA as Support and Assessment**

Unlike other licensure assessments, edTPA aims to support candidate and program learning, as well as to measure outcomes. edTPA provides states and preparation programs with a rich array of resources that support its educative implementation, including handbooks to guide implementation, extensive feedback to candidates and programs, and scoring opportunities for school- and university-based faculty.

edTPA is designed to be more than a summative measure of teaching effectiveness. As an educative assessment of teacher performance, candidate preparation for the assessment is embedded in multiple learning experiences across the teacher preparation program, and the assessment provides actionable data designed to support candidate development and program renewal. Formative learning experiences facilitated by the edTPA resources provide opportunities for candidates to develop their practice within coursework and student teaching experiences.

“We learned that edTPA mirrors or enhances teaching tasks and makes more evident the thinking used by practicing educators as they make their decisions. The cooperating teachers have commented favorably on the clear and systematic nature of the assessment of important teaching skills.”

Cheryl Hanley-Maxwell, Ph.D., Associate Dean of the School of Education, University of Wisconsin, Madison
Support for Teacher Preparation Programs

For teacher preparation programs, their faculty, and their teacher candidates, the authentic design and curriculum-embedded approach of edTPA makes it an “assessment of, for, and as learning.” Key benefits of edTPA for teacher preparation programs include:

- Ongoing professional development and resources to support implementation through an online professional learning community and resource library, and through face-to-face training opportunities
- Measurement of candidates’ abilities to plan instruction to meet learning standards and to differentiate instruction for diverse learners, including English language learners and special education students
- Formative use of rubrics in course assignments, locally developed curriculum-embedded assessments, and clinical practice evaluations
- Actionable evidence of candidates’ performance over time to address the real-world needs and challenges that new teachers face every day
- Opportunities for continuous program renewal based on meaningful performance data
- Support for state and national accreditation through easily accessible individual data that can be aggregated to analyze performance within and across subject areas and program options.

“edTPA brings us an opportunity to talk about planning: what kind of skills we want our candidates to have in terms of planning, assessment and instruction. We can fine tune those things across our programs and give programs the opportunity to hear what is working well, areas of weakness and opportunities to share. That’s been very positive.”

Diana Lys, Ed.D., Director of Assessment and Accreditation, East Carolina University

In addition, edTPA supports teacher candidates in their process of learning to teach. The assessment tasks and rubrics outline clearly the professional standards teachers are striving for. Through formative experiences embedded in program preparation, candidates may receive real-time feedback from their faculty around standards of professional practice as they build their understanding of planning, teaching, and student learning, and learn how to demonstrate their growing abilities.

Support materials to facilitate this learning are available online at no cost for candidates and program faculty. Resources informing candidates about how to prepare their portfolios include:

- edTPA electronic portfolio platform tips, guides, and videos, such as “Using the edTPA ePortfolio System,” “Frequently Asked Questions,” and “Preparing Your Assessment with the edTPA ePortfolio System.”
- Assessment preparation guides and video tutorials, such as “Making Good Choices,” “Selecting a Learning Segment,” “Requesting and Receiving Feedback,” and “Submitting Your Assessment.”
- Guidelines and tips for video submissions, such as “Guidelines for Video Confidentiality,” “Video Recording Guidelines and Suggestions,” and “Tips for Uploading Video Files.”
“The edTPA required us to reflect, in writing, every single day, but also over longer spans of time. I’m talking about critical, objective reflection based on evidence. We had to ask and answer: “What worked today? What didn’t? For whom? Why? What should I do about it? And most importantly, how do I know?” We had to demonstrate our ability to make mid-course corrections in response to student learning. For me, it was largely edTPA that provided me the rapid reorientation toward student thinking and learning that I needed as a student teacher and then as a novice in my own classroom.”

Nicole Barrick Renner, Teacher, Metro Nashville Public School, Former Teacher Candidate, Vanderbilt University

Support for State Education Agencies

edTPA provides state agencies, including state standards boards and commissions, with a new performance-based assessment for teacher licensure. States can use the performance results of edTPA as a key indicator for granting an initial license to teacher candidates regardless of the path they take to become teachers. Key benefits of edTPA for states include:

- Opportunity for the state, its school districts, and teacher preparation programs to share a common framework and language for defining and measuring teaching performance
- Ability to evaluate the impact of teacher preparation on candidate knowledge and skills that lead to greater student learning
- Ability to use a nationally available common measure that is valid and reliable to evaluate pre-service teachers’ readiness to teach
- Use of a subject-specific, performance-based assessment system aligned to general and discipline-specific teaching standards that were designed and developed by educators for educators nationwide
- Access to an array of educative implementation resources and protocols that support preparation program renewal
Assessment Design and Architecture

Design Rationale

Drawing upon the experience gained from over 25 years of developing performance-based assessments of teaching, including the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Standards portfolio, and the Performance Assessment for California Teachers, edTPA was designed with a focus on subject-specific student learning and principles from research and theory. As a performance-based assessment system for learning, edTPA is designed to engage candidates in demonstrating their understanding of teaching and student learning in authentic ways.

The focus of edTPA is in the systematic collection of authentic teaching artifacts and commentaries that demonstrate a candidate’s readiness to teach.

Authentic Tasks

State policymakers and teacher preparation programs understand that the future of the public education system resides in its teachers and leaders. edTPA is designed around job-related practices that teachers employ throughout their teaching career. The integrated task structure of edTPA draws on evidence of a candidate’s ability to teach his/her subject matter by documenting a series of lessons from a unit of instruction taught to one group of students.

edTPA’s collection of authentic job-related materials is used to evaluate teaching practice and student learning. In addition, edTPA systematically documents teachers’ thinking about their practices through analytic commentaries that explain their teaching context and knowledge about diverse students and justify instructional practices that meet their students’ varied strengths and needs. In short, edTPA is designed to demonstrate readiness to teach.

“Those components of teaching—understanding context, developing a plan for learning, engaging learners, assessing and analyzing artifacts of teaching, plotting next steps accordingly—encompass the large measure of what practitioners need to know and be able to do in order to earn their way to a first day of a first year of a teaching career.”

Desiree H. Pointer Mace, Ph.D., Associate Professor and Associate Dean, Alverno College School of Education, Milwaukee

Alignment with Standards

edTPA is aligned with the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium standards, and various professional standards, including Common Core State Standards and national subject matter organizations’ content and pedagogical standards. edTPA also shares points of alignment with the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation standards.
Subject-Specific Assessments

Unlike other generic evaluations of teaching, edTPA is not a “one size fits all” assessment system. It focuses on subject-matter learning and pedagogy. In each discipline, candidates are required to support student learning of highly valued knowledge and skills within that field. For example, in the elementary, middle childhood, and secondary mathematics assessments of edTPA, candidates must design and teach a learning segment with a central focus that supports students’ development of conceptual understanding of a standards-based topic, procedural fluency, and problem solving/reasoning skills. In addition, candidates must demonstrate subject-specific, grade-level appropriate pedagogy in mathematics.

The following table lists the subject-specific assessments available for edTPA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject-Specific edTPA Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Technology Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education (Includes Literacy and Mathematics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as an Additional Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Consumer Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Childhood English/Language Arts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Common Architecture and Shared Pedagogy

While edTPA assessments are subject-specific and capture pedagogical strategies that are focused on specific disciplinary goals, they share a common architecture across all 27 fields, which supports the evaluation of a common set of teaching principles and high-leverage teaching behaviors.

The edTPA assessment system contains an integrated cycle of planning, instruction, and assessment documenting and analyzing the candidate’s subject-specific pedagogical practices. These tasks represent a cycle of effective teaching that a teacher repeats many times during an academic year. It is what real teachers do on the job.

**Common Architecture.** edTPA contains an integrated cycle of planning, instruction, and assessment documenting and analyzing the candidate’s subject-specific pedagogical practices, representing a cycle of effective teaching.
To complete edTPA, all candidates submit artifacts and analytic commentaries as evidence of how they planned and implemented a segment of instruction to deepen student learning of a subject-specific objective.

- **Artifacts** represent authentic work completed by the teacher candidate and his/her students (e.g., lesson plans, copies of instructional and assessment materials, unedited video recording(s) of the candidate’s teaching, and student work samples).

- **Commentaries** require candidates to explain the artifacts, justify the rationale behind the choice of artifact or instructional decision, and analyze what he/she has learned about students’ learning and the effectiveness of his/her teaching practice.

The collection of evidence is organized around three key tasks that represent a cycle of effective teaching: A planning task documents **intended** teaching, an instruction task documents **enacted** teaching, and an assessment task documents the **impact** of teaching on student learning.

- Task 1 **Planning**: Planning for Instruction and Assessment
- Task 2 **Instruction**: Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning
- Task 3 **Assessment**: Assessing Student Learning

The deliberate focus on shared pedagogical competency and knowledge across subject-specific assessments reflects the universal “deep structure” of teaching across content areas.

The following table shows the common architecture of edTPA, including how edTPA tasks and embedded components map to the teaching artifacts required for submission and the scoring rubrics used to evaluate candidate performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Artifacts</th>
<th>Rubrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Planning   | Lesson plans, instructional materials, student assignments, assessments, Planning commentary | 1. Planning for Content Understandings  
2. Supporting Students’ Learning Needs  
3. Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Planning  
4. Identifying and Supporting Language Demands  
5. Planning Assessment to Monitor Student Learning |
| Instruction| Unedited video recordings, Instruction commentary | 6. Demonstrating a Positive and Engaging Learning Environment  
7. Engaging Students in Learning  
8. Deepening Learning During Instruction  
9. Subject-Specific Pedagogy  
10. Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness |
| Assessment | Samples of student work, Evidence of feedback, Summary of student learning Assessment commentary, Evaluation Criteria, Student Self-Reflections | 11. Analyzing Student Learning  
12. Providing Feedback to Guide Learning  
13. Supporting Students’ Use of Feedback  
14. Evidence of Language Use to Support Content Learning  
15. Using Assessment to Inform instruction |

Scorers evaluate a candidate’s entire edTPA submission, rather than rely on independent scorers of discrete, isolated tasks. This approach allows the scorer to effectively review the entirety of a candidate’s teaching evidence. In addition to the three edTPA assessment tasks (Planning, Instruction, and Assessment), each candidate submission also is scored on two key components, Analysis of Teaching and Academic Language, which are embedded in the three assessment tasks.
Scoring Rubrics

edTPA’s subject-specific approach is reflected in its scoring process. To evaluate candidate performance, each qualified edTPA scorer has pedagogical and subject-matter knowledge specific to one of the 27 subject-specific edTPA assessments. The edTPA scorer is assigned to score edTPA responses at the grade level and subject area for which he or she has qualified. Each scorer evaluates a candidate’s entire portfolio by reviewing evidence from across the three assessment tasks.

Each task is evaluated with five separate rubrics, representing distinctive elements of the task, as shown in the table above. Thus, there are 15 different elements of teaching that are scored. A candidate receives a total score on the edTPA that can range from 15 to 75.

The rubrics used to score performance—which address common outcomes across all fields and are uniquely adapted to address student learning and pedagogy specific to each individual subject area—include descriptors for five levels that address a wide range of performance:

- **Level 1** represents the low end of the scoring spectrum, representing the knowledge and skills of a struggling candidate who is not ready to teach.
- **Level 2** represents the knowledge and skills of a candidate who is possibly ready to teach.
- **Level 3** represents the knowledge and skills of a candidate who is ready to teach.
- **Level 4** represents a candidate with a solid foundation of knowledge and skills for a beginning teacher.
- **Level 5** represents the advanced skills and abilities of a candidate very well qualified and ready to teach.

The rubric criteria focus on practices long demonstrated by research to be associated with teacher effectiveness: how teachers plan to support learning goals and student needs, create a positive learning environment, engage students in ways that deepen their learning, create meaningful tasks and provide feedback on student work, support student learning of language, and analyze their teaching in relation to students’ learning and make further plans to facilitate their progress. The criteria emphasize how teachers support the learning of all students by understanding their students’ prior knowledge, experiences, and cultural contexts, and by teaching with an eye toward equity.

---

I approached edTPA with a critical eye regarding the extent to which the instrument supports or hinders equitable teaching practices. When I noticed that teacher candidates’ edTPA commentaries revealed much about their grasp of equitable teaching practices, I was prompted to work with colleagues to analyze how the edTPA process enables teacher candidates to provide evidence of culturally relevant pedagogy.

Results show that almost 75% of the directions in the edTPA Handbook either directly prompt or provide an opportunity for teacher candidates to provide evidence of culturally relevant teaching practices. Because these opportunities are so pervasive, they provide an authentic integration of culturally relevant practice throughout the process of teaching, rather than treating it as an add-on or afterthought. Additionally, 8 of 15 edTPA scoring rubrics do not allow a candidate to score above a 1 if he or she does not demonstrate some level of culturally relevant pedagogy.


---

2 Note that edTPA developed for use in Washington state shares the common architecture and 15 common rubrics and includes an additional component on “Student Voice” embedded in the three tasks and scored with three additional rubrics.
Development

Professional Involvement and Review

A hallmark of edTPA is the principle that educators are crucial to the development process. The array of teaching perspectives, backgrounds, and experience among the many educators who contributed to edTPA development broadened the scope and sensitivity of the assessment, reflecting the variety of classroom settings and educational contexts a teacher candidate may face.

- 12,000+ teacher candidates from 430 campuses in 29 states
- 100+ content validation reviewers
- 150+ benchmarkers and scoring trainers
- 120+ subject-specific design/review members
- 10 bias review members
- 650+ scorers
- 5,000+ online community members

Input from educators was structured throughout the extensive development process, including design teams composed of educators with expertise in specific subject areas who reviewed handbooks and rubrics at multiple points. Through their careful review and feedback, in conjunction with the results of two years of field testing edTPA nationwide, the design of edTPA was adjusted accordingly. Input from the field was used to achieve the following:

- Clarify the conceptual focus of the assessment and reduce redundancy across prompts and artifacts.
- Modify commentary prompts and rubrics to ensure
  -- attention to the wide range of student learning needs, including those of students with Individualized Education Programs, English language learners, students with gaps in academic knowledge, struggling students as well as those who are advanced;
  -- features of content-specific student learning and pedagogy are recognized; and
  -- clear, comprehensible language is utilized.
- Refine the approach to assessing the development of academic language, including revising rubrics to examine how the candidate identifies language demands, scaffolds student language use, and provides evidence that students are using academic language to support deep content learning.
- Provide subject-specific examples of academic language constructs.
- Restructure handbooks for ease of use to help candidates consider what to think about, what to do, what to write, and what to submit, and offering interactive features and links to templates and resources.
- Redesign rubrics to better represent the progression of beginning teacher development and a more even distribution of performance levels.

“In designing the special education-specific aspects of the assessment, the design team used five factors to guide the development of task components and associated rubrics: skills and knowledge of common special educator instructional practices, the general education task components of other handbooks, Center for Exceptional Children professional standards for special educators, research-based effective practices and emphases, and special education specific cycle components. These factors helped us create a handbook that is grounded in core instructional practices that cut across disability categories, learner ages, and variations in special educator teaching assignments.”

Cheryl Hanley-Maxwell, Ph.D., Associate Dean of the School of Education, University of Wisconsin, Madison
In addition to the edTPA Design Teams, critical review has been provided by the:

- **Bias Review Committee**, which included 10 nationally representative educators and teacher educators who reviewed draft edTPA materials for any potential bias and provided input for revision.
- **Technical Advisory Committee**, convened by SCALE, consisting of educators, psychometricians, and researchers who recommended and reviewed research and advised on the technical features of the assessment.
- **National Advisory Board**, which provides ongoing advice from teachers, teacher educators, education organization leaders, and state representatives on edTPA policy and implementation decisions. (For a list of members, refer to Appendix A of this report.)

## Major Milestones

Major development milestones for edTPA include:

- **2009–2010**: Initial design and small-scale tryout of assessment prototypes
- **2010–2011**: Assessment revision with multi-state pilot test
- **2011–2012**: First large-scale field test to inform revision of tasks, rubrics, scoring training, scoring, reporting systems
- **2012–2013**: Revision followed by second large-scale field test to establish validity and reliability of scores and conduct standard setting process
- **2013–2014**: Operational launch of edTPA
Scoring

Scoring by the Profession for the Profession

Scoring is one of the potentially transformative elements of the edTPA assessment process. Scorers are drawn from among teacher preparation program faculty, field supervisors, and P-12 educators who work with novice teachers. These individuals’ engagement in scoring enables them to better support the formative development of prospective teachers and to consider ongoing improvements within their preparation programs.

Qualifications

Because of the subject-specific nature of edTPA, trainers and scorers must have pedagogical and subject-matter knowledge, including relevant experience in roles that support teaching and learning in the content area and grade-level span in which they score. The pool from which trainers, scoring supervisors, and scorers are recruited include membership from the following groups:

- University faculty and administrators
- Field supervisors
- Cooperating teachers
- Induction mentors / coaches
- School site principals
- National Board Certified Teachers®
- Subject matter organization members (e.g., NCTM, IRA)
- Retired teachers and principals who are current in their content field

Scorers also must have experiences that make them aware of appropriate expectations for teacher candidates who are in the early stages of learning to teach. University faculty and supervisors must have recent experience teaching methods or clinical supervision responsibilities in the subject matter area they will score. P–12 educators must have recent experience teaching P–12 learners the subject matter area they will score, as well as guiding or mentoring beginning teachers.

During the field test, about half of the scorers were teacher preparation faculty and the other half were P–12 educators, of whom approximately 50 percent were National Board Certified Teachers. These proportions are expected to be similar in the operational phase of edTPA.

Training

Training for scorers comprises both individual online and interactive group sessions, totaling about 20 hours. The individualized training includes a series of online training modules that orient scorers to the tasks, rubrics, and scoring system and provides numerous opportunities to identify and evaluate evidence for each rubric. During training, scorers review and analyze up to five edTPA submissions prior to qualifying to score (one embedded in individual online modules, one interactive practice session, two or three qualifying submissions).

After completing the individual portion of the training materials, scorers independently score a sample edTPA submission and then engage in a live (online) interactive group session with a trainer in that content area. The independent scoring activity gives the scorers the opportunity to practice scoring a subject-specific submission that has been coded by experienced scorers and trainers and then discuss evidence and score justifications with the trainer and other scorers in the interactive session.
After completing the interactive training session, scorers score and identify evidence for at least two additional edTPA submissions, previously coded by experienced scorers (i.e., “qualifying submissions”), within their specific content area prior to scoring candidate submissions. The qualifying submissions verify the scorer’s understanding of the scoring criteria and his or her ability to score candidate submissions accurately and consistently.

—Gwynne Rife, Ph.D., Professor of Biology and Education, College of Education, University of Findlay, Ohio, and Scoring Supervisor for edTPA

**ePortfolio Scoring Management System**

To score submissions, scorers use the edTPA electronic portfolio scoring management system, which allows scorers to receive candidate materials, view them, tag evidence and record the scores they assign for each rubric. Scorers are presented with specific subject-area portfolios to score based on their qualifications. The system efficiently collects the scores assigned to each submission for results reporting and data analyses.

**Scoring Process**

The edTPA scorer is assigned to score responses at the grade level and subject area for which he or she has qualified. The scorer evaluates a candidate’s entire portfolio across the three assessment tasks. The scorer utilizes a secure online scoring platform to access each candidate’s materials and applies the rubric scores, viewing all evidence from artifacts, commentaries, and video recording(s) submitted by the candidate.

With each scorer scoring an entire candidate submission (rather than independent scorers of discrete, isolated tasks), the scorer can effectively review the entirety of a candidate’s teaching evidence and ensure the components are appropriately interrelated. The scorer evaluates how the candidate plans to support subject-specific student learning, enacts those plans in ways that develop student learning, and analyzes the impact of that teaching on student learning. Guided by 15 analytic rubrics that incorporate the criteria used to score each of the three major areas, the scorer assesses the extent to which—and the areas in which—the candidate is ready to teach.

**Adjudication Process**

The edTPA scoring process has been designed to be fair to both candidates and external stakeholders alike. All edTPA submissions that are at or near the recommended professional performance standard for passing and failing are scored by at least two, and sometimes three, scorers. This procedure increases the decision consistency of the final scores assigned to edTPA candidates. In all such cases the final score is based on at least two scorers who agree on the pass/fail decision.
Analyses

Validity and reliability are essential elements of any assessment program. Evaluating the validity and reliability of edTPA as an instrument to measure teacher candidates’ readiness to teach has been a continuous part of its rigorous, multi-year development process.

The assessments were developed within a technical framework of psychometric practice and principles guided by *The Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (AERA, APA, & NCME, 1999). The edTPA development process yielded important evidence to provide the foundation of the assessments’ validity, reliability, and usability for the purposes of teacher licensure, accreditation of teacher preparation programs, and candidate completion of preparation programs.

This work has proceeded under the guidance of experts in psychometric practices and procedures. In addition, participating states have subjected the analyses to further review by their own technical advisors. Advisors have held the process to a high standard.

Descriptive Data

This section reports descriptive statistics about how candidates performed on edTPA in the 2013 field test sample. These statistics provide a snapshot of performance on the 2013 field test of the edTPA across credential areas.

Distribution of Scores

The 2013 edTPA field test provided sample responses and data regarding edTPA's statistical and qualitative characteristics.

There were 4,055 submissions evaluated from the 2013 edTPA field test across 23 fields. Each submission was scored on five separate rubrics within each of the three major edTPA tasks: planning, instruction, and assessment. With five levels of possible performance for each rubric (and 15 rubrics total for most assessments), the total score could range from 15 to 75.

The following figure shows the distribution of total scores:

![Total Score by Number of Submissions](chart)

*Total Score by Number of Submissions.* Based on the 2013 edTPA field test, this chart shows the number of candidate submissions and the total scores assigned. NOTE: Data reflect complete submissions (i.e., no missing rubric scores). For candidates who received two scores, the average score across the two was used.
The score means and standard deviations for the 15 possible scores\(^3\) are reported for each credential area in Appendix B. Summary score data for each of the content areas is presented in the following figure. The highest scores were obtained in secondary science and the lowest in middle childhood mathematics.

**Mean Total Scores across Content Areas**

[Chart showing mean total scores across content areas]

**Mean Total Scores by Content Area.** This figure provides a visual depiction of the total mean scores by content area for the 2013 edTPA field test. NOTE: Data reflect complete submissions (i.e., no missing rubric scores). For candidates who received two scores, the average score across the two was used.

---

\(^3\) There are 18 scores in Elementary Education, which includes assessments of teaching in both literacy and mathematics. World Language and Classical Language have two fewer rubric scores because academic language is the content to be taught and therefore is not addressed separately by rubrics in these fields. In Washington state, three additional rubrics are added to evaluate “student voice.”
Scores also differed across each of the rubrics. Data for the score distribution from the 2013 edTPA field test rubrics are presented in the following table:\(^4\)

![Score Distribution across Rubrics and Tasks](image)

**Score Distribution across Rubrics and Tasks.** This table displays the overall distribution of scores by rubric for the 2013 edTPA field test.

In general, as might be expected of pre-service teachers, candidates performed most highly on the planning task, followed by the instruction task, and then the assessment task. This conforms with other studies that have found that learning to evaluate and respond to students’ learning is one of the more challenging elements of teaching, and one that even some veteran teachers have not always mastered in the past.

---

\(^4\) Data reflect complete submissions (i.e., no missing rubric scores). For candidates who received two scores, the average score across the two was used. Candidates who completed edTPA in a credential area with fewer than 15 rubrics are excluded from the data, and only the scores for rubrics 1 through 15 are used for candidates in an edTPA credential area where more than 15 rubrics are used.
Validity

A valid performance assessment provides an accurate measurement of the important features of a performance that are related to candidates’ abilities to succeed at that endeavor in a real-world context. Multiple sources of evidence from the edTPA development process and data analyses collectively provide the foundation to support the validity of edTPA scores for licensure and accreditation purposes. The following sections summarize validity evidence with respect to the content of the assessment, its relationship to job requirements, bias and sensitivity, and its psychometric properties.

Content Validity

The authenticity and content relevance of edTPA was a continual focus throughout the development process. It is the key feature that indicates that teacher candidates demonstrate pedagogical and subject-matter knowledge and skills on the same tasks for which they will be responsible as licensed educators.

Content validation activities for edTPA consisted of gathering feedback from educators to rate the importance, alignment, and representativeness of the knowledge and skills required for each rubric, and of the rubric itself, in relation to national pedagogical and content-specific standards. The content validation activities provide critical evidence that the content of the assessments is related to knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary for the job of teaching.

As a result of the initial round of content validation activities, all tasks and components were rated above 3 on a 5-point scale, reflecting the judgments of reviewers that the knowledge and skills represented by tasks have “importance” to “very great importance,” that they align to InTASC standards “well” to “very well,” and that the rubrics represent relevant tasks of teaching.

To further support content validity, an additional round of activities was conducted to provide additional confirmation of the importance, alignment, and representativeness of the edTPA tasks. The results are shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task/Component</th>
<th>Importance of Knowledge and Skills</th>
<th>InTASC Standards Alignment</th>
<th>Rubric Representativeness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1: Planning</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2: Instruction</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3: Assessment</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Content Validity Ratings. The table above displays content validity ratings (on a five-point scale with five being the most positive rating) given by edTPA content validity committee members. The data indicate a strong relationship between the assessment’s key tasks and the job of an entry-level teacher.
Job Analysis Studies

The Job Analysis Studies conducted for edTPA focused on the knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) identified as necessary for successful teachers by the pool of subject-matter experts who were involved in edTPA development processes. These experts were practicing classroom teachers or teacher educators in each of the content fields. The list of KSAs generated by this panel informed the development of the edTPA rubrics.

The link between these KSAs and teachers' actual work was then confirmed through Job Analysis Studies, which included the following steps: First, a group of teachers identified a list of 105 tasks and behaviors that are critical to teaching. These tasks then were taken to a national group of educators who rated several aspects of each identified task, answering questions such as:

- **Task Performed:** Is the task performed on the job by a teacher?
- **Task Importance:** On a scale of one to five, how important is the task to effective teacher performance?
- **Time Spent on Task:** On a scale of one to five, how much time is spent on the task?

Responses related to each task were analyzed to identify the importance of each task to the job of teaching. From these ratings, an overall “criticality” value of tasks was calculated (with a minimum possible value of 3.0 and maximum possible value of 15.0). Of the 105 total behaviors and tasks, 86 of them met or exceeded the criticality threshold, which meant that: 1) 90% or more of respondents agreed that they perform the task, and 2) each task’s mean criticality rating was 8.0 or higher. Overall, the criticality value across the tasks had a mean of 10.35, maximum of 12.45, and minimum of 8.38. A panel of educators confirmed that the 15 rubrics were strongly related to the critical tasks and behaviors. Through this process, the 15 core edTPA rubrics were confirmed as representing knowledge, skills, and abilities that are judged to be important or critically important to perform the job of a teacher.

Bias and Sensitivity Review

State agencies and teacher preparation programs adopting edTPA benefit from an assessment system that has been carefully reviewed for fairness and freedom from potential bias. This review was achieved through the structured examination of handbook prompts, rubrics, and directions by a diverse and trained pool of professional teachers and teacher educators from across the nation who provided feedback on the structure of prompts, phrasing of questions, language of rubrics, and formatting of handbooks to ensure comprehensibility and equitable access and evaluation for all candidates completing edTPA.

“edTPA is assessing candidates’ readiness for classroom teaching. Additionally, edTPA assesses the extent to which candidates have developed sensibilities for differences among students and the ability to accommodate differences in students’ needs based on prior academic performance and cultural, experiential, and linguistic differences.”

**Etta R. Hollins**, Ph.D., Professor and Kauffman Endowed Chair for Urban Teacher Education, University of Missouri, Kansas City

Subgroup Scores

As part of the bias and sensitivity review, average total scores across different subgroups were compared. For the 2013 edTPA field test participants, the following figure displays participation and performance data—including mean scores, standard deviation, and submission volumes—for various participant groups.\(^5\) Gender, ethnicity, and primary language are based on self-reported responses.

\(^5\) Candidates who completed edTPA in a credential area with fewer than 15 rubrics are excluded from the data, and only the scores for rubrics 1 through 15 are used for candidates in an edTPA credential area where more than 15 rubrics are used. In addition, candidates with missing rubrics scores are excluded from the data.
No noticeable differences were found across different genders or for candidates whose primary language was not English. (Note, however, that very few candidates reported that English was not their primary language.) Comparatively small differences were obtained among the subgroups in ethnic categories, given the standard deviation of mean scores. In other words, there was greater variation in scores within subgroups than there was variation across subgroups. Because many of these comparisons are based on very unequal sample sizes, and some of the subgroup sample sizes are very small, any differences should be interpreted cautiously.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary Statistics of Total Score by Subgroups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (Non-Hispanic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncategorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (Non-Hispanic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary Statistics by Subgroups. The table shows performance data from the 2013 field test relative to the demographic characteristics of ethnicity, gender, and primary language, based on self-reported responses.

Construct Validity

Validity refers to the degree to which evidence and theory support proposed interpretations about uses of test scores. In the case of edTPA, we make inferences about candidates' readiness to teach based upon their total score across all rubrics of the edTPA. The AERA, APA, and NCME Standards (1999) suggest that studying the internal structure of items or tasks on an assessment is one of the primary sources of evidence that can be used to support construct-based score inferences.

Factor analysis was used to provide support for the use of a total score on the edTPA and strengthen inferences about candidate readiness to teach based on edTPA scores. Factor analysis is a psychometric method that evaluates patterns in the scores of an assessment. It can be used to answer two important questions regarding the interpretation of edTPA scores. First, is there support for using a single total score, summed across all 15 rubrics, to summarize a candidate's performance? Second, do the patterns of scores across rubrics support the theory underlying the development of the edTPA tasks and rubrics? Finding one or a small number of related underlying dimensions in the data supports the validity of inferences that edTPA measures a primary characteristic of effective teaching.

An exploratory factor analysis results in a set of estimated factor loadings. Such loadings can range from about -1.0 to +1.0. We expect the factor loadings to be positive and approaching a score of 1 for all rubrics in order to support use of a total score. To study whether the theoretical task structure is appropriate we conducted additional factor analyses to
determine which rubrics were most strongly related. We expect that rubrics within the same task will be more closely
related, and that performance across tasks also will be strongly related.

The data suggest that all factor loadings are positive and of moderate to large magnitude. These results support the use
of a single total score. The second factor analysis demonstrated that the hypothesized task structure of the edTPA is
supported by the patterns of candidates’ scores. Refer to Appendix C for detailed results and estimation methods of the
factor analyses.

Reliability

All measurement procedures have some amount of random measurement error. To provide evidence in support of
inferences based on edTPA scores it is important to evaluate the consistency, or reliability, of edTPA scores. Reliability
of edTPA scores in the field test sample was analyzed in two ways. First, the agreement rates between different scorers
evaluating the same candidate’s submission were analyzed. Second, the overall variability in a candidate’s scores due to
chance measurement error was evaluated using a Cohen Kappa statistical procedure.

Approximately 10% of all edTPA submissions are randomly selected to be scored by a second, independent scorer. This
provides a way to study how consistent edTPA scores are across different scorers. Ideally, a candidate would receive
the same score from two different scorers. In practice, the high complexity of the edTPA makes this unlikely. However, if
differences across scorers are small, this supports the consistency of edTPA scores.

Inter-rater Agreement Rates

To study agreement rates between scorers, the research team conducted several kinds of reliability analyses. In the table
below, we report two kinds of reliability statistics. The first is the adjacent agreement rate. Adjacent agreement refers to
the proportion of cases in which two independent scorers assign either the exact same score or a score within 1 point of
each other. When scoring complex performance assessment tasks, this often is used as a measure of rater agreement.

In addition, a statistic called kappa - n ( \( \kappa_n \) ) is often reported to account for agreement by chance. In some cases, scorers
will assign the same score to a submission simply by chance, rather than due to consistency of scoring procedure. The
statistic \( \kappa_n \) adjusts the adjacent agreement rate to take into account this chance agreement. While there are no clear
guidelines for interpreting \( \kappa_n \) values, it is better for these values to be closer to 1.0. The values reported here, which are
generally greater than 0.8 (minimum of 0.65 and maximum of 0.921) suggest scorers are nearly always within 1 point.

The table below shows the inter-rater reliabilities using both of these statistics. The average adjacent agreement rate
was .92 and the average kappa -n was .83. These reliability levels are relatively high, and are comparable to those found
for well-established performance assessments such as National Board Certification and scoring of open-ended tasks like
Advanced Placement essays and portfolios.

\[\text{The version of Cohen’s} \ K \ \text{reported here is based on that suggested by Brennan and Prediger (1981). This adjusts for chance by assuming that scorers are equally likely to assign any of the 5 score points to a portfolio, a priori. This is an appropriate adjustment because scorers are encouraged to use all score points and there is no restriction on the number of scores at any level that must be assigned across submissions.}\]
edTPA Rater Agreement Rates. This table presents rater agreement rates (exact plus adjacent agreement rates) and $K_n$ (Kappa-N) agreement rates for the 2013 edTPA field test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Rubric</th>
<th>Agreement Rate</th>
<th>Kappa - N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 1: Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubric 01</td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubric 02</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubric 03</td>
<td>0.934</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubric 04</td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubric 05</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 2: Instruction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubric 06</td>
<td>0.962</td>
<td>0.921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubric 07</td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubric 08</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubric 09</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubric 10</td>
<td>0.946</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 3: Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubric 11</td>
<td>0.911</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubric 12</td>
<td>0.934</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubric 13</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubric 14</td>
<td>0.941</td>
<td>0.877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubric 15</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>0.829</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard Setting

Use of the Total Score for Decisionmaking

The integrated three-task design of edTPA and factor analysis findings support the assignment of one total score to the candidate upon which a pass/fail decision about readiness to teach is made. The total score is calculated as the sum of the scores on all the rubrics associated with the full collection of artifacts and commentaries, where all rubrics are given the same weight and contribute equally to the total score. Total scores can range from 15 to 75. In this compensatory model, a candidate may “compensate” for lower scores on some rubrics with higher scores on other rubrics. The use of compensatory scoring for professional certification systems is standard practice (See, for example, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification assessment and most state licensure tests).

Setting a Recommended Professional Performance Standard

Standard setting is an evidence-based process for determining which score on a test or assessment demonstrates a specified level of performance. The Briefing Book process for determining a passing score (documented by Dr. Edward Haertel, in Haertel (2002, 2008) and Haertel & Lorie (2004)) was used for edTPA. Very broadly, the process begins with a statement of the intended performance level description—that is, a description of what candidates meeting the performance standard should know and be able to do. The goal is then to determine a cut score, or professional performance (passing) standard (PPS) on an accompanying test or assessment that separates those who meet the performance standard from those who do not.

A single recommended professional performance (passing) standard (PPS) was set for edTPA for use across all content areas and grade levels. The single performance standard is a result of the integrative structure and evaluation process of edTPA, in which a single total score is assigned to each candidate’s entire integrated edTPA submission. The candidate’s single total score is then compared to the single recommended PPS, which is the same PPS applied to each of the 27 edTPA subject-specific assessments.

For states (e.g., Washington) or credential areas (e.g., World Language) that have more or fewer than the 15 rubrics, it is necessary to use an adjusted PPS because the score scale (number of possible scores) differs. A proportional adjustment is made such that the average rubric score corresponding to the total scores remains constant across fields. To achieve this adjusted PPS, edTPA began with the PPS based on 15 rubrics set during a national standard setting event. This PPS was adjusted upwards for areas with more than 15 rubrics (where higher total scores are possible) and downwards for areas with fewer than 15 rubrics (where lower total scores are possible). This results in PPSs that are proportional to the number of rubrics and maintain the same average rubric score.

The use of a common professional performance standard for performance-based assessments is standard practice in the teacher certification industry, due in part to the assessment design used by the National Board.
edTPA Standard-Setting Event Overview

The edTPA standard-setting event was held over two days in August 2013. A group of subject-area experts and relevant education policymakers from across the nation were convened for the standard setting session. (See Appendix D for a full list of participants.) The goal of the session was to have panelists recommend (after thorough orientation and multiple steps and discussions) an initial PPS, which was then discussed and evaluated prior to recommending a final PPS.

Key Panels

- **Practitioner Panel.** Panel group No. 1 included faculty from institutions of higher education and P–12 educators with varying levels of exposure and engagement with edTPA.
- **Policy Panel.** Panel group No. 2 was a group comprised of members from various national organizations and stakeholder groups including National Education Association (NEA), American Federation of Teachers (AFT), and National Board, as well as state departments of education and/or standards boards within states using edTPA.
- **Final Panel to Establish the Recommended Professional Performance Standard.** The Final panel included representatives from both the practitioner panel and the policy panels.

edTPA Standard Setting Guiding Question

Throughout the standard-setting event and examination of sample edTPA submissions, a guiding question was used and revisited to frame all discussions, which provided a common ground for which all participants could anchor their decisions.

- Think about a teacher candidate who is just at the level of knowledge and skills required to perform effectively the job of a new teacher in U.S. public schools.
- Guiding question: What score (the sum of all of the rubric scores of the edTPA) represents the level of performance that would be achieved by this individual?

The purpose of the edTPA standard setting guiding question and context was to identify the performance expectation (on the 15-rubric scale) of an initially licensed, classroom-ready teacher. The step-by-step, standard-setting process of examining actual candidate submissions and impact data guided participants to determine the candidate performance on edTPA that, as stated in the Briefing Book Method, “just meets the definition of performing effectively the job of a new teacher.”

Key Steps of the Standard Setting Process

- **edTPA Standard Setting Pre-Activities (Homework).** Prior to the meeting, each invited panelist received edTPA handbooks, rubrics, scoring materials, and four previously scored edTPA submissions representing different performance levels across various content areas. Panelists were asked to review materials submitted by candidates and the scoring evidence identified by trained benchmarkers for the submissions that were assigned to them.
- **Day 1 – Policy Capture 1 Activity Overview/Instructions.** Individuals were assigned to collaborate with other panelists who reviewed the same edTPA materials for the homework assignment. Each panelist recalled a specific edTPA submission that they reviewed for homework and then provided an individual rating for that submission. In assigned groups, they discussed their ratings with other panelists with the goal of arriving at a consensus on the rating. Panelists repeated the process three more times for the other edTPA submissions they reviewed for homework.
- **Day 1 – Policy Capture 2 Activity Overview/Instructions.** Each panel determined a score range that would include the potential cut score. Given this range, a set of “Candidate Score Profiles” (scores for each rubric and total score) were identified for independent review by the panelists.
• **Day 2.** Each panel returned to the guiding question and framing for establishing a recommended professional performance standard. Using data from the individual ratings of the four edTPA submissions examined, each panel was asked to review data and attempt to narrow the range of scores that would include the cut score. The following data were present during three rounds of facilitated review:
  - Demographic data from the 2013 edTPA field test
  - Decision Consistency and Modeled Pass Rates (impact data) based on the number of 2013 edTPA field test candidates who performed at or above a recommended cut score (as a percentage of all candidates in a given group) overall, by credential area, and by demographic

• **Final Panel.** The third panel gathered after Panel 1 and Panel 2 submitted their individual ratings and consensus decision for a recommended professional passing standard. Both panels presented the same recommendation for the professional performance standard on the 15-rubric scale and no additional consensus discussion was required.

---

**Professional Performance Standard**

**Results of Standard Setting**

During the edTPA standard-setting process (previously described), the practitioner panel and policy panel recommended a maximum score of no more than 42 as the professional performance standard that should be considered. The final panel (a subset of both the practitioner and policy panel) supported a similar cut score benchmark. Typically, in setting a cut score for a pass-fail decision, a standard error of measurement is applied to the recommended score so as to minimize erroneous decisions (e.g., false negatives).7

States set their own passing scores based on state standard setting that takes into account state-specific data, measurement data, and policy considerations. As discussed by the standard-setting committee members, states may consider setting their initial cut score lower than the committee-suggested cut score to give programs time as they learn to deliver and support edTPA activities and to support candidates’ preparation of their submissions. As warranted, the cut score can be raised over time.

**Candidate Pass Rates**

The following table reports the number and percent of candidates who would have “passed” edTPA (based on the edTPA 2013 field test data) at different potential cut scores for an edTPA assessment with 15 rubrics. The table lists possible passing scores within a band of 37 and 42 (within one standard error of measurement of the maximum recommended cut score). Estimated passing rates are reported for cut scores within this band.

---

7 The edTPA assessment includes 15 scoring rubrics, each of which is worth five points, for a total maximum score of 75. Following a three-panel standard-setting process in summer 2013, the panel recommended a maximum score of no more than 42 points as the professional performance standard that should be considered. Based on that recommendation, SCALE provided states with a national range from 39-42 (a half standard error of measurement) to use in their standard-setting process.
These passing rates are pooled across states and credential areas. Note that the field test sample is a voluntary sample of prospective teachers in edTPA participating states, and in many cases edTPA was not completed under high-stakes or consequential circumstances. Furthermore, many institutions were using edTPA for the first time and had not yet developed support strategies for candidates. However, the data provide an initial estimate of passing rates for edTPA at different potential cut scores. Under actual testing circumstances with programs that have become experienced in supporting the assessment, pass rates would be expected to increase.

It also is worth noting that, in the operational phase, all scores on or near the cut score are read and scored by two independent certified scorers. If there are differences in the scores, a third reader independently scores the submission to adjudicate discrepancies.

**Candidate Pass Rates.** The table provides number and percent of candidates “passing” at different potential cut scores for an edTPA assessment with 15 rubrics.
Submitting, Reporting, and Retaking edTPA

Consistent scoring of edTPA across campuses, states, and contexts is supported by a web-based registration, submission, and reporting platform. The edTPA electronic management system provides comprehensive services for candidates, teacher preparation programs, and state agencies in delivery of edTPA. Stakeholders can obtain assessment information, candidates can create a secure account for registration and upload their teaching artifacts for review and official submission, and candidates, teacher preparation programs, and state agencies can access score reports and performance information.

In addition, the electronic management system facilitates secure and official edTPA scoring by trained scorers, including the scheduling of qualified scorers, training and presentation of calibration exercises to scorers, the scoring of candidate submissions by the scorers, and ongoing monitoring of the overall process to achieve consistent scoring.

In summary, the architecture of the edTPA electronic portfolio platform features the following:

- An electronic system to register candidates and collect background information from them
- An electronic platform to collect submissions of edTPA materials, including video recordings
- An interface to allow submission of materials via a local vendor platform
- Functionality for faculty to provide formative feedback to candidates on the candidate's submission of edTPA materials before they are submitted for scoring, as an option
- Electronic training and calibration of educators to score edTPA
- An electronic platform to distribute edTPA submissions to scorers and collect the scorers' ratings
- An electronic platform to report scores to the candidate, to the teacher preparation program, and to the state
- A system for teacher preparation programs and the state to conduct detailed analyses of the database built from edTPA scores

Official score reports for edTPA are delivered to candidates, teacher preparation programs, and state agencies with a three- to four-week turnaround time between candidate submission deadlines and reporting of results. Electronic score reports are posted to the candidate's secure online account, as well as a secure database with accessibility for teacher preparation programs for their candidates' scores and accessibility for states for all candidate scores from the respective state.

Candidate score reports (i.e., profiles) include the score obtained on each of the edTPA rubrics, overall performance information (with links to additional interpretive information), and a narrative that provides rubric language descriptors of the candidate's performance for each of their rubric scores.

Candidates may retake one edTPA task or the entire edTPA assessment, with advice and counsel of faculty from their teacher preparation program. Guidelines are provided to programs to support faculty/candidate decisionmaking about which tasks to retake and appropriate support for candidates retaking edTPA.
Conclusion: Moving Forward with edTPA

Now, more than ever before, it is critically important for the success of individual students and our nation as a whole that individuals entering teaching be prepared to meet the academic needs of all students. With new, higher standards and greater diversity among students, teachers must develop more sophisticated teaching skills and be able to use them from the first day they enter the classroom. Preparation programs also must learn how to support this kind of practice with useful tools to develop and assess new teachers’ abilities to put their growing knowledge into action.

edTPA is the first nationally available, subject-specific assessment providing teacher preparation programs and states with access to a multiple-measure assessment system aligned to contemporary state and national standards. edTPA is an authentic, subject-specific, performance-based support and assessment system developed by the profession for the profession to assess teacher candidates’ readiness to teach.

edTPA is the first nationally available subject-specific assessment providing teacher preparation programs and states with access to a multiple-measure assessment system aligned to contemporary state and national standards.

edTPA may serve as an educational linchpin in states’ bold efforts to reform teaching and learning at the beginning of the professional life cycle of teaching. edTPA’s integrated, educative design supports teacher candidates, teacher preparation programs, and states with tools to ensure that every P–12 student has a well-qualified teacher who knows how to meet his/her learning needs and develop deep subject matter mastery.
Appendix A: edTPA National Advisory Board

Advisory Board

The edTPA Advisory Board was appointed in April 2013 to counsel partners on the design, implementation, policy and governance of the assessment. The board’s goal is to ensure that edTPA is a high-quality assessment that is well-used and effective in developing entering teachers, assessing their level of preparation and supporting teacher preparation programs. The advisory board was designed to include a broad representation from the field in order to ensure that edTPA continues to be developed and led by the educators it was designed to serve. Current members of the advisory board are:

William Buxton, Associate Professor, Literacy Education Department, SUNY Cortland

Thomas Bordenkircher, Michigan and Ohio Director for Teaching Fellowships, Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation

Lynn Cherkasky-Davis, Quest Center Coordinator, National Board Certification Initiatives, NBCT, Chicago Teachers Union

Mitchell Chester, Commissioner, Massachusetts Department of Elementary & Secondary Education

Jim Cibulka, President, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education and Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Carl Cohn, Clinical Professor of Education, Claremont Graduate University

Mary Diez, Professor, School of Education, Alverno College

Daniel Domenech, Executive Director, American Association of School Administrators

Anne Marie Fenton, Program Director of Assessment, Georgia Professional Standards Commission

Chris Koch, State Superintendent, Illinois State Board of Education

Marvin Lynn, Dean, School of Education, Indiana University South Bend

Callie Marksbary, Classroom Teacher, Lafayette, Indiana and Chair of the NEA Professional Standards and Practice (PSP) Committee

Bill McDiarmid, Dean and Alumni Distinguished Professor of Education, University of North Carolina Chapel Hill

Kendra Phelps, Professional Issues Representative, Cincinnati Federation of Teachers

Rebecca Pringle, Secretary-Treasurer, National Education Association

Phil Rogers, Executive Director, National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification

David Sevier, Deputy Executive Director, State of Tennessee Board of Education

Lee Shulman, Emeritus Professor, Stanford University

Kathleen Skinner, Director Center for Education Policy and Practice, Massachusetts Teachers Association

Ron Thorpe, President and CEO, National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

Jennifer Wallace, Executive Director, Professional Education Standards Board, Washington

Randi Weingarten, President, American Federation of Teachers

Bob Wise, President, Alliance for Excellent Education

Beverly Young, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Teacher Education and Public School Programs, California State University System

Ken Zeichner, Professor and Director of Teacher Education, University of Washington
Appendix B: Score Means and Standard Deviations

The following table presents the mean, standard deviation, and number of submissions by content area for each rubric of the edTPA assessment system, based on the 2013 edTPA field test.\(^8\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Area</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Education</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Literacy</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Mathematics</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^8\) Data reflect complete submissions (i.e., no missing rubric scores). For candidates who received two scores, the average score across the two was used. Candidates who completed edTPA in a credential area with fewer than 15 rubrics are excluded from the data, and only the scores for rubrics 1 through 15 are used for candidates in an edTPA credential area where more than 15 rubrics are used. Low-incidence fields that had less than 10 candidate submissions are included in the “All” row, but omitted from the field-specific analyses. Elementary Education has three additional rubrics due to an extra Task focusing on analyzing student learning in mathematics; data for these three rubrics follow the table.
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## 2013 Field Test Content Areas:
Mean, Standard Deviation, and Volume by Content Area and Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Area</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Task 1: Planning</th>
<th>Task 2: Instruction</th>
<th>Task 3: Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rubric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education*</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K–12 Performing Arts</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K–12 Physical Education</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Childhood English-Language Arts</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Childhood History/Social Studies</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Childhood Mathematics</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Childhood Science</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary English-</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2013 Field Test Content Areas:
### Mean, Standard Deviation, and Volume by Content Area and Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Area</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Task 1: Planning</th>
<th>Task 2: Instruction</th>
<th>Task 3: Assessment</th>
<th>Rubric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary History/Social Studies</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Mathematics</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Science</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean and Standard Deviation by Content Area and Rubric.** This table presents the mean, standard deviation, and number of submissions by content area for each rubric of the edTPA assessment system.
*Elementary Education has three additional rubrics due to an extra Task focusing on analyzing student learning in mathematics. Data for these three rubrics are presented in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Area</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Task 4: Mathematics</th>
<th>Rubric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Factor Analyses

The following table provides the detailed results and estimation methods of the factor analyses. Exploratory factor analysis of the Pearson correlation matrix was used. For candidates who randomly received double-scored submissions, the average of their two scores was used. The maximum likelihood estimation and promax rotation for the 3-factor model were used. 1- and 3-factor models were estimated. Correlations among the factors in the 3-factor model ranged from 0.68-0.75.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Rubric</th>
<th>1-Factor Model</th>
<th>3-Factor Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1: Planning</td>
<td>Rubric 01</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubric 02</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubric 03</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubric 04</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubric 05</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2: Instruction</td>
<td>Rubric 06</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubric 07</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubric 08</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubric 09</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubric 10</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3: Assessment</td>
<td>Rubric 11</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubric 12</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubric 13</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubric 14</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubric 15</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor Analysis. This table shows the results of factor analysis of the 15 edTPA rubrics using data from the 2013 field test. NOTE: In this table, “ML” refers to the maximum likelihood for each factor.

Note: Candidates who completed edTPA in a credential area with fewer than 15 rubrics are excluded from the data, and only the scores for rubrics 1 through 15 are used for candidates in an edTPA credential area or state where more than 15 rubrics are used.
Appendix D:
edTPA Standard-Setting Panels

Practitioner Panel

Panel group No. 1 was comprised of higher education faculty and P-12 educators with expertise in specific subject areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jorgelina Abbate</td>
<td>University of Massachusetts, Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amee Adkins</td>
<td>Illinois State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Aldous</td>
<td>Tukwila School District, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patti Bennett</td>
<td>Miamisburg Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhonda Bonnstetter</td>
<td>Southwestern Minnesota State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Bordenkircher</td>
<td>Woodrow Wilson Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mollie Davidson</td>
<td>Western Governors University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Evans</td>
<td>Kennesaw State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandra Foote</td>
<td>Niagara University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcy Singer Gabella</td>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianna Greivenkamp</td>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etta Hollins</td>
<td>University of Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Hyler</td>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Kimori</td>
<td>Ubah Medical Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Lys</td>
<td>Eastern Carolina University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desiree Pointer Mace</td>
<td>Alverno College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patty Alvarez McHatton</td>
<td>Kennesaw State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Mendle</td>
<td>University of CA, Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misty Sato</td>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Sexton</td>
<td>University of Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Welsch</td>
<td>The University of Toledo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Policy Panel**

Panel No. 2 is a group comprised of members from various national organizations. The members all specialize in different subject areas, which they represented during the small group activities and discussion of portfolios reviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Tine Sloan</td>
<td>University of California, Santa Barbara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Beverly Young</td>
<td>Teacher Education and Public School Programs - California State University System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Lynn Hammonds</td>
<td>Hawaii Standards Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Tammy Huth</td>
<td>Department of Public Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Lynn Cherkasky-Davis</td>
<td>NBCT, Chicago Teachers Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Chris Koch</td>
<td>Illinois State Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Callie Marksbary</td>
<td>Indiana, NEA Professional Standards and Practices Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Mitchell Chester</td>
<td>Massachusetts Department of Elementary &amp; Secondary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Karen Balmer</td>
<td>Minnesota Board of Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>Emerson Elliott</td>
<td>CAEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>Monica Fillipu</td>
<td>Teach for America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>Mariana Hayes</td>
<td>Alliance for Excellent Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>Peter McWalters</td>
<td>Council of Chief State School Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>Kathleen Paliokas</td>
<td>Council of Chief State School Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>Richelle Patterson</td>
<td>National Education Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>Phil Rogers</td>
<td>NASDTEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>Lisa Stooksberry</td>
<td>National Board for Professional Teaching Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>Deb Tully</td>
<td>American Federation of Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>Jane West</td>
<td>AACTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Bill McDiarmid</td>
<td>University of North Carolina Chapel Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Jennifer Case</td>
<td>NYS Education Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Jon Snyder</td>
<td>Bankstreet College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Rebecca Watts</td>
<td>Ohio Board of Regents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>David Sevier</td>
<td>Tennessee State Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Patti Larriva</td>
<td>Washington's Professional Education Standards Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>Mary Diez</td>
<td>Alverno College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBSERVERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saroja Barnes</td>
<td>AACTE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Johnston</td>
<td>The Hatcher Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina Moore</td>
<td>UCOP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Sandy</td>
<td>CTC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Final Panel was composed of selected representatives from both the policy and practitioner panels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Tine Sloan</td>
<td>UC Santa Barbara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Lynn Hammonds</td>
<td>Hawaii Standards Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Amee Adkins</td>
<td>Illinois State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Lynn Cherkasky-Davis</td>
<td>NBCT, Chicago Teachers Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Chris Koch</td>
<td>Illinois State Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Jorgelina Abbate</td>
<td>University of Massachusetts, Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Mitchell Chester</td>
<td>Massachusetts Department of Elementary &amp; Secondary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Karen Balmer</td>
<td>Minnesota Board of Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>David Kimori</td>
<td>Ubah Medical Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>Etta Hollins</td>
<td>University of Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>Emerson Elliott</td>
<td>CAEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>Peter McWalters</td>
<td>CCSSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>Kathleen Paliokas</td>
<td>CCSSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>Richelle Patterson</td>
<td>National Education Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>Phil Rogers</td>
<td>NASDTEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>Lisa Stooksberry</td>
<td>National Board for Professional Teaching Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>Deb Tully</td>
<td>AFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>Jane West</td>
<td>AACTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Bill McDiarmid</td>
<td>UNC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Jennifer Case</td>
<td>NYS Education Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Chandra Foote</td>
<td>Associate Dean - Niagara University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Jon Snyder</td>
<td>Bank Street College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Rebecca Watts</td>
<td>Ohio Board of Regents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Richard Welsch</td>
<td>U of Toledo, Chair, Early Childhood, Physical, &amp; Special Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>Marcy Singer Gabella</td>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Patti Larriva</td>
<td>Washington’s Professional Education Standards Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Patrick Sexton</td>
<td>University of Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>Mary Diez</td>
<td>Alverno College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>Tammy Huth</td>
<td>Department of Public Instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
edTPA: An Evidence-Based Assessment of Teacher Effectiveness

What is edTPA™?

- The Illinois School Code requires that teacher preparation programs in Illinois begin phasing in an “evidence-based assessment of teacher effectiveness.” As of Sept. 1, 2015, all teacher candidates for licensure will have to pass such an assessment in order to complete their teacher preparation programs and apply for licensure.

- edTPA, an assessment designed by Stanford University, is the “evidence-based assessment of teacher effectiveness” that has been approved by the State Board of Education in consultation with the State Educator Preparation and Licensure Board.

- edTPA has been piloted and/or implemented in various states around the country, including Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin and Wyoming.

- edTPA is meant to serve as a capstone assessment and complements other assessments of teacher readiness required by ISBE and the candidate’s individual program of study.

- edTPA is designed to measure teacher candidate effectiveness in the classroom by focusing on student learning.

- edTPA includes a review of a teacher candidate's authentic teaching materials, including short video clips of instruction, lesson plans, student work samples, analysis of student learning and reflective commentaries.

- edTPA assessments are securely submitted via an electronic online platform and are scored by carefully selected evaluators, who include teacher education faculty, clinical supervisors, K-12 teachers, administrators and National Board Certified Teachers.
edTPA is aligned with the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards, and various professional standards, depending on the subject area, including Common Core State Standards and Specialized Professional Association (SPA) standards. edTPA also aligns with the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standards.

What are the legal authorities and ISBE rules regarding edTPA?

- The Illinois School Code provides, at 105 ILCS 5/21B-30(f): “Beginning on September 1, 2015, all candidates completing teacher preparation programs in this State are required to pass an evidence-based assessment of teacher effectiveness approved by the State Board of Education, in consultation with the State Educator Preparation and Licensure Board. All recognized institutions offering approved teacher preparation programs must begin phasing in the approved teacher performance assessment no later than July 1, 2013.”

- ISBE’s administrative rules, at 23 Ill. Adm. Code 25.720(e), provide: “Beginning September 1, 2015, each candidate completing an educator preparation program in a teaching field shall be required to pass the TPA (see Section 21B-30(f) of the School Code). 1) Each recognized institution offering approved teacher preparation programs shall administer the TPA during a candidate’s student teaching experience. 2) No later than July 1, 2013, each recognized institution offering an approved teacher preparation program shall begin using the TPA with at least some of its students; however, before September 1, 2015, an institution shall not require passage of the TPA as a condition for program completion for students participating in any limited implementation required under this subsection (e)(2) unless the institution requires that all candidates pass the assessment.”

How does edTPA affect school districts?

- Teacher candidates will be completing edTPA during student teaching.

- Teacher candidates will be required to submit examples of their work in the classroom, including: video clip(s) of their instruction, examples of student work, and planning and assessment documentation.

  - Video-clip(s): Each teacher candidate will have to make arrangements to record him or herself teaching in the classroom. This component will generally consist of one or more clips totaling no more than 30 minutes.
Examples of student work: Each teacher candidate will be required to submit examples of student work.

Planning and assessment documentation: Each teacher candidate will be required to submit examples of the candidate’s lesson planning and assessment of and feedback to students.

What can school districts do to support teacher candidates?

- Because all teacher candidates in Illinois will soon be required to complete edTPA, school districts who host student teachers can do a variety of things to support this process:
  - Evaluate and review policies for the use of video and audio in your classrooms to determine whether current district procedures for obtaining parental permission are adequate.
  - Work with candidates to make sure that they understand district policy for recording and to secure parental permission for the video/audio recording and student work components.
  - Continue to collaborate with teacher preparation programs in ensuring mutually beneficial student teaching placements.
  - Cooperating teachers can support candidates by providing practical support, feedback, and assistance to teacher candidates during their student teaching experiences.
  - Seek additional information. If a district or school needs more information or does not understand a part of the edTPA process, ISBE encourages districts and schools to contact their Regional Offices of Education or ISBE directly. Helpful general information on edTPA is also available online at [http://edtpa.aacte.org/](http://edtpa.aacte.org/).

Security and Privacy during the edTPA Process

- ISBE recognizes that the use of technology where students may be video and audio recorded in the classroom presents concerns and challenges for parents and students as well as educators and administrators. Moreover, ISBE recognizes that submission of student work as part of the teacher candidate’s portfolio may implicate privacy concerns for parents, students, and schools. In order to address these concerns, please consider the following:
  - ISBE has drafted a sample letter to parents, guardians, and students aged 18 or older, along with a release form to be completed regarding edTPA video and audio recording and student work submission process.
and has provided this to Illinois teacher preparation programs. It is also attached here. While this form is not the only form by which candidates and programs can secure participant agreement, ISBE believes that the sample letter and release form reflect best practices for seeking agreement from parents, guardians, or students for students to participate in the assessment video and audio recording and submission of student work.

- ISBE encourages educator preparation programs to assist student teachers by making safe, secure video and audio recording options available to them. For instance, programs may wish to consider providing video cameras to student teachers for their use in completing the assessment rather than students utilizing their own devices, such as smart phones, to record their teaching. Programs may also wish to consider pursuing cooperation with the host school or district in utilizing school or district equipment for recording purposes. While neither of these approaches are required, ISBE believes that they reflect best practices for accomplishing this important assessment process while safeguarding the recorded material.

- ISBE encourages institutions and programs to include a provision in their student teaching agreements with teacher candidates that describes the expectations for the candidates’ use, transmission, and destruction of classroom recordings for assessment.

- The materials gathered are submitted securely to the electronic platforms maintained by Pearson, where only scorers may securely access them. The scorers are not able to download or otherwise save the information provided for scoring.

- Pearson may maintain edTPA materials for a short period of time (usually 12-24 months) in order to preserve a record for scores that are challenged and to continue to review the effectiveness and validity of the assessment. The materials will then be destroyed.

- Video recordings can be structured to accommodate students whose parents do not consent to their child being video and audio recorded, such as by positioning the camera such that such students are not visible in the recording. Student materials are submitted without identifying information.

- Failure to ensure the confidentiality of materials obtained and submitted for edTPA may result in adverse action, including rejection of the candidate’s application for licensure with ISBE.
Dear Parent/Guardian or Student at least 18 years of age:

I am enrolled in the teacher preparation program at [University] and am currently student teaching in your child’s classroom. Illinois participates in edTPA™, which means that, in order to complete my student teaching assignment, I have to complete an assessment called the Teacher Performance Assessment, conducted by Stanford University and Pearson, an education services company. This assessment includes submitting a video of me teaching a series of lessons in the classroom and examples of student work completed. In the course of recording my teaching, your child may appear on the video. I will gather samples of student work to submit as evidence of my teaching practice, which may include some of your child’s work. This is not an assessment of your child’s performance as the primary focus is on my instruction.

No student’s name will appear on any materials that are submitted, and materials will be kept confidential at all times. The video recordings and student work I submit will not be made public in any way. Materials I submit will be reviewed by my program at [University]. My assessment materials may also be used by Stanford University and Pearson under secure conditions for edTPA program development and implementation, including scorer training, and to support continued program improvement activities such as future validity and reliability studies.

This form is a request for your consent to include both your child in the video and his or her class work. Please complete the bottom half of this page and retain the top for your reference. If you have any questions about the use of this video or your child’s class work, please contact my academic advisor, [name], at [phone#].

Thank you for your consideration.

[name – printed and signature]

---

### RELEASE FORM FOR STUDENT PARTICIPATION

**Student name:** ______________________  **Student’s school:** __________________________

I am the parent or legal guardian of the child named above. I have read and understand the project description given in the letter provided at the top of this form, and agree to the following (please check the appropriate line below):

___ I DO give permission to include my child’s image and voice on video recordings and my child’s class work for use in the Teacher Performance Assessment of [Student Teacher]. I understand that my child’s name and any other personally identifiable information about my child will not appear on any of the submitted materials.

___ I DO NOT give permission to include my child’s image and voice on video recordings and my child’s class work for use in the Teacher Performance Assessment of [Student Teacher].

Signature of Parent or Guardian: ______________________________  Date: _______________

---

I am the student named above and am at least 18 years of age. I have read and understand the project description given at the letter provided at the top of this form, and agree to the following (please check the appropriate line below):

___ I am at least 18 years of age and DO give permission to include my image and voice on video recordings and my class work for use in the Teacher Performance Assessment of [Student Teacher]. I understand that my name and any other personally identifiable information about me will not appear on any of the submitted materials.

___ I am at least 18 years of age and DO NOT give permission to include my image and voice on video recordings and my class work for use in the Teacher Performance Assessment of [Student Teacher].

Signature of Student: _________________________  Date: __________  Date of birth: __/__/____
A Performance-Based Approach to License Teacher Candidates And Support Program Improvement

States and teacher preparation programs are looking for new ways to develop and evaluate teaching effectiveness and improve their programs. Increasingly, they are focusing on authentic assessments of how teacher candidates develop and evaluate student learning. edTPA™ represents this historic shift as the first nationally available, research- and standards-based support and assessment program that can serve as a common and external measure of candidate performance and teacher quality.

edTPA complements existing entry-level assessments used by states that focus on basic skills or subject matter knowledge and campus-based evaluations of clinical practice, coursework, grades and curriculum-embedded assessments of candidate performance. Developed by the profession for the profession, edTPA is available in 27 initial licensure areas. After a two-year period of field testing, it now can be used for teacher licensure, as part of state and national program accreditation and to guide program improvement. It is comparable to entry-level assessments in other professions such as the bar exam in law, medical licensing exams and the architectural registration exam.

edTPA is aligned with Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards, state professional teaching standards, Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) standards and the Common Core State Standards. edTPA provides meaningful data to support teacher education programs as they evaluate, reflect on and continually improve their programs to ensure a relevant, integrated curriculum centered on student learning.

How Does It Work?
The edTPA process is built around three-to-five continuous days of standards-based, subject-specific classroom instruction delivered by a candidate, typically at the end of the student teaching or clinical experience.

edTPA is a multiples-measure assessment of teaching – built and submitted by the candidate – that addresses planning, instruction, assessment and analyzing teaching. It includes unedited video recordings of the candidate teaching and examples of teaching materials (plans, teaching tools, assignments) that demonstrate how the candidate planned instruction, adapted it for diverse learners – attending both to subject specific learning and the development of academic language – and assessed student work.

Each assessment is scored by qualified and trained teachers and teacher educators who are subject matter experts with experience supporting beginning teachers. Half of current scorers are recruited from higher education and half are recruited from P-12 educators, including National Board Certified Teachers.

By the Profession for the Profession
The assessment draws from experience gained over a 25-year history developing performance-based assessments of teaching, including the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, the InTASC portfolio and the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT). Hundreds of teachers and teacher education faculty have been involved at every stage of development and continue to participate in a professional learning community that supports edTPA implementation. The Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity, in partnership with the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, provide a rich array of implementation support materials – including local evaluation training, curriculum mapping and embedded assessment design, webinars on academic language, resources for cooperating teachers and orientations for candidates. A National Academy of edTPA experts provides implementation consultation and face-to-face scoring training in key states.

What is the status of edTPA?
edTPA has been tried out nationally since the beginning of the 2012 academic year. edTPA underwent field testing...
with more than 12,000 teacher candidates during the 2011-12 and 2012-13 academic years. The field test data showed that edTPA is a rigorous, valid assessment that is scored reliably.

Information from the field tests was used to fine tune assessment tasks, scoring rubrics and candidate handbooks and, with the assistance of a standard-setting panel of educators and psychometricians, determine a recommended professional performance standard. edTPA was declared fully operational in September 2013. The feedback provided to teacher candidates and institutions will support ongoing inquiry and professional learning.

Seven states – Georgia, Hawaii, Minnesota, New York, Tennessee, Washington and Wisconsin – have adopted policies for using edTPA. Other states, including Illinois and Ohio, are considering edTPA policies at the state level. Campuses in 19 additional states and the District of Columbia continue to pilot the assessment. These states are considering edTPA as a preparation requirement for new teachers, as a formal requirement for licensure or as part of institutional accreditations.

The nation’s teaching force is younger than it has been in decades. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, at least 15 percent of teachers have three or fewer years of experience. The number of teachers entering the profession each year has been at its highest in recent history. Preparing these new teachers for success is more important than ever. edTPA is an educative process that builds on the latest research on teaching quality and supports preparation programs to increase their focus on student learning and the skills and abilities that improve teaching and student performance.

**Helping to Meet Education’s Top Priority**
The most important thing we can do to help students is to provide an effective teacher in every classroom. But the growing number of new teachers and high rate of teacher turnover make this a challenge.

**Supporting Change in Teacher Preparation**
edTPA will provide evidence of a teacher’s readiness to enter the profession that can be acted upon to support program improvement. The feedback provided to teacher candidates and institutions will support ongoing inquiry and professional learning.

edTPA also supports performance-based state teacher licensure systems by offering a common standard for teacher performance in the classroom as part of a system of multiple measures. Until now, completion of most state preparation programs relied primarily upon seat time in coursework, local clinical evaluation and the results of subject-matter assessments. Teacher preparation program models have evolved, with a range of approaches at the graduate and undergraduate levels along with alternative teacher preparation programs and new online delivery systems. It has been difficult, however, for states to maintain a credentialing system that represents a common standard of knowledge, skills and abilities with documented validity of their relation to the tasks of a classroom teacher that is comparable across institutions.

edTPA offers a rigorous measure of entry-level teaching skills and readiness for the classroom – regardless of the path candidates take to teaching – that can be used across programs, focusing attention on the capacity to teach.

**States with edTPA Policies or Institutions Participating in edTPA**

|--------|----------------------|---------|------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|--------------|------|----------|--------|--------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-------|-----------|------------|-----------|--------|
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

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

Agenda Topic: Approval of Intergovernmental Agreement Exceeding $1 Million for Illinois Department of Human Services-The Gateways to Opportunity Scholarship Program

Materials: N/A

Staff Contact(s): Reyna P. Hernandez, Assistant Superintendent, Center for Language and Early Childhood Development

Purpose of Agenda Item
The Early Childhood Division requests the Board to authorize the State Superintendent to renew an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) between the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) and the Illinois Department of Human Services (DHS) and authorize an additional $500,000.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
The Gateways to Opportunity Scholarship program supports the following Agency goals:

- **GOAL 1:** Every student will demonstrate academic achievement and be prepared for success after high school, and
- **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 the Board will authorize the State Superintendent to renew the Intergovernmental Agreement.

Background Information
P.A. 96-864, effective January 1, 2010, amended the Department of Human Services Act by adding Section 10-65 (20 ILCS 1305-10-65) to allow DHS to operate the Gateways to Opportunity Program, a comprehensive professional development system, which, among other things, is designed to support a quality workforce to serve children and youth. DHS administers and provides funding for the Gateways Program and contracts with the Illinois Network of Child Care Resources and Referral Agencies (INCCRRRA) for administration of the Gateways to Opportunity Scholarship program.

The purpose of this agreement is to continue the partnership between ISBE and DHS to provide funding for the Gateways Scholarship Program. The Gateways Scholarship Program is an individual-based scholarship opportunity for practitioners working in early care and education. The program provides financial assistance for Early Childhood Education and Child Development (ECE/CD) coursework and degrees offered through participating colleges and universities to participants in order for them to obtain the necessary college or university credit to meet the requirements for an Educator License with the early childhood endorsement and/or
the bilingual or ESL Approval/Endorsement, thus providing an increase in qualified teachers for ISBE Early Childhood programs.

Financial Information
On January 4, 2011 the ISBE entered in an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with the Illinois Department of Human Services for $500,000 ending June 30, 2011, to operate the Gateways to Opportunity Scholarship Fund. The agencies had the option to renew the Agreement contingent upon sufficient appropriation and satisfactory work performance of the contractor in the preceding year and has been renewed for three one-year periods from FY12 through FY14.

This request is for an amendment to extend the end date of the IGA through June 30, 2015, and to request an additional $500,000 of funding for Fiscal Year 2015. This amendment would bring the total amount of funding to $2,500,000. The funding will come from the Early Childhood Block Grant.

The financial background of the Intergovernmental Agreement is illustrated in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Grant State Funding</th>
<th>Current Grant Federal Funding</th>
<th>Requested Additional State Funding</th>
<th>Requested Additional Federal Funding</th>
<th>Total Grant per Fiscal Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY12</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Business Enterprise Program (BEP)
Intergovernmental Agreements are exempt from the agency’s BEP goal because each state agency and university is subject to its own BEP goal.

Effectiveness
Between FY11-FY14, the ISBE Gateways funding has supported 392 educators who have taken 1,818 courses, with verified course completion of nearly 3,800 credit hours. 38% of recipients have received support for more than one year.

The population served by the program has been very diverse: 45.9% White, 40.1% African American, 8.4% Hispanic, 1.8% Asian, 3.1% Multi-Racial/Other.
79% of recipients have used the scholarship towards completing their Bachelor's Degree in Early Childhood or their Type 04 Certification (now Early Childhood Endorsement). 2% have used the scholarship to work towards a Bilingual/ESL Endorsement. 13% have used the scholarship towards a Master's Degree in Early Childhood.

The scholarship program has increased the availability of quality, diverse teaching staff for Preschool for All classrooms.

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

Policy Implications: Not applicable

Budget Implications: Funds for this Intergovernmental Agreement are available through the Early Childhood Block Grant.

Legislative Action: None required

Communication: Not applicable

Pros and Cons of Various Actions

Approval of this contract will enable the scholarship program to continue.

Superintendent's Recommendation

I recommend that the following motion be adopted:

The State Board of Education authorizes the renewal of the Intergovernmental Agreement with Illinois Department of Human Services contract for the Gateways to Opportunity Scholarship Program; through June 30, 2015, with an increase of the contract’s maximum amount not to exceed $2,500,000.

Next Steps

Agency staff will commence the process of renewing the Intergovernmental Agreement in accordance with the approved motion.
TO: Illinois State Board of Education
FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
       Susie Morrison, Deputy Superintendent/Chief Education Officer


Materials: None

Staff Contact(s): Reyna P. Hernandez, Assistant Superintendent of Center for Language and Early Child Development

Purpose of Agenda Item
The Early Childhood Division requests the Board to authorize the State Superintendent to enter into an amended Intergovernmental Agreement with the Illinois Department of Human Services to transfer $16,635,871 of the Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge Phase 2 and Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge Supplemental funds.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
The Intergovernmental Agreement 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;

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
It is expected that the Board will authorize the Superintendent to enter into an amended Intergovernmental Agreement with the Illinois Department of Human Services.

Background Information
Illinois has been awarded a Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) Phase 2 grant by the US Department of Education and Health and Human Services. RTT-ELC focuses on improving early learning and development programs for young children. In Illinois, the grant builds on the state’s strong track record of rigorous evaluation and evidence-based decision making. A five-level quality rating improvement system will be created, which will be utilized by most early learning programs, including Preschool for All, Head Start, Early Head Start, center-and-home based child care, and private preschools licensed through the Department of Children and Family Services. Illinois will implement revised early learning standards for children ages birth to five. The plan will provide professional development and other supports to raise the quality of early childhood programs including ongoing supports for Illinois higher education faculty using avenues that have proven successful in the past.

ISBE is the fiscal agent for RTT-ELC funds. In April 2013, the Illinois State Board of Education entered into an Intergovernmental Agreement with the Illinois Department of Human Services to establish a partnership between the state agencies to perform certain services related to the
RTT-ELC, as set forth in the State Plan and the State’s Final Scope of Work. In July 2013, Illinois received notification from the Department of Education that it would receive an additional supplemental award to complete an additional scope of work, related to the original ELC application. Illinois submitted a scope of work and budget for the new supplemental grant. The supplemental award is focusing on additional development of the Quality Rating and Improvement System. Key projects include additional core personnel, quality improvements and additional data projects. The submitted scope of work and budget for the supplemental funding includes several projects which will be managed by DHS.

**Financial Background**

The Illinois State Board of Education entered into an Intergovernmental Agreement with DHS on April 2, 2013, in the amount of $20,939,776. The Board authorized ISBE to add $2,661,719 to accommodate for Targeted High Need Communities, if necessary and increase the maximum amount to $23,601,495.

ISBE is requesting to enter into an amendment with DHS to increase the maximum amount payable by $16,635,871 through December 31, 2016 for a total not to exceed $37,575,647. The increase includes the $2,661,719 originally requested for Targeted High Need Communities, an additional $3,011,587 for Targeted High Need Communities, and an additional $10,962,565 of supplemental Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge funds. The final scope of work and budget were approved by the U.S. Department of Education and the U.S. Department of Human Services on January 7, 2014.

Shown below is a summary for the funding for the proposed amended intergovernmental agreement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Contract State Funding</th>
<th>Current Contract Federal Funding</th>
<th>Requested Additional State Funding</th>
<th>Requested Additional Federal Funding</th>
<th>Total Contract per Fiscal Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>$ 769,788</td>
<td></td>
<td>$-323,631</td>
<td>$ 446,157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>$ 6,086,849</td>
<td></td>
<td>$458,063</td>
<td>$ 6,544,912</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>$ 6,410,372</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,465,010</td>
<td>$13,875,382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16</td>
<td>$ 5,950,924</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,275,575</td>
<td>$12,226,499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>$ 1,721,843</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,760,854</td>
<td>$ 4,482,697</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$20,939,776</td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,635,871</td>
<td>$37,575,647</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Business Enterprise Program (BEP)**

Intergovernmental agreements are exempt from the agency’s BEP goal because each state agency and university is subject to its own BEP goal.

**Effectiveness**

Effectiveness on this amended intergovernmental agreement will be measured in two ways. First, ISBE will work closely with the Governor’s Office for Early Childhood Development to monitor the use of DHS funds and timely completion of deliverables, in accordance with the approved scope of work. Second, the RTT-ELC grant will be evaluated based on Performance Measures identified by the Department of Education. These performance measures reflect the three strategic priorities of the Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge:
• Deepening the integration of the state supports to create a unified framework for all Early Learning and Development (ELD) systems:
• Connecting the most at-risk children with the services and supports they need; and
• Increasing the quality of both learning environments and instruction in early learning and development programs from “adequate to good” and from “good to great”.

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

**Policy Implications:** The amendment to the original intergovernmental agreement is required to transfer funds to the Department of Human Services to implement the state’s Early Learning Challenge Phase 2 Supplemental Funding grant.

**Budget Implications:** Funds for this Intergovernmental Agreement are available through the Federal Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge-Phase 2 and Supplemental Funding grants.

**Legislative Action:** None required

**Communication:** Not applicable

**Pros and Cons of Various Actions**

Approval of the amended Intergovernmental Agreement will allow ISBE to transfer funds according to the terms of the state’s scope of work and budget for Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge Supplemental Funding.

Failure to approve the Intergovernmental Agreement will delay or prevent implementation of the state’s RTT-ELC plan.

**Superintendent’s Recommendation**

I recommend that the following motion be adopted:

> The State Board of Education authorizes the State Superintendent to enter into an amended Intergovernmental Agreement with the Illinois Department of Human Services for the transfer of funds for Race to the Top, Early Learning Challenge. This amendment is for an additional $16,635,871 for a maximum of $37,575,647 effective upon execution through December 31, 2016.

**Next Steps**

Upon Board authorization, Agency staff will amend and execute the Intergovernmental Agreement with IDHS.
ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING
February 19, 2014

TO: Illinois State Board of Education

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

Agenda Topic: Contract Exceeding $1 million: Request to release a Request for Sealed Proposals for the QRIS Validation and Child Outcomes Study

Materials: None

Staff Contact(s): Reyna Hernandez, Assistant Superintendent, Center for Language and Early Childhood Development

Purpose of Agenda Item
The Early Childhood Division requests the Board to authorize the State Superintendent to authorize the release of a Request for Sealed Proposals (RFSP) for a maximum amount not to exceed $2,500,000 to procure a contractor to conduct a validation and outcomes study for the Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS), which is funded by the Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge Grant. The study is required under the grant.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
The contract supports all three 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
It is expected that the Board will authorize the State Superintendent to release a RFSP for the Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) validation and outcomes study funded by the Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge Grant.

Background Information
Illinois has been awarded a Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) Phase 2 grant by the US Departments of Education and Health and Human Services. RTT-ELC focuses on improving early learning and development programs for young children at risk. The grant supports rigorous evaluation and evidence-based decision making.

The RTT-ELC grant is being coordinated by the Governor’s Office of Early Childhood Development, in collaboration with the Illinois State Board of Education, Illinois Department of Human Services, Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, and the Illinois Early Learning Council. A leadership team, including agency leaders from each of these agencies, was established to oversee major decisions. An Intergovernmental Agency Team has been established to carry-out coordination of implementation.

Illinois identified the following strategic priorities for the RTT-ELC Project:
1. Deepening the integration of state supports to create a unified framework for all early learning and development programs
2. Connecting the most children at risk with the supports and services they need
3. Increasing program quality

The purpose of this RFSP is to select a contractor to serve as the entity to conduct a validation and child outcome study of “ExceleRate” Illinois. A validation and child outcomes study is a requirement of the RTT-ELC. ExceleRate Illinois is the State’s new Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) for early childhood programs, which has taken the place of the Quality Counts Quality Rating System. The State began the phase-in of ExceleRate Illinois in June 2013. In an effort to support and motivate programs to achieve and sustain higher levels of program quality and to ensure that all children, particularly those at-risk for poor educational outcomes, receive high-quality services, all Illinois licensed child care programs, Preschool for All programs, center-based Prevention Initiative programs, and center-based Head Start and Early Head Start programs will be included in ExceleRate Illinois.

For more information about ExceleRate Illinois, please see www.excelerateillinois.com

ExceleRate Illinois was developed by key stakeholders in Illinois and was designed to evaluate, recognize, support, and communicate the level of quality in early childhood programs in Illinois. Specifically, ExceleRate Illinois provides:

- A consistent definition of what constitutes high-quality early learning and development programs across a diverse range of settings,
- An accountability framework for programs receiving public funding,
- Pathways and support for continuous improvement, and
- Useful information for parents and families to help them select the best program to meet their needs.

Programs participating in ExceleRate Illinois can demonstrate four levels of increasing quality, known as Circles of Quality, and may earn additional designations known as Awards of Excellence. Each of the levels and designations has a distinct set of requirements that must be met. Requirements for each of the Circles of Quality can be found at http://www.excelerateillinois.com/resources. Below is an abbreviated explanation of the ExceleRate levels.

- Licensing: The first circle of quality equates to compliance with current Illinois licensing standards.
- Bronze Circle of Quality: The Bronze Circle includes additional requirements for training and education.
- Silver Circle of Quality: The Silver Circle includes a rigorous self-assessment and program improvement plan.
- Gold Circle of Quality: The Gold Circle of Quality includes a validation of high quality by an independent assessor.

The contractor will develop a study design to assess the extent to which the ExceleRate Illinois meaningfully distinguishes program quality and the extent to which rating levels and different pathways to rating levels relate to child outcomes.

**Financial Background**
The US Departments of Education and Health and Human Services approved $52,498,042 in Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge Funds for Illinois, for which ISBE is the fiscal agent. On January 8, 2014, the US Departments also approved a budget of $2,500,000 for the QRIS
validation and child outcomes study. The $2,500,000 is for the contract term of July 1, 2014, through December 31, 2016.

The financial background of this contract is illustrated in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Contract State Funding</th>
<th>Current Contract Federal Funding</th>
<th>Requested State Funding</th>
<th>Requested Federal Funding</th>
<th>Total Contract per Fiscal Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Business Enterprise Program (BEP)**
There will be a 20% Business Enterprise Program (BEP) goal placed on the solicitation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BEP Goal Percentage</th>
<th>BEP Goal Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Policy Implications:** The authority to administer this program comes from the Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge Grant and this study is a requirement of the federal grant. The Quality Rating System allows parents and users of early childhood services to better understand program quality and encourages programs to improve.

**Budget Implications:** Funds for contract are available through the Federal Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge Grant.

**Legislative Action:** None

**Communication:** None

**Pros and Cons of Various Actions**
**Pros:** The QRIS validation and child outcomes study is a requirement of the RTT-ELC. The funding for the study has already been approved by the US Departments of Education and Health and Human Services.

**Cons:** Failure to approve the release of the RFSP will delay or prevent the implementation of the RTT-ELC plan.
**Superintendent’s Recommendation**

I recommend that the following motion be adopted:

The State Board of Education hereby authorizes the State Superintendent to release a Request for Sealed Proposals (RFSP) to procure a contractor to conduct a validation and outcomes study for the Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) for a maximum amount not to exceed $2,500,000 over the term of the contract. The contract term is anticipated to be July 1, 2014, through December 31, 2016.

**Next Steps**

Upon Board authorization, agency staff will release the RFSP in accordance with the approved motion. Agency staff will bring the recommended award to the Board for approval after all proposals are evaluated and prior to the issuance of any award.
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

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

Agenda Topic: Approval of Renewal and Amendment of the Intergovernmental Agreement that will Exceed $1 Million for Illinois Department of Public Health-The Summer Food Service Program

Materials: N/A

Staff Contact(s): Elizabeth Hanselman, Assistant Superintendent, Specialized Instruction Nutrition & Wellness
Mark Haller, Division Administrator, Nutrition and Wellness Programs

Purpose of Agenda Item
The Division of Nutrition and Wellness Programs is requesting to renew an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with the Illinois Department of Public Health (IDPH) for an additional $1,035,000.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
The Intergovernmental Agreement with IDPH supports the following Agency goal:

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

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
It is expected the Board will authorize the State Superintendent to renew the Intergovernmental Agreement.

Background Information
Among the provisions of the current Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) is the requirement to perform or carry out health inspections (7 C.F.R. 225.6(h)(2)(v) and 7 C.F.R. 225.6(e)(9)). The SFSP federal regulations (7 C.F.R. 225.7(e)) also provide that in addition to the required inspections, the State agency may conduct or arrange to have conducted the following: inspections of self-preparation and vended sponsors’ food preparation facilities; inspections of food service sites; and meal quality tests. The procedures for carrying out these inspections and tests shall be consistent with procedures used by local health authorities.

To conduct the inspections, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) provides health inspection funds to be used solely to enable State or local health departments or other governmental agencies charged with health inspection functions to carry out health inspections and meal quality tests.

The purpose of this renewal is to continue the partnership between ISBE and IDPH to ensure that the health inspections continue to be performed by the local health departments. Prior to the current agreement that became effective on May 1, 2009, ISBE held separate agreements with the IDPH and also the Chicago Public Health Department. The current agreement
simplifies the process and ensures that IDPH works with the local health departments, including the Chicago Public Health Department, to complete the inspections. Due to the burden on IDPH, they will assign a .50 full time equivalent (FTE) program staff member specifically to this contract. Their role will be to ensure the work is completed, coordinate the inspections to ensure no overlap, and provide ISBE with the required information regarding the health inspections.

**Financial Information**

On May 20, 2009, ISBE entered into an IGA with IDPH for $475,000 ending April 30, 2014, to conduct and coordinate health inspections for the SFSP feeding sites with local health departments. The IGA had the option to renew for another five years to April 30, 2019, contingent upon sufficient appropriation and satisfactory work performance.

On June 22, 2010, ISBE entered into an amendment to add $174,175 to the IGA in order to provide additional health inspections for a maximum agreement amount of $649,175.

This request is for an amendment to extend the end date of the agreement to April 30, 2019, and to request an additional $72,000 in funding each year for IDPH administrative costs incurred while conducting health inspections with local health departments. The renewal and amendment would bring the total amount of funding to $1,684,175. The funding will come from the USDA Health Inspection funds and also the USDA State Administrative Expense funds.

The financial background of the Intergovernmental Agreement is illustrated in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Grant State Funding</th>
<th>Current Grant Federal Funding</th>
<th>Requested Additional State Funding</th>
<th>Requested Additional Fed Funding per Renewal</th>
<th>Total Grant per Fiscal Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY09-10</td>
<td>$177,175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$177,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY12</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>$67,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$207,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>$207,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$207,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16</td>
<td>$207,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$207,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>$207,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$207,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18</td>
<td>$207,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$207,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY19</td>
<td>$67,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$67,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,684,175</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Intergovernmental Agreement stipulates that a minimum of 1,150 health inspections are to be completed on an annual basis with 750 to be conducted in the city of Chicago and a minimum of 400, and a goal of 500, to be conducted for the rest of the state. IDPH receives $135,000 in funds which they subgrant to the local health departments to ensure that the minimum number of inspections is completed on an annual basis. The average cost is $117.00 per inspection.

**Business Enterprise Program (BEP)**

Intergovernmental agreements are exempt from the agency’s BEP goal because each state agency and university are subject to its own BEP goal.
**Analysis and Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action and Communications**

Policy Implications: Not applicable

Budget Implications: Funds for this Intergovernmental Agreement are available through the USDA Health Inspection funds and also unused State Administrative Expense funds.

Legislative Action: None required

Communication: Not applicable

**Pros and Cons of Various Actions**

Approval of this IGA will continue the coordination and completion of health inspections for SFSP feeding sites.

**Superintendent’s Recommendation**

I recommend that the following motion be adopted:

The Illinois State Board of Education authorizes the renewal of the Intergovernmental Agreement with the Illinois Department of Public Health for an additional $1,035,000 for conducting and coordinating the local health departments to conduct the required health inspections for the Summer Food Service Program through April 30, 2019. The increase of the IGA’s maximum amount is not to exceed $1,684,175.

**Next Steps**

Agency staff will commence the process of renewing the agreement in accordance with the approved motion.
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
       Robert Wolfe, Chief Financial Officer

Agenda Topic: Fiscal Year 2014 Targeted Initiative Grants:
              Austin Childcare Providers Network

Materials: None

Staff Contact(s): Robert Wolfe, Chief Financial Officer

Purpose of Agenda Item
The Budget and Fiscal Management Division seeks Board authorization to award a $20,000
grant to the Austin Childcare Providers Network. Grant funds will be used to support costs for
training early childhood care providers in areas required under the Illinois Quality Rating and
Improvement System (QRIS), with special emphasis on Social and Emotional Development.
The center has been recommended by the Chair of the House Appropriations-Elementary and
Secondary Education Committee to receive funding to support child care programs offered by
the center. While youth do not participate directly in the program, it indirectly targets youth in
age groups ranging from birth to Kindergarten in the Austin neighborhood on the west side of
Chicago through professional development to providers.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board's Strategic Plan
The activities of the Austin Childcare Providers Network report a link to the following Agency
goal:

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

The program describes how participating providers who furnish home-based day care or
operate preschool centers will receive training addressing human growth and development;
health, safety and well-being; observation and assessment; curriculum or program design; and
other areas of social and emotional development.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
The Board is being asked to authorize the State Superintendent to award a grant to the Austin
Childcare Providers Network to support training programs for early childhood care providers.
This grant will be for the period beginning January 2, 2014, through June 30, 2014, with
permission given to the State Superintendent to extend expenditure availability of the grant for a
period not to exceed two years, if needed, to complete grant activities as provided in Section
five of the Illinois Grant Funds Recovery Act [30 ILCS 705-5]. The total cost of the grant is
$20,000.

Background Information
In May 2013, the Illinois General Assembly included an allocation of $350,000 from the General
Revenue Fund for various targeted initiatives. In September 2013, the Chair of the House
The Austin Childcare Providers Network, in partnership with other community organizations, has conducted an early childhood needs assessment for the Austin community. As a result of that survey, the Network helped develop a resource directory for parents, caregivers, teachers, childcare providers and others within the Austin neighborhood of available services for children and families. These services include family support, child care and mental health referrals, preschool, Head Start and other early childhood services. The Network has also worked with other community organizations to implement an initiative to improve the transition of young children into Kindergarten.

The grant application indicated that the overall goals of the Network for this program, which includes 80 licensed home childcare providers and 15 childcare centers, include:

- Improving the overall quality of early childhood care and education in the Austin neighborhood;
- Providing leadership in areas of early childhood education, youth development, and workforce development, and
- Providing leadership in social and emotional learning services and training for community partners, school staff, parents, and community leaders and organizations.

The Network cooperates with both community organizations (such as Austin Coming Together and the By The Hand Club) and higher education (University of Illinois at Chicago College of Education; the Erikson Institute; and the University of Illinois Extension) in providing services.

**Goals and Measures**
The Austin Childcare Providers Network administrators have set achievement objectives for this program:

- To provide training to 75 early childhood care providers in 2 of 7 areas of social and emotional development learning, in accordance with Illinois QRIS and the Gateways for Opportunity program.
- These 75 providers will serve up to 600 children under the age of 6 in the Austin neighborhood of Chicago.
- Participants will complete an assessment component at the end of training to demonstrate what they have learned.

At the end of the grant period, the Austin Childcare Providers Network will have agreed-upon procedures performed by an independent Certified Public Accountant licensed in Illinois to verify that spending was in accordance with the grant agreement.

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

**Policy Implications:** This project supports students and families by providing training in various areas of social and emotional development to early childhood care providers.
**Budget Implications:** Funding for this grant was allocated from the General Revenue Fund by the General Assembly for fiscal year 2014.

**Legislative Action:** None required.

**Communication:** The grant recipient will be notified of the Board’s approval.

**Pros and Cons of Various Actions**
Approval of this grant will allow for the activities of the proposed project to proceed, which include training offered by the Network to early childhood care providers. If this grant is not approved, the $20,000 allocation will not be expended.

**Superintendent’s Recommendation**
I recommend that the following motion be adopted:

The State Board hereby authorizes the State Superintendent to award a grant to the Austin Childcare Providers Network for support of early childhood care provider training for an initial period beginning January 2, 2014 through June 30, 2014, with permission given to the State Superintendent to extend expenditure availability of the grant for a period not to exceed two years, if needed, to complete grant activities as provided in Section five of the Illinois Grant Funds Recovery Act [30 ILCS 705/5], in the amount of $20,000.

**Next Steps**
Upon Board authorization, Agency staff will notify the Austin Childcare Providers Network of the approval of the award and will execute an agreement in accordance with Board approval.
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
Robert Wolfe, Chief Financial Officer

Agenda Topic: Fiscal Year 2014 Targeted Initiative Grants: Spencer Technology Academy (through Chicago PSD 299)

Materials: None

Staff Contact(s): Robert Wolfe, Chief Financial Officer

Purpose of Agenda Item
The Budget and Fiscal Management Division seeks Board authorization to award a $10,000 grant to Chicago Public School District 299 for Spencer Technology Academy. The grant applicant intends to use the funds to supplement the school’s efforts in parent engagement. The school is located in the South Austin neighborhood on the west side of Chicago and has been recommended by the Chair of the House Appropriations-Elementary and Secondary Education Committee to receive funding to support its parenting center. This program targets primarily students in grades Pre-Kindergarten through 8 and their parents at Spencer Technology Academy.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
The activities outlined in the proposal of the Spencer Technology Academy report a link to the following Agency goal:

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

The program provides exposure to cultural institutions and performances. Parent and student meetings are used to discuss perceptions of relationships after shared experiences. Student achievement data will be reviewed for those who participated in at least five experiences.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
The Board is being asked to authorize the State Superintendent to award a grant to Chicago Public School District 299 for Spencer Technology Academy. This grant will be for the period beginning January 16, 2014 through June 30, 2014, with permission given to the State Superintendent to extend expenditure availability of the grant for a period not to exceed two years, if needed, to complete grant activities as provided in Section five of the Illinois Grant Funds Recovery Act [30 ILCS 705-5]. The total cost of the grant is $10,000.

Background Information
In May 2013, the Illinois General Assembly included an allocation of $350,000 from the General Revenue Fund for various targeted initiatives. In September 2013, the Chair of the House Appropriations-Elementary and Secondary Education Committee provided a list of the intended recipients of the targeted initiative funds, as well as the allocation of the funds. At its September meeting, the Board approved a motion to send applications to the intended grantees, with the
applications subject to review and final approval by the Board. This is the fourth of the applications to be presented to the Board.

Spencer Technology Academy, located on the west side of Chicago in the Austin neighborhood, houses nearly 800 students, of which approximately 98 percent participate in the free and reduced lunch program. In the school vision, technology is used as a driving force to motivate students to see “beyond the immediate” and look at potential for the future.

The school has an active parent engagement center (called Spencer Parent University) which allows parents to engage in side-by-side learning with their students. Parents have access to GED courses, work placement resources and enrichment courses. It is here that parents and students can develop a shared learning experience.

The grant application indicated that, in the school’s strategy, all community members (parents, families, students, and teachers) are valued as partners in the educational process. Therefore, support for the needs of the community is seen as support for the educational needs of the students.

**Goals and Measures**

School leadership has set achievement objectives for this program:

- To serve approximately 210 students in grades Pre-Kindergarten through 8 with age-appropriate activities while including parents and teachers in actively engaging the students.
- Both parents and students will be exposed to a variety of cultural, artistic and historical activities, with preview sessions on background and how to appropriately interact with each other through these shared learning experiences.
- Through side-by-side learning, new connection points will be developed between students and their parents as they engage in new learning experiences together.

At the end of the grant period, Chicago Public School District 299 will have agreed-upon procedures performed by an independent Certified Public Accountant licensed in Illinois to verify that spending was in accordance with the grant agreement.

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

**Policy Implications:** This project supports students and families by providing opportunities for shared activities between the children and their parents. It is intended to promote discussion and engagement through shared experiences and opportunities for side-by-side learning.

**Budget Implications:** Funding for this grant was allocated from the General Revenue Fund by the General Assembly for fiscal year 2014.

**Legislative Action:** None required.

**Communication:** The grant recipient will be notified of the Board’s approval.

**Pros and Cons of Various Actions**

Approval of this grant will allow for the activities of the proposed project to proceed. If this grant is not approved, the $10,000 allocation will not be expended.
**Superintendent’s Recommendation**
I recommend that the following motion be adopted:

The State Board hereby authorizes the State Superintendent to award a grant to Chicago Public School District 299 for Spencer Technology Academy for an initial period beginning January 16, 2014, through June 30, 2014, with permission given to the State Superintendent to extend expenditure availability of the grant for a period not to exceed two years, if needed, to complete grant activities as provided in Section five of the Illinois Grant Funds Recovery Act [30 ILCS 705/5], in the amount of $10,000.

**Next Steps**
Upon Board authorization, Agency staff will notify Chicago Public School District 299 of the approval of the award and will execute an agreement in accordance with Board approval.
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

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 September 2013, and to secure approval of the Spring 2014 Waiver Report for submission to the General Assembly before March 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 authorize submission of the Spring 2014 Waiver Report to the General Assembly.

Background Information
The Spring 2014 Waiver Report is the thirty-eighth report to be submitted to the General Assembly pursuant to Section 2-3.25g of the School Code. This report contains 85 requests that seek to waive mandates of School Code provisions upon which the General Assembly must act. These requests address nonresident tuition (25 requests); daily physical education (22 requests), school improvement (11 requests); limitation of administrative costs (ten requests); fees for driver education programs (eight requests); conversion/formation of school districts (six requests); statement of affairs (two requests); and one request for state graduation requirements.

Since the Fall 2013 waiver report, the State Superintendent has approved four requests that waive State Board rules pertaining to driver’s education. (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

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 conversion/formation of school districts and for daily physical education.
**Conversion/Formation of School Districts.** There are six waiver requests in the current report on this topic, submitted as two distinct groups. Two come from districts in Jefferson County (Woodlawn CCSD 4 and Woodlawn CHSD 205). Four come from districts in Rock Island and Henry Counties (United Township HSD 30; Colona SD 190; East Moline SD 37; and Silvis SD 34). This type of waiver has been requested, but rarely. In each case the requesting districts share territory with other districts not party to the waiver, although no adverse affects are predicted for non-participating districts should the waivers be approved.

**Woodlawn CCSD 4 and Woodlawn CHSD 205.** The Woodlawn districts have submitted identical waivers, asking to file a petition for the formation of an Optional Elementary Unit District. This is necessary because they are not 'substantially coterminous,' as the law requires. Portions of three other elementary districts share territory with Woodlawn High School (Ashley CCSD 15, Grand Prairie CCSD 6, and Rome CCSD 2) and portions of two other high school districts share territory with Woodlawn 4 (Nashville CHSD 99 and Mt. Vernon Township HSD 201). If the waiver is approved, the two Woodlawn districts could legally file a petition to form an Optional Elementary Unit District without the participation of, but without affecting the corporate existence of, the other five districts with territory common to the Woodlawn districts.

Were the waivers to be approved, the two districts would still follow all the traditional petition processes included within Article 11E of the School Code (Conversion and Formation of School Districts). If voters approved the petition, the new district would have one boundary for elementary purposes (Prekindergarten-8) and one boundary for high school purposes (9-12). While there will be overlapping territory with students attending the new district for both grades Pk-8 and grades 9-12, some students will live within territory that is only included in one of the boundaries for the new district, and would continue to attend school in their current district for either elementary or high school grades.

The applications state that the formation of an Optional Elementary Unit District would improve the quality of the curriculum offered to students and allow for flexibility in staffing.

**United THSD 30, Colona SD 190, East Moline SD 37, and Silvis SD 34.** These four districts have submitted waivers asking to file a petition for the formation of an Optional Elementary Unit District. It is necessary because the districts are not 'substantially coterminous', as is also the case with the Woodlawn districts above. Portions of Hampton SD 29 and Carbon Cliff-Barstow SD 36 (both in Rock Island) share territory with the requesting districts. If the waiver is approved, the four districts could legally file a petition to form an Optional Elementary Unit District without the participation of, but without affecting the corporate existence of, the other two districts with common territory.

Were the waivers to be approved, the four districts would still follow all the traditional petition processes included within Article 11E of the School Code (Conversion and Formation of School Districts). If voters approved the petition, the new district would have one boundary for elementary purposes and one boundary for high school purposes.

The four districts state that formation of an Optional Elementary Unit District would improve the curricula and high school preparation; strengthen the gifted education program; enhance extracurricular opportunities for middle school students; and help to coordinate professional development activities.

**Physical Education.** The report contains 22 waiver requests from school districts seeking relief from the mandate to provide physical education on a daily basis. Of these 22 petitions, 12
affect students in kindergarten through grade 8; eight affect high school students only; and two affects students in both elementary and high school grades. Eighteen of the 22 requests are renewals.

Two requests in this group are discussed below.

1. O'Fallon CCSD 90 (St. Clair County) submitted a waiver request in the last report that would have excused students in kindergarten through grade 5 from the daily physical education requirement. The State Board recommended to the General Assembly that the waiver be disapproved, as it ultimately was. O'Fallon has submitted a new waiver request, asking that students in the same grades participate in one 40-minute session of physical education each week, along with 30 minutes of recess each day.

O'Fallon's current waiver request is similar to many received over the years from districts with elementary grades. While the majority of such waivers request two or three sessions of formal PE each week, there are also approved applications from districts offering one weekly session of physical education with a licensed educator.

2. Midland CUSD 7 (Marshall County) has submitted a first-time request for physical education. If approved, the waiver would excuse students in the following grades from daily physical education:
   - Grades 5 through 12 – students in academic intervention programs; students enrolled in band, chorus or other music classes;
   - Grades 7 through 10 – students participating in interscholastic athletics;
   - Grades 7 through 12 – students participating in cheerleading and dance;
   - Grades 9 through 12 – students taking Advanced Placement (AP) classes, vocational classes, or driver education class; and
   - Grades 10 through 12 – students participating in dual credit programs offered through community colleges.

This application is more comprehensive in its scope than the majority of physical education waivers received. The district states that daily PE classes will still be offered if the waiver is approved, and that students may take advantage of the exceptions but not necessarily every semester. The waiver would allow more time to be given to students receiving intervention services at the middle school level, thus lowering the number of students needing those services in high school. Moreover, the district hopes that a reduction in its high school drop-out rate, and increased rates of college enrollment could result from the waiver. The application acknowledges the importance of physical education for student growth and a healthy lifestyle, but believes that academic remediations are equally important.

**Limits on waivers for daily physical education.** 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 22 waiver requests submitted in this report, nine 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 2016 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 nine districts are:
- Waukegan CUSD 60 (Lake County) – 100-5834;
- New Lenox SD 122 (Will) – 100-5838;
- Collinsville CUSD 10 (Madison) – 100-5839;
- Wethersfield CUSD 230 (Henry) – 100-5850;
- Nashville CHSD 99 (Washington) – 100-5864;
- Hononegah CHSD 207 (Winnebago) – 100-5865;
- Oregon CUSD 220 (Ogle) – 100-5879;
- Freeport SD 145 (Stephenson) – 100-5892; and
- Palatine CCSD 15 (Cook) – 100-5901.

**Superintendent’s Recommendation**

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

- The State Board of Education hereby forwards the 85 waiver requests summarized in the Spring 2014 Waiver Report to the General Assembly without comment.

**Next Steps**

Staff will submit the Spring 2014 Waiver Report as presented to the General Assembly before March 1.
MEMORANDUM

TO: The Honorable John J. Cullerton, Senate President
    The Honorable Christine Radogno, Senate Minority Leader
    The Honorable Michael J. Madigan, Speaker of the House
    The Honorable Jim Durkin, House Minority Leader

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

DATE: March 1, 2014


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 September 2013. 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 March 1, 2014.

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 85 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 (25 requests) seeks waivers from the requirements for non-resident tuition. There are 22 requests for daily physical education; 11 requests for school improvement/inservice training; ten requests for administrative cost cap limitations; eight requests to raise the fee to be charged for driver's education; six requests for conversion/formation of school districts; two requests for statement of affairs and one request for the a waiver from state graduation requirements.

Section 2-3.25g of the School Code (105 ILCS 5/2-3.25g) limits the number of waivers of daily physical education that may 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 22 waiver requests for physical education contained in this report, nine 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 85 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-eighth 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.
### Summary of Applications for Waivers and Modifications

**Volume 38 – Spring 2014**

<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>Conversion/Formation of School Districts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal School Holidays</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitation of Administrative Costs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-resident Tuition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Improvement/Inservice Training</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of Affairs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Graduation Requirements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Petition Summary</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS:** 97
SECTION I

Applications Transmitted to the General Assembly

Conversion/Formation of School Districts

Woodlawn CHSD 205 – Jefferson (SD 58/HD 115) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year
WM100-5835 – Waiver of School Code (Sections 11E-30, 11E-35 and 11E-65) request to allow the district, working with Woodlawn Community Consolidated School District 4, to be eligible to file a petition for the formation of an Optional Elementary Unit District, commonly called a 'hybrid district.' The waiver is being requested since the two districts are not 'substantially coterminous' as defined in the School Code. If granted, this waiver would allow the two districts to file a petition to form an Optional Elementary Unit District. This potential consolidation is expected to improve the curriculum in both districts and allow for flexibility in staffing (the districts share a superintendent and two other staff members). The corporate existence of the five districts not included in this petition would not be affected. If granted, the participating districts will follow the consolidation process outlined in Article 11E of the School Code (105 ILCS 5/11E, Conversion and Formation of School Districts), including referendum.

Woodlawn CCSD 4 – Jefferson (SD 58/HD 115) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year
WM100-5836 – Waiver of School Code (Sections 11E-30, 11E-35 and 11E-65) request to allow the district, working with Woodlawn Community High School District 205, to be eligible to file a petition for the formation of an Optional Elementary Unit District, commonly called a 'hybrid district.' The waiver is being requested since the two districts are not 'substantially coterminous' as defined in the School Code. If granted, this waiver would allow the two districts to file a petition to form an Optional Elementary Unit District. This potential consolidation is expected to improve the curriculum in both districts and allow for flexibility in staffing (the districts share a superintendent and two other staff members). The corporate existence of the five districts not included in this petition would not be affected. If granted, the participating districts will follow the consolidation process outlined in Article 11E of the School Code (105 ILCS 5/11E, Conversion and Formation of School Districts), including referendum.

United Township HSD 30 – Rock Island (SD 36/HD 72) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year
WM100-5887 – Waiver of School Code (Sections 11E-30, 11E-35 and 11E-65) request to allow the district, working with Colona School District 190, East Moline School District 37 and Silvis School District 34, to be eligible to file a petition for the formation of an Optional Elementary Unit District, commonly called a 'hybrid district.' The waiver is being requested since the four districts are not 'substantially coterminous' as defined in the School Code. If granted, this waiver would allow the four districts to file a petition to form an Optional Elementary Unit District. This potential consolidation is expected to improve the curriculum and high school preparation; strengthen the gifted education program; enhance extracurricular opportunities for middle school students; and coordinate professional development opportunities. The corporate existence of the elementary districts not included in this petition would not be affected. If granted, the participating districts will follow the consolidation process outlined in Article 11E of the School Code (105 ILCS 5/11E, Conversion and Formation of School Districts), including referendum.
Colona SD 190 – Henry (SD 36/HD 71) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year
WM100-5888 – Waiver of School Code (Sections 11E-30, 11E-35 and 11E-65) request to allow the district, working with United Township High School District 30, East Moline School District 37 and Silvis School District 34, to be eligible to file a petition for the formation of an Optional Elementary Unit District, commonly called a 'hybrid district.' The waiver is being requested since the four districts are not 'substantially coterminous' as defined in the School Code. If granted, this waiver would allow the four districts to file a petition to form an Optional Elementary Unit District. This potential consolidation is expected to improve the curriculum and high school preparation; strengthen the gifted education program; enhance extracurricular opportunities for middle school students; and coordinate professional development opportunities. The corporate existence of the elementary districts not included in this petition would not be affected. If granted, the participating districts will follow the consolidation process outlined in Article 11E of the School Code (105 ILCS 5/11E, Conversion and Formation of School Districts), including referendum.

East Moline SD 37 – Rock Island (SD 36/HD 72) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year
WM100-5889 – Waiver of School Code (Sections 11E-30, 11E-35 and 11E-65) request to allow the district, working with United Township High School District 30, Colona School District 190, and Silvis School District 34, to be eligible to file a petition for the formation of an Optional Elementary Unit District, commonly called a 'hybrid district.' The waiver is being requested since the four districts are not 'substantially coterminous' as defined in the School Code. If granted, this waiver would allow the four districts to file a petition to form an Optional Elementary Unit District. This potential consolidation is expected to improve the curriculum and high school preparation; strengthen the gifted education program; enhance extracurricular opportunities for middle school students; and coordinate professional development opportunities. The corporate existence of the elementary districts not included in this petition would not be affected. If granted, the participating districts will follow the consolidation process outlined in Article 11E of the School Code (105 ILCS 5/11E, Conversion and Formation of School Districts), including referendum.

Silvis SD 34 – Rock Island (SD 36/HD 72) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year
WM100-5890 – Waiver of School Code (Sections 11E-30, 11E-35 and 11E-65) request to allow the district, working with United Township High School District 30, Colona School District 190, and East Moline School District 37, to be eligible to file a petition for the formation of an Optional Elementary Unit District, commonly called a 'hybrid district.' The waiver is being requested since the four districts are not 'substantially coterminous' as defined in the School Code. If granted, this waiver would allow the four affected districts to file a petition to form an Optional Elementary Unit District. This potential consolidation is expected to improve the curriculum and high school preparation; strengthen the gifted education program; enhance extracurricular opportunities for middle school students; and coordinate professional development opportunities. The corporate existence of the elementary districts not included in this petition would not be affected. If granted, the participating districts will follow the consolidation process outlined in Article 11E of the School Code (105 ILCS 5/11E, Conversion and Formation of School Districts), including referendum.
Driver Education
Fee Limits

Lyons THSD 204 – Cook (SD 04/HD 08) / Expiration: 2017-18 school year
WM100-5841 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code (Section 27-24.2) request to allow the district to charge a fee not to exceed $350 of students who participate in driver education courses.

Oak Lawn CHSD 218 – Cook (SD 18/HD 36) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year
WM100-5849 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code (Section 27-24.2) request to allow the district to charge a fee not to exceed $350 of students who participate in driver education courses.

Waukegan CUSD 60 – Lake (SD 30/HD 60) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year
WM100-5857 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code (Section 27-24.2) request to allow the district to charge a fee not to exceed $500 of students who participate in driver education courses.

Rock Island – Milan SD 41 – Rock Island (SD 36/HD 72) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year
WM100-5858 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code (Section 27-24.2) request to allow the district to charge a fee not to exceed $300 of students who participate in driver education courses.

Adlai E. Stevenson HSD 125 – Lake (SD 30/HD 59) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year
WM100-5861 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code (Section 27-24.2) request to allow the district to charge a fee not to exceed $570 of students who participate in driver education courses.

Bloom Township HSD 206 – Cook (SD 40/HD 80) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year
WM100-5876 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code (Section 27-24.2) request to allow the district to charge a fee not to exceed $350 of students who participate in driver education courses.

Lexington CUSD 7 – McLean (SD 53/HD 105) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year
WM100-5884 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code (Section 27-24.2) request to allow the district to charge a fee not to exceed $300 of students who participate in driver education courses.

Northfield THSD 225 (Glenview) – Cook (SD 09/HD 17) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year
WM100-5921 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code (Section 27-24.2) request to allow the district to charge a fee not to exceed $350 of students who participate in driver education courses.

Limitation of Administrative Costs

Eastland CUSD 308 – Carroll (SD 45/HD 89) / Expiration: 2013-14 school year
WM100-5830 – 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 the 2012-2013 school year the superintendent also served as building principal for a small prekindergarten through grade 2 facility. That facility was closed during the 2013-2014 school year and the superintendent's time is now fully devoted to superintendent duties. The increase in costs for the superintendent account function caused the district's budgeted administrative costs for FY 2014 to exceed those for FY 2013 by more than the 5 percent limitation.

Rhodes SD 84.5 – Cook (SD 39/HD 78) / Expiration: 2013-14 school year
WM100-5831 – 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 order to address the need for improved student performance, the district has added four building-level teacher positions, including an English Language Learning/Bilingual Teacher, two grade-level teachers and one social worker. No new administrative staff have been hired but salaries and benefits have been slightly increased to compensate for additional duties. These increases caused the district's budgeted administrative costs for FY 2014 to exceed those for FY 2013 by more than the 5 percent limitation.

Wesclin CUSD 3 – Clinton, St. Clair (SD 54/HD 108) / Expiration: 2013-14 school year
WM100-5842 – 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 employed an interim superintendent for 100 days during FY 2013. A full-time superintendent has been hired for the 2013-2014 school year. The hiring of a full-time administrator for FY 2014 caused the district's administrative costs to exceed the 5 percent limitation.

Rantoul City SD 137 – Champaign (SD 52/HD 104) / Expiration: 2013-14 school year
WM100-5854 – 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 prior years salary and benefit costs for the superintendent were divided among several funds and functions. The district's accounting firm advised that all costs related to the superintendent's salary and benefits should be placed in one function. The one-time shifting of monies necessary to place funds correctly caused the district’s administrative costs for 2013-2014 to exceed the 5 percent limitation.

Elwood CCSD 203 – Will (SD 43/HD 86) / Expiration: 2013-14 school year
WM100-5855 – 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 increased the compensation for its superintendent in FY 2013, noting the improvement in students' academic outcomes during her tenure. It was also decided to include family medical premiums for administrators as part of their salaries and not as a separate benefit. The effect of these two changes caused the district's administrative costs to exceed the 5 percent limitation.

West Harvey – Dixmoor PSD 147 – Cook (SD 15/HD 30) / Expiration: 2013-14 school year
WM100-5856 – 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 2012-13 school year, the district employed an interim superintendent on a part-time basis. A full-time superintendent was hired for the 2013-14 school year with full benefits and salary, causing the district to exceed the 5 percent limitation.
**Sunnybrook SD 171 – Cook (SD 17/HD 33) / Expiration: 2013-14 school year**

WM100-5866 – 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 2012-13 school year, the district employed an interim superintendent for 100 days and then employed its Business Manager, who held a provisional superintendent license. For the 2013-14 school year the district hired a full-time superintendent as well as a new Business Manager, with family insurance benefits. The effect of these changes caused the district to exceed the 5 percent limitation.

**Lincolnwood SD 74 – Cook (SD 08/HD 16) / Expiration: 2013-14 school year**

WM100-5901 – 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 employed an interim superintendent for 100 days during FY 2013. A full-time superintendent was hired for the 2013-2014 school year. In addition, the district's auditors directed that expenses for the business manager must be recoded to administrative expenses. The hiring of a full-time administrator for FY 2014 in combination with the necessary reallocation of costs caused the district's administrative costs to exceed the 5 percent limitation.

**St. George CCSD 258 – Kankakee (SD 17/HD 34) / Expiration: 2013-14 school year**

WM100-5903 – 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 FY 2014 the district elected to employ a full-time Dean of Students, a position that allowed for the elimination of two part-time positions but increased administrative expenses. The new position will provide additional resources for managing student behavior and is expected to improve student performance. In addition, a new staff member hired in FY 2013 elected health insurance not needed by the employee previously holding the position. The combined effect of these changes caused the district's budgeted administrative costs for FY 2014 to exceed those for FY 2013 by more than the 5 percent limitation.

**Carrollton CUSD 1 – Greene (SD 50/HD 100) / Expiration: 2013-14 school year**

WM100-5917 – 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 superintendent retired in June of 2013, with 64 unused vacation days; under the terms of her contract with the district she was compensated for the unused days. This unplanned payment was not included in the district's budget for FY 2013; therefore, the district's costs for FY 2014 exceeded those for the previous fiscal year by more than the 5 percent limitation.

**Non-resident Tuition**

**Shiloh CUSD 1 – Edgar (SD 51/HD 102) / Expiration: 2019-20 school year**

WM100-5837 (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 granted, this waiver would take effect in the 2015-2016 school year.

**Jonesboro CCSD 43 – Union (SD 58/HD 115) / Expiration: 2017-18 school year**

WM100-5844 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code (Section 10-20.12a) request to
enable the district to allow non-resident students from neighboring school districts that participate in an intergovernmental agreement with Jonesboro to attend its schools free of charge.

**Oglesby ESD 125 – LaSalle (SD 38/HD 76) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year**
**WM100-5847 (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.

**Deer Park CCSD 82 – LaSalle (SD 38/HD 76) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year**
**WM100-5848 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code** (Section 10-20.12a) request to enable the district to charge less than 110 percent of the per capita tuition cost to non-resident students wishing to attend school in the district. For the 2012-13 school year, an annual tuition rate of $2,500 was charged to non-resident students choosing to attend Deer Park.

**Wabash CUSD 348 – Wabash (SD 55/HD 109) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year**
**WM100-5852 (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.

**Central City SD 133 – Marion (SD 54/HD 107) / Expiration: 2017-18 school year**
**WM100-5859 – 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.

**North Wayne CUSD 200 – Wayne (SD 55/HD 109) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year**
**WM100-5863 (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.

**East Dubuque USD 119 – Jo Daviess (SD 45/HD 89) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year**
**WM100-5868 (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.

**Gallatin County CUSD 7 – Gallatin (SD 59/HD 118) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year**
**WM100-5871 (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.

**VIT CUSD 2 – Fulton (SD 47/HD 93) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year**
**WM100-5872 (renewal) – 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.

**Edinburg CUSD 4 – Christian (SD 48/HD 96) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year**
**WM100-5875 – 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.
attend its schools free of charge.

_Havana CUSD 126 – Mason (SD 47/HD 93) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year
WM100-5881 (renewal) – 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.

_New Hope CCSD 6 – Wayne (SD 55/HD 109) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year
WM100-5883 (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.

_Grayville CUSD 1 – White (SD 55/HD 109) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year
WM100-5891 (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.

_Kings CSD 144 – Ogle (SD 45/HD 90) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year
WM100-5893 – Waiver of School Code (Section 10-20.12a) request to enable the district to allow non-resident students whose parents are administrators and teachers in the district to attend its schools free of charge.

_Woodlawn CHSD 205 – Jefferson (SD 58/HD 115) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year
WM100-5894 – 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.

_Bradford CUSD 1 – Bureau, Marshall, Stark (SD 37/HD 73) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year
WM100-5898 – 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.

_Hampton SD 29 – Rock Island (SD 36/HD 71) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year
WM100-5905 – Waiver of School Code (Section 10-20.12a) request to enable the district to allow non-resident students to attend its schools free of charge. The district states that a stable student enrollment would permit continuation of courses with small enrollments; retention of staff; and the chance to expand curricular options.

_Flanagan – Cornell SD 74 – Livingston (SD 53/HD 106) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year
WM100-5908 (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.

_Porta CUSD 202 – Menard (SD 44/HD 87) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year
WM100-5909 – 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.
Robinson CUSD 2 – Crawford (SD 55/HD 110) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year
WM100-5912-1 – 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.

Palestine CUSD 3 – Crawford (SD 55/HD 110) / Expiration: 2016-17 school year
WM100-5913 (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.

Gifford CCSD 188 – Champaign (SD 52/HD 104) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year
WM100-5915 (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.

East St. Louis SD 189 – St. Clair (SD 57/HD 14) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year
WM100-5918-1 – Waiver of School Code (Section 10-20.12a) request to allow the district to charge less than 100 percent of the per capita tuition cost to non-resident students wishing to attend school in the district. For the 2013-14 school year, an annual rate of $3,300 was charged, and rates for subsequent years will be determined by the board of education.

Rankin CSD 98 – Tazewell (SD 46/HD 91) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year
WM100-5920 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code (Section 10-20.12a) request to allow the district to charge less than 100 percent of the per capita tuition cost to non-resident students wishing to attend school in the district. For the 2013-14 school year, an annual rate of $3,300 was charged, and rates for subsequent years will be determined by the board of education.

Physical Education

Waukegan CUSD 60 – Lake (SD 30/HD 60) / Expiration: 2015-16 school year
WM100-5834 (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 30 minutes each session rather than daily. This schedule will allow the district to increase the time spent in language arts and mathematics to 90 minutes daily for each of those subject areas, leading to improved student performance and test scores. Each building has programs in place to incorporate physical activity into classroom and extracurricular activities. If granted, this is the last physical education waiver the district will be permitted to request under the law.

New Lenox SD 122 – Will (SD 19/HD 37) / Expiration: 2015-16 school year
WM100-5838 (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 two times a week for 30 minutes each session and students in grades 4 through 6 to participate three times a week for 30 minutes each session due to inadequate facilities. Additionally, all students participate in daily physical education activities based on a district-developed “Motor Activity Guide” (30 minutes per day for students in kindergarten through grade 3 and 15 minutes per day for students in grades 4 through 6). Smaller classes will enable the district to provide safer and more effective instruction. If granted, this is the last physical education waiver the district will be permitted to request under the law.
Collinsville CUSD 10 – Madison (SD 56/HD 112) / Expiration: 2015-16 school year
WM100-5839 (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. If granted, this is the last physical education waiver the district will be permitted to request under the law.

Plainfield CCSD 202 – Will (SD 49/HD 97) / Expiration: 2015-16 school year
WM100-5840 (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.

Wethersfield CUSD 230 – Henry, Bureau, Stark (SD 37/HD 74) / Expiration: 2015-16 school year
WM100-5850 (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 on an every-other-day basis for 40 minutes each session rather than daily. This schedule will allow more instructional time to be devoted to core areas for the purpose of improving student performance. If granted, this is the last physical education waiver the district will be permitted to request under the law.

Nashville CHSD 99 – Washington (SD 54/HD 108) / Expiration: 2015-16 school year
WM100-5864 (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, and those in grades 9 and 10 for ongoing participation in an interscholastic athletic program. In periods when students in grades 9 and 10 are not engaged in these athletic programs, they will be enrolled in daily physical education. If granted, this is the last physical education waiver the district will be permitted to request under the law.

Hononegah CHSD 207 – Winnebago (SD 35/HD 69) / Expiration: 2015-16 school year
WM100-5865 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code (Section 27-6) request to allow the district to excuse students in grades 10 through 12 from the daily physical education requirement for one semester for ongoing participation in an interscholastic athletic program. Students in grades 10 through 12 also will be excused from the physical education requirement if they both pass a pre-test for fitness and enroll in a sixth academic course. The district notes that its decision to drop from eight to seven daily periods during the 2004-2005 school year has resulted in many students losing the opportunity to take all classes needed for college entrance or future career plans. 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: 2015-16 school year
WM100-5870 (renewal) – 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 then be able to enroll in a foreign language, fine arts, or a second math or science class, thereby completing all necessary college entrance requirements.

Quincy SD 172 – Adams (SD 47/HD 94) / Expiration: 2015-16 school year
WM100-5874 (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 30 minutes each session and students in grades 4 through 6 to participate twice a week for 40 minutes each session. Students in grades 7 through 12 will be excused from the daily physical education requirement on a case-by-case and semester-by-semester basis. Reasons for waiving the physical education requirements for students in grades 7 through 12 include: participation in interscholastic athletics (grades 9 and 10); participation in health class (grade 11); the need for additional academic instruction; participation in driver’s education (either the classroom or the behind-the-wheel segment); and participation in cheerleading and/or pom-poms. The district expects student performance in core academic areas to improve through the use of this waiver, which allows increased time to provide students the intervention services needed to eliminate academic deficiencies.

Proviso THSD 209 – Cook (SD 4/HD 7) / Expiration: 2015-16 school year
WM100-5878 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code (Section 27-6) request to allow the district to excuse students in grades 9 and 10 from the daily physical education requirement in order to take an academic course not mandated by existing graduation standards but required by a post-secondary institution the student plans to attend or to take another academic or Advanced Placement class, with prior approval of the superintendent.

Oregon CUSD 220 – Ogle (SD 45/HD 90) / Expiration: 2015-16 school year
WM100-5879 (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 on a less-than-daily basis due to the district’s ongoing academic recovery program. Students in kindergarten through grade 2 will receive physical education three days a week for 30 minutes each session; students in grades 3 and 5 will have physical education three days a week for 45 minutes each session; and grade 4 students will take physical education four days a week, with two sessions of 35 minutes and two of 45 minutes. Students in grade 6 will receive physical education three days a week for 45-minute sessions. The district must focus on core classes in order to meet Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) standards for all its schools. If granted, this is the last physical education waiver the district will be permitted to request under the law.

Cambridge CUSD 227 – Henry (SD 37/HD 74) / Expiration: 2015-16 school year
WM100-5886 (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 30 minutes each session due to inadequate facilities. On the days when students are not in physical education, they will participate in an extended recess time with a required walking program.

Freeport SD 145 – Stephenson (SD 45/HD 89) / Expiration: 2015-16 school year
WM100-5892 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code (Section 27-6) request to allow the district to excuse students in grades 9 through 12 from physical education for
participation in show choir and marching band (for which they do not receive credit); and to excuse students in grades 9 and 10 from the daily physical education requirement when they are either participating in interscholastic athletics or have enrolled in an additional academic class. In addition, students in grades 9 through 12 who enrolled in an additional academic class would be allowed to earn high school credit for physical education taken during the district's summer school physical education session. The waiver would allow these students to enroll in courses in the fine arts, career preparation and/or other areas. If granted, this is the last physical education waiver the district will be permitted to request under the law.

**Midland CUSD 7 – Marshall (SD 37/HD 73) / Expiration: 2015-16 school year**

**WM100-5895-1 – Waiver of School Code (Section 27-6)** request to allow the district to excuse students in the following grades from the daily physical education requirement: for grades 5 through 12, students receiving academic intervention programs in English, reading or math, or students enrolled in band, chorus or other music classes offered for credit; for grades 7 through 10, students participating in interscholastic athletics; for grades 7 through 12, students participating in cheerleading and dance; for grades 9 through 12, students taking Advanced Placement (AP) classes, vocational classes, or driver education class; and, for grades 10 through 12, students participating in dual credit programs offered through community colleges. The waivers would allow the district increased flexibility to provide academic interventions and opportunities to its students and improve student performance by increasing both graduation and college enrollment rates.

**Rock Falls ESD 13 – Whiteside (SD 36/HD 71) / Expiration: 2015-16 school year**

**WM100-5896 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code (Section 27-6)** request to allow the district to alternate daily physical education with music and art for students in kindergarten through grade 5. Students will participate in physical education for 30 minutes each session on an every-other-day basis. They also will have 15 to 20 minutes of supervised recess each day, and access to extracurricular programs. The district states that this physical education schedule will allow it to continue to improve student performance in other academic areas.

**CCSD 59 (Arlington Heights) – Cook (SD 28/HD 55) / Expiration: 2015-16 school year**

**WM100-5897 – 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 every third day for 40 minutes each session due to inadequate facilities. Students will participate in structured physical activities from classroom teachers to supplement the time spent in formal physical education.

**Kewanee CUSD 229 – Henry (SD 37/HD 74) / Expiration: 2015-16 school year**

**WM100-5899 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code (Section 27-6)** to allow the district to permit students in kindergarten through first grade to participate in physical education four times a week for 30 minutes each session; for students in grades 2 and 3 to participate in physical education four times a week for 25 minutes each session; for students in grades 4 through 6 to participate in physical education two times a week for 40 minutes each session; and for students in grades 7 and 8 to participate in physical education three times a week for 45 minutes each session, due to inadequate facilities. Kewanee students in grades 3 through 6 did not meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) goals in 2010-2011. Students will spend time in various intervention programs and school improvement activities in order to improve student achievement.
Palatine CCSD 15 – Cook (SD 27/HD 54) / Expiration: 2015-16 school year
WM100-5900 (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 twice a week for 30 minutes each session rather than daily due to inadequate facilities. Students have 20 minutes of recess each day, and intramural sports are offered beginning in grades 5 and 6. The district states that this schedule offers a safer environment and improved time on task for its students. If granted, this is the last physical education waiver the district will be permitted to request under the law.

Aurora West USD 129 – Kane (SD 42/HD 83) / Expiration: 2015-16 school year
WM100-5902 (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 25 minutes each session due to inadequate facilities. Providing less than daily physical education will allow the district to schedule physical education classes for fewer students for a longer period of time.

Pontiac Township HSD 90 – Livingston (SD 53/HD 106) / Expiration: 2015-16 school year
WM100-5906-2 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code (Section 27-6) Waiver of School Code (Section 27-6) request to allow the district to excuse those students in grades 9 through 12 from the daily physical education requirement when they are part of the color guard accompanying the district's marching band, and to excuse students in grades 11 and 12 when they are participating in cheerleading.

East St. Louis SD 189 – St. Clair (SD 57/HD 114) / Expiration: 2015-16 school year
WM100-5918-2 – Waiver of School Code (Section 27-6) 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 one semester in order to participate in a semester-long college entrance examination preparatory course offered by a professional provider.

O'Fallon CCSD 90 – St. Clair (SD 57/HD 114) / Expiration: 2015-16 school year
WM100-5919 – 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 once a week for 40 minutes each session due to inadequate facilities. Students will have 30 minutes of recess daily that promotes cardiovascular health and muscle fitness. The district expects to gain a 40-minute planning period for elementary teachers each week with the aim of improving student performance.

School Improvement/Inservice Training

St. Charles CUSD 303 – Kane (SD 33/HD 65) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year
WM100-5843 (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 pupil attendance required by Section 10-19. The district will accumulate sufficient time beyond the five-clock-hour requirement to apply towards these days.

Fenton CHSD 100 – DuPage (SD 39/HD 77) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year
**WM100-5851 – 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 pupil attendance required by Section 10-19. The district will accumulate sufficient time beyond the five-clock-hour requirement to apply towards these days.

*Winnebago CUSD 323 – Winnebago (SD 45/HD 89) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year*

**WM100-5860-1 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code** (Section 18-8.05(F)(2)(d)(2)) request to allow the district the option of holding three full-day teacher inservice sessions instead of six half days, and to count the days among the 176 days of pupil attendance required by Section 10-19. The district will accumulate sufficient time beyond the five-clock-hour requirement to apply towards these days.

*DuPage HSD 88 – DuPage (SD 39/HD 77) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year*

**WM100-5867 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code** (Section 18-8.05(F)(2)(d)(2)) request to allow the district to use accumulated time during the school year to apply to 31 “late start” Mondays, in which students would begin classes at 9:00 a.m. and end at 3:00 p.m. with 40 minutes for each instructional period. This extra time would allow teachers to engage in school improvement activities on a regular basis. The schedule would not be put in place until the conclusion of the first week of school.

*Momence CUSD 1 – Kankakee (SD 17/HD 34) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year*

**WM100-5869 (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 pupil attendance required by Section 10-19. The district will accumulate sufficient time beyond the five-clock-hour requirement to apply towards these days.

*La Harpe CSD 347 – Hancock (SD 47/HD 94) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year*

**WM100-5885 (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.

*Champaign CUSD 4 – Champaign (SD 52/HD 103) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year*

**WM100-5904 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code** (Section 18-8.05(F)(2)(d)(2)) request to allow the district to hold up to six full-day teacher inservice sessions instead of using 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.

*Pontiac Township HSD 90 – Livingston (SD 53/HD 106) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year*

**WM100-5906-1 (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.

*Dallas ESD 327 – Hancock (SD 47/HD 94) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year*
**WM100-5907 (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.

**Pontiac CCSD 429 – Livingston (SD 53/HD 106) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year**

**WM100-5914 (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.

**Rooks Creek CCSD 425 – Livingston (SD 53/HD 106) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year**

**WM100-5916 – 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.

**State Graduation Requirements**

**Midland CUSD 7 – Marshall (SD 37/HD 73) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year**

**WM100-5895-2 – Waiver of School Code** (Section 27-22.10) request to allow the district to permit students in grades 7 and 8 to take math and science courses required for high school graduation under Section 27-22 of the School Code at the middle school, as opposed to taking them at the high school, provided that such courses are taught by an educator licensed high school teacher. The district states that this waiver would increase curricular opportunities for middle school students and increase high school graduation rates. In addition, the waiver would ease the scheduling arrangements and transportation time needed otherwise in this rural district either to take students ten miles from the middle to the high schools or to have high school teachers travel the same distance.

**Statement of Affairs**

**Plainfield CCSD 202 – Will, Kendall (SD 49/HD 97) / Expiration: 2018-19 school year**

**WM100-5846 – Waiver of School Code** (Section 10-17) request to allow the district to not prepare and publish in the newspaper a "statement of affairs," thus saving the district approximately $4,560. The district will instead publish its annual financial report on the district’s website; make bound copies available in all district schools; and display a bound copy at the district's administrative center. The district states that the money saved through this waiver would be used for instructional purposes leading to improved student performance.

**Huntley CSD 158 – McHenry, Kane (SD 33/HD 66) / Expiration: 2014-15 school year**

**WM100-5911 (renewal) – Waiver of School Code** (Section 10-17) request to allow the district to not prepare and publish in the newspaper a "statement of affairs," thus saving the district approximately $6,000. The district will instead publish its annual financial report on the district’s website and have copies available in all district schools. The
district states that the money saved through this waiver would be used for instructional purposes leading to improved student performance.
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
       Melissa S. Oller, Chief Internal Auditor

Agenda Topic: Presentation of FY 2013 Financial Audit Report


Staff Contact: Melissa Oller, Chief Internal Auditor

Purpose of Agenda Item

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
The Board will be informed of the issues identified by the Office of the Auditor General in the FY 2013 Financial Audit report, and accept the audit.

Background Information
The Auditor General is responsible for conducting a Financial Audit of the Agency. The objectives of this audit are to determine if financial statements are fairly presented.

Analysis and Implications for Legislative Action and Communications

Legislative: This audit will be reviewed by the Legislative Audit Commission.

Communications: The audit is issued by the Auditor General and is available to the public.

Superintendent's Recommendation
I recommend that the State Board adopt the following motion:


Next Steps
No further actions necessary.
 agenda topic: Technology Capital Funds Update

Materials: None

Purpose of Agenda Item
To update the Board regarding the recent announcements regarding Federal Funding for School Technology and the Board’s request for Capital Funds to be included in the Governor’s Budget for Technology for Instruction and Assessments.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
This item relates to:
Goal 1: Every student will demonstrate academic achievement and be prepared for success after high school.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
This item is for informational purposes.

Background Information
In the State of the Union Address, President Obama made a reference to E-Rate modernization and commitments from technology companies that would provide a down payment to start connecting schools to high-speed broadband. Since the State of the Union, there have been several announcements regarding the potential amount of federal funding available.

E-rate Background:
Through funding generated from federal excise taxes on telecommunications, schools and libraries have been able to apply for discounts from service providers in two priority areas:

Priority 1 – Basic telephone, cellular service and internet connections that are currently in place
Priority 2 – Building of infrastructure or if necessary funding to light existing fiber

Since 1996, the vast majority of E-rate funding has been expended on Priority 1 services.

Schools and libraries are eligible for discounts based upon the percentage of students eligible for the National School Lunch Program and the location of the school (rural or urban location).

Below is a table identifying the available discounts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Low Income Pupils</th>
<th>Urban Location</th>
<th>Rural Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% to 19%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% to 34%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since the State of the Union, there have been several announcements from the Federal Communication Commission (FCC) regarding the potential amount of federal funding available.

- The FCC Chair endorsed the President’s broadband capacity goals and pledged to do his part to meeting them during the term of his office.
- The FCC Chair committed to funding all Priority 1 E-rate applications for Federal Fiscal Year 2014.
- The FCC will accelerate the investment of money in E-rate with one-time funds, although at this time it is not known when and how this money will flow. It is also not clear how much of this is a new investment.
- The FCC will issue an order on E-rate modernization reforms by the beginning of March 2014.
- At some point after the FCC decides on the issues in its forthcoming order, it will consider the sufficiency of funds for E-rate. The Chair has signaled that a new investment is a possibility.

Other significant announcements include:

- Commitments have been made valued at $750 million in total by several corporations to provide free and/or discounted products and services. Details will be forthcoming.
- There will be a request for Enhancing Education Through Technology Program in the Federal Budget for Fiscal Year 2015.
- The U.S. Department of Education released guidance on how to use federal grants to leverage technology.

Agency staff have been in contact with the Governor’s Office regarding the $450 million Capital Funds request the Board approved as part of their overall FY15 budget recommendation to help ensure that the Governor’s Capital Funds Budget includes funding for Technology for Instruction and Assessments that contemplates E-rate funding and additional Federal Funding when it is known.

**Superintendent’s Recommendation**
This item is for discussion purposes only.

**Next Steps**
Agency staff will continue to work with the Governor’s Office on technology infrastructure investments.
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

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

Agenda Topic: 2014 Legislative Session

Attachments: Tracked Legislation Document

Staff Contact(s): Nicole Wills, Governmental Relations
                Amanda Elliott, Governmental Relations

Purpose of Agenda Item
The purpose of the agenda item is to provide the Board with a summary legislation that has been filed in advance of the Spring 2014 legislative session and an update on the Board’s 2014 legislative agenda.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
The Legislative Agenda will implement changes that align with all three goals identified within the Board’s Strategic Plan.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
The Board will be informed of tracked legislation and Board initiatives.

Background Information

Synopsis of Tracked Legislation
In addition to legislation included on the Synopsis List, and legislation listed in the Board Initiatives section below, the following bills are highlighted as bills of particular interest.

- HB 4191 (Welch) / SB 2760 (Lightford) – Creates the Student Bill of Rights which sets out rights of students when being questioned by authorizes in the school environment.
- HB 4207 (Fine) – Amends the bullying prevention provisions of the School Code to add cyber-bullying to the definition of bullying.
- HB 4237 (Chapa LaVia) / SB 2779 (Holmes) – Amends the Charter School Law to provide that if the Commission or another State entity reverses the decision of a local school board to deny, revoke, or not renew a charter school, the reversal will not be effective unless and until the decision is submitted to the voters of the local school district for referendum at a regularly-scheduled election, and the initiative passes by majority vote.
- HB 4257 (Chapa LaVia) – Amends the College and Career Success for All Students Act to provide that if a student receives a score of 3 or higher on an Advanced Placement Exam that student is entitled to receive postsecondary level course credit at a public institution of higher education.
- HB 4287 (Ford) – Amends the School Code to require the Chicago Board of Education to appoint a superintendent of early childhood education.
• HB 4301 (W. Davis) / HB 4480 (Franks) – Amends the Election Code and School Code to give school districts the right to “opt out” of the Election Code requirement that all public buildings are subject to being designated polling places on election day.
• HB 4424 (Tryon) – Amends the School Code to permit a school board to excuse pupils in grades 9 through 12 from engaging in PE courses if those pupils are enrolled in 2 or more AP courses.
• HB 4493 (Hammond) – Makes a supplemental appropriation of $400,000 GRF for district consolidations.
• HB 4612 (Sandack) – Amends the School Code to provide that any 2 or more school districts that share the same boundaries may combine transportation activities to achieve savings. Provides that for any school districts electing to combine such transportation, the State Board of Education shall reimburse the school districts in amount equal to 75% of the cost savings achieved.
• SB 2647 (Althoff) – Amends the School Code to require school districts to comply with local zoning ordinances.
• SB 2775 (Lightford) – Amends the School Code to require the Chicago Board of Education to provide free transportation to and from a pupil’s assigned school and a pick-up point for any pupil who must walk along a safe passage route.
• SB 2793 (Hutchinson) – Amends the School Code to require every school to provide expulsion and suspension data for the annual school report card.
• SB 2945 (Harmon) – Amends the School Code to require the Purchased Care Review Board to approve the usual and customary rate or rates of an out-of-state, non-public special education program that serves 12 or fewer Illinois students.
• SB 2972 (Bertino-Tarrant) – Amends the School Code to expand the qualifications of a superintendent to include 2 years of general administrative experience (currently 2 years’ experience as a full-time principal, director of special education, or chief school business official).
• SB 2989 (Delgado) – Amends the School Code to make changes to out of state licensure for school psychologists and expands the qualifications for a principal endorsement to those who have worked in the capacity of school support personnel for four years (currently four years of teaching).

Summary of Board Initiatives
Over the past several months, the Agency’s Governmental Relations staff has been working with Agency divisions to develop legislative proposals for the spring 2014 legislative session. Some of our initiatives have been filed. If the legislation has been filed the bill number and sponsor are listed below.

District Interventions: This proposal will amend Section 3.25(f) of the School Code to clarify ISBE’s authority to intervene in failing school districts. This legislation will be similar to SB 2340 which did not move through the House during the Spring 2013 legislative session. The bill would specifically:
• Identify low-performing school districts that may be subject to an accreditation process run by a national organization with research-based, peer reviewed standards.
• Provide that if a district fails to meet accreditation because of governance, as defined in part by failure to adhere to requirements in the School Code for school board members, then ISBE has the discretion to remove the school board and put in place an Independent Authority (IA).
• Provide specific criteria that the accreditation entity will use when considering if a district can meet the governance standards for accreditation.
- Provide specific due process rights to board members being removed.
- Define an IA’s authority as being identical to a school board.
- Provide specifics on the make-up and organization of an IA, including requiring a majority of the IA members be residents of the District.
- Suspend school board elections for one election cycle and then phase school board elections back into the district over 4 years while keeping an IA in place.

Assessments: This proposal will include amendments to the assessment provisions in the School Code remove specific references to the Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) and Prairie State Achievement Examination (PSAE) to allow for new state assessments aligned with new Illinois Learning Standards.

HB 4527 (Chapa LaVia) Charter Schools: This proposal will amend Article 27A to make it explicit that charters are subject to all state laws, regulations and rules regarding Special Education and English Language Learning instruction.

Under the Charter Law, charter schools are exempt from all requirements of the Illinois School Code except for those specifically enumerated therein. Nothing in the Charter Law expressly provides that Article 14 (“Children With Disabilities”) and Article 14C (“Transitional Bilingual Education”) are applicable to charter schools. Notwithstanding, ISBE Legal has taken the position that all special education requirements set forth in Article 14 of the School Code and Part 226 of the 23 Illinois Administrative Code apply to charter schools. The rationale is that IDEA establishes a broad framework to define and regulate special education programs in the United States, but leaves to the states the responsibility for developing and executing educational programs for students with disabilities. Put another way, IDEA compliance presupposes compliance with all State statutes, regulations and rules concerning special education. The Illinois State Charter Commission has challenged this position, asserting that charter schools are not subject to any State-imposed requirement that exceeds Federal special education statute and regulation [20 U.S.C. § 1408(1)(2)].

ISBE Legal has recently considered extending this position to State requirements for English Language Learning. Again, the rationale is that federal law (including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title III Part A of NCLB, and the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974) establishes broad sweeping requirements for equal access to educational opportunities, leaving it to the states to develop and execute the necessary programs to guarantee these rights, including with respect to English Language Learners.

Requiring charter schools to comply with all state laws, regulations, and rules concerning Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners is good public policy. These are protected categories of students and consistent policies across schools will protect schools and districts against potential charges of discrimination. In addition, State Board monitoring staff have repeatedly requested clarity regarding requirements for Special Education and English Language Learning instruction in charter schools.

SB 3081 (Biss) Charter Schools: This legislation will amend Article 27A to align the beginning of the fiscal year for charter schools with State and school district fiscal years and make changes regarding the review of material modifications to charter agreements.

SB 2711 (Sullivan) Federal Grant Processing: This proposal will provide 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). There is no actual change in policy for school districts that will take place as a result of this change, but it will allow ISBE to operate without potential audit issues when processing federal funds.

Elections: While developing a legislative fix for an April 2013 DuPage Regional Board of School Trustees election concern during the spring legislative session, it became apparent that the School Code was silent on several additional related issues which could cause election questions in the future. Changes to Articles 6 and 9 of the School Code would help remedy the deficiencies in the statutory language, thus preventing a need to address potential future concerns through special legislation after the fact.

HB 4262 (Fine) Tuberculosis Testing: This proposal will align Tuberculosis (TB) screening requirements for school district employees in the School Code with screening requirements in Illinois Department of Public Health (IDPH) rules. Currently, 105 ILCS 5/24-5 requires school employees to be screened for TB prior to employment. In October 2012, IDPH made modifications to the Control of Tuberculosis Code (77 Ill. Adm. Code 696) with respect to the screening of certain persons. Specifically, IDPH rules no longer require TB screening of all teachers prior to employment in a school. The requirement for TB screening, however, does remain in effect for workers in child day care and pre-school settings. Also, under Section 140, subsection (b), persons who have a documented positive TB screening test result are to be screened for active TB disease. ISBE intends to work with IDPH to bring clarity to the latter categories. It should be further noted that a shortage of TB screening materials has been experienced in the field, dating back to early spring of 2013. This shortage of screening materials only complicates the lack of connection between the School Code and IDPH rules.

SB 2710 (Cunningham) School Safety Drills: This initiative would clarify that non-public schools are required to conduct a minimum of one annual meeting regarding safety drill programs. This would align safety drill requirements for state-recognized non-public schools with public school requirements.

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. Changes may include:

- Home/Hospital Reimbursement – legislation to align the amount of home/hospital reimbursement for each eligible teacher from $8,000 to $9,000 as currently provided in Section 14-13.01
- Special Education Reimbursement – legislation to strike obsolete language as to how special education students are reimbursed in group orphanage settings. Since fiscal year 2002, eligible special education students served in group homes are claimed individually instead of via a group program budget application through the regional superintendent. All eligible students are claimed individually with appropriate eligible costs and reimbursed fully.
- Multi-Function School Activity Bus (MFSAB) – legislation to align Section 29-6.3 regarding the definition of a multi-function school activity bus (MFSAB) to mirror the Illinois Vehicle Code (IVC) in 625 ILCS 5/1-148.3a-5 which defines such vehicle. Currently, the School Code in Section 29-6.3 limits a MFSAB to 15 passengers while the IVC defines the same vehicle as those manufactured to carry 11 or more persons including the driver.
• Reorganization – changes are needed to the various reorganization articles in the School Code. When the new performance evaluation language was enacted, the section on contractual continued service protection in a reorganization was moved from Section 24-12 of the School Code to Section 24-11(h) of the School Code. Due to this, the references within the reorganization articles dealing with this topic need to be updated.

**Next Steps**
Staff will move forward with drafting all approved legislative proposals and will proceed with securing legislative sponsors for the 2014 Legislative Session.