



# Illinois State Board of Education

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

## Illinois State Board of Education\*

100 North First Street  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor Board Room  
Springfield, Illinois 62777  
217/782-2221  
217/785-3972

### Dial up numbers for Conference Call Access:

September 17 1-888-329-2154 Pass code: 8584765#  
September 18 1-888-327-3006 Pass code: 8589785#

### SCHEDULE AND AGENDA OF MEETING September 17-18, 2003

#### Agenda Items

[View on Screen Board Meeting Information Document](#)

[Download for Printing Board Meeting Information Document](#)

#### WEDNESDAY, September 17, 2003

9:30 a.m. **Education Policy Planning Committee Meeting**  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Superintendent's Conference Room

11:45 a.m. **Call Meeting to Order/Roll Call**  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor, State Board Room

12:00 p.m. **Executive Session/Lunch**  
Board Conference Room

1:00 p.m. **Presentations**

- Presentation of financial status of Elgin School District U 46: Dr. Connie Neale, Superintendent (pp. 9-12)
- Presentation of financial status of Calhoun Community Unit School District 40: Dr. Linda Basden, Superintendent (pp. 13-16)
- Presentation of financial status of West Harvey-Dixmoor Public School District 147: Dr. Alex Boyd, Superintendent (pp. 17-20)
- Presentation of Status Activities Related to Schools in Financial Difficulty
- Presentation of the Illinois Assessment Frameworks (pp. 21-23)

3:15 p.m. **Break**

3:30 p.m. **Items for Discussion**

- Prairie Crossing Charter School Renewal (pp. 24-25)
- 2003 Title II State Report Card (pp. 26-38)
- Passing Scores for the Assessment of Professional Teaching and New Special Education Tests (pp. 39-52)
- Proposed Criteria and Procedures for Approval of Coursework, Programs, and Activities Leading to Standard Certification Eligibility (pp. 53-57)
- Institutional Accreditation Decisions for Rockford College (pp. 58-63)
- Submission of Waiver Report to the General Assembly (pp. 64-124)

- Rules for Adoption—Part 25 (Certification) (pp. 125-151)
- Fiscal Year 2005 Budget Schedule (pp. 152-153)
- ISBE Monthly Reports: Finance, Audit, Agency Operations Status (pp. 154-183)
- Superintendent's Quarterly Travel Analysis (March 2003-June 2003)

**7:30 p.m. Executive Session (if needed)**

**THURSDAY, September 18, 2003**

**8:00 a.m. Executive Session (if needed)**

**9:30 a.m. PLENARY BUSINESS MEETING**

- A. Call Meeting to Order/Roll Call**
- B. Introduction of Dr. Walt Warfield, Executive Director of the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA)**
  - Presentation of framed poster on the Horace Mann League
- C. Public Participation**
- D. Approval of Minutes:**
  - August 20, 2003 (pp. 184-299)
- E. Action Items**
  - Consideration of Prairie Crossing Charter School Renewal
  - Authorization of submittal of the 2003 Title II State Report Card
  - Adoption of the Passing Scores for the Assessment of Professional Teaching and New Special Education Tests
  - Approval of Proposed Criteria and Procedures for Approval of Coursework, Programs, and Activities Leading to Standard Certification Eligibility
  - Approval of Institutional Accreditation Decisions for Rockford College
  - Authorization of Submission of Waiver Report to the General Assembly
  - Rules for Adoption—Part 25 (Certification)
  - Acceptance of ISBE Monthly Reports
  - Approval of Superintendent's Quarterly Travel Analysis (March 2003-June 2003)
- F. Announcements and Reports**
  - Superintendent
  - Chair
  - Committees
    - a. Board Operations - Joyce Karon, Chair
    - b. Finance & Audit - Richard Sandsmark, Chair
    - c. Joint Education - Ronald Gidwitz, Chair
    - d. Governmental Relations - Bev Turkal, Chair
    - e. Education Policy Planning - Greg Kazarian, Chair
  - Members
- G. Other Information**
  - Monthly Status Report on Rulemaking (pp. 300-301)

**ADJOURN**

\*All State Board of Education meetings listed on this agenda will be accessible to persons with disabilities.

September 17-18, 2003  
State Board Meeting

**ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION\***

100 North First Street  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor Board Room  
Springfield, Illinois 62777

<p><b><u>Call Meeting to Order/ Roll Call</u></b></p>	<p>The September 17-18, 2003 Illinois State Board of Education was called to order at 12:08 p.m. by the Chair, Dr. Janet Steiner. Dr. Steiner stated that the Board would have a two-day meeting, and then she asked for the roll to be called. A quorum was present.</p> <p>MEMBERS PRESENT: Janet Steiner      Dean Clark      Greg Kazarian Joyce Karon      Beverly Turkal</p> <p>Richard Sandsmark and Ronald Gidwitz joined the meeting during Closed Session.</p> <p>Judith Gold joined the meeting at 1:55 p.m. via conference call.</p> <p>MEMBERS ABSENT: Dr. Steiner then announced that the Board would be going into Closed Session and requested a motion from the Board.</p>
<p><b><u>Closed Session Motion</u></b></p>	<p>Greg Kazarian then made a motion for the Board to enter into Closed Session under the exceptions set forth in the Open Meetings Act of the State of Illinois.</p> <p>Dean Clark seconded the motion.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner called for a vote on the motion. The motion carried as all members present voted yes. Thus, the Board recessed at 12:10 p.m. for a Closed Session over lunch.</p>
<p><b><u>Presentations</u></b></p>	<p>Dr. Steiner reconvened the meeting at 1:12 p.m. for a series of presentations. She stated that the first financial status presentation would be given by Dr. Connie Neale, Superintendent of Elgin School District U 46.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller stated that the Board has invited three school districts for them to present their financial status so the Board would have a better picture and profile of what our districts are going through in the field. Thus, presented would be three districts which have distinctive issues that are affecting their capacity to provide the quality of education that they would like.</p>

	<p>Dr. Schiller then introduced Dr. Connie Neale, the Superintendent of Elgin School District along with John Prince, Chief Financial Officer and Pat Broncato, the Chief Legal Officer of the district.</p>
<p><b><u>Presentation of financial status of Elgin School District U 46</u></b></p>	<p>Dr. Connie Neale thanked the Illinois State Board of Education for allowing them to present their school district’s financial situation as she knows that the Board has a heavy agenda.</p> <p>Dr. Neale then proceeded to discuss her history with the district and the status of the district when she came on board. According to Dr. Neale, she had a strong background in the Superintendency that helped her to deal with some of the unknown financial situations that arose after she took the position.</p> <p>She stated that there were internal as well as external factors that impacted their school district after September 11, 2001. U46 is a large district in the State of Illinois with about 40,000 children, and has been in a rapid growth mode for several years. They have grown 10,000 children in the last ten years. The impact of getting funds after the fact has severely impacted their ability to provide funds.</p> <p>Diversity has also impacted their finances. The district is diverse economically as well as ethnically. They have grown in their bilingual population by 2,000 students. In addition, there is also a low Equalized Assessed Valuation (EAV) in the district.</p> <p>In September 2002, Dr. Neale began to take major and immediate steps to deal with their financial dilemma. The district staff was asked to cutback and postpone purchases in whatever ways that they could. At that point, the district decided to bring in an external consultant to aid the district in determining the factors that led to the financial status they were currently in and what they needed to do to become stable again. Consultants were used at the advisement of the Community Advisement Business Group due to the fact that there was a great concern with the reliability of the information because it was substantially different from what people had thought. In addition, the assistant superintendent in charge of business as well as the director of finance resigned.</p> <p>The district asked the consultants to not only tell them how they got in this financial situation but also what steps they needed to remedy their current situation. The consultants stated that the district needed to look at a balanced budget for the 2003-2004 school year.</p>

	<p>The consultants recommended for the district to make cuts of 14% of the staff equaling \$40 million in the year 2003. The Superintendent then put together a committee of stakeholders in the community that would help the district prioritize. The goal was to maintain the essence of many programs as they could, with knowing that many of them would have to be scaled down.</p> <p>The district was in the process of opening up several new schools. With the advice of the community and consultants, some of the schools' openings were put on hold for a year's window of time. Actually, one of the elementary schools is not ready and is behind building construction. The two that are ready are in a holding pattern. The middle school will open at half capacity with the seventh graders. Dr. Neale stated that while this is a child-friendly approach, it is hard to explain to tax payers. In light of the condition of the district and two referenda failing in the past, John Prinz was hired as the Chief Financial Officer. The Board may attempt a referendum again in 2004 for the remaining 37 ½ cents.</p> <p>The auditing and establishment of controls were put in place to monitor the budgetary flow. The effectiveness and efficiency of programs and spending was taken very seriously. A balanced budget was submitted this year. The district received an A-3 rating because they have a very strong plan in place and are making very deliberate steps. An outside foundation has also partnered with the district to help them with their instructional and academic program due to their faith and trust in the district.</p> <p>In the long-term view, the district's goal continues to be to maintain fiscal accountability. The district is looking at long-term planning to forecast as best they can the necessary steps that need to be taken to maintain financial stability so the district does not have to repeat the financial cutbacks of last year. The district is also looking toward accrual instead of cash accounting to get a truer picture of their financial situation and make it easier to deal with their finances when revenues come in past the accounting cut-off.</p> <p>In regard to how the state could help their district, Dr. Neale stated that categorical funding would be a continued benefit to their district. She cited as an example the bilingual education item has not grown with the growth in their district of bilingual students. She also stated that some type of adjustment to the September 30<sup>th</sup> enrollment count deadline for districts would be helpful when looking at the growing financial requirements in response to the</p>
--	--

	<p>needs in their district. In addition, the requirements of No Child Left Behind have been a financial strain on the district. One example Dr. Neale cited was the smaller class size item. The district had to raise class sizes due to staffing cutbacks. Thus, they were not in compliance with the goal of NCLB to create smaller class sizes.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner thanked Dr. Neale and Elgin for their presentation; stating it was a very good report and that their district has done a lot of hard work in one year's time.</p> <p>Joyce Karon commended the district and their Community Advisory Committee, which has worked together to do some great work in their community and district.</p> <p>Greg Kazarian stated that the Board is hearing that schools are running inefficiently. He asserted that you have to have a high degree of confidence that you have found all the spots. Thus, he asked the panel if they are still looking at ways to improve and save or should the Board look at U46 as a benchmark for what costs to deliver at a core level of education.</p> <p>Dr. Neale commented by stating that the district is continuing to look at ways that they can improve as far as the efficiency of operations and how the district deals with business. They are looking at if there are better avenues to experience more success. For example, the district is looking at bonds. The district is still experiencing continued growth, and is becoming more diverse.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller asked if the district has done some scenarios for FY05 with regard to if there are little or modest increases in state funding and/or if the referendum does not pass.</p> <p>John Prince stated that this is one of the next pieces that they will be talking with the Board about doing a one year plan and five year projection to look at some "what if" scenarios, for example in categorical funding.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller then asked what the health care premiums looked like this year in their district. According to Mr. Prince, they have been going up. The actuary said they need to budget 30 million dollars for this year as well as for next year.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller asked what the plan is now for the new facilities for next year. Dr. Neale stated that the elementary school and the middle school are scheduled to open next year. The high school is</p>
--	--

	<p>under construction will not be ready. Additionally, the student-teacher ratio is 30:1. The district is trying to find a delicate balance in doing what is right for the children and taking into account the budgetary constraints. Dr. Schiller then asked how the staffing formula has changed. Dr. Neale stated that before the cuts the ratio was student-teacher ratio was 27:1 last year.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller stated that he appreciated Dr. Neale traveling to present to the Board. He said that he recognized the needed assistance from the Board in such areas as the categorical funding and the one year delay for the student count.</p> <p>Mr. Kazarian stated that he would like to find a way to capture the lessons learned as Elgin went through this process and even disseminate the success story through ISBE or IASB. Dr. Schiller stated as difficult as it was, the specificity in the process is the key to the success of this financial experience. Dr. Neale stated that they are willing to do whatever they can to support other districts in this process as they are all in this together.</p> <p>Beverly Turkal left the meeting at approximately 1:45 p.m.</p>
<p><b><u>Presentation of financial status of Calhoun Community Unit School District 40</u></b></p>	<p>Dr. Schiller stated that the Board would like welcome Dr. Basden, Superintendent of Calhoun Community Unit School District 40 as well as School Board members Bob Banghart and Doug Fox, School Board Vice-President who will also present their district’s financial situation to the Board of Education. The Superintendent stated that the Board may want to compare Calhoun and Elgin School District in terms of state share funding, the EAV value, and the percentage of low-income students despite the difference in size of the district.</p> <p>Dr. Linda Basden proceeded to give some history about Calhoun CUSD 40 concerning their district employees and location. There is one elementary school (K-8) and one high school. The district has 93 employees. It is located 100 miles southwest of Springfield. The student enrollment in Calhoun has been steady, and averages about 575 students Pre-K-12.</p> <p>With regard to the economic environment, Calhoun CUSD 40 is the third largest employer in Calhoun. In the past, Calhoun revenues have barely covered the expenditures. In 2001, the balance tipped and it has been worsening since then.</p> <p>However, in regard to academics, the high school PSAE scores have continued to increase over the last three years and the district is very proud of that.</p>

	<p>The district started by working on financial accountability by initiating use of purchase orders with administrators' approval of purchases, consolidating ordering of operations and maintenance supplies, checking on questionable invoices to determine legitimacy, and involving building principals in planning and monitoring building budgets.</p> <p>The district has also worked on training central office personnel to implement new financial and payroll software programs, exploring other options for various costs, reducing transportation costs of extra curriculum events, and examining the processes for both tuition reimbursement and lateral movement on salary schedule.</p> <p>In looking toward the future, the district plans to complete a three year projection of EAV and enrollment predictions, levies, and extensions as well as prepare a yearly cash flow analysis for current and estimated future staffing plans.</p> <p>Due to a three or ten year expense for a Financial Oversight Panel (FOP), Dr. Basden stated that a FOP would not be a good option at this time. Consolidation is not a practical option in the district because of the city bridge. Dr. Steiner then asked about consolidation being an option for Calhoun and Brussels. One of the Board members stated that there have been discussions about consolidation. However, the conditions of the roads are very bad for children to be transported on them. Dr. Steiner then asked why the institution of a FOP would not be an option. Dick Sandsmark stated that the district is looking at the costs. He said this is not a good way to look at this as there may be some value in the Financial Oversight Panel even though the Board is thinking there may not be value. However, other districts have experienced great success with FOPs.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller asked Dr. Basden to elaborate on what was meant by without assistance from the State, Calhoun CUSD 40 cannot survive. She said that when they said they need help, they need ideas.</p> <p>Greg Kazarian and Dean Clark asked what the community felt about the status of the district and if the community was knowledgeable. Mr. Kazarian asked if there is there a community outreach program. The Board members stated that they just found out about the conditions. The community does not understand that there are not any frills to cut out. As an example support from their educators, the school board members stated that the teachers even</p>
--	--



	<p>signed a contract with no raise.</p> <p>One of the Board members stated that the community is not aware that the district cannot operate the school on a daily basis or pay their bills. The community believes that Calhoun is in debt just because of the new school. They don't understand the condition that the high school is in, such as the heating and wiring. The high school is in bad shape and the district may lose the school.</p> <p>Dick Sandsmark questioned the high school program asking if it was basic. Dr. Basden stated that yes, it is basic and the school offers shop and agriculture. The high school did offer art ½ time, but has since had to cut the program.</p> <p>Mr. Kazarian asked if the students are able to take college prep classes. Dr. Basden responded affirmatively by stating that students are able to take this route through the Illinois Virtual High School program (IVHS). According to Dr. Basden, even though the district is bare bones, they are doing terrific things for their children. Dr. Steiner asked if the high school has explored the option of networking with the surrounding community colleges or universities. According to Dr. Basden, this option has not been explored. The nearest community college, Lewis and Clark, is about one hour away.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller stated for clarification that the state share is 57% and the district is operating at about \$7,000 a student operating costs. Dr. Basden affirmed the statement by answering yes. Then, Dr. Steiner and Dr. Schiller thanked the district for coming to present to the State Board.</p> <p>(Please refer to attachments for the PowerPoint presentation.)</p>
<p><b><u>Presentation of financial status of West Harvey-Dixmoor Public School District 147</u></b></p>	<p>Dr. Schiller stated that he was pleased to welcome this third school district which has a different profile than what we have previously looked at. According to the materials provided to the Board, this is a district that has a low-income population of over 94% and a 62% reliance on state share with operating cost being \$9800 per pupil. The State Superintendent then introduced Dr. Alex Boyd, the Superintendent of West Harvey-Dixmoor School District 147 along with Robert Charnot, Business Manager and thanked the Superintendent Boyd for traveling to make the presentation to the Board.</p> <p>Superintendent Boyd then requested that his Business Manager give the Board a perspective of the district's financial history and how the financial problems occurred in the district. Mr. Charnot</p>

stated that he used to work in George Patton School District Riverdale at District 133. The day he came into the district on July 1 the Board was doing a TAW of \$ 910,000 which was a surprise to him. Mr. Charnot stated that obviously it was not enough money as the Board was limited in the amount of TAW they could withdraw as well as accounts payable that were overdue for the past couple of months. The district just recently did a Revenue Anticipation Note in the amount of \$1 million. They are working to procure \$1, 075,000 in working cash bonds and \$2 million in funding bonds. Mr. Charnot stated that the district is in the midst of collecting a lot of data and thus does not have some of the information that the other school districts offered as he just started on the job.

Mr. Charnot then explained the revenue verses expenditure history of the West Harvey-Dixmoor. It is apparent that the district's variance is still very much in the negative margin and going in the wrong direction. He also provided the Board with a six year General State Aid (GSA) history which showed the GSA payments and their average daily attendance (ADA) numbers.

Superintendent Boyd then proceeded to state that the administrative team's first objective was to develop a process and determine how to proceed. Their purpose was clarified in the development of a three tier structure of cuts, to meet with the Board and Finance Chair, share with principals and get their input, meet with union representatives, and then to provide a dollar amount on all the proposed cuts, finalization, and enactment. In addition, the district plans to close Garfield School, decrease legal fees, limit staff conference attendance, pay some teacher salaries out of the Reading First grant, enact registration fees, discontinue administratively expelled student placement, approve no administrative or teacher raises, renegotiate the AFSCME Contract or enact no raises in 2005, and contract out Custodial/Maintenance Services.

Mr. Charnot has been working with Jay Grimes of ISBE. He informed Mr. Grimes once the district has the numbers and has a good starting point and clearance of outstanding accounts payable that the district plans to develop a yearly plan by month and then a five year plan to speculate expenditures in an effort to turn around the status of their district. He stated that the district can use some help in that the USDA is holding back about \$365,000 of their district's money for their school lunch program. According to Mr. Charnot, the recent audit on September 15-16 went very well. Thus, if the State Board can help the district in getting a release of

their funding, they would appreciate it as the district is carrying out a lot of expenditures without money in hand. In addition, there are several building needs as the buildings in the district are deteriorating.

Superintendent Boyd stated that the effects of No Child Left Behind have drastically affected their ability to provide services through staffing, especially in the area of personnel. Dr. Steiner then asked how many administrators the district currently has. Dr. Boyd stated that they have an administrator in each of their six buildings, a central office assistant superintendent, a director of special education, a case manager that works with the Special Education director, a director of technology, three assistants to the technology director, and an outreach officer.

Joyce Karon asked for clarification of when the Garfield School would be closing. Dr. Boyd stated that it was stated that this process would begin in 2003-2004 but will not actually take place until the 2004-2005 school year.

Dean Clark inquired about the existence of TIF districts and the EAV that reaches to many different areas. In regard to the TIF districts, Mr. Charnot stated that he is exploring this but he is sure that there probably are TIF districts and that he would be investigating this. In addition, he stated that the surrounding districts are not high EAV areas.

In extension, Mr. Charnot stated that the Special Education costs are very high and that affects the district as well. The Superintendent affirmed this by stating the district has had many special education students transfer into their district, and these students must be served.

Mr. Kazarian asked if after going through Tier 1 and Tier 2 changes and balancing the budget, does the district believe they have the capacity to do what you need to do to improve student performance? Superintendent Boyd responded positively by stating that the district is doing the things they need to as they are in their third year of a new reform model entitled New American Choice School. The district has seen remarkable improvement in their students and the test scores have gone up. The district is seriously looking at ways to make the district plausible and accountable. With the budget cuts, they are looking at restructuring their teachers by letting go of some of the newer teachers, and moving the veteran teachers into certain positions while still trying to maintain a balance within the teaching staff.

	<p>Mr. Charnot added that he is meeting with Mr. Grimes to put together a plan that will state by expenditure what it takes to run a school (salaries, benefits, etc.) and then they will have a clearer picture of where they are going and some real numbers to support the data.</p>
<p><b><u>Presentation of Status Activities Related to Schools in Financial Difficulty</u></b></p>	<p>Dr. Schiller stated that the Board just had the opportunity to look at three out of the twenty-two districts that ISBE staff are gauging weekly as to their financial difficulties and status. As a follow up, ISBE staff wanted to inform the Board on the status of these districts who have Financial Oversight Panels or School Finance Authorities (SFAs) as well as those districts in which we are watching their financial status. It is the intention to make everyone knowledgeable about the financial profile and the changes that we are making as well as some of the issues that we are facing as to how to provide assistance to some of the districts that are in financial difficulty. Therefore, Dr. Schiller stated that David Wood was invited to discuss these districts’ unique circumstances.</p> <p>David Wood stated that the Operations staff thought it was important for the Board and other staff to hear from differing districts about their views and efforts of their financial circumstances. It has been a recommendation of the staff to draft legislation for districts to submit a balanced budget. Dr. Schiller interjected to add the importance of some of our districts to maintain a balanced budget in that some districts were deferring decisions and thus were racking up debt and digging a deeper hole for themselves and thus were unable to have a balanced budget without extreme cuts. Thus, it is important for us to stress the need for a balance budget even though it is not required by the legislature.</p> <p>Mr. Wood agreed by stating that yes, it is important to work with these districts to get them to submit a balanced budget even though Illinois is a locally controlled state and to share it with their community stakeholders. If possible, it would be good for districts to have available professional consultants who can work on forecasting, staffing analyses, cash flow models, and Regional Financial Consultants from the State Board.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller stated that there are a number of financial management software programs that districts are looking at. However, districts do not have the funds to invest in this software. Therefore, we are looking at a state-wide solution to aid districts in submitting a balanced budget. However, most of our capacity to assist as an agency has been lost, even with the financial profiles that are</p>

	<p>released six to seven months later. Therefore, we are looking for a pro-active posture instead of the reactive one that we are currently operating under. When looking at the financial profile, many of the issues deal with timing. Therefore, going to an accrual model may be an option as some issues would not even be present as with the cash model.</p> <p>According to Mr. Wood, one of the main focuses of the legislation, as staff is envisioning it, is to not have the state involvement wait until the district is in such a desperate state that they need a FOP. If you met certain criteria, then you would have to provide the State Board with specific figures to force a certain discipline in these areas. Mr. Wood added that there is an increasing trend that state and federal budgets are interrelated and therefore the access to and distribution of funds is very important. Depending on the district, it can be all state or all federal monies. In speaking to the Board, Mr. Wood asserted that whatever can be done to work with the Governor and General Assembly for growth, stability, and planning for what the districts will get as costs continue to grow most likely faster than inflation along with the mandated costs of NCLB and the populations of at-risks and special education, it is best to explore those options.</p> <p>In moving to what can be done with looking at the trends in the profile and including the working cash fund, Mr. Wood stated that when surveying in the field, there was a 50/50 response in concerns to the utilization of the working cash funds. Thus, the working cash funds will still be included as districts can use this fund as it can come into play at some time.</p> <p>Another issue is the one-time revenue or spending when districts borrow for something in one year and/or don't use it until another year. The state is trying to create a better way of displaying this information without creating a bias. The questions are: will the 02 profile be changed or wait until the 03 profile comes out and change both of them?</p> <p>With the concern of getting a financial profile, many districts have stated that the monies they receive only offset the other costs that they currently have. There has thus been some discussion of increasing the assistance from the state (possibly from \$250 to \$1000).</p> <p>In response to a problem with a School Finance Authority in controlling some of the information they received and putting questions on the table for them to discuss and decide upon, staff</p>
--	---

	<p>has discussed the possibility of the state buying and selecting the financial management, advisors, and legal advisors that an SFA operates under since the state imposes and selects the SFA or FOP to help set the agenda better and control it.</p> <p>According to Mr. Wood, the fundamental question is how do you broaden the criteria for state involvement for essentially certifying a district and setting it on the path for putting a SFA or FOP in place? The concern in the field is that we don't want ISBE having the capacity to take over, for example, 100 districts. As the agency does not want to do this nor does the agency have the capacity to do it, staff is looking for assistance in creating a balancing act in order to help districts that severely need help.</p> <p>Mr. Wood stated that possibly later in the fall staff will be able to bring to you an update on the financial profile and/or legislation being introduced.</p> <p>Mr. Kazarian stated that balancing budgets is a good place to start. As the agency discusses AYP and research strategies to improve student performance, our "house" (collectively) is going to have to be in order on the finances so that we can make the claim.</p> <p>He stated that he was particularly struck by the presentations by the school districts that were willing to come to the Board to present their financial situations and ask for help from the Board. Mr. Kazarian stated the agency will get strong support in the legislature in this event if we have districts that have balanced budgets. Accordingly, Mr. Kazarian added that he is inspired by districts that are not here whining but are serious about making changes in their financial situations, and they are to be applauded.</p>
<p><b><u>Presentation of the Illinois Assessment Frameworks</u></b></p>	<p>Dr. Schiller introduced the Illinois Assessment Framework presentation as a high watermark as the agency discusses the expectations for student improvement as ISBE moves into the next phase of assessment that will be driven grade by grade. It has been very critical that staff take the Illinois Learning Standards and Goals that have set out the landscape for our districts in the last several years and refine them in such a way that teachers know what to teach and what students should learn grade by grade. The staff has been working with Ted Rebarber, a national consultant who has been working with ISBE on the entire NCLB process and assessment.</p> <p>Dr. Lynne Curry first gave a history of the Illinois Learning</p>

Standards in that the standards were first introduced for development in late 1994 and early 1995 with the culmination of that project being the adoption of the standards in 1997. According to Dr. Curry the standards have stood up very well with many national reviews and cover the depth and breath of what students should know in all the fundamental learning areas, including more than rote memorization but high order thinking skills and demonstration of performances as well. However, over time as educators have been implementing the standards in the classroom around the state they have asked for more clarification to the standards particularly now as the level of accountability is increasing and there is an even brighter spotlight on state assessments. As we look more and more at state assessments, it becomes very important for people to feel comfortable with the alignment of the standards they have been working so hard to implement to the state test. Dr. Curry stated that hopefully with the Illinois Assessment Frameworks, the state will be able to provide a more enhanced testing system for 2006. At that point, she turned it over to Mary Anne Graham, Division Administrator for Student Assessment to discuss how educators may fill in one of the pieces of the puzzle that they have asked for and have needed for quite a while now.

Ms. Graham then proceeded to state that her purpose during the presentation would be to provide the Board with a look into the future and to show the resources that the team has been showcasing around the state at the Regional Superintendent Conferences. The main focus in Student Assessment is preparing the enhanced assessment system which will be released in 2005-2006 to be in full alignment with the No Child Left Behind requirements to bring the state into full compliance in every grade level. Then, Mrs. Graham proceeded to review the assessments that the state currently has in place according to federal and state mandates, while highlighting the changes to take place in 2005-2006.

The state has just released the RFSP that would cover all of the mentioned assessments with the exclusion of the ACT portions which are covered under the PSAE. A majority of the assessments will thus be under one contractor, at least as a primary contractor. However, there will need to be separate projects for Limited English Assessment (LEA) and Alternative Assessment. There are currently projects under way with the English Language Learning and Special Education divisions to work on both of these measures as there are increased requirements to the LEA with new Title III mandates requiring reading, speaking, listening, and writing proficiency plus reading, math, and science achievement.

According to Ms. Graham, everything ties back to the standards which are broad but are the organizing point. There are several statewide resources that are available to districts. Some of these resources are the Illinois Learning Standards, Assessment Frameworks, Item Bank CDs, On-line sample tests, and Score Reporting by Category Choice, which has been in high demand by districts.

At this point, Dr. Curry requested that Mr. Rebarber present himself to the Board to explain some of the percentages that were displayed by grade level to give a clearer understanding of how test scores are reported out in terms of the weighting and percentages. Mr. Rebarber then proceeded to explain that the percentages recorded by grade level (grades 3-8) and represent the proportion of the test or the weight that is valued to the different subcomponents or categories, for example, in Math. The main organizers are the established state goals, for example, goal 6: number sense or goal 7: measurement. In some cases, there are even instances where categories can even be broken down further into subcategories to provide more information about the tested category. With this information, teachers will know what will specifically be tested and what the emphasis is grade by grade in each tested category.

At this point, Mrs. Graham continued to explain specific categories and items on the state assessment tests that are outlined in the Illinois Assessment Frameworks. The assessment objectives and frameworks are designed to narrow the target and give a focus to the test designers as well as the teachers when they have to make decisions as to what to teach. The frameworks form the foundation for the tests in 2005-2006 and they are a link between the learning standards and instruction. Basically, the frameworks give a guideline as to what is fair game to be tested. Mrs. Graham then walked the Board through an example of a Social Science assessment framework and the concurrent alignment to the tested items on the assessment test. According to Mrs. Graham, the materials have been well-received in the field and the teachers are excited about the information that they will be receiving.

Dr. Curry then asked Mr. Rebarber to comment on how Illinois now measures up nationally with the national wave of testing in all the states. Mr. Rebarber stated many states are wrestling with these issues but that Illinois is in the forefront in regard to coming up with workable solutions early enough to help districts and schools prepare for the new assessments. For a change, districts



	<p>and schools in Illinois will have what they need early enough to properly align their instruction and develop curriculum and lesson plans. It is a very logical roll-out, and the quality of the assessment frameworks is definitely a step above.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner stated that she can see how these frameworks will be good for teachers and students as they will know and understand what they will be tested on. Dr. Curry stated that yes, it takes some of the mystery out of the whole process and that these frameworks will be released in the next couple of weeks. Joyce Karon stated that she is very excited about the prospect of the power in these documents, especially that they will be on-line resources. These documents are not the “be all or end all” to where we want them to be, but it definitely they do provide an assisted framework.</p> <p>Ron Gidwitz addressed the Chair at 3:20 p.m. stating that he had to leave the meeting.</p>
<b><u>Break</u></b>	At 3:25 p.m. Dr. Steiner then announced that the Board would recess for a 10 minute break and come back at 3:35 p.m.
<b><u>Items for Discussion</u></b>	Dr. Steiner stated that the Board would reconvene from break and begin to discuss items for Board action.
<b><u>Prairie Crossing Charter School Renewal</u></b>	<p>The first item for discussion was the Prairie Crossing Charter School Renewal. Dr. Steiner stated that the purpose of this agenda item was to discuss the request by Prairie Crossing Charter School to renew their existing charter for an additional five years.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller stated that the Prairie Crossing Charter school is seeking an early renewal due to an upcoming building program in the district. The staff has gone through with a site visitation and review of the charter renewal as well as objections. The Educational Policy Planning Committee discussed in great detail the findings concerning Prairie Crossing as well as conferred with the some individuals from Prairie Crossing with regard to some of the stipulations that were noted. Dr. Schiller stated that it is being recommended that the school be renewed as long as a variety of stipulations are met on a timeline as delineated in the report and recommendation. Superintendent Schiller then went on the briefly review the stipulations of the charter being renewed upon satisfactory completion and remedy of the finding. To achieve satisfactory completion the charter must:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide more detailed information on its governance as described in the Recommendation by the State Superintendent.</li> <li>2. Provide better access to the community as described in the Recommendation of the State Superintendent.</li> </ol>

3. Ensure that all teachers are certified or otherwise qualified under the Charter Schools Law.
4. Establish, publish, and implement a Freedom of Information Act policy.
5. Comply with items noted in the September 12, 2003 special education compliance report by October 31, 2003. These items are:
  - hiring a full time Director of Special Education that is available when necessary to ensure the needs of all children are fully satisfied, recognizing that reimbursement would be available only for employment of a full-time Director of Special Education
  - providing technical assistance supervision to special education staff.
  - developing written special education policies and procedures.
  - training staff members relative to the policies and procedures with specific reference to the findings of a formal referral process, identification of needed assessments, timelines, determination of eligibility, and the IEP process.
6. Ensuring that Board members and administrative staff file Statements of Economic Interest with the Lake County Clerk's Office.

The stipulations were cited as follows:

1. Prairie Crossing Charter School will receive 100% of the per capita tuition rate (PCTR) for a maximum enrollment of 360 students.
2. Any enrollment increase beyond 360 and up to 432 students would require a financial review and negotiation of the PCTR.
3. Based on the projections and tables presented in the Recommendation by the State Superintendent, an increase in student enrollment would likely result in a decrease in the PCTR in the 75% - 85% range.

Several other non-material governance items were also identified as they are issues that need to be addressed. One such issue was with regard to enrollment for the charter to demonstrate to the State Board their efforts in retaining and sustaining the low-income student population in order to broaden the population that is in the school. Dr. Schiller cited the difficulty in attending to retaining the low-income population in light of the present lottery system. We will have to look for ways to assist Prairie Crossing, if the Board

goes forward with the renewal, to meet the spirit of their application in light of the lottery selection. Staff has also spoken to Prairie Crossing about accessibility to transportation in that students who wish to attend and who are eligible to attend, who may live remotely from the school, have direct access to the school so that there is no hindrance to their attendance at the school (i.e. bus). Also, brought to their attention was the minority representation in the school that it be more reflective of the Woodland School District population. It is the hope that even though Woodland has a high minority population that both populations are more desegregated within the context of the lottery.

There was also some brief discussion on receiving clarification on their fee structure and fee waiver policies. Prairie Crossing stated that this is an area that they have cited as well and are determined to provide information and solutions regarding these policies.

Dr. Schiller stated that these findings, material and non-material, are concerning standards that we hold all state schools to. He then proceeded to inform the Board of the extensive materials they were provided in concerns to the Prairie Crossing renewal. Superintendent Schiller then deferred to one of the Educational Policy Planning Committee members for comment.

Mr. Kazarian stated that the Educational Policy Planning Committee has reviewed this at length in the committee meeting and representatives from Prairie Crossing have been available for some response, which was helpful. He stated that it was encouraging to look at a school that from every objective measure of a high performing school, it is meeting the needs of its community. In the stipulations that have been identified and required, they have been joined by Prairie Crossing who has agreed and acknowledged what needs to be accomplished under the stipulations. Therefore, there is no disagreement between the Superintendent and Prairie Crossing as to what needs to be done. As a result of this deliberation, it was the consensus of the committee that the Superintendent's Recommendation be accepted.

Joyce Karon stated that she commended staff on the thoroughness of materials that were made available for this item as it was exceptional. However, she wanted to reiterate her concern with the charter school representing the district and their ability to meet the special education requirements. Ms. Karon stated that if a charter school is going to reside in a district, it should reflect that district. Dean Clark agreed with Ms. Karon in her concern about the special education and the lack of low-income representation.

	<p>He stated that he does believe that these situations can be resolved and there are solutions out there.</p> <p>Dick Sandsmark stated that as he was going through the document, he came across several items that were found to be suggested as remedial in the Superintendent’s Recommendation. He stated that the Board must be careful in that if it is going to renew a charter, that the charter reflects the area that it is in. Mr. Sandsmark stated that at his first reaction, Prairie Crossing did not represent this.</p> <p>Mr. Kazarian stated that he did not believe that the characterization that has been put on Prairie Crossing was a fair description of the school and its operation. Accordingly, Mr. Kazarian added that this characterization is not consistent with his or staff assessments of Prairie Crossing. He then went on to assert that somewhere along the process there must be a timetable by which a school receives a discussion or compliance visit before their charter is at the renewal point just in case there are areas of concerns or inquiry with the policies and procedures of the school.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner inquired as to why the Board is approving the renewal at this point when it is not up until June 2004. Mr. Kazarian asserted that the some students are in temporary classrooms and the school needs the expansion. They have a lender that wants to know that the school will have its charter renewed before taking action to construct a facility. Mr. Kazarian also noted that Prairie Crossing is the only charter school operating in suburban Chicago.</p>
<p><b><u>2003 Title II State Report Card</u></b></p>	<p>Dr. Schiller stated that the next item to be discussed would be the 2003 Title II State Report Card. The purpose of this item was to inform the Board about the developments and contents of the Title II State Report Card which was mandated for issue under the 1998 Amendments to the Higher Education Reauthorization Act to impose accountability expectations on the institutions of higher education that prepare teachers and the states in which they operate. Dr. Schiller then proceeded to additionally note that there are eight sections of requirements as speculated by the Amendment. Staff has identified four sections for discussion being sections three, five, six, and seven. Dr. Schiller stated that it would be at the discretion of the Board to authorize staff to submit the Title II Report Card to the U.S. Department of Education on October 7 and authorize the dissemination of the report where and when it was needed.</p> <p>At that point, Dr. Schiller called Marti Woelfle, staff contact for this agenda item to be available for Board questions. Dr. Steiner asked about the ranking quartiles of institutions in regard to the accountability measures. Ms. Woelfle then proceeded to discuss</p>

	<p>the meaning of the quartile rankings, which were developed by the U.S. Department of Education in an attempt to rank institutions. The quartiles are based on the performance of candidate program completers of the Basic Skills and Content Area Tests. Lee Patton discussed the accountability factor that Congress enacted. In this effect, scores are very high because you must pass the tests in order to receive your certificate. With new requirements in place, candidates now must pass the Basic Skills Test before being admitted into Teacher Education. Therefore, next year for the Basic Skills test the Board will see a pass rate of 100%.</p> <p>Lee Patton added that this method of score reporting was designed by Congress as an accountability measure but it is a very flawed model in that it is difficult to draw conclusions with data being reported for multiple years against institutions instead of against standards. Ms. Patton stated that she feels that the accountability system that ISBE has in place currently with the Accreditation Review and visitations is a far stronger accountability system.</p> <p>Mr. Kazarian asked will the report reflect the inconsistencies. Ms. Patton stated that no, the report will reflect what the report asks although the U.S. Department of Education has been contacted about the definitions and inconsistencies within the required report.</p>
<p><b><u>Passing Scores for the Assessment of Professional Teaching and New Special Education Tests</u></b></p>	<p>Superintendent Schiller stated the next agenda item would be the consideration of adopting the Passing Scores for Assessment of Professional Teaching and New Special Education Certification Tests. Dr. Schiller then proceeded to state that the purpose of this item would be to review the recommendations of the raw passing scores for the four new Assessment of Professional tests and twelve new special education tests and for the Board to approve the passing scores for these tests.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller stated that the recent action has been the development of these tests in May. These tests were administered for the first time in July. The work on these scores is very scientific in nature as a modified Angoff standard-setting model was used for establishing the recommended raw passing scores for the four levels of the Assessment of Professional Teaching: Early Childhood, Elementary, Secondary, and Special. There are also five new special education contest test including: Teacher of Students Who Are Blind or Visually Impaired, Teachers of Students Who Are Deaf or Hard of Hearing, Early Childhood Special Education, Speech-Language Pathologist Teaching, and Speech Language Pathologist Non-Teaching, and finally seven Learning Behavior Specialist II test based upon the corresponding</p>

	<p>sets of Learning Behavior Specialist II standards.</p> <p>The State Teacher Certification Board discussed the panel-based recommended passing scores at its September 5, 2003 meeting. The discussion focused on three issues.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed raw passing score for speech-language pathologist: teaching (57) is notably lower than the scores for the others, which are in the 60s. There is no obvious explanation for this lower recommendation, and the Certification Board members agreed with staff that it would be appropriate to increase this score by one standard error of measurement. This would result in a passing score of 61.</li> <li>2. The Certification Board members felt that passing scores for these tests should be reviewed within a year due to the importance of the APT tests and the fact that they represent completely new areas of assessment.</li> <li>3. The procedure used by the agency for setting passing scores typically calls for presentation of the pass rate data to the Bias Review Committee prior to its presentation to the Certification Board. The Bias Committee did meet on September 12 to review the pass rate data.</li> </ol> <p>According to Dr. Schiller, the Certification Board recommended that the State Board adopt the State Teacher Certification Board's recommended actions as specified. Dr. Schiller then asked the Board if they had questions concerning the item. Ms. Karon stated that she did not have a question but appreciated the complexity in which the report was prepared. Dr. Schiller affirmed Ms. Karon's statement by saying that staff did a wonderful job with preparing the agenda item.</p>
<p><b><u>Proposed Criteria and Procedures for Approval of Coursework, Programs, and Activities Leading to Standard Certification Eligibility</u></b></p>	<p>Dr. Schiller stated that the next action would be to recommend to the Board the Proposed Criteria and Procedures for Approval of Coursework, Programs and Activities Leading to Standard Certificate Eligibility. Basically, a logistical issue was brought to the State Certification Board with regard to what extent the State Board and the Certification Board would like to be directly involved and responsible for approving all of the criteria and procedures for individual programs and courses each time they are brought forward or would the State Board wish to delegate approval responsibility for programs, coursework and activities leading to Standard Certification eligibility to the State Superintendent to respond in an immediate nature to those who would be applying. The issue that we would have is that these requests for approval would not come in on a regular basis each month but on an ad hoc basis. Thus, there could be a situation</p>

	<p>where an approval would have to go through the State Certification Board and then the State Board before it was approved. There would thus be a longer timetable in which individuals would receive approval.</p> <p>The requirements for each option would be assessed for each approval case in that the State Superintendent would assess if the proposal addressed all the required aspects of the option (completeness) and if the components of the proposal meet the content and process requirements (compliance).</p> <p>Janet Steiner and Dick Sandsmark both stated that they could see where this process would be a good one in that the State Board has had the State Superintendent act in such a role before. The Superintendent affirmed their statements positively by asserting that in this instance as well as others the Board is still setting the policy but the actual administration for timeliness would best serve the applicants through the State Superintendent.</p> <p>Greg Kazarian inquired as to how the approvals by the Superintendent and the Certification Board would work together. Dr. Schiller stated that the proposed courses, activities, and/or programs would be forward to the State Superintendent for approval, and then the State Superintendent's approval or disapproval would be then brought to the Certification Board for ultimate disposition.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller then referred to staff as to the correctness of the explained process. Lee Patton stated that the explained process was correct in that the Certification Board, after reviewing four options for procedures that would meet the requirement for Certification Board approval, the Certification Board chose the process in which proposals be presented to the Certification Board members with staff recommendations for action. In this instance, the members of the Certification Board will be able to review electronic proposals in advance if they choose to do so. Certification Board members did express some concern about the potential volume of applications to be approved and thus indicated that this procedure should be subject to review in the future as needed.</p> <p>In this instance, the State Board has two options for action:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Proposals can be presented to the State Board along with Certification Board recommendations for action; or</li><li>2. State Board approval authority can be delegated to the State Superintendent.</li></ol>
--	---

<p><b><u>Institutional Accreditation Decisions for Rockford College</u></b></p>	<p>Dr. Steiner then called for the agenda item: Institutional Accreditation Decisions for Rockford College.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller stated that back in August the Board decided to grant accreditation to eight of the nine institutions that the Certification Board recommended for accreditation. At that time, the State Board did not take action concerning Rockford College because the institution did not respond within the allotted 30 day period to notify the Board of intention to file a notice of objection nor of its acceptance of the recommendation. Since the 30 day filing period has expired, the State Board may move forward with its review of the Certification Board’s recommendation to assign Rockford College “accreditation with conditions” with a focus visit to be assigned within two years of the date of the decision.</p> <p>Thus, Dr. Schiller recommended to the State Board that they assign Rockford College “continuing accreditation with conditions” with a required focus visit within two years of the decision and authorize the Superintendent to inform the institutions of the State Board’s decisions.</p>
<p><b><u>Submission of Waiver Report to the General Assembly</u></b></p>	<p>Dr. Steiner then stated that the next topic for Board consideration would be the submission of the Waiver Report to the General Assembly.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller stated that this is the 17<sup>th</sup> annual report to the General Assembly. The report contains 21 requests that seek to waive mandates contained in eight School Code provisions. These include requirements pertaining to driver education fees (7 requests), daily physical education (3 requests), evaluation plans for tenured teachers (3 requests), non-resident tuition (2 requests), and parent-teacher conferences and in-service training (2 requests each). Other requests will be forwarded to the General Assembly for action address limitation of administrative costs and substitute teachers.</p> <p>The State Board of Education, since the spring waiver report, has approved 136 requests that modify School Code mandates or modify or waive agency rules. Of those, 125 address legal school holidays ; five address daily physical education; three address adjustment of instructional time pertaining to the spring administration of the Prairie State Achievement Examination; and one each addresses course requirements, driver’s education, and substitute teachers.</p> <p>The Superintendent then proceeded to state that in June of 2003 the State Board denied a request wishing to waive regulatory</p>



	<p>requirements pertaining to rules governing reimbursement of transportation costs for Oak Park ESD 97. The fall waiver report will also include this appeal.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller then asserted that it would be his recommendation for the State Board to forward the 21 waiver requests summarized in the report along with the appeal of the State Board’s denial of the request to waive administrative rules to the General Assembly, and the Board should approve the report and authorize its submission to the General Assembly by October 1.</p> <p>Joyce Karon inquired about the request to waive the 90 day limit for substitutes. Staff clarified that the waiver must be submitted in that it is a waiver of the School Code (Section 21-9) which states that a district may not employ a substitute for more than 90 days in any one school year.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner asked the about the change in the teacher ratings on evaluations from three ratings of “excellent, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory” for the teacher evaluation process with a professional growth plan or the standards of “meets districts standards of excellence, needs to improve to meet district standards, and unsatisfactory.” Staff responded by saying this is a waiver originating with many unions in districts who believe the “excellent, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory” rating creates unhealthy competition between teachers. The purpose for the professional growth plan would be for teachers to set up their own individual goals.</p>
<p><b><u>Rules for Adoption— Part 25 (Certification)</u></b></p>	<p>Dr. Schiller stated that the next agenda item would be the Rules for Adoption. He questioned if the Board would like him to explain the rules or defer discussion with concurrent action until the Plenary Business Meeting. The Superintendent and the Board agreed that the Rules for Adoption—Part 25 (Certification) would be discussed the following day before taking action.</p>
<p><b><u>Fiscal Year Budget Schedule</u></b></p>	<p>Dr. Schiller stated that staff would like discuss the next steps in developing the FY05 Budget Schedule and to put out a schedule that staff would propose for the Board’s consideration and the next steps in developing the State of Education document and where staff sees the Board going in the next three months with regard to the Board’s focus at its next Board meeting in respect to the budget.</p> <p>Mr. Wood stated while the schedule is relatively self-explanatory and most of the Board members have been through it before and it</p>

has not changed much, it is staff intention to give the Board an overview of the revenues and to remind the Board of the proposed multi-year budget from last year as well as discuss some of the overall context issues that the agency may be facing. In looking toward the months ahead, Mr. Wood stated that staff then plans to possibly in the October meeting come with some more specific discussion of programs, and then in November possibly come to the Board with a Superintendent's recommendation and then finally adopting a budget in December. Within this timeframe, there would be several opportunities to collect information and have several discussions in the field as to what educators and educational leaders would propose in regard to the Budget Schedule.

Mr. Wood then began to discuss with the Board two handouts (see attachments) entitled General Funds Appropriations and Illinois State Board of Education Multi-Year Budget. The purpose of the General Funds Appropriations handout was for the Board to see from FY00-FY04 the final spending appropriations by program category for most of the major state education programs. In regard to General State Aid (GSA) appropriation, the data are not yet formalized in that data has not been received from Cook and Lake County. Part of these counties problem is that they do not have final data from the previous year with regard to their EAVs. We may be \$8 million dollars short in GSA this year. Given the legislation that just passed that changed the poverty count in the way the formula works, there was a provision that stated that if you are short in GSA, you will first take it against your growth in poverty. Therefore, at this point, we are estimating on the basis of everything, the state will just pay out the GSA with no prorations and pay hold harmless possibly at 80% and hope when the final data are received, the loss will be supplemented. Due to this year's data not being finalized, we do not have a file for next year. We do have one thing working against the agency in that the Corporate Property Replacement Tax (CPRT) is estimated to take a dive. So while this year, the state was able to get an increase of \$250 on the foundation level, next year it will come at a higher price, possibly nearly 300 million dollars to get the same level that we got last year. Greg Kazarian stated that there is a natural "catch up" we have to make if we wanted the foundation to stay flat we would have to have an increase in state aid to replace that. Mr. Wood agreed affirmatively by stating that data shifts happen when ADAs are dropping and EAVs are growing, you can buy some money on the foundation level without it putting anymore money in from the state or actually even take some money away and still keep the same level. However, it will not work quite this way next year.

	<p>Mr. Wood additionally asserted that special education personnel and transportation were fully-funded by the Governor and General Assembly according to the state statutory formula. While ending FY03 with a deficit of \$100-120 million in fully-funding those formulas, FY04 will only be about \$65 million short. Therefore, there has been some progress in funding those categorical programs, and if the Board would continue their trend of asking for 100%, there will be at least another \$100-130 million in addition to the 300 million in GSA. One of the budget deals that were cut was not to fund Chicago's retirement which was \$65 million with the prospect of Chicago finding a different funding source and a commitment to try to bring it into the budget next year. However, when the time rolls around again, the Board will have to look at some strategic increases to supplement this, for example, in the Early Childhood Program.</p> <p>David Wood then proceeded to give an outline of the FY05 Budget by item. At this point, there was not a specific FY04 Budget Summary from the Office of Budget and Management. Therefore, there is not an official FY04 revenue statement. Mr. Wood stated that hopefully, this document would be out by the end of September or within the first quarter.</p> <p>Ms. Karon stated that she knew that it is the case that in a lot of instances federal funds match with state funds. Therefore, she questioned if that projection was okay in regard to the Illinois State Board's budget. David stated that this is not the case with our state. For example, by increasing special education the state has helped this issue, and it has made funding a non-issue. However, the state is somewhat limited in the career and vocational education area because of this concern. Mr. Wood said that the state has been working with the budget office to explore expenditures that school districts spend whether it's with local money or state grants that could be match for other state programs, and there may be some opportunities as with Chicago Public Schools for expansion. Mr. Wood explained to the Office of Management and Budget that to the extent school districts will participate; they probably will expect some benefit for their participation. We have money on our federal side but cannot access it since we have state cuts. Therefore, we are boxed in the area of the vocational education.</p>
<p><b><u>ISBE Monthly Reports</u></b></p>	<p>Dr. Schiller stated that the last item for Board review for action in the Plenary Session would be the ISBE Monthly Reports.</p> <p>The Superintendent shared with the Board that the headcount of</p>

<p><b><u>Approval of Superintendent's Quarterly Travel Analysis (March 2003-June 2003)</u></b></p>	<p>staff is at 490, and staff is working on further describing each agency position with regard to its function and where we are unable to perform any of the functions.</p> <p>He then inquired of the Board if there were any questions regarding the reports and/or if the Board would have any comments related to the reports.</p> <p>Dick Sandsmark stated that he thoroughly reviewed the Superintendent's travel and there was no question as to where the Superintendent was on any given day and at any given time. He asserted that the report was very concise and detailed.</p>
<p><b><u>Closed Session Motion</u></b></p>	<p>Dr. Schiller stated that the Board needed to make a motion to go into Closed Session at 8:00 a.m. tomorrow.</p> <p>Greg Kazarian then made a motion for the Board to enter into Closed Session under the exceptions set forth in the Open Meetings Act of the State of Illinois.</p> <p>The motion was seconded by Dean Clark.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner then called for a roll call on the motion. The motion carried as all members present voted yes.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner then stated that the meeting would reconvene tomorrow at 9:30 a.m. Thus, the first day session recessed at 4:56 p.m.</p>

	<b><u>Thursday, September 18, 2003</u></b>
	<b><u>Plenary Session</u></b>
<b><u>Reconvene</u></b>	Dr. Steiner stated at 9:37 a.m. that the official meeting of the Illinois State Board is now in session.
<b><u>Call Meeting to Order/Roll Call</u></b>	Then, Dr. Steiner asked for the roll to be called. All members were present at the plenary session with the exception of Beverly Turkal. Judith Gold joined the meeting shortly after the roll call.
<b><u>Introductions</u></b>	<p>Dr. Steiner proceeded to call Dr. Walt Warfield, Executive Director of the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA). Dr. Warfield stated that most of the Board knew him as the director of the IASA. However, he asserted that he was “wearing a different hat” in that he was presenting himself to the Board as one of the governing members of the Horace Mann League. The Horace Mann League is a national group that is loosely affiliated with IASA, and has been in existence for some eighty years.</p> <p>The league promotes public education through the recognition of Horace Mann being the founder of the American public education school system. Dr. Warfield stated that the goal of the league, through Horace Mann’s writing, is to prepare all students for effective citizenship in our democracy, and that the public school embraces all children regardless of race, wealth, or ability.</p> <p>Dr. Warfield stated that his purpose was to present to the Board a framed poster that is given out all across the country to schools in support of keeping public education free, classless and open to all children. He stated that he is proud to say that the framed poster is in all schools in the nation that bear the Horace Mann name and have been made available to others as well. At the Horace Mann governing Board meeting in July, their Board authorized Dr. Warfield to present the framed poster to be placed in the Illinois State Board of Education office in support of public education and to thank as well as recognize the Board for all the work they do on behalf of public education in the State of Illinois.</p> <p>Ronald Gidwitz inquired of Dr. Warfield as to why there is nothing stated in the purpose concerning quality. Dr. Warfield stated that the league has tried to stay close to the writings of Horace Mann. In those writings, the issues of quality was simply not spoken of because at that time the focus was on universal access. It has just been during our times that we have begun to stress universal proficiency. Mr. Gidwitz stated that as it may not have been</p>



<p><b><u>Jay Runner,</u></b> <b><u>Facilitating</u></b> <b><u>Coordinator for</u></b> <b><u>Agriculture</u></b> <b><u>Education</u></b></p>	<p>coalition has presented and would like ISBE to support is to make non-public schools a part of the legislation in the Fall Veto Session that would mandate the Illinois State Board of Education to provide a non-public school recognition process on a voluntary basis. It is the belief of the coalition that the process can be streamlined by significantly reducing the financial burden on the State Board while maintaining its integrity and effectiveness. An idea to initiate this process includes ISBE's acceptance of private accreditation and/or an agreed upon peer view accreditation process made up and carried out by non-public school recognition staff. However, the coalition feels strongly about establishing in the school code an authority for carrying out the non-public school recognition. Mr. Reed stated that he appreciates the willingness that the State Board of Education staff has shown with the non-public school recognition process. The recognition process is vital and the coalition is committed to its restoration. The coalition wants and expects for the recognition process to continue.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner then called Jay Runner to discuss his agriculture education issue with the Board. Mr. Runner thanked Dr. Steiner and Dr. Schiller for the opportunity to address the Board, and then proceeded to thank them for their continued support of the agriculture line item in the ISBE budget.</p> <p>Mr. Runner stated that his purpose today was to share with the Board a packet of information that was provided to teachers in Illinois free of charge because of the funds that were made available in the budget. The company that developed the CDs has a market, in agreement with ISBE, for other districts to also purchase the agriculture education information. Currently, there are 42 school districts that are purchasing individual CDs and there are 14 states that are purchasing the whole entire curriculum project as a package.</p> <p>Academic assessments are now being developed that address No Child Left Behind and the agriculture education standards. Teachers have been hired to write these assessments and make them available via their website. Currently, there are 200 assessments done. It is the hope that teachers would then have the opportunity for in-service on these materials so that they know how to use them in the classroom, and then finish them so that there will be a lesson on every activity on the CD. This tool has been requested by administrators for quite some time. Therefore, he again thanked the Board for supporting the line item and allowing him to show them a product of the budget allocation. He then</p>
---	--

<p><b><u>Penny Dagley, Woodland District 50</u></b></p>	<p>asked if any Board members had questions.</p> <p>Dick Sandsmark asked if the royalties would be made off of the CDs that were sold to the other states. Mr. Runner stated that yes, they do gain royalties as there is a reciprocal agreement in that an account is set up at ISBE in a trust fund account. The money that is gained from the royalties is then put into this account for future professional development. However, the dollars in that account are not accessible due to the veto of the governor in regard to the allocation of those lines. There has been work to change or address the contract so this will not be a future issue. There has been a discussion with Brenda Holmes as well. Currently, there is \$57,000+ in that line, and in November there will be another payment made into that line item in excess of the \$57,000 amount by the company producing the CDs. In addition, the company has expressed concerns in making the payments if they will not be accessible to us. Ronald Gidwitz asked if there is some way to get out of the contract. Mr. Runner stated that right now they are working with the ISBE lawyers to try and revise the contract so that this issue will not be an issue in the future. Dr. Steiner thanked Mr. Runner for his presentation citing that she enjoyed the horticulture CD.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner then called Penny Dagley of Woodland District 50 to discuss the renewal of the Prairie Crossing Charter School. Ms. Dagley then introduced herself and stated that she was the director of pupil personnel services. Ms. Dagley then proceeded to cite the a portion of the Prairie Crossing Recommendation of the State Superintendent which stated that “In accordance with Section 27A-9(c) of the Illinois Charter School Law, ‘a charter may be revoked or not renewed if the State Board, as the chartering entity, clearly demonstrates that the charter did any of the following, or otherwise failed to comply with the requirements of this law.’” She cited the fourth requirement which refers to a violation of any provision of the law from which the charter school was not exempted. Mr. Dagley stated that Prairie Crossing was not exempted from being in full compliance under IDEA. According to Ms. Dagley, no other LEA would get away with not fully complying with IDEA, and would like to know why Prairie Crossing has been granted this privilege. She stated that other LEAs are monitored on regular basis while Prairie Crossing has not been monitored regularly over the last four years. Ms. Dagley stated that the finding cited in the Recommendation of the State Superintendent with regard to special education were not minor adjustments in the delivery of special education services but speak to the core of essential services that should be provided under IDEA. Therefore, she urged the Board to</p>
---	--



<p><b><u>Anne Swanson,</u></b> <b><u>Director of</u></b> <b><u>Curriculum and</u></b> <b><u>Instruction of</u></b> <b><u>Woodland District 50</u></b></p>	<p>deny their request to renew their charter based on their non-compliance with IDEA as they are not exempt for providing for the 15% of special education children in their population.</p> <p>Ron Gidwitz stated that he wished that it was easy to give the black and white of the situation and be as strict as Ms. Dagley speculated. However, Mr. Gidwitz stated that there are some grey areas in this case as was with Corey H. There are 49 people working across our state to provide special education services to 893 school districts. He stated that we are working with several school districts to get them into compliance. However, we just do not shut schools down who do not follow the exact letter of the law. We attempt to remediate the school situations before that process occurs.</p> <p>Ms. Reed said that she does not disagree with Mr. Gidwitz and that we all struggle with complying with IDEA on a regular basis but stated that Prairie Crossing's disregard for the basic core of what is required in the law is unacceptable.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner then called Anne Swanson from Woodland School District. Anne Swanson stated that the Board would be hearing from several parents concerning their pleasure with the Prairie Crossing Charter School. She stated that this was good, and without doubt Prairie Crossing has a good program. However, she stated her purpose was to present herself to the Board on behalf of the other parents who are unhappy with Prairie Crossing.</p> <p>Ms. Swanson stated that Prairie Crossing asserted in their original charter and renewal that their intent was to generally reflect the populations of the communities from where the students come from as well as the populations of special education and at-risk children. However, Ms. Swanson asserted that Prairie Crossing does not reflect the Woodland population even though they indicate that they do. She stated this is not a situation that evolved slowly over time. However, it has been a situation that Prairie Crossing anticipated. She supported this statement by stating that Prairie Crossing asserted that they would find remedy for situations that presented themselves, such as transportation that would prevent an accurate reflection of the population from which the children came. However, according to Ms. Reed, this attempt was not made by Prairie Crossing. Thus, she stated that she would like this false information corrected. She stated that the Prairie Crossing charter be denied until some of these issues can be remedied. She stated that the lottery is a fair system but it is not</p>
---	---

**Dennis Conti,**  
**Superintendent of**  
**Woodland District 50**

being implemented in the way that it should. Thus, she stated that the Prairie Crossing renewal should be denied or at least delayed until such remedies have been made not just planned.

Dr. Steiner then called Dennis Conti to present himself to the Board. Superintendent Conti proceeded to discuss the demographics of Woodland stating there has been great growth and diversity within their district. When he started in the district 11 years ago, the enrollment was 2500. At of the meeting, the enrollment was 7,000 students. However, with the erosion of the budget, Mr. Conti stated that it is going to be hard to maintain the level of functioning.

Mr. Conti asserted that he was not against the Prairie Crossing School or a charter school at all. Accordingly , he stated that the diversity and the choice is an enjoyable challenge. The issue that Woodland has, however, is with the financial impact as Woodland has given General State Aid dollars for the 200 children that attend Prairie Crossing. As students continue to enroll in Prairie Crossing Charter School, the GSA dollars in Woodland District diminish. If the enrollment goes to over 400 students, the GSA will be lost along with the other funds Woodland receives from the state.

Thus, the concern is with the loss of revenues but no decrease in expenditures for their district. Woodland’s budget was decreased by \$1 million but the expenditures remained the same. There have been four referendums (bond and tax) in the last ten years to supplement the growth in the district and then to pay for more teachers to teach the increased percentage of students. The voters of the community in Lake County will most likely not be favorable of another referendum despite the district’s increasing inability to provide services with a decrease in resources.

Ronald Gidwitz pointed out that Woodland benefits from the real estate taxes that parents pay for living in the district, even though their children go to Prairie Crossing. Mr. Gidwitz further asserted that school districts do not have an entitlement to the state dollars provided for each child’s education. The money is to follow the child according to the Charter School Law. Mr. Conti stated affirmatively that Mr. Gidwitz was correct but that this is still a loss to Woodland School District as they still have the same expenditures.

<p><b><u>Minerva Familiar,</u></b> <b><u>Parent of Prairie</u></b> <b><u>Crossing Charter</u></b> <b><u>School</u></b></p>	<p>Dr. Steiner then stated that the Board would continue with public participation, and then she called Minerva Familiar, a parent from Prairie Crossing Charter School. Ms. Familiar greeted the Board by saying, “Buenos Dias!” and stated that before she began her presentation she would like to submit to the Board letters from 144 families in support of Prairie Crossing Charter School. Ms. Familiar stated that she questioned the basis on which Woodland District stated that Prairie Crossing Charter School is operating an elitist private school using public funds. Ms. Familiar stated that she further questioned the documentation used to make this assumption and several other allegations against Prairie Crossing School. She then proceeded to defend Prairie Crossing School as a good charter school that is committed to responsible citizenship and environmental stewardship as well as places a high regard on the respect of diverse populations.</p> <p>Ms. Familiar said that she took personal offense to the comments made about Prairie Crossing being an elitist white school in that her Puerto Rican/ Filipino daughter is very well respected at Prairie Crossing as a minority, and if she were not respected, her daughter would not be there. She stated that she wanted her child to go to a school such as Prairie Crossing to be prepared to work as a Hispanic/Asian woman in the world. Ms. Familiar asserted that she wanted her child to have the best education in which to achieve this goal. In addition, Ms. Familiar stated that while she does not live in Prairie Crossing subdivision, she does live in a neighboring subdivision. She stated that there would be no reason to take her child to another school further away.</p>
<p><b><u>Eileen Murphy,</u></b> <b><u>Parent of Prairie</u></b> <b><u>Crossing Charter</u></b> <b><u>School</u></b></p>	<p>Eileen Murphy then presented herself to the Board introducing herself as a parent of three Prairie Crossing children as well as an officer of the Prairie Crossing PSO. Mrs. Murphy stated that her and her husband adopted their daughters from Russia in the last two to four years, and because of this they have special needs. She stated that staff at Prairie Crossing have went out of their way to service her daughters’ ESL needs, particularly in the areas of reading and writing.</p> <p>Mrs. Murphy stated that the academic and social success that her children achieved as a result of the care and time of their teachers was phenomenal. The children were included in the regular classroom, and the hands-on instruction allowed her children to successfully participate in the instruction, especially in the schools’ environmental science program. She stated that Woodland did not identify a learning disability that her daughter has. However, Mrs. Murphy stated that Prairie Crossing noticed her child’s disability</p>

<p><b><u>Steve Barg,</u></b> <b><u>Executive Director of</u></b> <b><u>Liberty Prairie</u></b> <b><u>Conservancy and</u></b> <b><u>Parent of Prairie</u></b> <b><u>Crossing Charter</u></b> <b><u>School</u></b></p>	<p>and her daughter is well on her way to receiving the assistance that she needs. In addition, she stated that the small school environment is a good transition and adjustment for her children coming from a different environment. She granted the success of her children to the factors she noted about Prairie Crossing.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner then called for Steve Barg who introduced himself as a parent of a fourth grader at Prairie Crossing and the Executive Director of the Liberty Prairie Conservancy. Mr. Barg stated that in years past he has worked with Prairie Crossing serving as an environmental science field study specialist. In this role, Mr. Barg asserted that he worked with the students as well as the teachers on the learning and teaching of the environmental curriculum. Currently, the position is being co-funded by Liberty Prairie and Prairie Crossing. He stated that after four years of training, Prairie Crossing is prepared to give back to the community what it has learned in regard to the environmental training received. The school will be reaching out to surrounding districts to include them in their teacher professional development opportunities through the use of grants.</p> <p>He stated that it is interesting that the surrounding districts— School District 50 and School District 56 are in the process of opening up schools very similar in approach to Prairie Crossing with regard to the offering of multi-age classrooms, a looped curriculum, and innovative teaching approaches. Thus, Mr. Barg stated that he wonders if these districts would have even attempted exploring these types of schools if it had not been for Prairie Crossing.</p>
<p><b><u>Mohammad Nasir,</u></b> <b><u>Board of Education</u></b> <b><u>member from</u></b> <b><u>Prairie Crossing</u></b> <b><u>School</u></b></p>	<p>Dr. Steiner then asked Mohammad Nasir to come forward to present to the Board. Mr. Nasir stated that he is a living example of diversity as he is a scientist by training and a member of the Prairie Crossing Charter School. He stated that if he would have been anywhere else, for instance at Woodland, he would not be sitting on the Board of Education as an elected member. He stated that his children have been to Woodland and Grayslake but now attend Prairie Crossing. Mr. Nasir proclaimed to the Board if they had any doubts about renewing the charter, they should remove that doubt due to the effect the school has on not only the children in the school but also the international outreach the school maintains with students in other countries. Prairie Crossing students communicate with students in Pakistan through letter writing. According to Mr. Nasir, if it would not have been for the letter writing, the children in Pakistan would not know what is going on in America and the American children would not have</p>

<p><b><u>Cynthia Ward,</u></b> <b><u>Prairie Crossing</u></b> <b><u>Charter School</u></b> <b><u>Teacher</u></b></p>	<p>knowledge of other countries outside the USA. Thus, this is a wonderful experience with a different kind of education focused on global citizenship.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner then called for Cynthia Ward, a teacher at Prairie Crossing Charter School. As Ms. Ward came to speak to the Board, several teachers passed out student work for the Board to view. Ms. Ward then proceeded to thank the Board for allowing her to speak as a teacher from Prairie Crossing and an original staff member. She stated that as teacher she has had various opportunities to work with colleagues and parents in many ways. Prairie Crossing Staff works to collaborate and update the curriculum with the Curriculum Advisory Board which is comprised of teachers, administrators and parents. Curricular mapping is done to make sure that transitions between grade levels are smooth and all skill areas are covered in alignment with the Illinois State Standards. Prairie Crossing Charter School provides leadership opportunities to its teachers through its mentoring program, parent committees, and school design committees.</p> <p>According to Ms. Ward, teachers and parents work together on such issues as report card revisions, curriculum design, discipline action, and recertification. When the teachers redesign the curriculum, they become invested in the educational process. In addition, the environmental education emphasis has had a great impact on the children’s learning in all areas and has been especially important in the children gaining knowledge about the environment in which they live as well as a maximizing of parents interest of the outside world. Lessons are tiered to meet the needs of various ability levels within the multi-age grouping. Ms. Ward then read an essay from a student explaining why students should attend Prairie Crossing Charter School citing that PCCS is a better school in that he does not have to sit in his seat all day but can learn in many different ways.</p>
<p><b><u>Maria Sandborn,</u></b> <b><u>Prairie Crossing</u></b> <b><u>Charter School</u></b> <b><u>Teacher</u></b></p>	<p>At this point, Dr. Steiner stepped out and temporarily left Dick Sandsmark with the responsibility of facilitating the public participation segment. In this regard, Mr. Sandsmark called Maria Sandborn, another teacher from Prairie Crossing Charter School. Ms. Sandborn stated that this year would be her fourth year teaching at Prairie Crossing. She started off as a multi-age age teacher and a Spanish teacher. However, this year she will be concentrating just on Spanish education. She stated that she sought out Prairie Crossing School as an alternative to some of the other public schools where she was a bilingual Spanish teacher for four years. As a former Peace Corps volunteer, what attracted her to</p>

<p><b><u>Vicky Ranny, Acting President of Prairie Crossing Board and President of the Prairie Holding Corporation</u></b></p>	<p>Prairie Crossing was their environmental education program as well as their emphasis on Spanish education, even beginning in the kindergarten year. She stated that she has been able to take her personal experience of living and traveling throughout Central America and enhance the student learning.</p> <p>Ms. Sandborn stated that several years ago she translated informational flyers about enrollment openings in a Prairie Crossing brochure to Spanish-speaking families in the area to provide the option of attending Prairie Crossing to these families and their children, and that she would make every effort to continue to communicate and strengthen the relationships with the Spanish-speaking community as the minority population increases. The school thus welcomes parent participation and assistance in this process. Ms. Sandborn stated while Prairie Crossing is a challenging place to work, working at the school has enhanced her professionally through the growth she has experienced while teaching at the school.</p> <p>Mr. Sandsmark then called Vicky Ranny, acting president of the Prairie Crossing School Board. She stated that she began to serve as acting president when the previous president had to step down due to serious illness and death in his family, and that she was proud to be the only founding member of the Board left on the Board. Ms. Ranny stated that she is also president of the Prairie Holding Corporation which handles conservation in the area in which Prairie Crossing school is located.</p> <p>She stated that in the Prairie Crossing area, they are dedicated to ten guiding principles which include: environmental protection and enhancement, lifelong learning, and racial and economic diversity. These principals are posted in the Prairie Crossing subdivision sales office for new homes and it is stated that admission to Prairie Crossing Charter School is not guaranteed as it is based on a lottery system. In addition, Ms. Ranney noted that two-thirds of the children that attend Prairie Crossing charter school live outside of the charter school area. She stated that in her role, it is her duty to make sure that Prairie Crossing is in compliance with the State Board on issues of governance, freedom of information, and statements of economic interests. She stated that the school is well on their way to completing these and will complete them by September 30<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Ranny then shared her appreciation to the State Board staff in helping Prairie Crossing as new school to be successful.</p>
---	---

<p><b><u>Dr. Linda Brazdil,</u></b> <b><u>Director of Prairie</u></b> <b><u>Crossing Charter</u></b> <b><u>School</u></b></p>	<p>Mr. Sandsmark then called Dr. Linda Brazdil. Dr. Brazdil greeted the Board and thanked them for the opportunity to speak. Then she proceeded to state that she joined Prairie Crossing as its director in July. She stated that she found a wonderful, inclusive atmosphere through the entire school community that encourages every child to achieve high standards with every teacher and parent working together toward this goal and vowing to continue to learn themselves. Dr. Brazdil stated that now that the school has both a principal and director, she can focus now on the issues brought forth by the Illinois State Board of Education to Prairie Crossing’s recharter. She stated that she is committed to do all that she can by working with the State Board, the Superintendent, and ISBE staff to remedy the situations concerning low-income and limit English speaking children. She stated that she looks forward to codifying the special education issues that were set forth so that all special education students receive the services and education that they should as this is their right. Dr. Brazdil stated that she will also ensure that the staffing requirements are met as well. She stated that Prairie Crossing is a vibrant and happy learning community and she looks forward to the chance to continue to grow and become even better.</p>
<p><b><u>Donna Baiocchi,</u></b> <b><u>EDRED</u></b></p>	<p>Dr. Steiner joined the meeting again and then called Donna Baiocchi to come to address the Board on her issue. Ms. Baiocchi thanked the Board for the opportunity to always address them at every meeting. She stated that she is the Executive Director of EDRED which represents many suburban districts, including Woodland School District. She stated that she did not intend to address the Board at this meeting. However, she was surprised by a recent procedural change. The usual procedure in acting on matters such as the Prairie Crossing Charter School would be to have a discussion session the day before the meeting, and then have the Board to vote on the issue. Ms. Baiocchi stated that this process was done. However, she learned, after the fact that some members of the Board also met during the Education Policy meeting with active participation from Prairie Crossing. However, she was not made aware of this meeting. She stated that she looked for the citation of the Prairie Crossing delegation to discuss the consideration of renewing the charter in a meeting before the regular session and the meeting agenda on the web and did not find it. Therefore, she stated that if there have been changes in meetings and discussions that she and her colleagues be made aware of them.</p> <p>Greg Kazarian stated it is incumbent for the Board to take heed to Ms. Baiocchi’s comments as the committee and Board continue to</p>

<p><b><u>Laura Arterburn, Illinois Federation of Teachers/ Waivers</u></b></p>	<p>work hard on behalf of educational issues such as these. He stated that we must make sure that we do not disrupt the spirit of certain “Board watchers” who would like to participate in certain important policy discussions as the Board appreciates their input as decisions are being made.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner then called Laura Arterburn. Ms. Arterburn stated that she would like some serious consideration for the teachers who now hold initial certificates and will be due to obtain a standard certificate by July 1, 2004. She stated that there are no specific guidelines for these teachers or a form for them to complete in regard to obtaining their standard certificate. Ms. Arterburn stated that due to this fact she is requesting that the Board not put more pressure on these teachers and require anything else of them but the four successful years of teaching. She stated that she believes those that come in 2005-2006 should be held to these standards. However, the Board should give great consideration to the teachers who are currently going to be up for the standard certification in 2004.</p> <p>Ms. Arterburn then stated that in response to the waiver item, she was glad to see that there was only one waiver for substitutes. She stated that with regard to the NCLB mandates and having highly qualified teachers in the classroom, the State Board should take an active role in stating that these waivers should not go through as it would affect our children and our compliance with the NCLB mandates.</p>
<p><b><u>Break</u></b></p>	<p>Then at 10:42 a.m. Dr. Steiner stated that the Board would take a break and reconvene in five minutes.</p>
<p><b><u>Approval of Minutes</u></b></p>	<p>Dr. Steiner stated that the first action item was to approve the minutes of the August 20, 2003 meeting, and asked for motion from one of the Board members.</p> <p>Joyce Karon then moved that the Illinois State Board of Education approve the minutes of the August 20, 2003 meeting as published. Greg Kazarian seconded the motion. The motion carried as all members present voted yes. Dean Clark was out of the room during the vote.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner then asserted that the minutes stood approved as published.</p>
<p><b><u>Action Items</u></b></p>	<p>Dr. Steiner stated that each of the action items have been reviewed by the Board and by the appropriate committees and discussion on</p>



	<p>the items took place prior to the meeting. Therefore, Dr. Steiner stated that she would ask for the Superintendent to summarize each item, then she would call for a motion, allow Board discussion, and then the Board would take appropriate action.</p>
<p><b><u>Consideration</u></b> <b><u>Prairie Crossing</u></b> <b><u>Charter School</u></b> <b><u>Renewal</u></b></p>	<p>Thus, Dr. Steiner stated that the first item for Board attention and action was the consideration of Prairie Crossing Charter School renewal. Dr. Schiller stated that documentation was presented to the Board that was submitted by staff with regard to the renewal of Prairie Crossing Charter School. In addition, the Board had been provided with the recommendation of the Superintendent and all the relevant attachments.</p> <p>The Superintendent stated that he was under the belief and stood firmly on his belief that the Prairie Crossing Charter School proposal complies with the Illinois Charter School Law. He stated that Prairie Crossing is indeed in need of some attention and refinement but these issues do not stand as a material matter that would dissuade him from his recommendation in going forward. Thus, the Superintendent stated that he would recommend to the Board upon the completion and meeting of the deadlines upon Prairie Crossing school, the State Board of Education authorize the Superintendent to enter upon a written agreement to renew the Prairie Crossing Charter School for another term.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller then proceeded to review some of the documentation that was previously reviewed referring to the remedying of findings as well as the stipulations citing that Prairie Crossing Charter School would receive 100% of the per capita tuition rate (PCTR) for a maximum enrollment of 360 students. Any enrollment increase beyond 360 and up to 432 students would require a financial review and negotiation of the PCTR. Based on the projections and tables presented in the Recommendation by the State Superintendent, an increase in student enrollment would likely result in a decrease in the PCTR in the 75% - 85% range.</p> <p>The Superintendent stated that he felt certain that the charter school represents the intentions of the Illinois Charter School Law and is fulfilling its duty by providing a quality education and a true educational alternative.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner then called for a motion from the Education Policy Planning Committee regarding the consideration of the Prairie Crossing Charter School.</p> <p>Dean Clark then read the motion which asserted the Illinois State</p>

Board of Education hereby adopt the Superintendent's Recommendation for the renewal of the charter of Prairie Crossing Charter School. Upon the State Superintendent's satisfaction with Prairie Crossing's completion of the items noted in the Recommendation of the State Superintendent, the State Board authorizes the State Superintendent to enter into a written agreement with the charter school for five years with the following stipulations:

- Prairie Crossing Charter School will receive 100% of the PCTR for a maximum enrollment of 360 students.
- Any enrollment increase beyond 360 and up to 432 students would require a financial review and negotiation of the PCTR.
- Based on the projections and tables presented on page 10, an increase in student enrollment would likely result in a decrease in the PCTR in the 75% - 85% range.

Joyce Karon then seconded the motion.

Thus, Dr. Steiner asked if there was any discussion on the item. Mr. Clark stated that the issues raised by Woodland are important but not important and material enough to revoke Prairie Crossing's charter. He further asserted that the officials at Prairie Crossing have committed to remedying the situations. In addition, Mr. Clark said that on a personal note he would hate to see a charter revoked of a school with such great achievement and success.

Mr. Gidwitz inquired about the special education issues at the school. He stated that many schools have been in this situation and the governance of special education has not been rigidly enforced as suggested by some constituents from Woodland School District. Thus, he inquired to how the state is handling this issue with regard to special education compliance with state and federal statutes.

Dr. Schiller stated that the educational program of the special education students met the quality and spirit of the education intended for those students. However, there are some procedural special education concerns at Prairie Crossing that need to be refined, for example, with the hiring of a Special Education Director on a half-time or full-time basis. As this role has not been in compliance, the lack of a director has not impeded the delivery of special education services up to this time as determined. ISBE holds all schools in high levels of compliance under IDEA and state regulations in Illinois have a high level of expectation for requiring special education services.

	<p>Dr. Schiller stated that to his knowledge ISBE has not been in a position where noncompliance in a school or district has been an issue and we have shut down the school or district. In those circumstances, it has rather been the case that staff will go in and work in that area to help them remedy the special education issues and concerns for the benefit of the special education students and the entire school body. However, Dr. Schiller asserted that the state will ensure to the highest level possible that the special education students receive the education that has been intended for them in accordance with the requirements of the law.</p> <p>Richard Sandsmark stated that even though he is no “champion” of the charter schools, he has discussed these issues with the lawyers and come to the conclusion that areas in which he could have a case against the school are held up by the Illinois Charter School Law. Therefore, he stated that he has no reason to vote against it. The school has complied with staff recommendations, and as long as they have the things in place that they need to within the time frame, there would be no reason that this charter should not go forward.</p> <p>The Board then compared the Prairie Crossing renewal to that of Thomas Jefferson Charter School. Dr. Schiller stated that there is a difference in the Prairie Crossing renewal in that the services are being delivered at Prairie Crossing and there is a difference in the renewal. In addition, we are not making a renewal on the premise with regard to what is not being complied with but redefining the stipulations of the contract for renewal on July 1, 2004.</p> <p>Joyce Karon stated that she can vote for this because the Board has in the motion deadlines and stipulations that the charter must meet in order to be renewed.</p> <p>Greg Kazarian stated he could not see how anyone in the room could not be positively impressed with the quality education that is being provided at Prairie Crossing Charter School, and that they are definitely fulfilling their requirement and intention as speculated under the Illinois Charter School Law.</p> <p>Ronald Gidwitz stated that he was disappointed with the opposition in that they did not take in account the charter law requirements which state that money is to follow the child to benefit their educational process, and that this process does not take money away from the public schools as the money does not belong to the district.</p>
--	---

	<p>Dr. Schiller stated finally that the Board must remember that this is a high performing school acknowledged by the local school district with a level of satisfaction, and under NCLB there must be a choice provision for children who are in school that are not meeting the standards. Thus, this school offers a spectrum of choice on both ends from students who are not meeting standards to students that are achieving the standards.</p> <p>As there was no further comment, Dr. Steiner called for the question. All members present voted yes, with the exception of Dr. Steiner who passed on the vote.</p>
<p><b><u>Authorization of submittal of the 2003 Title II State Report Card</u></b></p>	<p>Dr. Steiner then proceeded to ask Dr. Schiller to summarize the item: Authorization of submittal of the 2003 Title II State Report Card. Dr. Schiller stated that by October 7<sup>th</sup> the Illinois State Board of Education has the obligation to submit the State Report Card to the U.S Department of Education. The Superintendent asserted that the Board was informed of the eight section requirements of the Title II State Report Card and provided with detailed information of four of the sections:</p> <p>Section III—Data on Statewide Pass Rates  Section V—Listing of “Low-Performing” Programs in the State  Section VI—Information on Waivers of State Certification  Section VII—Information on State’s Alternative Routes to Certification.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller stated that following the authorization from the State Board, staff would finalize the 2003 Title II State Report Card and submit it to the U.S. Department of Transportation no later than October 7, 2003.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner then called for a motion from the Education Policy Planning Committee. Greg Kazarian then stated that he moved that the Illinois State Board of Education hereby authorize the State Superintendent and staff to complete the 2003 Title II State Report Card and to submit it to the U. S. Department of Education no later than October 7, 2003. This action is taken with the understanding that if policy, legislative, and/or budget issues are identified during the completion of this report, these will be reported to the State Board during the October 2003 Board Meeting.</p> <p>Ron Gidwitz seconded the motion and then asked if ISBE was satisfied with the level of graphics. Dr. Schiller stated that no, staff would be preparing the final report to be submitted to the U.S. Department of Education. Mr. Gidwitz stated the consideration of</p>

	<p>graphics is important to make the document more user-friendly for the public. He stated that possibly an executive summary could accompany the document. The Board agreed that it is a heavy document but that it may not be possible to simplify it but affirmed Mr. Gidwitz’s suggestion.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner then called for a vote on the motion. The motion carried as all members present voted yes.</p>
<p><b><u>Adoption of the Passing Scores for the Assessment of Professional Teaching and New Special Education Tests</u></b></p>	<p>Dr. Steiner then stated that the Board would take action on the Adoption of the Passing Scores for the Assessment of Professional Teaching and New Special Education Tests. Dr. Schiller then proceeded to summarize the item by informing the Board that as presented on the previous day, great detail and review had gone into the passing scores and levels as well as the recommendations of the Certification Board. Dr. Schiller noted that the proposed raw passing score for speech-language pathologist (57) had been increased by one standard error of measurement, resulting in a passing score of 61.</p> <p>Greg Kazarian pointed out that as was discussed in the Education Policy Planning Committee meeting, the Superintendent Recommendation actually exceeds some of the Panel Based Recommendations in keeping with our expectation of high standards for teacher certification.</p> <p>Consistent with the recommendations of the State Teacher Certification Board and the Bias Review Committee, Greg Kazarian moved that the Illinois State Board of Education hereby adopt the outlined passing scores for tests in the Illinois Certification Testing System.</p> <p>Dean Clark seconded the motion. Then, Dr. Steiner called for a vote on the motion. The motion carried as all members present voted yes.</p>
<p><b><u>Approval of Proposed Criteria and Procedures for Approval of Coursework, Programs, and Activities Leading to Standard Certification Eligibility</u></b></p>	<p>Dr. Steiner then announced that the Board would take action on the Approval of Proposed Criteria and Procedures for Approval of Coursework, Programs, and Activities Leading to Standard Certification Eligibility. Dr. Schiller then stated that as discussed previously, it is being recommended that the State Board approve the criteria for approval of proposed courses, activities, and programs that lead to eligibility for the Standard Teaching Certificate in regard to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Completeness—Does the proposal address all required aspects of the option?</li> <li>2. Compliance—Do the components of the proposal meet the content and process requirements?</li> </ol>

	<p>Dr. Steiner then called for a motion for this approval. Joyce Karon then moved that the Illinois State Board of Education hereby adopt criteria for approval of courses, activities, and programs leading to eligibility for the Standard Teaching Certificate. She then further moved that the Illinois State Board of Education delegate its authority for these courses, activities and programs to the State Superintendent of Education with the understanding that the Board will be provided with a periodic report on the status of options leading to eligibility for the Standard Teaching Certificate.</p> <p>The motion was seconded by Greg Kazarian.</p> <p>Richard Sandsmark stated that there is a legitimate concern with regard to the timeline by which ISBE is defining the requirements for initial certificate holders to receive a standard certificate. Mr. Kazarian stated that with this Board action, the principle requirements will be set up for the Certification Board and then in the following month, make recommendations to waive or modify the eligible requirements for Illinois initial certificate holders.</p> <p>Lee Patton stated that staff is very much aware the fact that these requirements and procedures need to be approved so that it is possible to set in place a guideline for 2005-2006 initial certificate holders. Ms. Patton stated that there is however a problem with the "Class of 2004" in that these initial certificate holders do not have any approved coursework, activity, or program options. She stated that staff is working on viable options for these teachers. However, with regard to moving other groups forward, it is the goal of the State Board to set the stage for the system to be put in place in order to gain a Standard Certificate. She stated that staff would be happy to come back to the Board in October to present a recommendation with regard to the "Class of 2004."</p> <p>Dr. Steiner then asked for the question to be called on the motion. The motion carried with all members present voting yes.</p>
<p><b><u>Approval of Institutional Accreditation Decisions for Rockford College</u></b></p>	<p>Dr. Steiner announced that the next item for action would be the Approval of Institutional Accreditation Decisions for Rockford College.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller then stated that at the August Board meeting the Board took action on the consideration of accreditation for eight institutions, with the exception of Rockford College because Rockford neither notified the State Board of its intention to file a notice of objection nor its acceptance of the recommendation within this time period, so it was not considered with the rest.</p>

	<p>Since the 30-day time frame expired, the State Board could move forward with the Certification Board’s recommendation for Rockford College to be assigned accreditation with conditions and be subject to a focus visit within two years of the decision.</p> <p>Dick Sandsmark then moved that the Illinois State Board of Education hereby grant Rockford College the following accreditation status—“Continuing Accreditation with Conditions”—and require that Rockford College be subject to a focused visit within two years of the date of this decision.</p> <p>Greg Kazarian seconded the motion and then reiterated the conditions of the accreditation.</p>
<p><b><u>Authorization of Submission of Waiver Report to the General Assembly</u></b></p>	<p>Dr. Steiner then stated that the next action item would be the Authorization of Submission of the Waiver Report to the General Assembly.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller stated that as in the past, the Board must authorize staff to submit a waiver report to the General Assembly for its consideration of the waivers or modification of state education laws and administrative rules promulgated by the State Board of Education.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner then requested a motion for the item. Greg Kazarian so moved that the Illinois State Board of Education hereby authorize submission of the Fall 2003 waiver report to the General Assembly by the Oct. 1 deadline. The twenty-one waiver requests and one appeal of the State Board’s denial of a request to waive administrative rules will be forwarded to the General Assembly without comment.</p> <p>The motion was seconded by Joyce Karon.</p> <p>Board members commented on the length of the document and if there could be some way that the Board would not have to vote on such a vast amount of waivers that come in, for example, waiving the observance of Abraham Lincoln’s Birthday with a day out of school. Dr. Schiller stated that short of changing the code, this procedure could not be changed.</p> <p>Joyce Karon then inquired as to the number of waivers to shorten the school day. She then asked if there were in trends in this direction. Dr. Schiller stated that there were no trends with regard to shortening the school day that he was aware of.</p>

	<p>Then, Dr. Steiner asked for a roll call to vote on the motion. The motion carried as all members present voted yes.</p>
<p><b><u>Rules for Adoption— Part 25 (Certification)</u></b></p>	<p>Dr. Steiner stated that Rules for Adoption—Part 25 (Certification) would be the next item for Board action.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller then went on to explain that these rules are being presented to the Board for adoption. He also noted the emergency amendments that were adopted in June to maintain in effect a number of provisions that were slated to expire on either June 30 or September 30. In addition, the proposed amendments also included minor revisions and reorganizations. Therefore, these changes, along with others that were not of an emergency nature but would make the rules more explicit, have been incorporated into these regular amendments, which the agency will need to put in place to replace emergency amendments when they expire.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner then requested a motion from the Board concerning the adoption of Part 25 (Certification). Joyce Karon then proceeded to make the motion that the Illinois State Board of Education hereby adopt the proposed rulemaking for:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Certification (23 Illinois Administrative Code 25).</p> <p>She then further moved that the State Board authorize the State Superintendent of Education to make such technical or nonsubstantive changes as the State Superintendent may deem necessary in response to suggestions or objections of the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules.</p> <p>The motion was seconded by Dean Clark. As there was no discussion on the rules, Dr. Steiner called for a vote on the motion. The motion carried as all members present voted yes.</p>
<p><b><u>Acceptance of ISBE Monthly Reports</u></b></p>	<p>Dr. Steiner then stated that the next action item for the Board was the Acceptance of ISBE Monthly Reports. Thus, she called for a motion on the item. Dick Sandsmark made the motion that the Illinois State Board of Education accept the financial, agency operations, and budget status reports presented during the September 2003 meeting. The motion was seconded by Ronald Gidwitz. As there was no discussion on the item, Dr. Steiner called for a vote on the motion. The motion carried as all members present voted yes.</p>
<p><b><u>Approval of Superintendent’s</u></b></p>	<p>Dr. Steiner called for action item: Approval of Superintendent’s Quarterly Travel Analysis (March 2003-June 2003). Then, she</p>



<p><b><u>Quarterly Travel Analysis (March 2003-June 2003)</u></b></p>	<p>called for a motion on the action. In response, to the request, Dick Sandsmark made the motion that the Illinois State Board of Education approve the quarterly travel analysis for March 2003-June 2003. The motion was seconded by Greg Kazarian.</p> <p>As there was no discussion, Dr. Steiner called for a vote on the motion. The motion carried as a members present voted yes.</p>
<p><b><u>Announcements and Reports</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>Superintendent Report</u></b></p> <p>Dr. Schiller stated that his report would be brief due to the time of the day. There were several noted matters, however. On Friday, September 12, 2003 a subcommittee of the Senate Education Hearing was held to discuss No Child Left Behind mandates and implementation at the state level. Some individuals that were present to discuss NCLB and its implementation were the U.S. Department of Education as well as Local Superintendents. It was a valuable meeting for those that were in attendance. In addition, the meeting was very well attended and also identified a prevailing note, at least in our state, that we are not backing away from accountability but are however looking toward increased productivity. However, there are aspects of the law that are making it very difficult. Yet, we are moving forward as a state.</p> <p>In regard to the agency, we are in a mode of decline. The agency is largely in a mode of leadership and advocacy as well as support with regard to compliance issues. However, our ability and capacity to assist has been problematic. Staff has been working on accounting for all positions with regard to the citation of positions in the school code with the corresponding funding those positions receive. Dr. Schiller stated that he has been working with Deloitte to explore identified areas that GRF funds could be used and reallocated in other areas and to bring the funds to prioritized areas. As known, without proper and satisfactory funding, it is hard to make decisions in response to allocating funds for priority areas.</p> <p>The Superintendent then requested that David Wood, Clay Slagle, and Lugene Finley present themselves to the Board to further discuss the agency's position with regard to agency staffing levels and funding. Mr. Slagle then proceeded to reiterate the fact that staff has been working very hard to identify each position and the need for that position. In addition, Deloitte has assisted ISBE in doing a review on the needed staffing levels for the agency to get a microscopic view of where the positions are and the needed funding for those positions. In this respect, Deloitte conducted a review of the Technology and Operation Centers.</p>

Mr. Slagle then referred to Mr. Finley who stated that Information Technology has been working closely with Human Resources looking at the ability to cut back on various costs as the IT center expends \$1.1 million on outsourcing. The IT center is exploring the option of making some of the outsourcing positions permanent positions that will enable the center to address a variety of programming needs rather than each year outsourcing these through contracts. The other effort that has been made is to make more applications available on line as well as making final decisions on the student information system. There is also a new RFP out for the new feasibility study for building the data warehouse as well as looking at other ways to allow the agency to access our system without the high costs of the remote access system.

Dr. Schiller stated that the key goal is to bring in functions instead of the outsourcing and maximize what we currently have with regard to funding under funded areas, for example, in accountability.

David Wood then proceeded to state that with the Operations division, Deloitte looked primary at the transportation programs with regard to the expenditures for staffing and how it works. According to Deloitte, the transportation is being run efficiently from the state agency end. However, it is important to look at how the districts spend their transportation money. Using information from the district levels and comparing them may be appropriate to help districts in how to save money within locals and regions by forming cooperatives. In addition, the possibility of streamlining the way the state pays for transportation and the way it mandates transportation making it more of a local decision with a simple formula instead of the claim-based system is a viable option. In this case, a district would have to have something more than the number of children. The location and definition of their transportation needs would have to assessed as well.

**Chair**

Dr. Steiner stated that she did not have an actual report but wanted to thank everyone for their hard work. She then announced that Dean Clark, Joyce Karon, and Ron Gidwitz would be going to the NASBE Annual Conference in Baltimore, MD. in October.

**Board Operations**

Ms. Karon stated that the October Board meeting would be held in Rock Island on October 22-23 at their High School Library.

	<p>Then, Ms. Karon proceeded to give an update on the NASBE diversity study that Illinois is involved with Ohio. She announced to the Board that the school district is representing Illinois for NASBE’s “The Changing Face of American’s School Children” study is Oak Park Public School District 97. Ms. Karon stated that the district has received a \$20,000 grant to continue to work on implementing and expanding the cultural diversity programs and initiatives in their district. She stated that it was very fascinating and interesting to be involved with their district and community personnel in this very involved project. Ms. Karon asserted that Oak Park would be willing to share with the Board the initiatives and results that come out of this study. She stated that it speaks to the community of Oak Park that they have been addressing these issues for a long time.</p> <p><b><u>Finance and Audit Committee</u></b> Richard Sandsmark stated that there would be a Finance and Audit Committee meeting on the morning of the first day at the next Board meeting as there are several issues to discuss.</p> <p><b><u>Joint Education Committee</u></b> Ronald Gidwitz stated that the committee has had a meeting since the Board’s last meeting. However, there was not much to report as the meeting was more of an organizational meeting. The meeting for October has been cancelled.</p> <p><b><u>Governmental Relations Committee</u></b> As Beverly Turkal was not present, Ms. Karon stated that she spoke with her and Ms. Turkal is planning on having a Governmental Relations meeting next month ,and that it would be pretty extensive.</p> <p><b><u>Education Policy Planning Committee</u></b> Greg Kazarian stated that because of scheduling, the Education Policy Planning Committee would possibly meet a week before the Board meeting, and that the meeting time and place would be published to make everyone aware of the meeting. The committee will possibly meet in Chicago. However, the committee will let everyone know ahead of time.</p>
<b><u>Other Information</u></b>	Dr. Steiner then informed the Board of the Monthly Status Report on Rulemaking that has no particular action but that the report was prepared for their review.
<b><u>Adjournment</u></b>	Dr. Steiner then called for a motion that the September 17-18, 2003 meeting be adjourned. Joyce Karon then moved that the meeting

	be adjourned. Dick Sandsmark seconded the motion. The meeting officially adjourned at 11:54 a.m.
	Respectfully Submitted,  _____ Richard Sandsmark Secretary  _____ Dr. Janet Steiner Chair