



Illinois State Board of Education

Jesse Ruiz, Board Chair
Dr. Christopher Koch, State Superintendent

**ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Crowne Plaza Hotel*
3000 South Dirksen Parkway
Springfield, Illinois 62703**

**SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS
August 23-24, 2000**

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 23

- 10:00 a.m.** **WORK-STUDY SESSION I**
Diamond Room – 2nd Floor (Ballroom Level)
- 12:00 noon**** **LUNCH**
Capital V – 3rd Floor (Conference Level)
(Board may discuss business during lunch)
- 1:00 p.m.** **WORK-STUDY SESSION II ****
Diamond Room – 2nd Floor (Ballroom Level)
- 3:30 p.m.** **CLOSED SESSION**
Diamond Room – 2nd Floor (Ballroom Level)
- 6:00 p.m.** **DINNER**
Capital V – 3rd Floor (Conference Level)
(Board may discuss business during dinner)
- 7:00 p.m.** **STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**
Closed Meeting
Capital V - 3rd Floor (Conference Level)

THURSDAY, AUGUST 24

- 8:00 a.m.** **WORK-STUDY SESSION III**
Diamond Room – 2nd Floor (Ballroom Level)
- 9:30 a.m.** **PLENARY BUSINESS MEETING**
Diamond Room – 2nd Floor (Ballroom Level)
- 12:00 noon** **LUNCH**
Capital VI – 3rd Floor (Conference Level)

INFORMATION ITEM

- * All meetings are accessible to persons with disabilities
** Meeting will begin at the conclusion of the previous session

Illinois State Board of Education
100 North First Street
Springfield, IL 62777



Illinois State Board of Education

Jesse Ruiz, Board Chair
Dr. Christopher Koch, State Superintendent

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION WORK-STUDY SESSION I

Crowne Plaza
Diamond Room
3000 South Dirksen Parkway
Springfield, Illinois 62703

Wednesday, August 23, 2000
10:00 a.m.

Agenda

A. Call to Order/Roll Call

B. Status of Business and Strategic Planning

Cover

Illinois Education Planning (Draft)

System Goals and ISBE Leadership Goals (Draft)

System Goals and Aggregate Measures (Draft)

C. FY 2002 Budget Discussion

Cover

D. Teacher Certification Structure - Designations for Social Science

Cover

E. Adjourn

Illinois State Board of Education
100 North First Street
Springfield, IL 62777



Illinois State Board of Education

Jesse Ruiz, Board Chair
Dr. Christopher Koch, State Superintendent

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION WORK-STUDY SESSION II

Crowne Plaza
Diamond Ballroom
3000 South Dirksen Parkway
Springfield, IL 62703

Wednesday, August 23, 2000
1:00 p.m.

Agenda

A. Call to Order/Roll Call

B. Teacher Induction

Cover

C. Special Education Certification Structure and Teacher Standards

Cover

Special Education Certification Structure and Content Area Standards

D. Break

E. Virtual High School/Advanced Placement Opportunities

Cover

Cover

F. Adjourn

Illinois State Board of Education

100 North First Street
Springfield, IL 62777



Illinois State Board of Education

Jesse Ruiz, Board Chair
Dr. Christopher Koch, State Superintendent

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION WORK-STUDY SESSION III

Crowne Plaza
Diamond Ballroom
3000 South Dirksen Parkway
Springfield, IL 62703 Thursday, August 24, 2000
8:00 a.m.

Agenda

- A. Call to Order/Roll Call
- B. Funds for Education from the Illinois Portion of the Tobacco Settlement

Cover

- C. Board Priority Reports
- D. Federal Legislative Update

Cover

Washington Education News
History of Federal Grant Awards

- E. Adjourn

Illinois State Board of Education
100 North First Street
Springfield, IL 62777



STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION PLENARY BUSINESS MEETING

Crowne Plaza
Diamond Ballroom
3000 South Dirksen Parkway
Springfield, IL 62703
Thursday, August 24, 2000
9:30 a.m.

Agenda

- A. Call to Order/Roll Call
- B. Approval of Minutes: June 15-17, 2000
 - MINUTES OF THE CLOSED MEETING (June 15, 2000)
 - MINUTES OF THE PLENARY BUSINESS MEETING (June 15, 2000)
 - MINUTES OF THE CLOSED MEETING (June 16-17, 2000)
- C. Public Participation
- D. Items for Immediate Action
 1. Teacher Certification Structure - Social Science
See Work Study Session I
 2. Special Education Certification Structure and Standards
See Work Study Session II
 3. Virtual High School
See Work Study Session II
 4. Chicago Public School District 299 - Supplemental
 5. General State Aid Plan (SGSA)
Cover
SGSA Executive Summary
 6. Resolution - Organ Donor Awareness Education
Cover
Recommended Resolution
 7. Board Expenditures
- E. Announcements and Reports
 1. Chairman
 2. Superintendent
 3. Committees
 4. Board Members
- F. Items for Future Action
 1. Teacher Induction
See Work Study Session II
- G. Adjourn

**MINUTES OF THE WORK STUDY SESSION I AND II
AND CLOSED SESSION
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING**

Crowne Plaza
Springfield, Illinois
August 23, 2000

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ronald J. Gidwitz
Marjorie Branch*
William E. Hill

Marilyn McConachie
Sandra M. Pellegrino

Connie Rogers
Janet Steiner

Glenn W. "Max" McGee, State Superintendent of Education

MEMBERS ABSENT:

David P. Gomez, Vincent J. Serritella

Roll Call

In the absence of Chairman Gidwitz, the meeting was called to order at 10:15 a.m. by the Vice Chair, Ms. Pellegrino, who asked Judy Carmody, the staff secretary to the Board, to call the roll. Mrs. Carmody called the roll of members. A quorum was present. (*Ms. Branch is a newly appointed Board member.)

Vice Chair Pellegrino indicated that Chairman Gidwitz and Marjorie Branch, a newly appointed Board member, would be late joining the meeting due to weather conditions. She noted that Mr. Gomez and Mr. Serritella were unable to be present due to business conflicts.

Agenda
Item B.

The Vice Chair called for Agenda Item B., Status of Business and Strategic Planning.

Vice Chair Pellegrino indicated that during the June Work Conference, the Board asked staff to continue with their planning efforts and share their progress to date at this meeting.

Superintendent McGee reported that agency planning has been progressing on two fronts: 1) refining the division/unit business plans that were initially started during FY 2000; and 2) drafting and refining a framework for an aligned system of strategic planning and performance management. He indicated that Lynne Haeffele and David Wood would share the agency activity of the past two months in this planning effort. He commented that it is important to note that documents to be addressed are DRAFT documents and need refinement. The Superintendent reported that we anticipated involving the Board, particularly the Strategic Planning Committee, in their refinement. He indicated that in addition, our partners and stakeholders would be key players in the system, and their involvement would be

MINUTES OF WORK STUDY SESSIONS

I AND II AND CLOSED SESSION

August 23, 2000

Page 2

essential in this process. He noted that at this meeting, we are asking for the Board's endorsement of our direction.

Lynne Haeffele, Chief Deputy Superintendent, provided a power-point presentation on strategic planning (see Addendum II).

David Wood, Assistant Chief Deputy Superintendent, gave brief remarks and distributed information on business planning.

Discussion followed for clarification purposes.

An audio tape of the meeting is available through the State Board office in Springfield (217/782-9560).

Chairman Gidwitz and Ms. Branch arrived at 11:00 a.m. The Chairman introduced Marjorie Branch who has served the Chicago Public Schools for more than 38 years as a deputy superintendent, principal, administrator, and teacher. He indicated that Ms. Branch also served as a part-time English instructor at Central Y.M.C.A. Junior College and has broad community service and board participation.

Agenda Item C.

The Chairman called for Agenda Item C., FY 2002 Budget Discussion.

Chairman Gidwitz reported that David Wood, Assistant Chief Deputy Superintendent, has arranged for the Board to hear from representatives of the Bureau of the Budget and the two majority appropriations staffs. He welcomed the guests and thanked them for joining the Board at this meeting.

Superintendent M^CGee indicated that this session is intended to assist the Board in the development of its FY 2002 budget. He noted that we hope to gain an understanding or at least an awareness of considerations that are made in determining allocations for education.

Mr. Wood introduced the guests.

- George Hovanec, Deputy Director for the Bureau of the Budget
- John Lowder, Appropriation Staff Director for the House Democrats
- Mike Bass, Appropriation Staff Director for the Senate Republicans

Discussion followed between the three guests, the Board, and the Superintendent.

An audio tape of the meeting is available through the State Board office in Springfield (217/782-9560).

MINUTES OF WORK STUDY SESSIONS

I AND II AND CLOSED SESSION

August 23, 2000

Page 3

Agenda Item D.

The Chairman called for Agenda Item D., Teacher Certification Structure -- Designations of Social Science.

Chairman Gidwitz indicated that during the next half hour or so, the Board would be building on its discussion in June regarding the need for a designation to accompany a social science endorsement.

Superintendent M^CGee reported that during the June Board meeting, a revised certification structure and teacher content area standards were adopted. He indicated that at that time, there was a question as to whether a required designation of history should accompany the social science endorsement or be left open to choice from one of six designations. He noted that at the Board's request, Division Administrator Mike Long and staff have done further investigation which included:

1. Reconvening selected members of the original content area standards' panel joined by other social science educators and
2. Performing a review of the 29 social science endorsement standards and the social science learning standards for students.

The Superintendent commented that this was to determine if the teacher standards were sufficient to help students achieve the learning standards.

Mr. Long highlighted the key points and responded the Board members' questions for clarification purposes.

Superintendent M^CGee reported that on August 24, he would recommend that the Board adopts the proposed social science designations and require that teachers with a social science endorsement also obtain a designation in one of the six social science disciplines.

An audio tape of the meeting is available through the State Board office in Springfield (217/782-9560).

The Superintendent introduced Peter Leonis, the new State Relations Office Director, who will begin employment with the State Board in September.

The meeting recessed at 12:15 p.m. and reconvened at 1:10 p.m. with the Work Study Session II agenda.

MINUTES OF WORK STUDY SESSIONS

I AND II AND CLOSED SESSION

August 23, 2000

Page 4

Agenda

Item C.

The Chairman called for Agenda Item C., Teacher Induction.

Chairman Gidwitz indicated that during the next 45 minutes, the Board would have an opportunity to review and discuss preliminary recommendations associated with teacher induction and mentoring. He noted that this strategy has gained a great deal of momentum as a support for new teachers.

Superintendent M^CGee reported that Teacher Induction and Mentoring programs are gaining a great deal of attention throughout the nation, and in Illinois, the Governor's staff are strong advocates for such programs. He indicated that the ACHIEVE report cited the lack of legislation to support this type of program as a significant deficiency in the state's teacher preparation and continuing professional development system. He noted that during this past winter, an external work group was convened to develop recommendations on this issue.

Deputy Superintendent Frank Llano and Division Administrator Mike Long provided a short overview followed by a discussion for clarification purposes.

The Chairman requested a more specific plan for collaboration with higher education and data showing the value of induction and mentoring programs.

An audio tape of the meeting is available through the State Board office in Springfield (217/782-9560).

Agenda

Item D.

The Chairman called for Agenda Item D., Special Education Certification Structure and Teacher Standards.

Chairman Gidwitz indicated that the next item is an action item on the Plenary Business Session agenda on August 24. He reported that a date of August 25 for submission of Teacher Content Standards, together with a Certification Structure for Special Education, has been issued by the Corey H. Court Monitor.

The Chairman noted that the Board has embarked on a process of developing a special education certification structure and teacher content standards for the better part of two and one-half years. He reported that the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules (JCAR) examined the materials last month, and JCAR approved it.

The Superintendent reported that this is a very complicated issue, and there are really three things going on at once: the rules, the certification issues, and the special education standards. He noted that the certification issues spring from Corey H. But as he testified to the legislative committee, we would have made

MINUTES OF WORK STUDY SESSIONS

I AND II AND CLOSED SESSION

August 23, 2000

Page 5

these recommendations regardless, because we believe that we do need to upgrade the certification system to meet the needs of the boys and girls with disabilities. Superintendent McGee also noted that the process of adopting the special education standards needed to be accelerated again at the request of the Court Monitor. He indicated that it was important to note that although the Court Monitor does play an important role, these are the Board's matters which needed to be done and addressed anyway. He noted that though we may be addressing them sooner than later, it is in the best interest of boys and girls, teachers, families, and the general public as well.

Superintendent McGee noted that in March 2000, the Board adopted a certification structure for special education teachers. He indicated that in a determination issued by the Corey H. Court Monitor, additional specificity of the Content Standards for each of the designations needed to be submitted by August 25, 2000. He asked Deputy Superintendent Gordon Riffel to review some critical dates, processes, and requirements associated with the Board's past and future action. The Superintendent noted that we would also be discussing the recommendation for the special education LBS I and LBS II certificate. He indicated that the Board passed those along as he believed as preliminary recommendation, pending approval of the Court Monitor, and the Court Monitor seemed to think that that recommendation was a good one. He commented that at this point, we were looking for final feedback from the Board and recommending on August 24 that we move this forward as the final recommendation.

Gordon Riffel briefly shared with the Board the way this issue has materialized.

- In 1966, the Illinois Framework for Certification -- this was when certification redesign really came to the forefront and special education was part of that.
- In 1997, there was Public Act 90-548, which also indicated that we needed to develop standards; so long before Corey H. was decided, there were movements taking place both on the State Board and by the General Assembly to change the way that we certify teachers in the State of Illinois -- special education being part of that.
- In February 1998, Robert Gettelman, the federal court judge, issued his opinion and order; and in that opinion and order, he primarily indicated that ISBE did not monitor Chicago Public Schools the way that it should be monitoring in the area of Least Restrictive Environment (LRE). He went on to say that the way that we certify teachers in the State of Illinois has a tendency to exasperate the problem of not allowing students to be in the least restrictive environment. It was his opinion that the LRE mandate was being violated through a categorical approach to teacher certification, so as we designed and put together the settlement agreement, we had to place in the settlement agreement how we were going to correct or rectify these problems. What we said is that we would approach the certification redesign in two phases: Phase I primarily being the

MINUTES OF WORK STUDY SESSIONS

I AND II AND CLOSED SESSION

August 23, 2000

Page 6

redesign that would deal with special education teachers and that is the framework in the standards (that we are dealing with at this meeting); and Phase II would be dealing with the general education population, as far as standards are concerned, and what kinds of standards we would have for general education teachers to understand the needs of children with disabilities.

- We are now at Phase I. When we started this process, it was with the understanding by the State Board's team that we would have until January 2003 to get this entire process completed, so we have been going down the track here. We have had Panel A and Panel B, and they have put together a framework and standards. That came before the Certification Board last fall, and the Certification Board did not accept that. It then came to the State Board of Education, and the Superintendent felt that we had to have some additional investigations.
- We put a Blue Ribbon Panel together, and we looked at the framework and made some decisions internally about a framework that we felt would meet the needs of kids and teachers in the State of Illinois -- that was Learning Behavioral Specialist I and II. That went to the court and the court-appointed monitor. Since that time, we have had comment back from the plaintiffs who had some concerns saying that the framework -- Learning Behavioral Specialist I and II -- needed to have more information attached to it, so we are trying to provide that with the framework and also with the standards. As we went through the initial cut of this, we did have public comment, and most of the comment that we received a year ago primarily dealt not with the standards but dealt with the framework. In fact there was very little comment about the standards at all. We felt that the standards were fairly well designed and felt they could be used as we try to put those together in meeting the needs of the framework.
- The State Board's team recommended to the court-appointed monitor that we have all these standards in place by December 2000, and a timeline was put together that would get us to that point where we would have this completed by December 2000. The reason we wanted that additional time is first of all to allow Panel A and B to review these and also to have an opportunity to go for public comment. He thought it was extremely important that we have public comment.
- The court-appointed monitor, however, did not see it that way and gave us 65 days from June 22 to develop the standards and the framework and submit it to him. At this meeting, we have reworked the standards and included additional standards that deal with reading. We still would like to include some additional standards hopefully as this matures and moves along in math. The intent and the hope is that usually the court-appointed monitor give the plaintiffs and Chicago Public Schools a period of 30 to 40 days to respond to anything that we present. We are hoping that he does that again, and if he allows that to happen, then we would like to request of the monitor that we be allowed to put

MINUTES OF WORK STUDY SESSIONS

I AND II AND CLOSED SESSION

August 23, 2000

Page 7

this out for public comment and receive public comment in that 30-day period of time. We will have to wait and see what his feeling is about that.

- We have tried to put something together that was built on the work done by Panel A and B and try to make the standards applicable and realistic for teachers in the future. There is a great deal of concern and misinformation that probably is circulating in the field. During this whole time, the joint resolution was passed by the General Assembly that said that we would study this. We have the General Assembly who is studying this issue, and we also have a federal court judge that is telling us to move this ahead rather rapidly. We want to try to be able to be sensitive to the needs of both the federal court and also our own state lawmakers. We feel that it is extremely important to be communicating with them and letting them know specifically what is happening.

The Chairman asked if we did not have the request from the monitor, how would we have handled the revision in these standards. Dr. Riffel responded that if we had not had the pressure from the monitor, we felt that we had till January 1, 2003, to get everything done, including this.

Chairman Gidwitz asked what would the process have been on this particular area. Dr. Riffel responded that we would have asked and would have followed probably the timeline that we would have something to the court monitor by December 2000.

The Chairman asked if something would have happened in between now and December. Dr. Riffel said "yes." He indicated that we would have taken the standards that we had designed and shared that with Panel A and B -- the panels that originally worked on that. He noted that we would also have probably had at least three to six public comment periods in that period of time between now and December. Dr. Riffel commented that we felt that it also pretty well paralleled what the General Assembly in their joint resolution was doing too. He thought they were supposed to have a report back in January 2001, and this would provide additional information for them.

Chairman Gidwitz asked why we would not want to have a public comment now. Dr. Riffel responded that the difficulty of having a public comment period now is the fact that we have to have these submitted by August 25. The Chairman noted that he understood that, and he would like to know what people think about them. Dr. Riffel agreed. Chairman Gidwitz indicated that it seemed to him that certainly the monitor and the federal judge will articulate an opinion -- good, bad, or indifferent -- we certainly all individually have opinions as to pieces of this, but it would also be nice to know what other people think about it and might even be helpful as the judge makes up his mind in finality. He did not know what the lawyers think about it. He asked if that would be construed as an unfriendly act.

MINUTES OF WORK STUDY SESSIONS

I AND II AND CLOSED SESSION

August 23, 2000

Page 8

General Counsel Res Vazquez indicated that as long as we are the ones who are soliciting the information as opposed to having them sent to the judge, because he thought that may have been irritating to the judge in the past -- that public comments were being forwarded to him.

Mrs. McConachie commented that she thought public comment should not be structured in the first place; and in the second place, it seems to her that we are taking a somewhat subpoenaed role that is not warranted in this case. She indicated that we should be taking a leadership role -- collecting information, developing the best things that we can, and continuing to advise the judge and the monitor of what we are learning as we go along. She noted that it would seem that would be valued.

Superintendent McGee reported that his experience with the monitor and the LRE policy was very positive as we did develop that and came to some resolution over time. He noted that he did like the idea of putting these out for public comment and taking it back to the monitor -- what we get periodically.

The Chairman suggested that we tell the monitor what we are doing.

Ms. Pellegrino asked when the date was set for arguing our response. The response was the court appearance is on August 29 at 11:00 a.m.

Chairman Gidwitz asked why we do not solicit comments from those people who sent e-mails to the people we know have an interest -- there is a long list -- and ask them if they can get comments back to us quickly. He suggested that we keep the comment period open for 30 days or so, but anything we receive before August 29, if we deem appropriate, we would make testimony and submit it to the monitor and requested to move on to the discussion of the certification framework.

Dr. Riffel talked about the two frameworks -- Learning Behavioral Specialist I and II. Learning Behavioral Specialist I would primarily be the entry level position and this would be cross-categorical. In working with the individuals from the state universities, many of them are already training cross-categorical at the current time and feel that they will be able to meet the requirements of training teachers across categories. We also want to remind the Board that we will be maintaining the continuum of services, and if indeed a child needs a more structured program, that that program has to be provided to that student based on the IEP.

In response to Dr. Hill's inquiry, Dr. Riffel indicated that the definitions for the Learning Behavioral Specialist I and II were included in the Board packet. He noted that this was one of those situations that we feel like that it describes briefly what it is as far as LBS I. He noted that the court monitor and plaintiffs may have some additional comment regarding that. Dr. Riffel commented that the LBS I

MINUTES OF WORK STUDY SESSIONS

I AND II AND CLOSED SESSION

August 23, 2000

Page 9

would be a K-12 certificate, so there would not be elementary and secondary certification. He noted that the LBS II is a certificate that is designed to enhance skills, primarily in areas like transition and technology. He indicated that it would also be a certificate that a person who is teaching the visually impaired would receive or multiple disabilities would require perhaps some additional coursework to get that accomplished. Dr. Riffel reported that there was a lot of question as to what will happen to people in the field as far as how their certification will transfer and that is still part of what we have to discuss and talk about as far as rules and regulations. He indicated that there were also questions from the speech and language pathologists as to how they are going to be certified. He noted that staff member Jodi Fleck could address questions on that issue.

Mrs. McConachie commented that she just needed to have clear in her mind whether or not we have collapsed the categories that the Board approved on March 16 -- there being five at the top of the page and three in the middle of the page. She noted that this brought to mind a question that she received from a constituent -- does a person who is going to specialize in deaf and hearing impaired first complete all requirements for LBS I and then go on to specialize in deaf and hard of hearing or is there already a framework for deaf and hard of hearing that we will be using.

Staff member Cindy Terry called the Board members' attention to page 5 of the standards and reviewed the chart with them.

- Starting at the top right-hand side, Illinois Teaching Standards are standards that anyone getting a teaching certificate in Illinois has to meet and they include language arts and technology -- and they will also include special ed content knowledge.
- After you have met those common standards, then if you are going to get one of the three designations (LBS, deaf/hard of hearing, or blind/visually impaired), you have to meet the special ed common core standards.
- They will come back to early childhood.
- Let's say you have met the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards and the special ed common core standards. That will get you down to the next level so that you will make a choice and meet the standards for either a LBS I or deaf/hard of hearing or blind/visually impaired.

Dr. Hill asked that in the process of becoming a supervisor for special education, what must a supervisor have in order to become a supervisor -- do they have to go to the LBS II level or is it all together different. The response was that it is different. Dr. Terry indicated that the LBS II is strictly optional -- it is for people who may want to move up on the pay scale, may want to direct their professional development plans that way, or just may want to go to a perspective employer with

MINUTES OF WORK STUDY SESSIONS

I AND II AND CLOSED SESSION

August 23, 2000

Page 10

a leg-up saying I want to teach emotionally disturbed kids and I also have an LBS II in behavior intervention.

Dr. Hill asked what it required with regard to background to get a supervisory certificate for special education. Dr. Terry reported that those are under development right now through Mike Long's division in the total administration package. He has a panel that is working on administration for special education, and they are looking at director of special ed, supervisor, coordinator, etc. Dr. Hill commented that he would assume that they would have to have some of the components of this in order to qualify. Dr. Terry responded that you would think so, and one of the documents that she knows that they have used is the set of standards that was developed by the Special Education Leadership Academy two years that does reflect a background in certification in special education.

Mrs. Rogers would like to clarify for Mrs. McConachie's and Dr. Hill's questions, the LBS II development here is different than it was last spring. Dr. Terry responded that it did not have any definition to it. Mrs. Rogers commented that she did not see it last spring as tied to the deaf and visually impaired, and now it is. Dr. Terry commented that we have in that one of the options that you can go for is for instance, deaf/blind and we have standards from the Perkins Institute that relate to just deaf/blind studies and that might be something that somebody might want to pursue that would have a deaf/hard of hearing or blind/visually impaired. Mrs. Rogers noted that as she saw it in the spring, she did not see that the deaf/hard of hearing standards they have that certificate, they could have gone on and got the LBS II. Dr. Terry responded "right," and now they can. Mrs. Rogers commented that it is too bad that we do not change that definition from LBS II, because it is really a different classification -- it is really included in that would be your blind and visual, so she saw the LBS II encompassing what she called the LBS I, the deaf and whatever. She noted that to her that is really a whole different definition, but she did not have a name. She indicated that once she understood that and how it is working, she liked it a lot better than what she saw in the spring, but she really thought we needed to have a different name. Mrs. Rogers commented that the reason is that it is more than the LBS I, and when you hear LBS II, it looks like you are just progressing in that avenue and that is not it.

Dr. Hill indicated that when you get to the LBS II, then you have all of these options, but LBS I is limited basically to what the definition is with regard to serving kids (page 2-23). He noted that LBS I and LBS II are certainly very much different with regard to what you can do with the LBS II, so it would seem to him that the LBS II should have some sort of a different name just to disassociate itself with LBS I. Because it seems to him that if you say LBS I and LBS II you have to move from LBS I to LBS II, and the way he understood this if you have a certificate for deaf/hard of hearing standards and blind/visually, you can go to LBS II without going to LBS I. Dr. Terry noted that if you look at the way the chart is laid out, you

MINUTES OF WORK STUDY SESSIONS

I AND II AND CLOSED SESSION

August 23, 2000

Page 11

have any one of those three designations on your certificate and then you specialize in one of the seven domains. Dr. Hill noted that maybe it would not be that big of a problem for special education teachers to differentiate, but it seems confusing because you would think it would be a stair-stepping process.

Mrs. McConachie commented that probably not much could be done in the next two days, but she would have to agree that over the longer term, we need to think about -- because conceptually it is changed enough that maybe having the same labels is not workable any more. She asked that this issue be considered over the longer term. The Superintendent responded that his initial reaction is that it is a good idea.

Dr. Terry reported that there has been much discussion on this issue, and it is just very difficult to try to capture what you are trying to say into a term that everyone agrees with.

Dr. Hill commented that if you are asking for input, that may be an input item and then we go back to the monitor and say here is something that may describe this better and add some clarity to this whole matter.

Dr. Riffel noted that he thought this was a good idea, and the other thing that may happen if the Board is having some question about that, he was sure that the plaintiffs may also -- which would open it up even a little bit more.

Mrs. Rogers suggested that changing the title of the LBS II would help any concerns teachers might have.

An audio tape of the meeting is available through the State Board office in Springfield (217/782-9560).

The meeting recessed at 2:25 p.m. and reconvened at 2:45 p.m.

Agenda Item F.

The Chairman called for Agenda Item F., Virtual High School/Advanced Placement.

Chairman Gidwitz indicated that during the final segment of this Work Study Session, the Board would be discussing the progress made to date on planning and implementing a Virtual High School. He noted that a major project of the Joint Education Committee, this effort is getting widespread attention from all partners and stakeholders.

Superintendent McGee commented that there is no question that development of the Virtual High School would move fast with this attention. He reported that during the next 45 minutes, he would like to ask Deputy Superintendent Mary

MINUTES OF WORK STUDY SESSIONS

I AND II AND CLOSED SESSION

August 23, 2000

Page 12

Jayne Broncato and Division Administrator Brad Woodruff to share some of the key policy questions that we will begin to address at this meeting and on August 24. He noted that on August 24, he would be recommending that the Board adopts a series of policy positions and directives to staff.

Dr. Broncato and Dr. Woodruff provided a power-point presentation on the Virtual High School and gave a brief overview of the advanced placement policy and its origin. They then responded to Board members' questions for clarification purposes.

An audio tape of the meeting is available through the State Board office in Springfield (217/782-9560).

Closed Session

Chairman Gidwitz called for a motion to go into closed session.

Motion

Mrs. Rogers moved that "the State Board of Education go into closed session under the exceptions set forth in the Open Meetings Act of the State of Illinois as follows:

- Section 2 (c) (1) for the purpose of discussing information regarding appointment, employment, or dismissal of an employee,
- Section 2 (c) (11) for the purpose of discussing litigation, and
- Section 2 (c) (15) for the purpose of discussing advisory body's advice concerning the screening of secured test items.

She further moved that Superintendent M^CGee be included in this meeting and that the Board be authorized to invite anyone else into the meeting as needed."

Dr. Hill seconded the motion.

Vote on Motion

The Chairman called for a roll call vote on the motion. The motion passed with the following votes recorded.

Ms. Branch - yes

Mrs. McConachie - yes

Mrs. Rogers - yes

Mr. Gidwitz - yes

Ms. Pellegrino - yes

Dr. Steiner - yes

Dr. Hill - yes

The meeting recessed at 4:25 p.m. and went into closed session at 4:35 p.m. The closed session recessed at 5:50 p.m. and reconvened at 6:15 p.m.

Adjournment The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 9:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

MINUTES OF WORK STUDY SESSIONS

I AND II AND CLOSED SESSION

August 23, 2000

Page 13

Marilyn McConachie, Secretary

Sandra M. Pellegrino, Vice Chair

Ronald J. Gidwitz, Chairman

**MINUTES OF THE WORK STUDY SESSION III
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING**

Crowne Plaza
Springfield, Illinois
August 24, 2000

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ronald J. Gidwitz
Marjorie Branch*
William E. Hill

Marilyn McConachie
Sandra M. Pellegrino

Connie Rogers
Janet Steiner

Glenn W. "Max" M^CGee, State Superintendent of Education

MEMBERS ABSENT:

David P. Gomez, Vincent J. Serritella

Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 8:10 a.m. by the Chairman, Mr. Gidwitz, who asked Judy Carmody, the staff secretary to the Board, to call the roll. Mrs. Carmody called the roll of members. A quorum was present. (*Ms. Branch is a newly appointed Board member.)

Agenda
Item B.

The Chairman called for Agenda Item B., Funds for Education from the Illinois Portion of the Tobacco Settlement.

Chairman Gidwitz indicated that during the next 30 minutes, the Board would review the implementation of the Tobacco Prevention Education funding received as a result of the Tobacco Settlement Master Agreement. He reported that this year, \$10 million was received from the General Assembly to provide Tobacco Prevention Education Programs. He noted that as a result, the State Board is participating in a statewide partnership to educate early adolescents about tobacco resistance.

Superintendent M^CGee reported that we have heard a lot about the use of the tobacco settlement funds. He indicated that we are aligning our efforts with Governor Ryan's "Futures for Kids" initiative, and it appears to be working very well. He asked Deputy Superintendent Mary Jayne Broncato and Division Administrator Xavier Botana to comment on the issue.

Dr. Broncato and Mr. Botana presented the highlights of the issue.

An audio tape of the meeting is available through the State Board office in Springfield (217/782-9560).

MINUTES OF WORK STUDY SESSION III

August 24, 2000

Page 2

Agenda

Item C.

The Chairman called for Agenda Item C., Board Priority Reports.

Superintendent M^CGee gave a presentation on the Board Priority Reports for reading; math; system of support; standards, assessment and accountability; and teacher quality.

There were two short videos on reading, and the Superintendent provided an overhead on some of the important features of the reading kits.

An audio tape of the meeting is available through the State Board office in Springfield (217/782-9560).

Agenda

Item D.

The Chairman called for Agenda Item D., Federal Legislative Update.

Gail Lieberman, Director of the Federal Relations Office, provided an update on federal legislation.

An audio tape of the meeting is available through the State Board office in Springfield (217/782-9560).

Adjournment The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 9:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn McConachie, Secretary

Ronald J. Gidwitz, Chairman

**MINUTES OF THE PLENARY BUSINESS MEETING
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING**

Crowne Plaza
Springfield, Illinois
August 24, 2000

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ronald J. Gidwitz
Marjorie Branch*
William E. Hill

Marilyn McConachie
Sandra M. Pellegrino

Connie Rogers
Janet Steiner

Glenn W. "Max" McGee, State Superintendent of Education

MEMBERS ABSENT:

David P. Gomez, Vincent J. Serritella

Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 9:45 a.m. by the Chairman, Mr. Gidwitz, who asked Judy Carmody, the staff secretary to the Board, to call the roll. Mrs. Carmody called the roll of members. A quorum was present. (*Ms. Branch is a newly appointed Board member.)

Chairman Gidwitz indicated that Mr. Gomez and Mr. Serritella were absent from the meeting due to prior business commitments.

Approval of Minutes

Dr. Hill moved that "the State Board of Education hereby approves the minutes of the June 15-17, 2000, meetings of the State Board. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Rogers, and it was passed by a unanimous voice vote.

Agenda Item C.

The Chairman called for Agenda Item C., Public Participation. The following individuals spoke to the Board.

Jim Guilinger, representing the Illinois Leadership Council for Agriculture Education, indicated that the funds which come in the agriculture education line item have been used to develop entirely new CD-ROM curriculum in agricultural. He distributed the latest CD-ROM to the Board members addressing horticultural education in Illinois, and it was also issued to every agricultural teacher in Illinois. He noted that it is cross-referenced to all of the learning standards as well as all of the skills standards developed for that particular industry.

Mr. Guilinger reported that the Illinois Committee for Agricultural Education, which is an advisory group to the State Board, prepared a proposed budget for FY 2001 and presented it to the staff of the State Board. He indicated that they are requesting a \$1 million increase in the line item, which would total \$3 million for the coming year. He noted that the bulk of those funds are aimed at the final completion of all agricultural education curriculum by next year that would

MINUTES OF PLENARY BUSINESS MEETING

August 24, 2000

Page 2

encompass about 8,000 separate lesson plans -- all CD-ROMs with test scores, etc. Mr. Guilinger reported that other initiatives included in those funds are additional upgrading of teacher in-service at both the elementary and secondary levels addressing agricultural literacy and also to do studies on what has been accomplished at this point with the initiatives.

Mr. Guilinger indicated that he would be back in September asking for the support of the State Board for this concept, and he would then go the legislature to work on the \$3 million line item in concert with the State Board.

Chairman Gidwitz responded that the Board members would be happy to take a look at this initiative.

Laura Arterburn, on behalf of the Illinois Federation of Teachers, applauded the move forward in so many different directions with all the discussions on August 23, especially in movement toward the mentoring program. She noted that she served on the Committee and Task Force. Ms. Arterburn indicated that they encouraged that the program be made very strong and worthwhile. She noted that we need to make sure that we also give the teachers some time to teach.

Ms. Arterburn commented that regarding Learning Behavior Specialist I, it is not an entry-level certification and is a Type 10 certificate in much the same way as a teacher of deaf/hard of hearing or blind/visually impaired. She noted that this could be as far as a teacher opts to go. She asked that the State Board not put this out to potential or current teachers that this is strictly entry-level -- it is a full teaching certificate.

Ms. Arterburn asked that the Board gives consideration to the movement with the speech-language pathologists' certificate to make it a Type 73 for all of those who earn them in the future, as she understood the way it was drafted. She indicated that they would like to see that be optional -- that teachers could be Type 73 if they so choose or Type 10. She noted that this may be something to leave up to the teachers, as we are leaving it up to the current teachers.

Ms. Arterburn expressed appreciation for the comments from Dr. Hill and Ms. Branch on August 23 regarding the Virtual High School. She noted that it is a good concept in many ways, but we need to make sure that we do have the qualified teachers teaching these classes. She urged that we move forward with all due caution.

Sharon Foster, the vice president-elect for professional affairs of the Illinois Speech-Language-Hearing Association, spoke to the Board regarding the consideration of the Type 73 for practicing speech-language pathologists (SLP) and for those who graduate after 2003. She indicated that with this vote later in the meeting, the State Board actually has the opportunity to change some of the dialogue that has been going on in the state for many years. She noted that the

MINUTES OF PLENARY BUSINESS MEETING

August 24, 2000

Page 3

dialogue always begins with "I don't see why we can't have a Type 73," and it ends with "We should have it."

Ms. Foster commented that the State Board would also be recognizing a national precedent in which at least 19 other states already recognize a credential other than a teaching certificate -- either a pupil personnel support credential or a professional license for employment in the public schools. She indicated that this would help people who move in from out of state to more reasonably gain access to a credential for public schools and help to possibly fill shortages in some of the populated areas. She noted that this could also help in teaching preparation or in SLP preparation by allowing students to choose classes that may help them to meet the challenges of their eventual work places.

Ms. Foster indicated that with the Board's vote later in the meeting, it would set challenges for them. She noted that there is a great need for information about what the changes will mean and what they will not mean, and they need to be able to assure their constituents that they will still be able to fill the many varied roles that they already fill. Ms. Foster commented that even with the Type 73 certificate, the team teaching opportunities remain with them for those collaborative and creative partnerships. She indicated that they look forward to working with the State Board in disseminating information to their constituents throughout the state.

Agenda Item D.1.

The Chairman called for Agenda Item D.1., Items for Immediate Action, Teacher Certification Structure -- Social Science.

Superintendent McGee reported that on August 23, Division Administrator Michael Long reviewed the activity that has occurred since June in an examination of the social science endorsement and the need for a designation. This included:

- A review of the 29 social science endorsement standards and the social science learning standards for students; and
- Reconvening selected members of the original Content Area Standards Panel joined by other social science educators.

The Superintendent indicated that the results of these two efforts led to recommend that the State Board:

1. Recommit to a required endorsement of social science;
2. Adopt the proposed social science designations -- economics, history, geography, political science, psychology, and/or sociology/anthropology -- and their respective standards; and
3. Require that teachers with a social science endorsement develop depth of knowledge in at least one of the social science disciplines and meet the standards for that designation.

MINUTES OF PLENARY BUSINESS MEETING

August 24, 2000

Page 4

Motion

Dr. Hill moved that "the State Board of Education hereby adopts the recommendation to recommit to:

- A required social science endorsement as the foundation certification for all social science teachers;
- To adopt the proposed social science designations of economics, history, geography, political science, psychology and/or sociology/anthropology -- and their respective standards; and
- To require that teachers with a social science endorsement develop depth of knowledge in at least one of the social science disciplines and meet the standards for that designation."

Mrs. McConachie seconded the motion.

Vote on Motion

The motion passed by a unanimous voice vote.

Agenda Item D.2.

The Chairman called for Agenda Item D.2., Items for Immediate Action, Special Education Certification Structure and Standards.

Superintendent M^CGee reported that on August 23, Deputy Superintendent Gordon Riffel and his staff reviewed the timeline and history associated with the certification structure and teacher standards. He recommended that the State Board approves the certification structure and the special education content standards as recommended by the State Teacher Certification Board. He noted that this includes the modified speech-language pathologist certification as follows.

- Speech language pathology students graduating from an Illinois training institution after January 1, 2003, will be required to hold a Type 73 School Service Personnel Certificate endorsed in speech-language pathology.

Motion

Mrs. McConachie moved that "the State Board of Education hereby approves the Special Education Certification Structure and the Teacher Content Standards as presented and as recommended by the State Teacher Certification Board. This includes the modified speech-language pathologist certification as follows:

- Speech-language pathology students graduating from an Illinois institution after January 1, 2003, will be required to hold a Type 73 School Service Personnel Certificate endorsed in speech-language pathology for Illinois certification.
- Speech-language pathologists renewing their certificates have the option of retaining their current Type 10/Type 03 and Type 09 teaching certificates or exchanging them for the Type 73 School Service Personnel Certificate."

MINUTES OF PLENARY BUSINESS MEETING

August 24, 2000

Page 5

Dr. Hill seconded the motion.

Chairman Gidwitz indicated that he would like to get the question answered that was asked by Ms. Arterburn: "Why can't the teachers have an option after 2003 -- either a Type 10 or Type 73"?

Deputy Superintendent Gordon Riffel indicated that in order for them to meet the Type 10 requirements, they would also have to meet all of the requirements of a teacher, in addition to that of a speech and language pathologist. He noted so they would not only have to be a speech and language pathologist, but they would also have to be a certified teacher to meet that Type 10 requirement.

Dr. Riffel indicated that they still could have that option -- they could still be trained as a teacher and they can acquire a Type 10 certificate and then go on because speech and language pathologists are trained at the masters level. He noted that they could go ahead and get their additional training and hold both if they chose to do that.

Chairman Gidwitz asked Laura Arterburn what he was missing here.

Ms. Arterburn indicated that if that is the case, it would not be both. She noted that they just had a number of members who were very concerned that they would be certified in the Type 73 and not be able to get a teaching certificate as an individual teacher with a license.

The Chairman indicated that his understanding is that we do not have enough speech and language pathologists at the moment, and rather than limit ourselves to speech and language pathologists which are also teacher certified, we wanted to broaden the group.

Ms. Arterburn commented that that is why they said to just make it an option.

Dr. Riffel responded that it is an option. Chairman Gidwitz indicated that effectively it is an option. Ms. Arterburn noted that, yes -- with additional training, it is an option.

Sharon Foster indicated that one of the things we were just discussing is that the current proposal really doesn't make changes for those people who are already practicing. She noted that one of the criticisms about speech pathologists is that in the classrooms we are truly not trained to be teachers; we don't have that educational preparation. She commented that we do have a lot of skills to benefit students within the classrooms, and sometimes those skills are the most beneficial.

The Chairman commented that he guessed there were some nuances here he was not following. He indicated that he understood we are grandfathering people

MINUTES OF PLENARY BUSINESS MEETING

August 24, 2000

Page 6

into the profession now who are teaching without probably having sufficient credentials. He noted that they have the credential -- but they may not have the skill set, because they were not trained originally as teachers.

Ms. Foster commented that they learned it on the job. Chairman Gidwitz responded right -- they are grandfathered in, so future teachers either have the option of working to get a teaching certificate and speech and language pathology Type 73 or Type 73 and only be performing their function as a speech and language pathologist. He asked that those people who are grandfathered, is there something she suggests that we do about that. She responded "no."

Ms. Arterburn indicated that she thought what we were just saying is that just with a Type 73, a person cannot go in and be an individual classroom teacher. She noted that it has to be in some sort of a team teaching mode. She commented that a person can go back for additional work, but it puts that person through extra work. The Chairman commented that he thought the reality quite frankly is that we are so short of teachers of all kinds, that anybody in the school is going to get extra duty.

Division Administrator Mike Long reported that a survey of all the certified speech-language pathologists in the state had been conducted, and among the things we found, there were fewer than 40 speech-language pathologists in the classroom as teachers. He indicated that the overwhelming majority of them were serving in a different capacity -- not in a classroom capacity. He noted that we also learned in that survey that well over 80 percent of those that responded indicated that they would prefer the Type 73 certificate over a Type 03, 09, or Type 10, so respective from the field based on that, it suggests that the speech-language pathologists are more interested in School Service Personnel certificate endorsement rather than teaching.

Mr. Long commented that if the Board chooses to extend the option to after 2003, which is not in the motion, then we would make certain that those who choose a teaching route are aware of the fact that they are going to have to meet teaching standards and the associated core standards that are required of all other teachers.

Chairman Gidwitz responded that is what we want, so he did not think there was any objection. He commented that we all seem to be in agreement.

Mrs. Rogers asked that her following statement be made a part of the record.

"I will vote for the proposed special education certification structure and standards, because I believe these are sound proposals.

However, I would like to put into the record my concern about the name of one certificate designation -- Learning Behavior Specialist II.

MINUTES OF PLENARY BUSINESS MEETING

August 24, 2000

Page 7

When the State Board adopted the proposed special education certification structure in March 2000, it was with the stipulation that the Learning Behavior Specialist I and Learning Behavior Specialist II designations would be further defined.

At that time, the LBS II designation was described as an optional, advanced designation building on the LBS I designation.

Consistent with the Board direction and the parameters subsequently set by the Court, State Board staff have worked with educational representatives to develop more specificity to the special education certification structure.

I believe the refined proposal is a good one, and I particularly like the skill concentrations identified for the LBS II designation.

I also like the fact that this optional, advanced designation of LBS II would now be available to teachers of students who are blind or visually handicapped and deaf or hard of hearing, as well as to LBS I teachers, as was originally proposed.

However, I am concerned that the title 'Learning Behavior Specialist II' is inaccurate in light of the additional clarification this designation does not exclusively build on or enhance the knowledge and skills specific to the LBS I designation. Instead, it reflects advanced training in specific skill areas that can be attained by holders of any one of three other designations (i.e., LBS I, Deaf/Hard of Hearing, and Blind/Visually Impaired).

I believe that the recommended certification structure would be better understood if the LBS II title was changed to something more encompassing, such as 'Special Education Advanced Skills' or 'S.E.A.S.'

In this way, a teacher of the blind and visually handicapped might hold the following certification:

Type 10 -- Special Education,
Blind and Visually Handicapped, and
S.E.A.S. Concentration in Behavioral Intervention."

Vote on
Motion

The motion passed by a unanimous voice vote.

Agenda
Item D.3.

The Chairman called for Agenda Item D.3., Items for Immediate Action, Virtual High School/Advanced Placement.

MINUTES OF PLENARY BUSINESS MEETING

August 24, 2000

Page 8

Superintendent M^CGee reported that on August 23, a variety of policy issues were discussed relating to the Virtual High School and its direction. He indicated that as a result of that discussion, he modified some of the recommendations in the packet, notable when it is related to teacher certification issues. He noted that he thought it was important to continue to report on the progress every month and that we continue to work closely with the Joint Education Committee (JEC) as we develop and move toward rapid implementation of this new initiative.

The Superintendent commented that he thought we all agreed that there is potential for enormous success, but there are also some pitfalls which we need to be sure we do not step into. He thanked Deputy Superintendent Mary Jayne Broncato and Division Administrator Brad Woodruff for their continued leadership in this issue. He also thanked Mrs. McConachie and Chairman Gidwitz for their work on the JEC in moving this ahead as a collaborative effort.

Motion

Mrs. Rogers moved that "the State Board of Education hereby adopts the following policies as the framework for actions to establish the Illinois Virtual High School.

- The mission of the Illinois Virtual High School is to use new and emerging technologies that expand the boundaries of space and time to provide Illinois students and their teachers with increased equity and access to the highest quality educational opportunities.
- The Illinois Virtual High School (IVHS) should be designed to serve three primary purposes:
 1. Assure equitable access to rich and varied learning opportunities for Illinois students, with emphasis on curricular areas needed to ensure that all students can meet the Illinois Learning Standards and succeed in higher education and the workplace;
 2. Expand high-quality professional development opportunities for Illinois teachers and other educators; and
 3. Support schools in integrating technology into teaching and learning.
- The IVHS should be designed to supplement and complement local efforts. It should not be a degree-granting high school.
- The IVHS should begin operation no later than January 2001 with programs and services phased-in to reflect ongoing assessment of needs and the availability of resources.
- All students should have access to the IVHS curriculum regardless of whether they attend public, private, or home schools. However, students must be registered through a local public school district.

MINUTES OF PLENARY BUSINESS MEETING

August 24, 2000

Page 9

- The curriculum of the IVHS should meet specified criteria and include both IVHS-designed courses and courses that are available through commercial or other sources. Partnerships and linkages should be developed to expand the resources and opportunities available to Illinois students.
- Teachers for IVHS courses should be well qualified in the subject or area in which they are teaching and have knowledge and skills specific to teaching on-line or through other technologies.
- The technology platform for the IVHS should meet identified criteria and provide technical assistance and support twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week.
- Funding for IVHS should come from multiple sources and meet standards of adequacy, sustainability, and legality.
- State funding requirements for local school districts (i.e., Average Daily Attendance) should be modified to ensure that school districts are not harmed by student participation in the IVHS.

State Board staff will provide monthly progress reports on the development of the IVHS and present policy, legislative, and budget recommendations as additional decisions are needed."

Mrs. McConachie seconded the motion. She indicated that we did agree to revisit the question of qualifications for instructors for the Illinois Virtual High School. She noted that the original policy statement, which the Board saw on August 23, was more restrictive than current Illinois law on distance learning, so she thought this was an appropriate modification. She reported that the goal is to ensure rigorous and effective instruction through this system, and the cautions advised by Laura Arterburn earlier that day were right on target.

Mrs. McConachie reported that nationally, the dropout rate for students in distance learning programs at both the university and school levels is extremely high -- it is over 50 percent in many cases. She indicated that it is incumbent upon us to ensure that the instruction is high quality but that students succeed. She noted that the standards that Dr. Woodruff talked to the Board about on August 23 would ensure that kind of effectiveness, but the Board members do need to track the development of those policies and ensure that this works as well as they want it to.

Vote on Motion

The motion passed by a voice vote. Ms. Branch voted "no," and Ms. Pellegrino abstained.

MINUTES OF PLENARY BUSINESS MEETING

August 24, 2000

Page 10

The Superintendent indicated that as we discussed on August 23, we are asking for a policy statement that is directly related to a federal grant. He commented that we are very excited about expanding opportunities for boys and girls to participate in advanced placement classes and coursework.

Motion

Mrs. Rogers moved that "the State Board of Education hereby adopts the following policy statement.

'The State Board of Education is committed to the proposition that equitable access to advanced placement courses by all Illinois secondary school students is essential to meeting the state goal of preparing all students to succeed in college and the workplace. Therefore, the goal of the State Board of Education will be to ensure availability of and access to advanced placement courses for all Illinois high schools and all Illinois high school students.'

Mrs. McConachie seconded the motion.

Vote on

Motion

The motion passed by a unanimous voice vote.

Agenda
Item D.4.

The Chairman called for Agenda Item D.4., Items for Immediate Action, Chicago Public School District #299 -- Supplemental General State Aid Plan (SGSA).

Superintendent M^CGee reported that each year we approve the Chicago School District #299 plan for use of their Supplemental General State Aid. He introduced Division Administrator Don Full of the Accountability Division.

Dr. Full introduced staff member Dan Payne, and they provided a brief explanation of why the State Board is doing this. The Superintendent and staff then responded to Board members' questions for clarification purposes.

Motion

Dr. Steiner moved that "the State Board of Education hereby adopts the following resolution.

'Whereas the FY01 Chicago Plan for the sub allocation of Supplemental General State Aid, in compliance with Section 18-8.05 (H) of the Illinois School Code, meets the criteria for approval (except for those schools without Plans approved by the Local School Councils and the Chicago School Reform Board of Trustees), the State Board of Education hereby approves that Plan and authorizes the distribution of \$261,000,000 to be used by the individual schools in Chicago Public School District #299 in accordance with the requirements of Section 18-8.05 (H). Of the \$261,000,000 to be distributed, \$207,183,296 shall be allocated from the Supplemental General State Aid Grant for FY00 and the remaining \$53,816,704 shall come from the General State Aid funds. The State Board of Education also

MINUTES OF PLENARY BUSINESS MEETING

August 24, 2000

Page 11

directs that a letter be sent to the Chicago School Reform Board of School Trustees noting the approval and indicating that no monies may be allocated to individual schools until those schools each have an approved Plan in place."

Dr. Hill seconded the motion.

Vote on
Motion

The motion passed by a unanimous voice vote.

An audio tape of the meeting is available through the State Board office in Springfield (217/782-9560).

Agenda
Item D.5.

The Chairman called for Agenda Item D.5., Items for Immediate Action, Resolution -- Organ Donor Awareness Education.

Chairman Gidwitz indicated that Representative Mary Lou Cowlshaw had planned to be present for this item, but unfortunately, she had an emergency that prevented her participation. He introduced Bill Hector, a Milken award winner for this year, and during the June Board meeting, Mr. Hector participated in the public comment period and requested that the Board consider adopting a resolution on donor awareness education.

Mr. Hector reported that he has been a teacher for 31 years and he is also a kidney/pancreas transplant recipient. He commented that the experience changed his life, and for the last two years, he has been pushing for transplant education in every high school in Illinois. He indicated that he believed it is a goal that is imminently possible through teacher training.

Mr. Hector reported that the Regional Organ Bank of Illinois has budgeted \$15,000 for a series of statewide workshops to training teachers to properly handle this subject, and the Secretary of State's Office has also pledged part of its budget to provide materials. He indicated that the Regional Offices of Education have currently set up seven statewide workshops, and they are hoping to increase that number this year. He commented that this resolution would help in this effort.

Superintendent M^CGee indicated that through conversations between staff and Mr. Hector, some minor modifications have been made, and he recommended that the Board adopts the resolution.

Motion

Dr. Hill moved that "the State Board of Education hereby adopts the resolution in support of Organ Donor Awareness Education.

'Whereas, there are currently over 70,000 people on the national donor waiting list; and

Whereas, over 4,000 of those people reside in the State of Illinois; and

MINUTES OF PLENARY BUSINESS MEETING

August 24, 2000

Page 12

Whereas, over 1,400 of those are children; and

Whereas, in 1998, the General Assembly and Governor passed Public Act 90-635, an act to promote donor awareness education in every high school in Illinois; and

Whereas, every transplant organization in the State of Illinois, the Regional Offices of Education throughout Illinois, and the Illinois Secretary of State's Office have all pledged their support towards the implementation of this act;

Be it resolved that the Illinois State Board of Education and the State Superintendent of Education endorse and support donor awareness education."

Mrs. McConachie seconded the motion.

Vote on
Motion

The motion passed by a unanimous voice vote.

Agenda
Item D.6.

The Chairman called for Agenda Item D.6., Items for Immediate Action, Board Expenditures.

Chairman Gidwitz asked Mrs. Rogers to comment on the Board members' expenditures.

Mrs. Rogers reported that she had surveyed in detail all of the Board members' expenses, and she also reviewed the Superintendent's expenses. She indicated that she found them all in order.

Motion

Mrs. Rogers moved that "the State Board of Education hereby approves the quarterly travel expenditures of the State Board members. (A copy of the report is on file in the State Board office in Springfield.)"

Mrs. McConachie seconded the motion.

Chairman Gidwitz asked the Superintendent what the rule is regarding where he spends his time. Superintendent McGee responded that 51 percent annually has to be spent in his headquarters -- which is Springfield. The Chairman asked how he was doing on that, and the Superintendent responded that he spent over 51 percent in Springfield.

Vote on
Motion

The Chairman called for a roll call vote on the motion. The motion passed with the following votes recorded.

Ms. Branch - yes

Mrs. McConachie - yes

Mrs. Rogers - yes

MINUTES OF PLENARY BUSINESS MEETING

August 24, 2000

Page 13

Mr. Gidwitz - yes
Dr. Hill - yes

Ms. Pellegrino - yes

Dr. Steiner - yes

Agenda Item E.1.

The Chairman called for Agenda Item E.1., Announcements and Reports, Chairman.

Chairman Gidwitz reported that on July 18, the JEC Committee met, and he briefly highlighted the items that were covered. He indicated that a copy of the minutes is available to anyone who wants to see them (through the State Board office in Springfield -- 217/782-9560). Following are the items the Chairman highlighted.

- The work product of the Illinois Virtual High School was essentially reviewed on August 23 by the State Board and voted on earlier in the meeting.
- In regard to higher education more than the State Board directly and the Title II report card to the Department of Education, it was mentioned that only about 65 percent of the 55 teacher education institutions have appointed a Title II report card coordinator for compliance. This is federal regulation. That information needs to be generated quickly, so there is concern that we get the educational institutions in the state to understand what the federal government is looking for and get them moving on it.
- A preliminary research budget and agenda which was financed through a HECA grant to S.I.U.-E was discussed. An offer for a research director for the JEC will be made.
- The JEC discussed dual credit which the Board talked a little bit about on August 23 and will be talking about it significantly more in the future.
- The JEC talked about teacher quality issues, about a conference of P-16 that Lynne Haeffele and Keith Sanders attended, about the JEC preliminary legislative agenda, about a little unified workforce development plan that was principally driven by the Community College Board, and about updating the vocational rehabilitation interagency agreement.

Mrs. McConachie reported that she and Mrs. Rogers attended a number of the meetings of the Joint Subcommittee for Certificate Renewal, which was appointed by the State Board to work with the Teacher Certification Board to implement the teacher certificate renewal program. She indicated that starting in January 2001, we are launching a major change in the way that teachers get their certificates renewed, and it requires extensive professional development. She noted that it is a very complex process, and getting it off the ground has been a challenge.

Mrs. McConachie distributed a report on the work of this Subcommittee (see Addendum II). She indicated that basically, they have reviewed four drafts of the certification manual, and it will go to press the first week of September. She noted that the manual explains the roles and responsibilities of each of the parties in the renewal process. Mrs. McConachie reported that it has been disseminated to the field, and they have received some feedback, which has all been incorporated into the manual revisions. She indicated that they are putting in place as many pieces

MINUTES OF PLENARY BUSINESS MEETING

August 24, 2000

Page 14

as they can to help train and prepare people in the field for the certificate renewal work. She noted that there has been a tremendous amount of work done by Division Administrator Dennis Williams and staff to get this rolling.

Mrs. McConachie commented that there was one hang-up that she knows of in the way of getting the certificate manual published and into the hands of teachers by October 1, and that is the need for legal opinion. She noted that she believed the Superintendent knew about this, and she did not know if Chairman Gidwitz had been apprised of this matter. She indicated that they did not know whether the meetings of local professional development committees are subject to the Open Meetings Act or not. Mrs. McConachie reported that a request for an opinion went to the Attorney General's Office last January, and despite repeated requests, it is languished there.

In response to the Chairman's question, General Counsel Res Vazquez indicated that they made an inquiry to the Attorney General's Office this past week, and he was not given a definite date as to when and how soon they can get to it. Chairman Gidwitz asked Mr. Vazquez to follow up on this issue to find out why we cannot have an opinion by next week.

Mrs. McConachie indicated that regarding what to expect concerning teacher certificate renewal, by August 25 or 28, there should be new questions and answers available to all teachers on the website to help them get the information that they need. She reported that the certificate renewal manual goes to press September 8 and should be ready for dissemination on October 1. She noted that as the Superintendent has advised local superintendents, their local professional development committee needs to be in place and operational by November 1.

Mrs. McConachie commented the Kathy Nicholson-Tosh, Director of the Board Services Office, is arranging for Board members to have an opportunity to talk with local board presidents around the state to help them understand what their role is. She indicated that this has been a controversial process, especially with local administrators and boards, so a lot of training and discussion is needed in order to move it forward. She noted that there are some particular stress points and needs for resources.

- First of all, the local professional development committees are going to need training. There is no money in the law and no particular designation of who is responsible for doing that. The Subcommittee has talked about using technology in a variety of ways, but we need to pool resources with others who are interested in training these committees -- with the teachers associations, higher education, Regional Offices, etc. This is the next challenge for the process -- to help those committees be training to do their jobs well. They need to be very serious about doing it, because it is highly sensitive and affects every teacher's employability.

MINUTES OF PLENARY BUSINESS MEETING

August 24, 2000

Page 15

- Secondly, the Regional Offices of Education have been given an enormous work load, and they do not have the training or resources to take it on along with everything else. The Subcommittee asked that the State Board consider what we could do to better support the Regional Offices -- get them the technology, the resources, the training -- whatever they need. The Board's staff have already been working with training Regional Office staff to help them get ready for this.

Mrs. McConachie indicated to the Superintendent that the Subcommittee wanted to draw that to his attention as an area where we need to do some work. Superintendent McGee responded that they would be working very closely with Deputy Superintendent Brenda Heffner on this effort, because the Regional Superintendents are the key to the success of this program. He noted that they would try to get better data on exactly what their needs are.

The Chairman asked if this is an unfunded mandate for the ROE's.

Mrs. McConachie responded that she did not know if she would go that far, because she did not have enough data to say that. She indicated that it is troublesome to them, so as their partners, the State Board needs to be supporting them. She noted that she thought that was a question to the Superintendent.

Indicating that he did not know the appropriate period of time, Chairman Gidwitz suggested that maybe we could get a report from the Superintendent as to how we are progressing with this process during the balance of the year. Superintendent McGee responded that we may be able to provide the information within a couple of weeks or next month at the latest.

Mrs. McConachie reported that a need has been expressed by members of the State Board, as well as members of the Joint Subcommittee, to build in some continuous improvement features into the certificate renewal process. She noted that it was very complex and controversial, and the Board needs to be proactive in trying to gather information and solve problems as the system develops. She indicated that the recommendations from the Board members of the Joint Subcommittee is that we form an advisory group as we often do to advise the Board on solving system problems with certificate renewal. Mrs. McConachie commented that the Board has a copy of a proposal to the Board for consideration and for action in September. She reported that it proposes three purposes for this advisory committee:

1. To serve as a listening post -- to gather information proactively in the field about how the system is working;
2. To suggest strategies for resolving implementation problems; and
3. To develop recommendations for legislative, regulatory, and budget proposals.

Mrs. McConachie noted that the committee would be advisory to the Certification Board and the State Board, and they very much hope that the Certification Board

MINUTES OF PLENARY BUSINESS MEETING

August 24, 2000

Page 16

will co-sponsor this advisory group and accept them as advisory to them as well as to the State Board. She commented that this would be part of ongoing collaboration and partnership between the two boards. She indicated that proposed membership of the advisory committee is 17 members -- nine of them teachers -- a majority of teachers because certification most affects teachers. But it would also include the other stakeholders who have to make the system work, and it is not going to work without the collaboration and support of administrators, Regional Superintendents, providers, the business community (which is very critically interested in teacher quality), and a partner.

Dr. Hill indicated that he agreed with the proposal, but his concern was with the procedure -- is this something that the State Superintendent can do by simply appointing this group or is it necessary for this Board to actually go on record by motion of approving them.

Mrs. Rogers commented that we would like to continue the avenue of collaboration.

Dr. Hill asked that then it is a matter of endorsing and approving. Mrs. McConachie and Mrs. Rogers both responded "yes." Mrs. McConachie commented that we know if the Certification Board is not interested in participating, the Superintendent has the authority to go ahead, and we feel that it is a responsibility.

Since there were not any substantive questions or objections, Mrs. McConachie asked that this proposal be sent to the members of the Subcommittee, to the Certification Board to be put on its agenda for the September meeting, and then to the State Board for action on the September meeting agenda.

Chairman Gidwitz indicated that hearing no objections, this is so ordered.

Mrs. Rogers commended staff member Sally Vogl for the excellent job of condensing this, and she hoped to have it available on the website for all teachers by September 1. Mrs. McConachie asked that as soon as this is ready, a copy be sent to the Board members in case they have to answer questions.

A brief discussion followed for clarification purposes.

Mrs. Rogers reported that the Illinois Education Association (IEA) is providing all of their teachers with a little folder that contains all of the continuing professional development rules and a place to keep their records. She complimented Dr. Susan Shea of the IEA for the nice piece of work.

Dr. Hill expressed concern about the Open Meetings Act and local development committee meetings. He noted that if the Attorney General does rule that they are subject to the Open Meetings Act, he thought that we need to find out since this is

MINUTES OF PLENARY BUSINESS MEETING

August 24, 2000

Page 17

professional development and in a sense is an evaluation. He indicated that whether or not these people could declare the meeting open and then go into closed session and deliberate on these individual plans may relieve some of the apprehension of meeting in open session. Dr. Hill commented that this would probably assist some people in making a decision of whether or not they wanted to even be on these local development committees.

Mrs. McConachie wanted to clarify that this process evaluates individual plans -- it does not evaluate their job performance. She agreed that this is a critical piece -- who wants to be on these committees; it looks like a lot of work, etc.

Dr. Hill indicated that perhaps the Board should ask General Counsel Res Vazquez to find out the magnitude of this regarding whether or not the local development committees could go into closed session, because they would be evaluating a plan of an individual.

Mr. Vazquez indicated that he thought the question that went to the Attorney General would be whether they would be subject to the Open Meetings Act in general, and that would include all of the exceptions under the Open Meetings Act.

Mrs. McConachie asked that this issue be considered at the September Board meeting, because we need to ask the Certification Board for a response and hope that they will co-sponsor this effort with the State Board.

Agenda Item D.2.

The Chairman called for Agenda Item D.2., Items for Immediate Action, Special Education Certification Structure and Standards (**amendment to motion**).

Chairman Gidwitz indicated that he would like to recall Division Administrator Mike Long to talk about Type 10 and Type 73 teaching certificates for speech and language pathologists. He reported that Mr. Long has suggested that the Board amend the motion that it adopted earlier in the meeting. He asked Mr. Long to explain the rationale for that amendment.

Mr. Long reported that the discussion of the Board appeared to focus on the fact that it was important to give speech-language pathologists an option in selecting either a teaching certificate or a School Service Personnel certificate. He indicated that one part of the motion allows that for those exchanging certificates, but the other part of the motion says that those who are completing an approved program after January 1, 2003, can only get the School Service Personnel certificate; in other words, the option is not present. He commented that if it is the wish of the Board to present that option to those completing approved programs, then the motion needs to be amended.

The Chairman read the suggested language change to add to the earlier motion adopted by the Board.

- **Speech-language pathology students graduating from an Illinois institution will have the option to hold a**

Type 10, 03, 09, or 73 teaching certificate

endorsed in speech-language pathology for Illinois certification.

Chairman Gidwitz asked if there was any reason why the Board should not do this explicitly. Mr. Long responded "no" and that he thought this is consistent with what Laura Arterburn (who spoke to the Board during Public Participation) was talking about, with the discussion that was held at the State Certification Board meeting earlier in the month, and with the desires of the speech-language pathologists. He noted that it seemed to be a reasonable approach.

The Superintendent commented that he was uncomfortable about last minute things, and he asked what the consequences are for delaying this matter a month and having time to talk to the Certification Board.

Superintendent M^CGee noted that he did think that would be a better idea, because sometimes we get accused of just moving forward too hastily -- if we have to, we have to but if we do not, let's wait.

Mr. Long commented that one observation here is that the Board might need a decision on this for what needs to be provided to the court monitor on August 25.

General Counsel Res Vazquez responded that according to what his understanding is of the discussion at the Certification Board meeting, he thought there was a specific concern, at least from the members that voted against it, that this option was not available. He indicated that if the Board went ahead and recommended this option and the Board approves this, it was his understanding that the Certification Board would not be upset with this.

The Chairman asked for Susan Foster from the Illinois Speech-Language-Hearing Association, to speak to this issue. Ms. Foster spoke in support of the option.

The Superintendent asked staff member Jodi Fleck to provide input on this issue. Ms. Fleck indicated that she thought it was fine to offer that option, as long as when we send information to the field they understand that if they choose the Type 10 track, it is probably going to require a minimum of one to three semesters more coursework/standards to meet. She noted that this would give more flexibility, and that is what the field wanted. She commented that we would just have to make it clear in any kind of publications that the State Board puts out the difference between the Type 73 track and the standards needed to be met and those for the Type 10/03, 09 track.

MINUTES OF PLENARY BUSINESS MEETING

August 24, 2000

Page 19

The Superintendent indicated with that information, he would withdraw his objection.

Dr. Hill asked if this runs counter to anything else in the motion. Chairman Gidwitz responded that as Mr. Long pointed out, the motion said that those people who are presently certificated have the choice of either staying Type 10 or electing to become Type 73. He noted that the motion said after 2003, those people have no choice; they could be a Type 73. The Chairman indicated that the point that was made and discussed earlier was a person can still get a Type 10 certificate and then can add to it the speech-language track so that a person would end up with both a Type 10 and Type 73 to qualify. He noted that what this says is that a person can probably have a slightly shorter curriculum and do both.

Amendment Dr. Hill moved to amend the motion "by adding the specific language Chairman
To Motion Gidwitz read to the motion made earlier by the Board.

- Speech-language pathology students graduating from an Illinois institution will have the option to hold a

Type 10, 03, 09, or 73 teaching certificate

endorsed in speech-language pathology for Illinois certification."

Mrs. McConachie seconded the motion to amend.

Mrs. Rogers asked how the Board could change this as we go to the court monitor and we cannot change the name of a certification. Staff member Harry Blackburn responded that this was consistent with what has been at the table all along with respect to discussions that has gone forth. He commented that it just had not been made that specific. He indicated that the LBS I and II discussions were presented both in the memo to the federal judge whereas this aspect has not gone directly to the federal judge, and the concept of 03, 09, 73, and Type 10 have always been on the table.

Dr. Hill commented that he was going to vote for the motion to amend, but he was troubled that this was not resolved before it was brought to the Board in the first place. He did not understand why there was an issue in the first place.

Chairman Gidwitz interpreted what he heard. The State Board staffs the Certification Board. We presented to the Certification Board a resolution that they approved, although some people were uncomfortable with it. So it was our staff who made the presentation. Arguably, it was not as comprehensive as it might have been. (The Chairman referred this matter to the Superintendent to report back to the Board on this issue.)

Vote on

MINUTES OF PLENARY BUSINESS MEETING

August 24, 2000

Page 20

Amended

Motion

The amended motion passed by a unanimous voice vote.

Agenda

Item E.2.

The Chairman called for Agenda Item E.2., Announcements and Reports, Superintendent.

Superintendent M^CGee reported that the agency had embarked on a 90-day improvement plan that he had outlined to the Board last May, and we have been making significant progress. He indicated that the improvement plan ends September 1, and there will be a great wrap-up and summary report at the September Board meeting. He noted that three components of this have been the commitment:

1. To delivering a quality of education that is "Second to None" (The employees have stepped up to deliver that);
2. To support improvement and innovation (The Board will hear some results of that in a moment); and
3. To deliver first-class service (First-class service being defined as responsive service -- prompt and attentive; courteous service -- civil, courteous, cheerful, pleasant; accurate service -- accurate and consistent).

The Superintendent reported that there have been several different processes used, and he provided some examples: restructuring of the organization; restructuring of the communications department; developing under Ray Schaljo's leadership customer service field teams and customer service centers at each of the three offices; the School Ambassador Program (the training for that is going very well); making changes to the external and internal communications strategies; and the system, leadership, and division goal alignment.

Superintendent M^CGee reported that as far as results, we have received all kinds of unsolicited response, and he recognized the special accomplishments and achievements of several staff members by selecting four to read.

- Brenda Heffner -- for quick and responsive action;
- Nancy Patton and Jean Lewis -- for supportive, pleasant, organized, and hard-working liaisons with a clear sense of purpose;
- Rob Sampson and Sharon Battles-- for Rob's department doing things right and for Sharon's one-on-one prompt assistance; and
- Hilda Everage and Gloria Jordan -- for Goals 2000 evening work and doing what it takes to make a difference in the local school districts.

The Superintendent reported on how the 90-day improvement plan has addressed elements of the ACHIEVE report.

MINUTES OF PLENARY BUSINESS MEETING

August 24, 2000

Page 21

- We have made progress with the performance standards, and they will be delivered in September.
- We are working to begin making selective improvements to the assessments and bringing them to a uniformly rigorous level.
- We will be talking about expanding the limits on testing time at the September Board meeting.
- We have made significant progress to fund district-based induction programs, and there was a great report on that issue in the *State Journal-Register* that day.
- We have not addressed the network subject-based professional development academies.
- We just finished evaluating the Administrative Academy, and he understood that draft would be coming to him next week. This issue would be discussed at the September meeting as well.
- We heard on August 23 how we changed the quality assurance improvement planning program on schools above the line.
- We had fully intended to make a report from the school designation committee at this meeting, but it was unable to meet in August. That report has been deferred until September.
- The Superintendent noted that there were three or four more, but he would not take the time to read all of them.

Superintendent M^CGee indicated that what was important was that by developing this 90-day improvement plan to do the work of the agency and to focus on outcomes and products, we had to change some processes. He commented that we have been able to provide better customer service and to address significant recommendations as well.

The Superintendent reviewed the ACT results of this year (see Addendum III). There was a brief discussion for clarification purposes.

Superintendent McGee noted that we would have a report on standards implementation in the near future. He indicated that we need to redouble our efforts to make sure that the standards are taught in every classroom and perhaps especially focus on high school curriculum. He commented that we make sure that we use the Prairie State Examination as it was intended -- as a rigorous measure of learning standards.

Chairman Gidwitz noted that the Board has essentially adopted a core curriculum for high school by adopting the Prairie State, so what we are not doing is probably giving guidance to parents as to what is required for their children to be successful in the Prairie State Examination. The Superintendent commented that communication is the key here. The Chairman suggested that the Board's website might be a vehicle that could be used to communicate with parents to use the language that is appropriate and provide some guidance they can relate to, so

MINUTES OF PLENARY BUSINESS MEETING

August 24, 2000

Page 22

they know which direction to assist their child in when making choices on elected courses in school. Lee Patton, Director of the Policy Development Office, indicated that a P-16 team report that would be sent to the Board next week for the JEC on September 12 would address this issue.

The Superintendent reported that we are one of three states participating with the New American Schools in a pilot to involve state education agencies and supporting comprehensive, long-term systemic school reform. He indicated that he gave an address at a school in Prairie Hills that is involved in the Success for All program, and these are really templates that schools adopt over a long-time period to make a difference in the lives of students. He noted that Illinois is one of the leaders with approximately 20 schools involved federal comprehensive reform designs, and we expect 10 more the following year -- schools in Decatur and in South Cook County. Superintendent McGee commented that we were very excited about this initiative and expect to see some significant differences. He reported that what he has observed by being in these schools is a change in the whole spirit of teaching and learning. He noted that this is one of the initiatives that we need to communicate a little more successfully and clearly about how we are working school by school, district by district to make a difference in the lives of kids.

An audio tape of the meeting is available through the State Board office in Springfield (217/782-9560).

Agenda The Chairman called for Agenda Item E.3. & 4., Announcements and Reports,
Items E.3.&4. Committees, Board Members. There was nothing to report.

Ms. Pellegrino requested that the back cover of the bound Board packets that lists the Board meeting dates and locations be updated.

Agenda The Chairman called for Agenda Item F.1., Items for Future Action,
Item F.1. Teacher Induction.

Superintendent M^CGee indicated that there was an extensive discussion on August 23 regarding Teacher Induction, and action will be postponed. He reported that we would be responding to all the issues raised in a policy paper and will be collecting more data from local districts. He noted that the Board is on record as supporting the establishment of induction and mentoring programs.

The Superintendent commented that he appreciated the Chairman distributing the related article earlier in the meeting. He indicated that he thought the timing was right on this -- perhaps we could have even been a year earlier, but the point is that we are moving ahead on an outstanding induction program.

Superintendent M^CGee reported that the recommendation in the Board packet did cover four years, and he wanted to emphasize that we are flexible on that. He

MINUTES OF PLENARY BUSINESS MEETING

August 24, 2000

Page 23

indicated that the purpose is to provide guidelines to provide a framework, and whether it is a one-, two- or four-year program, the most intensive training has to be up front. He noted that based on Dr. Hill's discussion, we would come back to maybe talk about the pros and cons of a shorter versus a longer program and the role of the state in each year -- more guidelines the first year and fewer the out years. The Superintendent expressed appreciation for the Board's input on this, and we look forward to another exciting discussion and hopefully some action at the September Board meeting.

Chairman Gidwitz again welcomed Ms. Branch as a new member to the State Board of Education.

Adjournment The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 11:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn McConachie, Secretary

Ronald J. Gidwitz, Chairman