



# Illinois State Board of Education

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

## Illinois State Board of Education\*

James R. Thompson Center  
100 Randolph Street, 9<sup>th</sup> Floor, Room 031  
Chicago, Illinois 60601  
(217) 782-2221  
(312)814-2220  
Chicago, Illinois

### SCHEDULE AND AGENDA OF MEETINGS December 18, 2003

(A live audio stream, via the Internet, will be available during the meeting on Thursday.)

Thursday, December 18 8:30 a.m.

#### Public - Listen Only

Call in number: 1-800-640-5128

Access Code: Illinois State Board of Education Meeting  
(Must also give operator full name and name of business/organization)

View on Screen Board Meeting Information Document  
Download for Printing Board Meeting Information Document

THURSDAY, December 18, 2003

8:30 a.m.

#### PLENARY BUSINESS MEETING

##### A. Call Meeting to Order/Roll Call

James R. Thompson Center, 9<sup>th</sup> Floor, Room 031

##### B. Public Participation

##### C. Approval of Minutes

- November 19-20 (*pp.309-336*)

##### D. Presentations

- East St. Louis Financial Oversight Panel (FOP) response to dissolution petition
- The Condition of Education Annual Report

##### E. Action Items

- Approval of the submission of the Annual Charter Schools Report to the General Assembly and Governor (*pp.1-27*)
- Approval of the Professional Teaching Standards for Middle Level Educators

*(pp. 28-53)*

- Approval of institutions assigned Continuing Accreditation *(pp. 54-56)*
- Approval of new programs to be offered at higher education institutions *(pp. 57-67)*
- Authorization of Rules for Initial Review and Public Comment: Part 25 (Certification) *(pp. 68-191)*
- Authorization of Rules for Initial Review and Public Comment: Part 27 (Standards for Certification in Specific Teaching Fields) *(pp. 192-240)*
- Authorization of Rules for Initial Review and Public Comment: Part 29 (Standards for Administrative Certification) *(pp. 241-269)*
- Authorization of Rules for Initial Review and Public Comment: Part 350 (Secular Textbook Loan) *(pp. 270-276)*
- Approval of inclusion of legislative recommendations in the Cumulative Waiver Report *(pp.277-286)*
- Fiscal Year 2005 Budget\* *(p. 287)*
- Authorization of The Condition of Education Report *(p. 287)*
- Acceptance of ISBE Monthly Reports: Finance, Audit and Agency Operations Status *(pp. 288-308)*

## **F. Announcements and Reports**

- Superintendent
- Chairman
- Committees
- Members

## **G. Other Information**

- Monthly Status Report on Rulemaking *(pp. 337-338)*

## **H. Adjourn**

### **Lunch/Closed Session (as needed)**

\*All State Board of Education meetings listed on this agenda will be accessible to persons with disabilities. Persons planning to attend who need special accommodations should contact the Board office no later than the date prior to the meeting.

Contact the Superintendent's office at the State Board of Education, 100 North First Street, Springfield, Illinois 62777-0001.

Phone: 217-782-2221  
TTY/TDD: 217-782-1900  
Fax: 217-785-3972

## **Illinois State Board of Education**

100 North First Street  
Springfield, IL 62777

December 18, 2003  
 State Board Meeting

**ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

James R. Thompson Center  
 100 West Randolph, Suite 9-031  
 Chicago, Illinois 60601

|  |  |                   |            |                  |             |                |                   |             |                |  |
|--|--|-------------------|------------|------------------|-------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------|----------------|--|
| <p><b><u>Call Meeting to Order/<br/>Roll Call</u></b></p>  | <p>The December 18, 2003 Illinois State Board of Education meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m. by Board Chair Janet Steiner. She then proceeded to request that the roll be called. A quorum was present as all members were in attendance.</p> <p>MEMBERS PRESENT:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Janet Steiner</td> <td>Dean Clark</td> <td>Gregory Kazarian</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Joyce Karon</td> <td>Beverly Turkal</td> <td>Richard Sandsmark</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Judith Gold</td> <td>Ronald Gidwitz</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>Dr. Steiner stated that the meeting would a one day plenary session for Board discussion and action on presented agenda items.</p>  | Janet Steiner     | Dean Clark | Gregory Kazarian | Joyce Karon | Beverly Turkal | Richard Sandsmark | Judith Gold | Ronald Gidwitz |  |
| Janet Steiner  | Dean Clark   | Gregory Kazarian  |            |                  |             |                |                   |             |                |  |
| Joyce Karon  | Beverly Turkal   | Richard Sandsmark |            |                  |             |                |                   |             |                |  |
| Judith Gold  | Ronald Gidwitz   |                   |            |                  |             |                |                   |             |                |  |
| <p><b><u>Public Participation</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Tina Lechnick, Chief Administrator for the Philip J. Rock Center and School</u></b></p> | <p>Chair Steiner then announced that the Board would begin the meeting with public participation. She stated that individuals who had the desire to address the Board must have signed in prior to the time of public participation, as listed on the agenda. Additionally, she asserted that the presentation must be specific to educationally-relevant issues and be addressed to the entire Board. Dr. Steiner then called the first public participant to come before the Board.</p> <p>The first public participant, Tina Lechnick, stated that it was her privilege to be with the Board to speak on behalf of the 450 children across Illinois who are deaf-blind. Ms. Lechnick then proceeded to give some history on the origination of the Philip J. Rock Center and School. She stated that for the past 24 years, ISBE operated a statewide service center and residential school program for children who are deaf-blind. This program originally was called the Illinois Deaf-Blind Service Center and School. However, it was renamed the Philip J. Rock Center and School (PRC) and it is now located in the Chicago western suburb of Glen Ellyn.</p> <p>She stated that the PRC program was established because children who have a combination of hearing/visual impairments</p> |                   |            |                  |             |                |                   |             |                |  |

have unique, complex and challenging educational needs. The program was also established because Illinois universities do not have teacher preparation programs in deaf-blindness. Therefore, district programs need specialized information on effective instructional practice for students who are deaf-blind.

According to Ms. Lechnick, the Illinois School Code Section 14-11.02 delineates the authority and responsibility to the State Board of Education of maintaining and operating the Philip J. Rock Center and School. Therefore, in this endeavor, Ms. Lechnick stated that technical assistance is given to local teams to assist in the targeting of IEP goals and objectives for student achievement.

Ms. Lechnick then went on to add that for the past four years, PRC has been operating from a reduced or flat funded budget. Meanwhile, the center has absorbed increases in insurance rates and general operating expenses. Each year they have had to cut staff positions, dilute technical assistance activities, cancel training events, and reduce community educational programming. In addition, the center is now serving students with more complex medical needs, and school districts do not have the staff employed with expertise in the area of deaf-blindness. Therefore, districts and families turn to PRC to provide assistance.

In essence, Ms. Lechnick asserted that she was addressing the Board to respectfully request that the Board consider increasing their funding allocation by 7% which would amount to a \$200,827 increase. She stated that unlike school districts, PRC does not have the ability to pass referendums, or borrow money. Ms. Lechnick further asserted that the center starts the fiscal year with a zero balance and ends the fiscal year with a zero balance. Their employees have not received a raise in two years. Therefore, she requested that since ISBE has made a commitment to serving children with deaf-blindness, that ISBE fund the program at a level that would allow the center to provide the necessary educational support to be successful with their commitment.

Dr. Schiller informed Ms. Lechnick and the public that the 7% allocation was placed into the proposed FY 05 budget options spreadsheet as requested. In the previous year, this recommendation was also made by the agency, but an increase was not funded. The line item only received a flat continuation of funding, only after being reinstated into the budget after

**Steve Barg, Parent of Philip J. Rock Center and School**

being zeroed out in the beginning of the budget process.

Mr. Barg thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak as a parent of a child at Philip J. Rock Center and School in support of a funding increase allocation with the intent of providing high quality education to the center's deaf-blind students. He stated that throughout the state there is a desperate need for support. Mr. Barg stated that without the funding support from the State Board, he is afraid that the education of these students and the services provided to them will be compromised. He stated that everyone is familiar with the Helen Keller story that articulated the needs and challenges of a dually impaired child in that their ability to learn is substantially different from that of a singly impaired child.

He further stated that what the Board may not be aware of is how these challenges are being met by the Philip Rock School which has served as a national model for over 25 years with regard to how states can best provide educational services to deaf-blind students, who are a part of such a low incidence community of learners.

Mr. Barg stated that when thinking of his son's progress, he said that it is easy to praise the Philip Rock Center and School for the substantial growth and progress that his son has experienced since being at the school. He stated that at nine months, his child went through a process which identified him as deaf-blind. At that point he entered the Philip Rock Center. Then, at the age of three, he entered a public school system. Mr. Barg asserted that the Philip Rock Staff were there to train teachers and related staff on the educational needs of his son. In addition, Mr. Barg stated that as parents they have learned sign language at the center.

In closing, he stated that at the age of eleven, his child reentered the Philip Rock Center. He said that due to the support of the Philip Rock staff, his son is now beginning to reach his full potential. Mr. Barg thus stated that he would like to thank the Board for supporting the center, and would encourage them to advocate for the allocation of this state-wide service to continue.

**Carolyn Thomas-Davidoff, Illinois Association of Gifted**

Ms. Carolyn Thomas-Davidoff introduced herself as a 20-year gifted teacher at Aptakisic Junior High School in Buffalo Grove and a parent of gifted child. She said that she would like to

**Children (IAGC)**

thank ISBE for reinstating funding in the FY 05 Budget for gifted education. Ms. Thomas-Davidoff proclaimed that she wanted to speak of the necessity of funding for gifted education and the necessity of language for gifted education in the Illinois School Code. She stated that the removal of the language has been catastrophic to the field of gifted education.

She stated that many people see gifted education as a “frill” or an elitist education that is seen as a pat on the head designed to make these students feel good about themselves. However, she stated that she was present to convince to the Board that this is not the case. However, gifted education addresses the needs of these students. According to Ms. Thomas-Davidoff, it is just not some extra benefit that they can do without. As a teacher of gifted education for 20 years, Ms. Thomas-Davidoff stated that what gifted students tend to learn in school is how to mark time. They learn to be inattentive in a public school. She said that one parent claimed that she learned that her child learns in two days what other children learn in eight days. The question of the parent then was what their child does on day three. Ms. Thomas-Davidoff said from her experience, these children have learned to be present in body but not in mind and spirit. They have learned also to be angry as a result of their idle time. As an example, she stated that within the city of Chicago, 30% of the high school dropouts are identified gifted children, as noted by the IAGC.

According to Ms. Thomas-Davidoff, what these students need is the opportunity for challenge. She asserted they need an education that addresses their needs not just the needs of the other students in the classroom. In addition, she stated that the No Child Left Behind Act puts a lot of attention on special education. She stated that if this state however wants to leave no child left behind, gifted education students need to be provided the same accommodations in order for their needs to be met to reach their highest potentials. As an example, Ms. Thomas-Davidoff cited her daughter who is a middle school student. She proclaimed that her daughter informed her that she reads the material, takes the test, and gets an A. According to her daughter, there is no need for her to study, as she can get an A without studying. Therefore, her daughter told her mother she had no study skills. Ms. Thomas-Davidoff expressed her concern with her daughter entering high school with no study skills that some other students receive who are not gifted because these students devote time to studying the material. In closing, she stated that it is very important for the state to fund

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p><b><u>Beth Burke,</u></b><br/><b><u>Executive Director</u></b><br/><b><u>for Illinois</u></b><br/><b><u>Computing</u></b><br/><b><u>Educators (ICE)</u></b></p> | <p>gifted education so that gifted students also receive the best education possible to enable them to reach their full potential.</p> <p>At the end of Ms. Thomas-Davidoff's presentation, Mr. Gidwitz stated that funding gifted education is a broader issue than coming before the State Board of Education. The issue comes with the General Assembly and the Governor. He stated that she and others of a like mind need to express themselves and be present when these issues are being acted upon in the General Assembly. Mr. Gidwitz and Dr. Schiller suggested that Ms. Thomas-Davidoff also contact the Office of Management and Budget to express their views as well as contact other organizations that share her same concerns to unite together in Springfield to express their opinions on the budget needs and priorities.</p> <p>After Ms. Burke introduced herself as the Executive Director for Illinois Computing Educators (ICE), a non-profit organization dedicated to supporting the use of technology in Illinois schools, Ms. Burke expressed her appreciation to the State Board for their concern in trying to do their best with the state budget. She stated that she realized that economic times continue to be difficult. However, Ms. Burke asserted that ICE believes that education cannot continue to take steps backwards in Illinois.</p> <p>She stated that ICE is concerned about the future of educational technology in the state of Illinois. Ms. Burke asserted that in the late 1990s, Illinois was extremely proactive, establishing a statewide telecommunications infrastructure for schools, supporting community-based technology planning, funding sound technology plans in schools, training thousands of teachers, strategically investing state funds, and applying for and receiving millions of dollars in federal subsidies for telecommunications.</p> <p>Ms. Burke then stated that this momentum has come to a stop as the state is moving backwards in the area of educational technology. She asserted that in 2002, the state funds for school technology were cut from 49.25 million dollars to just over 25 million. Ms. Burke added that last year funds were cut again to 11.5 million. She stated that even the proposed 3% cost of living increase for FY 05 is not enough to put Illinois back on track to ensure that our graduates are reading to thrive in the digital age.</p> |
|--|--|

**John Hill,**  
**Superintendent of**  
**Fox River Grove**  
**School District 3**

With the No Child Left Behind Act and in order to support the state learning standards effectively, Ms. Burke proclaimed that it is imperative that technology become a strong component of the state budget. According to Ms. Burke, technology is an integral part of learning in our classrooms and is necessary in order to provide our children the 21<sup>st</sup> Century skills needed to succeed in this ever-changing world with which they are faced.

In concluding, she encouraged the State Board, on behalf of the Illinois Computing Educators, to look closely at the budget and the technology needs of all children in the state of Illinois. She then thanked the Board for their time and consideration on this exceedingly important matter.

John Hill stated that as the Superintendent of Fox River Grove, a small elementary school district, he came before the Board at the direct of his community and his Board of Education to discuss the face of education and his district's financial status within the circumstances the state is dealing with.

Mr. Hill stated from his understanding, the Condition of Education Report would be discussed by the Board later in the meeting, and Fox River Grove would be used as a profile school. He stated that in this regard, he wished to make his own personal remarks. Mr. Hill stated that Fox River is a small but affluent area that has about 700 students. The tax rate is currently 2.42 in the education fund. He stated that in March, the district is being forced to go the community and request a 42 cent increase. Mr. Hill stated that even with the 42 cent increase in the tax rate, they will still be reducing 7 teachers out of the 47 teachers. If the referendum fails, the district will be forced to reduce their teaching staff to 32 teachers, which would be a cut of 15 teachers. In addition, the class sizes would rise from about 22 students to over 34 students. All fine arts would also be removed from the curriculum.

Mr. Hill stated that his district is not unique. There are at least 15 out of the 18 school districts in McKendree county in deficit spending. In addition, at least 9 of the school districts are attempting educational fund referendums. Mr. Hill then asserted that the failure of the state to adequately fund school districts is becoming very critical. The same impact on educational funding is now apparent in even the affluent, suburban areas.

He stated that he also wanted to make a comment regarding the



**Donna Baiocchi,**  
**Executive Director of**  
**EDRED**

release of the report cards. Mr. Hill proclaimed that he is one of the 400 schools that are going to be affected by the participation rate reporting. He stated that he understands that it is a massive job for the State Board to support the report card system. Mr. Hill however stated that even though the State Board is going to put out a disclaimer, he is very concerned about the school district being named for not making adequate year progress. He said that he is sure the State Board is dealing with this, and that he appreciated the Board's time.

Mr. Gidwitz then inquired of the Superintendent if he was going to address the status of the school report cards. Dr. Schiller affirmed that he would address the topic of school report cards during his report.

Donna Baiocchi, Executive Director of Education Research Development, thanked the Board for the opportunity to address them on behalf of the suburban school districts. She stated that there are few schools that can take care of the needs of gifted children in their buildings. In addition to gifted education, the suburban schools have experienced a cumulative effect with regard to budget constraints and cuts locally and at the state level. For example, she stated that since 1998, nine of her districts have lost 121 million dollars.

Ms. Baiocchi expressed her pleasure with the Board's work toward being advocates for what the school districts need. She stated that she was also pleased with the fact that the Board put back into the budget the ADA block grant, a measure that suburban school districts can benefit from as most of these dollars go to staff development toward certifying highly qualified teachers. Ms. Baiocchi also stated that she was glad to see that the Board had included funding the special education formula at 100%. Additionally, she stated that the Hold Harmless funding is very essential in her suburban districts as well. Lastly, she stated, as she said that others had, she was pleased that gifted education also was placed back into the budget.

To conclude, Ms. Baiocchi presented the Board with an illustration of the need for our state to seek other ways to fund and support education with sharing an advertisement for a 700,000 home in Chicago that has a guaranteed tax bill of no more than \$1000 a year for 8 years. She said that this is an example of the kind of thinking that we need across our state with regard to funding schools. Ms. Baiocchi asserted that it is

**Deborah Curtis,**  
**Middle Level**  
**Standards Panel**  
**Chair**

not just about what the state is going to give us but also pressing other revenue sources locally to provide a good education for our students.

Deborah Curtis, chair of the Middle Level standards panel, stated that the panel has begun its fourth year toward developing Middle Level Teacher Education Standards. She thanked the Board for taking the time to look at the standards in their December packet and requested that the Board consider approving the standards. Ms. Curtis stated that the panel is still discussing implementation information with various individuals with throughout the state. Ms. Curtis then said that she, along with others, believes that already having a middle level endorsement in place and no standards is a problem. Therefore, she would like to see the Board move toward approving the standards. After the approval of the standards, the panel will continue to work toward the implementation of the standards.

Mr. Kazarian stated that as the Board looks at approving the middle level standards, he would like to see technology proficiency woven into to the standards toward the implementation phase. Ms. Curtis stated that the standards that before the Board are the focus standards. At Illinois State University, all teacher preparation students have the expectation of technology proficiency as they go throughout the program, and according to Ms. Curtis, these students are meeting them. Ms. Curtis asserted that is definitely not the students who have a problem with technology proficiency but the instructors who are also being trained and encouraged in this vital area of instruction and implementation.

**Loomis Mayfield,**  
**Illinois After School**  
**Alliance**

Loomis Mayfield expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to address the Board during the public participation portion of the meeting. He also thanked the Board for the time and dedication they put into being a Board member of ISBE.

Mr. Mayfield then stated that he was presenting to the Board as a representative of the providers, educators and professionals of after school programs around the state. He asserted that their alliance is in support of after school programs, and therefore encourages the Board to act boldly with regard to increasing funding for after school programs. For example, Mr. Mayfield stated that the summer bridges program is a prime example of what a program can do to aid students around the state toward meeting the standards. Therefore, Mr. Mayfield stated that his alliance would like to see an increase more toward the middle



|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>greatest student achievement gaps between students in poverty and wealthier students on three out of the four tests in reading and math. Ms. Batchu stated that she believes that this is such a problem for Illinois when we think about where we want to be as a state with the No Child Left Behind Act and having an economy that has a great work force for current businesses and graduates going into the work force. Therefore there is a great concern to provide resources to move our state further toward these goals.</p> <p>In addition, Ms. Batchu asserted that while she is glad that the Board has recommended an increase in the foundation level, she believes it should match the EFAB recommendation of a \$250 increase to be consistent with what was done last year and provide the important framework in the legislature. For example, she cited that many districts are struggling with resources to buy new textbooks and equipment as well as meeting average classroom expenses with the current funding that is allocated. She stated that if the \$250 is not reinstated, districts and schools will possibly be dealing with a bigger challenge down the road as the state pension crisis has revealed.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner thanked all of the public participants and then announced that the public participant segment of the meeting would come to a close.</p> |
| <p><b><u>Approval of Minutes</u></b></p>   | <p>Chair Steiner then requested a motion for the approval of the November 19-20, 2003 State Board minutes. Gregory Kazarian moved that the Illinois State Board of Education approve the minutes of the November 19-20, 2003 meeting as published. The motion was seconded by Dean Clark. Thus, Dr. Steiner requested for the roll to be called. The motion passed as all members present voted yes to approve the minutes.</p>   |
| <p><b><u>Presentations</u></b></p>   | <p>Dr. Steiner then stated that there would be a presentation by the East St. Louis Financial Oversight Panel with regard to their response to the East St. Louis School District's petition to dissolve the Financial Oversight Panel. She then requested that the Board welcome Lorilea Buerkett, attorney for the East St. Louis School District #189 Financial Oversight Panel.</p>   |
| <p><b><u>East St. Louis Financial Oversight Panel response to petition to dissolve the FOP</u></b></p> | <p>Lorilea Buerkett thanked the Board for the opportunity to respond to the East St. Louis School District #189 petition to dissolve the Financial Oversight Panel.</p> <p>She stated that the FOP was established by the State Board</p>   |

some nine years ago in accordance with the financial assistance law to assist districts in financial difficulty to ensure financial integrity. Ms. Buerkett then asserted that with this purpose in mind, the panel is requesting that the State Board deny the district of East St. Louis their request to dissolve the panel until the point of October 2004 when the panel would naturally dissolve. Ms. Buerkett stated that the question remains as to why the East St. Louis Board of Education would request the dissolution of the FOP by June 30, 2004. She stated while it would seem to make sense as it is the beginning of the fiscal year, many critical financial steps and measures are taken between June and October to ensure a financially sound budget. During this period, the FY05 budget will be drafted and finalized as well as a multi-year contract will be negotiated between the district and the Union. According to Mr. Buerkett, it is because of these two reasons; the East St. Louis Board of Education would like unfettered control over their finances. Furthermore, these two events will have significant impact on this district in the next year.

Ms. Buerkett then went on to give examples of the administration of these two events in this current year. She asserted that the budget for FY04 was very difficult to complete and could not have been done without the assistance of the FOP and the State Board of Education. With regard to contract negotiations, the Board has reneged on the agreement with the FOP. Thus, they have tried to hire as many staff as they can without having the budget to do so. However, the budget simply will not allow this. According to Ms. Buerkett, the Board will say and do anything to get what it wants, and then will do what it wants at a later time.

In speaking of the criteria for dissolving an FOP, Ms. Buerkett stated that that the petitioner erroneously stated that the main criteria for approving the dissolution of a FOP would be that the financial status or situation of the district improves. According to Ms. Buerkett, this would only be a condition for filing a **petition** to dissolve, not specific criteria for dissolving a FOP. She stated that this discretion is not stated in the law but was left up to State Board pursuant to Section 1b5 of the School Code. She stated that it is the Board's judgment that is important in this circumstance, and that the decision is based on objective resources that prove or disprove that the district has improved financially. Ms. Buerkett stated that the financial situation of the East St. Louis district has improved. However, the financial status has improved not because of the Board but

in spite of the Board.

In addition, she stated that Robert Oats was misquoted on his statement with regard to the need for a FOP in the district. She asserted that upon his exit from the FOP, Robert Oats said that there will always need to be a financial oversight panel with an elected Board of Education in East St. Louis.

Ms. Buerkett stated that it is the history of the district that is important to the Board. She stated that past conduct is the best predictor of future conduct in the district of East St. Louis. To give example of their history, Ms. Buerkett stated several circumstances that, from her viewpoint, showed lack of financial responsibility and wise fiscal spending on behalf of the district in the past. Ms. Buerett thus concluded that the history of the Board requires that the request be denied.

With regard to the relationship between the district and FOP, Ms. Buerkett asserted that the relationship between the Board and the panel has been uncooperative from the start. She stated that as this relationship was involuntary, one would not expect that a good relationship would be the hallmark of the situation. According to Ms. Buerkett, the panel's roll is not to engender friendships but to established financial integrity. In addition, she state that the panel has worked with the district by answering their questions and guiding them through the financial recovery process.

Finally, Ms. Buerkett stated that the panel is now faced with a difficult transition of power and duties. There is a short time frame to accomplish the remaining panel goals before October. In the panel's opinion, time should not be cut short in attempting to carry out their present duties. Ms. Buerkett then said several decisions will have to be made in the midst of the hiring of a new financial manager and maintaining a stable, effective administrative team. Ms. Buerkett further asserted that the district does not have a sound investment policy or plan in place. She stated that the FY05 budget is critical and the panel is needed in this planning process.

With regard to financial planning and processes, Ms. Buerkett stated that the East St. Louis Board is a body who is unwilling to have its conduct considered, and therefore is unlikely to desire to change that conduct. She thus stated that the panel members feel strongly that the financial oversight should continue in the district until the planned sunset in October. In addition, she proclaimed that the FOP will gain nothing from

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>their service to District 189 or even from the recommendation to deny the dissolution petition. Ms. Buerkett thus urged the Board to seek and support changes in the governance of the district, when necessary in order that the advanced gains that have been made on behalf of the FOP are not lost. She stated that the panel would also support an amendment to the downstate School Financial Authority (SFA) statute in order to implement such a measure as needed in the district.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller thanked Ms. Buerkett for her presentation. He then stated that the local school board will have an opportunity to reply as well as the FOP to each other at the January 21-22, 2004 Board meeting. After that point, the hearing opportunity will be closed and the State Board will have an opportunity to begin deliberation to consider if the petition for dissolution would be accepted or denied.</p>   |
| <p><b><u>The Condition of Education Annual Report</u></b></p> | <p>After Chair Steiner announced that the next presentation would be The 2003 Condition of Public Education Annual Report, Dr. Schiller began to give an introduction of the report contents. He stated that the report provides a wide range of demographics, statistics, and student/school achievement data to help Illinois citizens better understand their educational system. He asserted that the report should serve as a dependable resource for understanding pre-kindergarten, elementary and secondary education in Illinois. In addition, the report offers an opportunity for the citizens of the state to realize the demands and expectations on our districts, schools, students and teachers have never been greater as the expectations are rising from the state and federal level in response to the No Child Left Behind Act. Accordingly, special needs populations are growing at a rapid rate. Dr. Schiller asserted that failure to provide an adequate education for these students and all students will leave them ill-equipped for jobs in our emerging economy.</p> <p>The Superintendent then said that the report points out clearly that the goal for all students to meet the standards is achievable. There is evidence and recognition of schools within our state who have earned the status of being a Blue Ribbon School and/or Spotlight School. There are children that have already met the standards at a high level, and there are proven programs and research-based strategies to help all students reach this level of achievement. However, the cost of providing a basic educational service is outpacing the growth in resources to schools as education is labor-intensive. Districts are having extreme difficulties paying for the increasing costs to fund</p> |

regular and special education needs and programs. Dr. Schiller stated the Board realizes that Illinois is highly, overly dependent on funding by the local property tax to the districts. Local levels are having a difficult time generating the revenue and passing referendums. Therefore, without new revenue streams, we are faced with a limited ability to provide new revenue sources to schools. Dr. Schiller proclaimed that our educational system is on a collision course. As costs continue to outpace resources, the demands placed on schools are in collision with the demand to provide services. Thus, there are four possible ways to address these trends:

- Cut programs at the local level and erode the ability of schools to prepare students to achieve standards.
- Increase local property taxes at a time when most local referenda are already failing.
- Reallocate existing state resources from other important state programs and dedicate them to education.
- Dedicate new state resources to meet the increasing funding needs for education.

Therefore, The Condition of Education is a document that is provided by the State Board detailing the progress made and the progress that must be made with regard to funding the education of the students in our schools. Dr. Schiller stated that the Board has outlined priorities in making progress toward continued goals. Some of these priorities include:

- Fully funding state mandates, particularly special education.
- Funding programs which provide districts flexibility for local decisions and circumstances such as General State Aid or the School Safety and Improvement Block Grant (ADA Block Grant).
- Funding programs which help districts cope with the significant additional costs associated with special populations such as bilingual, gifted, truants, etc.
- Funding initiatives that are researched-based and have the greatest promise for moving the entire elementary and secondary system ahead or that address areas where achievement is lagging.
- Funding programs that do not have a local funding base such as early childhood.
- Providing assistance to schools not meeting adequate yearly progress targets by investing in the System of Support.

Dr. Schiller then asserted that the report lays out not only fiscal



needs related to education in the State of Illinois but a vision. According to Dr. Schiller, it identifies where we are as a state and where we must go. Therefore, a systemic blueprint was put together to position our schools to attain the goals of NCLB so that every child that leaves our school system can display the skills needed before leaving the classroom.

Dr. Schiller then proclaimed that great work has been put into the report over the last four months. The Board document states the condition of education, not the budget for the state, which will be released at a later time. He then requested that the Board members offer comments regarding the report.

Dr. Steiner stated that she appreciated that items were presented very clearly within the report. She further asserted while there are many positive things in the report, the state must do something about the funding crisis. Dr. Steiner then inquired of Greg Kazarian, chair of the Education Policy Planning Committee if he had any comments regarding the report.

Mr. Kazarian responded affirmatively by stating that the report was discussed in detail in the Education Policy Planning Committee meeting and that prior discussion was also held with the Superintendent and staff with regard to communicating the Board's direction and vision for the report. Mr. Kazarian offered that the report is a collaborative document which written with the intention of speaking to all of our constituents in Illinois regarding the state of education so those who care about education have a focus from which to work. He stated that document shows the diversity of this state, and that the common denominator is that the State Board believes and cares about education and this education being delivered at a high caliber level to our 2 million children in the state.

Mr. Kazarian then proclaimed that it was his hope that the document will carry some weight. He stated that the Board did not chicken out but rather discussed funding the priorities and looking at different revenue sources as well as looking at certain principles. He applauded the fellow Board members for taking the position that they have. Moreover, he asserted that it is folly to take the exact system last year we know failed 50% of our students, do it again this year, and expect a miraculously different result. However, in adequate funding, according to Mr. Kazarian, we can deliver the results that our children and businesses deserve and respect. Mr. Kazarian asserted that in the Board deliberations, they struggled with keeping a balance.

Yet, he stated that he believes the Board has come up with a good plan that supports public policy debate for providing funding for a quality educational system.

Mr. Sandsmark then said that the Board has not backed away from advocating for things just because they may get the Board in political trouble. He stated that it is important that the Board has made priorities, and while the entire report and the priorities and principles are good statements of philosophy, it is important to recognize that a lot of work needs to be done.

Mr. Gidwitz began by thanking staff for the hard work that was put into the creation of the report. Then, he went on to inquire about specific components of the report. As an example, Mr. Gidwitz inquired about the transiting from grade to grade (i.e. the institution of the Kindergarten Plus program) and concurrent remediation for these students, for instance in third and fourth grade. Mr. Gidwitz also emphasized the importance of not condoning social promotion, and the need to have some ammunition concerning social promotion. David Wood then stated that under the remediation provided for students not meeting the standards, all students who need the services will be served as these are critical benchmark services. (The Summer Bridges Program was cited as an example.)

Mr. Gidwitz further asserted that the state must take a leadership role in providing a high quality education for all of its students. Dr. Schiller affirmatively agreed by stating that this is being done under the System of Support, and models and simulations are being run as well. Mr. Wood added there is some difficulty with running the simulations, and yet some are easy as you just project on a formula and keep with the same inflation. However, when doing such programs such as early childhood and changes in allotments, it becomes difficult. Additionally, Mr. Gidwitz added that before getting to the legislative session, it would be good to have the simulations so the State Board can give specific examples on a line item basis. It would therefore be the hope that the budget would be released in January and all of the calculations would be completed.

Mr. Gidwitz then asserted that there is another issue involving the Regional Offices of Education as they are heavily dependent on the state for a lot of school services. Thus, Mr. Gidwitz asked how the state will deal with this beyond the funding aspects. Dr. Schiller stated that the ROEs serve as intermediate service centers. Mr. Gidwitz agreed affirmatively with this role

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>but stated that many people do not understand this. Therefore, Mr. Gidwitz proclaimed that it is important that they are told exactly what the ROEs do and what services they provide so in the event the General Assembly or Governor needs to draw a line through it, they do it on a knowledgeable basis.</p> <p>Mr. Gidwitz then stated that the report does not give special education justice as far as the burden that is placed on local school districts. He said that it is important to understand the impact special education will have on many school districts. Mr. Gidwitz stated that such information as different levels of need and specific cost per child should be included within the report.</p> <p>Lastly, Mr. Gidwitz inquired as to if the issue of Chicago Pension was discussed within the report. Dr. Schiller positively affirmed Mr. Gidwitz inquiry by stating that addressing the Chicago Pensions was discussed in the section entitled “How Can Illinois Improve School Finance and Funding?”</p> <p>At the conclusion of the presentation, Dr. Steiner stated that the Board would take a break before beginning Discussion and Action items.</p> |
| <p><b><u>Items for Discussion/Action</u></b></p>   | <p>Dr. Steiner then announced that the meeting would be called back to order for the purpose of reviewing Items for Board Discussion and Action. She then proceeded to inform the Board and public that she would ask the Superintendent to summarize each item on the agenda, ask for a motion and second, allow for Board discussion, and then request that the Board take appropriate action, as needed.</p>  |
| <p><b><u>Annual Charter Schools Report</u></b></p> | <p>Dr. Schiller stated that purpose of the Annual Charter Schools Report agenda item was for the Board to discuss and take action on the submission of the State Board of Education’s required annual report to the General Assembly and the Governor regarding the Illinois charter schools in 2002-2003. He stated that the last report was submitted in January 2003 for the 2001-2002 school year. Dr. Schiller then added that the report was discussed in the Education Policy Planning Committee meeting the previous day. The Superintendent stated that his recommendation would include the approval of the report for transmittal to the General Assembly and the Governor. Dr. Schiller asserted that some issues for the State Board to consider regarding possible legislative changes would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend response timelines from 14 days to 30 days to allow for adequate time to review charter school proposals.</li> <li>• Set an October 1 deadline for the submission of new</li> </ul>  |

charter school proposals to the local districts in order to provide adequate time for the completion of the approval process prior to the beginning of the next school year.

- In addition to school employees, require criminal background investigations for board members of the charter school.
- Add the requirement of a conflict of interest statement for charter school board members.

Dean Clark then inquired as to if the requirement for a criminal background investigation also was a requirement for public school board members. Staff stated that no, this is not a requirement for public school board members. However, a problem did arise with one charter school board as one of the members had a felony record. Mr. Kazarian stated that since the charter school board members are not elected but appointed or selected there are different governance issues that come into play. In setting parameters such as these, Mr. Kazarian asserted that the Board is setting a good standard for all charter schools in the state. It was noted that certain provisions don't prohibit service by anyone. If a charter school still wishes to have a certain person on the board, they can choose to do so.

Mr. Kazarian inquired about the administrative needs section as to whether the needs outlined are issues the Board would be looking at. Dr. Schiller said no, and stated that the needs listed were administrative needs from the charter school providers and personnel. These needs were presented to the Board in the event that the Board would want to consider policy decisions regarding the items listed. Thus, these administrative needs were included in the agenda item for the Board to consider from a policy perspective.

Beverly Turkal inquired as to whether there is currently a requirement concerning the reporting of finance and auditing issues. Don Full stated that there was no statutory requirement in the law that financial information should be submitted with this report. Then Ms. Turkal questioned how the state knows how much they are spending per student. Don Full stated that when the charter schools submit their renewal report they must provide this information. ISBE staff member Joann Price also stated that they have received some financial audits from the schools that have not been under renewal. Ms. Turkal said that she understands the philosophy of charter schools is very different. However, she stated that it is important to look at this

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>requirement.</p> <p>After some searching in the Illinois School Code, Don Full found that the statute does require an annual financial statement to be submitted. Mr. Gidwitz asked why the cost per pupil would still not be included in the annual report. Mr. Full stated that it just is not required in the statute. Mr. Gidwitz suggested that the information be added despite the lack of requirement. Dr. Schiller then stated that staff would work on an addendum to the report that included information on the per pupil expenditures in the charter schools. Mr. Gidwitz then also requested that staff compare the per pupil expenditures at the charter schools with the district per pupil expenditure amounts.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller and staff agreed that the addendum would be drafted and completed in a couple of weeks for the Board’s review.</p>   |
| <p><b><u>Professional Teaching Standards for Middle Level Educators</u></b></p> | <p>Dr. Steiner then announced that the next item for Board discussion and action would be the Approval of the Professional Teaching Standards for Middle Level Educators. Dr. Schiller stated that the purpose of this agenda item would be to secure Board approval of the proposed standards for middle level educators. The Superintendent informed the Board of the standards they would be voting to approve or disapprove:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Standard 1—Young Adolescent Development</li><li>• Standard 2—Middle School Organization</li><li>• Standard 3—Advisor/Advisee/Advocacy</li><li>• Standard 4—Middle Level Curriculum</li><li>• Standard 5—Middle Level Instruction and Delivery</li><li>• Standard 6—Assessment</li><li>• Standard 7—Collaborative Relationships</li></ul> <p>Dr. Schiller informed the Board the standards were unanimously voted upon at the State Teacher Certification Board and that they are in full support of the middle level panel’s recommendations. In addition, these standards were reviewed by the Education Policy Planning Committee who also concurred with the standards developed by the panel.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner then requested a motion concerning the Approval of the Professional Teaching Standards for Middle Level Educators. Gregory Kazarian then moved that the Illinois State Board of Education adopt the Professional Teaching Standards for Middle Level Educators, as recommended by the Middle Level Panel. The motion was seconded by Dean Clark.</p> |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>Dr. Steiner stated that the weakest area tends to be at the middle education level, as stated in The Condition of Education. She asserted that all the blame cannot be laid on the middle school as the Early Childhood Education is very important to the achievement at the middle level. She stated that she knows early childhood is striving to do all they can and that the middle level is truly a tough level to teach at. Mr. Sandsmark agreed with Dr. Steiner by stating that he also taught at the middle level and a lot of undue blame is placed on the middle school. He did however state that he does agree that the middle level teacher needs more preparation before going into the middle school classroom to teach. Ms. Turkal added that it isn't as if there has not been any preparation for these teachers. Yet, she stated that understands why they are pushing the standards forward. She then asked if the Board approved these recommendations would there be anything to keep a teacher from going into teaching because they were a part of a different program. Deborah Curtis, the chair of the Middle Level Panel stated that the approval of the standards themselves do not involve teacher certification issues. Certification is still an issue that must be dealt with at a later time.</p> <p>After the discussion, Dr. Steiner requested that the roll be called to vote on the motion. The motion passed as all members present voted yes.</p> |
| <p><b><u>Institutions assigned Continuing Accreditation status</u></b></p> | <p>Dr. Steiner then called for the next agenda item: Approval of Institutions Assigned Continuing Accreditation Status. Dr. Schiller stated that the purpose of this agenda item was for the Board to review the accreditation recommendations issued by the State Teacher Certification Board for Loyola University at Chicago, Augustana College, and Western Illinois University. Dr. Schiller informed the Board that it would be his recommendation to assign “continuing accreditation” status to each school and authorize staff to inform the institutions of the State Board’s decision.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner then requested a motion to approve the assignment of “continuing accreditation” status to these institutions. Gregory Kazarian thus moved that the Illinois State Board of Education hereby assign “continuing accreditation” status to the following institutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Loyola University at Chicago</li><li>• Augustana College</li><li>• Western Illinois University</li></ul> <p>The motion was seconded by Ronald Gidwitz. As there was no</p>   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>discussion on the motion, Dr. Steiner requested a roll call vote. The motion passed as all members present voted yes.</p>   |
| <p><b><u>New Programs to be offered at higher education institutions</u></b></p>       | <p>Dr. Steiner said that the next item would be the Approval of New Programs to be offered at Higher Education Institutions. Dr. Schiller proceeded to give the purpose for the agenda item which was to review the recommendations issued by the State Teacher Certification Board for the approval of new preparation programs at three recognized and accredited institutions: Knox College, McKendree College, and Northeastern Illinois University.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner then requested a motion for the approval. Richard Sandsmark then moved that the Illinois State Board of Education hereby approve the following educator preparation programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knox College—Special (K-12) Music Education Program,</li> <li>• McKendree College—Special (K-12) Music Education Program, and</li> <li>• Northeastern Illinois University—Secondary (6-12) Heath Education Program.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Sandsmark then said that this action would be taken in accordance with Section 25.145 of the State Board’s administrative rules on certification and authorizes the institutions to conduct programs and recommend candidates for certification by entitlement until the time of the institution’s next scheduled review.</p> <p>The motion was seconded by Ronald Gidwitz. As there was no discussion on the approval of the programs, Dr. Steiner requested a roll call vote. The motion passed as all members present voted affirmatively.</p> |
| <p><b><u>Rules for Initial Review: Part 25, Part 27, Part 29, and Part 350</u></b></p> | <p>Dr. Steiner stated the Board would continue with the authorization of rules. Dr. Schiller that this agenda item would present proposed rulemaking for State Board consideration and authorize the Board to distribute the proposed rules for public comment.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner then requested a motion to authorize the rules for initial review and public comment. Thus, Gregory Kazarian moved that the Illinois State Board of Education hereby authorize the solicitation of public comment on the proposed rulemaking for:</p>   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Certification (23 Illinois Administrative Code 25)—60 day review;</li> <li>• Standards for Certification in Specific Teaching Fields (23 Illinois Administrative Code 27)—45 day review;</li> <li>• Standards for Administrative Certification (23 Illinois Administrative Code 29)—45 day review; and</li> <li>• Secular Textbook Loan (23 Illinois Administrative Code 350)—45 day review, including publication of the proposed rules in the <i>Illinois Register</i>.</li> </ul> <p>The motion was seconded by Judith Gold. As there was no discussion on the rules for authorization, Dr. Steiner requested a roll call vote to authorize the initial review and public comment. The motion carried as all members present voted affirmatively.</p>  |
| <p><b><u>Cumulative Waiver Report</u></b></p> | <p>The next item on the agenda was the 2004 Cumulative Waiver Report. Dr. Schiller stated that the purpose of this agenda item would be to present for initial review proposed legislative changes that respond to certain approved waivers or modifications and are recommended for inclusion in the cumulative waiver report. Therefore, Dr. Schiller stated that the Board would direct staff as to the legislative recommendations to be included in the report to the General Assembly.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner then asked for a motion to approve the inclusion of the legislative recommendation in the Annual Cumulative Waiver Report. Gregory Kazarian moved that the Illinois State Board of Education direct staff to include the following recommendations in the 2004 Cumulative Waiver Report, which will be presented for final Board action in January:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a recommendation to allow the use of certain legal school holidays for student attendance, parent-teacher conferences, in-service training, teacher institutes or emergency days, provided that students receive instruction appropriate to the individuals honored by the holiday; and</li> <li>• a recommendation to allow districts to shorten the instructional day when the Prairie State Achievement Examination is administered, provided that they first accumulate sufficient time beyond the five-clock-hour requirement to be applied to the shortened days.</li> </ul> <p>The motion was seconded by Dean Clark. As there was no discussion with regard to the motion, Dr. Steiner called for the roll call to vote on the motion. The motion carried as all members present voted yes.</p> |



|  |   |
|--|---|
|  |   |
|  |   |
| <b><u>The Condition of Education, 2003</u></b> | <p>Dr. Steiner then stated that next item for Board action would be the authorization of The Condition of Education report. She then requested a motion. Dean Clark moved that the Illinois State Board of Education adopt the 2003 Condition of Public Education report and authorize the State Superintendent to incorporate the changes discussed during the meeting and publish the report for delivery to the Governor and General Assembly as soon as possible. The motion was seconded by Richard Sandsmark.</p> <p>Mr. Gidwitz then requested that the Board also move that the Superintendent be allowed to make minor alterations as done with rules that are of an administrative nature in the event that errors are found. Dean Clark stated that he concurred with Mr. Gidwitz's request being added to the motion. Thus, there was a roll call vote on the motion. As all members present voted yes, the motion passed.</p>  |
| <b><u>ISBE Monthly Reports</u></b>             | <p>Dr. Steiner then stated that the next item would be the ISBE Monthly Reports. Dr. Schiller stated that the typical monthly reports have been provided for the Board to review. Dr. Steiner then requested a motion. Richard Sandsmark moved that the Illinois State Board of Education accept the financial, agency operations, and budget status reports presented during the December 2003 meeting. The motion was seconded by Ronald Gidwitz.</p> <p>Mr. Gidwitz then presented a questioned. He inquired as to what the authorized agency headcount was to date. David Wood stated that the current agency headcount is at 492. Dr. Schiller then asserted that the agency number is predicated upon the funding that is received. There are some positions that need to be filled for non-public and GED, and the hiring of those positions is balanced with the retirements which are taking place.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner then requested a roll call to vote on the motion. As all members present voted affirmatively, the motion carried.</p> |
| <b><u>Fiscal Year 2005 Budget</u></b>          | <p>The next agenda item was the Fiscal Year 2005 Budget. The purpose of this agenda item was for the Board to continue to develop their FY 05 Budget recommendations. Dr. Schiller stated that the Board has tentatively scheduled a Finance Committee Meeting to discuss and finalized the budget recommendations on January 5. Additionally, the Board has</p>  |

scheduled the adoption of the budget to take place on January 8 in the afternoon via teleconferencing or conference call for both meetings.

He stated that the purpose of discussing the FY 05 Budget at the current meeting was to review the revised budget worksheet based upon the previous week's meeting proposed changes and recommendations. Therefore, David Wood proceeded to explain to the Board the changes that were made to the budget document. There was a discussion of low range with additions and subtractions with the GSA allotment. The cumulative increases were included, whether the amount increased or decreased. Mr. Wood asserted that it is important to emphasize that staff took the low range and added items pursuant to the Board's discussion. These items included:

- Increasing the categorical programs to 100%,
- Adding an additional 30million dollars to ADA,
- Restoring the ADA block grant back to the level during FY 03,
- Restoring the Gifted funding to the FY 03 level,
- Instituting a proration for bilingual education from 60 to 75% , and
- Funding National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) to meet statutory requirements.

Mr. Gidwitz then inquired as to if the TRS savings were a result of bonds. Mr. Wood responded affirmatively. He further stated that it is also important to look at what state pension fund receives as well as the pension bonds that have been sold. The base contribution drops a 129 million. Therefore, adding back in Chicago leaves a total reduction of 64. Mr. Wood then explained that this would be characterized as debt service toward another bond to pay debt. However, no special posturing of the money has been assumed.

Mr. Kazarian stated that between the Board meeting and January 5, he would like to see some more information on the programmatic impact of the low range, medium range, and high range in the bridges extended learning program (Summer Bridges) to see who we reach and how they are impacted. He stated that of the public comment received at the meeting, they were pretty well versed in emphasizing the importance of bringing the \$200 foundation level to \$250.

Mr. Kazarian then stated that there is one issue with the Illinois Economic Education Program. He questioned the established

advocacy in place that matches dollars three to one. However, Dr. Schiller stated that it is not an automatic but attracts the matching of private sector dollars. In the past, private sector dollars has worked on a 3 to 1 ratio. The Superintendent stated that possibly the Board could get a recommendation that amplifies what should be done about that. Mr. Gidwitz stated that it is a very worthwhile contribution to economic development in the state. Dr. Schiller then asserted that the value of this goes a long way. He said that there was an attempt for this to be added in as a supplemental but was struck by the final budget last year. Dr. Schiller stated that he has received a letter and tons of emails and wanted to bring that to the Board's attention. He then proclaimed that in the context of limited funds, the Board has to place its priorities on the dollars.

Mr. Wood then suggests that as suggestions such as these come up on behalf of the Board, they be sent to the Superintendent so that staff can revise the budget as needed. Mr. Gidwitz then said that he would like to see the Chicago Public School allocation increased from 65 million to 100 million as they did not get anything last year. He asserted that 65 million came out of classrooms at the expense of kids. Mr. Gidwitz then added that in reading the revised text of the *Condition of Education* report the original discussion that took place in the legislature, there was an affirmative commitment to fund Chicago at an appropriate level. However, this has not been the case. Mr. Gidwitz then stated it is important to properly proportion money for Chicago according to the *Condition of Education*.

Several Board members then requested further information on the differences between funding at the low range, mid range and high range and what the effects would be of each. Concurrently, Dean Clark requested information on the programs themselves. Dr. Schiller stated that individual program sheets were being drafted and finalized to be provided to the Board and public for understanding. One such program that was cited was the Summer Bridges Program. The Board agreed that the program is vital and key against retention and helps students prepare for the coming year. The program is also used at times as a condition for promotion. It has been shown that those participating in the programs stay in school and are better prepared for school. Some members even asserted that the Board should be investing more as research has been done that proves the program is very effective.

Dr. Steiner then questioned if money is provided for schools

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>that have not met the standards. Dr. Schiller answered positively by saying that the money is put into these programs to provide the services to the students. Dr. Steiner then inquired as to the process of providing services when some schools have subgroups that have needs and have met the standards. Dr. Schiller stated that funds are allocated to be provided to all those subgroups and schools. Specifically, it was proposed that the funding would be provided to all <b>students</b> not particularly the schools, so it would be all inclusive. Mr. Kazarian then added that it is also important to include the eight graders who are not meeting standards and fund programs at the high range that assist those students as well. He asserted that the Board must focus on all students not on level and to reach these students in an appropriate way.</p> <p>Mr. Wood requested that the Board members continue to review the spreadsheet and provide their recommendations with regard to the contents therein and define the Board priorities as they evolve.</p>  |
| <p><b><u>Announcements and Reports</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Superintendent</u></b></p> | <p>The announcements and reports of the Superintendent and Board members then followed the discussion of the FY 05 Budget.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller then proceeded with his report. He stated that he would begin his report by giving an update on several districts around the state. The Superintendent shared that he was invited to Rockford to discuss and describe the aspects of a Financial Oversight Panel and what the law requires. Rockford has been looking as a district to invite the Board to consider such an action. In January the Superintendent stated that he may be meeting with their Board to continue to discuss the option of instituting a FOP.</p> <p>The Superintendent then stated that there has been difficulty for over a year with the Venice school district which has been on probation. A letter of non-recognition has been issued as the district still does not have a balanced budget or records to support a budget. Thus, an action plan was given to Venice. They have 30 days to show cause that they can continue to exist without stopping state aid and resolving the district. The Superintendent stated that the investment of course should be for the children but this is not what they have been doing in the last several years. There has been proof of this in the area of finances, special education, and other programs. The district has been on probation and has unsuccessfully put action plans</p> |

in place. The Superintendent stated that he would keep the Board informed as of the happenings and the process with regard to Venice.

Dr. Schiller then asserted that another district that the Board is looking at is East St. Louis. The district, as part of a compliance review, was evaluated on their special education program. A meeting was held with Superintendent Nate Anderson and he has an opportunity to submit a corrective action plan. There has also been a request to conduct an investigation of the assessment of the special education students with in the district. Superintendent Anderson has responded quickly by taking disciplinary action and removing several district principals and administrators, and some teachers who violated aspects of the assessment guidelines. Dr. Schiller stated that this was rightly a local personnel decision. The Regional Office of Education (ROE) can also get involved as well as the state. Superintendent Schiller stated that he would be in communication with the ROE concerning their shared roll in this circumstance. Superintendent Anderson is closely communicating unprofessional conduct and staff will proceed to make sure the district is upholding the standards of the state.

In light of the compliance, in the school recognition status, the school would be placed on probation and must build an action plan to remediate the circumstance. Absent from doing that, the district could also be non-recognized. If the action plan is put in place, the district would continue to be on probation until the plan is fully implemented. Training and retraining is currently underway. The district is also charged to look at the students that were not getting services and to institute services to those students. Also, discussion has been held with the district superintendent concerning the search for special education administration and further monitoring and oversight in the district.

With regard to the school report cards, Dr. Schiller stated that the school report cards were delivered approximately one month ago to schools. The Superintendent stated that the school report cards are basically a data dump. Staff does not do anything with the data but regurgitate it. There is a 45 day period to clean up data after the data is released to the schools. The districts have received eight notices since February. Dr. Schiller stressed the fact that the data on report card is data submitted by school districts. Moreover, the state recognized that there were over 30, 000 data areas largely in the area of

|                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| <p><b><u>Chairman</u></b></p> | <p>appropriate coding of subgroups and disparities of whole group and subgroup reporting of participation rate that were erroneous. Therefore, students and districts were not appropriately coded or even coded at all to show a comparable participation rate. This error in reporting participation rate affected about 400 schools where this is the only measure that was not met regarding AYP.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller stated that the interest is less on the report card but more on the accuracy of the data base for calculations of AYP and sanctions.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller informed the Board that staff will be doing an intensive review of the data with the schools. Schools must present data and evidence to show that the school would have indeed met standards if the errors had not been present. Further, the Superintendent added that cleaning up the data base is vital. The Superintendent stated that he cannot halt the dissemination of the data. However, staff has worked with the media in understanding that this state, along with others, are working toward accuracy in meeting and calculating AYP.</p> <p>Richard Sandsmark inquired as to what was happening with the vendor. Dr. Schiller requested that Clay Slagle, Project Manager, to explain to the Board the recent activity with the contractors. Mr. Slagle stated that staff has been actively engaged in determining a solution for correcting data errors. Discussions have begun with Deloitte to make sure the information given is more accurate. Dr. Schiller stated that one of the critical issues is the Board had to defer due to lack of funding to institute an automated student identifier system. Mr. Slagle stated that this system would greatly improve efforts in data quality. Additionally, Dr. Schiller proclaimed that there has not been a great deal of attention to detail. It is important for school administrators and personnel to ensure that the data put in is clean as it is a direct transfer from schools to the contractor. Mr. Slagle stated that it is important to be mindful that some calculations are involved. However, there are some base numbers that are given to the contractors as well. Dr. Schiller then reiterated that schools must have due diligence and give attention to detail as the data is only as good as the data from the schools that has been put in the system.</p> <p>As a part of her Chairman report, Dr. Steiner stated that NASBE is in need of a person to be on a study group for athletics on achievement. According to Dr. Steiner, NASBE is requesting a</p> |
|-------------------------------|--|

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><b><u>Committees</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Board Operations</u></b></p> | <p>member from Illinois as our state is one of the largest states. She requested that if any Board member would be interested, please inform her of their interest.</p> <p>On behalf of Joyce Karon, the Board Operations Chair, Dr. Steiner stated that the next Board meeting would be held January 21-22 in Chicago. In addition, she stated that a special committee meeting has been planned for January 5 to discuss the FY05 Budget. A special Board meeting was also planned for January 8 to adopt the FY 05 Budget.</p> <p>There were no other committee reports.</p> |
| <p><b><u>Other Information</u></b></p>                                | <p>Dr. Steiner then requested that the Board review the monthly report on the status of agency rulemaking in the back of the packet.</p>  |
| <p><b><u>Adjournment</u></b></p>                                      | <p>The meeting adjourned at 12:23 p.m.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Respectfully Submitted,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">_____<br/>Richard Sandsmark<br/>Secretary</p> <p style="text-align: center;">_____<br/>Dr. Janet Steiner<br/>Chair</p>   |