



Illinois State Board of Education

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

Illinois State Board of Education*

100 North First Street
4th Floor Board Room
Springfield, Illinois 62777
217/782-2221
217/785-3972 (fax)

SCHEDULE AND AGENDA OF MEETINGS February 18, 2004

Conference Call Access Number for all meetings:
1-866-297-6391

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

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

WEDNESDAY, February 18, 2004

9:00 a.m.

PLENARY BUSINESS MEETING

A. Call Meeting to Order/Roll Call *(4th Floor Board Room)*

B. Public Participation

C. Approval of Minutes

- January 21-22, 2004 *(pp. 54-85)*

D. Discussion*/Action Items

- Approval of Revised Policies and Guidelines for Non-Public School Recognition *(pp. 1-14)*
- Approval of Revised SES Provider Criteria *(pp. 15-20)*
- Approval of Additional SES Providers *(pp. 21-27)*
- Approval of English Language Learner Proficiency Standards *(pp. 28-30)*
- Approval of New Program Proposal-Rockford College *(pp. 31-35)*
- Acceptance of ISBE Monthly Reports *(pp. 36-53)*
- 2004 Legislative Agenda*

E. Announcements and Reports

- Superintendent
- Chairman
- Committees
- Members

F. Other Information

- Monthly Status Report on Rulemaking (*pp. 86-88*)

G. Adjourn

*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

February 18, 2004
State Board Meeting

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

100 North First Street
4th Floor Board Room
Springfield, Illinois 62777

Wednesday, February 18, 2004

<p><u>Call Meeting to Order/ Roll Call</u></p>	<p>Vice-Chair Beverly Turkal called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m. and stated that she would be chairing the meeting in the absence of Chair Janet Steiner. She then proceeded to request that the roll be called. A quorum was present.</p> <p>MEMBERS PRESENT: Dean Clark Gregory Kazarian Judith Gold Joyce Karon Beverly Turkal Ronald Gidwitz</p> <p>Janet Steiner joined the meeting at 9:25 a.m. Gregory Kazarian joined the meeting by phone at 9:40 a.m.</p> <p>MEMBERS ABSENT: Richard Sandsmark</p> <p>Ms. Turkal stated that the meeting would be a one day meeting in which the Board would discuss and take action on the presented agenda items.</p>
<p><u>Public Participation</u></p> <p><u>Rich Buckler, Director of Research and Information</u></p>	<p>Ms. Turkal then announced that there would be one public participant to address the Board: Rick Buckler of the Decatur Public Schools.</p> <p>Mr. Buckler commenced by thanking the Board for the opportunity to speak to them on a very important issue that affects schools and the adequately yearly progress that they make from year to year. Mr. Buckler stated that in 2003 only 60% of the schools in Illinois met AYP according to the NCLB schedule. According to Mr. Buckler, the percentage of students who meet AYP in Illinois will decrease as the nation progresses toward 2014. He then referenced a handout displaying a graph showing this decline (please see attachment).</p>

Mr. Buckler then began to discuss the thirty-seven hurdles that schools must “jump” as part of the conditions for making AYP. According to Mr. Buckler, if ISBE were to add the multi-race component as a subgroup, there would be four more hurdles for schools to have to “jump” in order to make AYP. He then urged the State Board to rethink their decision to include the multi-race category in the AYP calculations. As an example, Mr. Buckler stated that schools report test score data on nineteen groups; and of these nineteen groups only nine of them are actually included in the AYP calculations. According to Mr. Buckler, the system worked last year without the need to include them. Thus, Mr. Buckler asserted that this proves that the multi-race category does not need to be included in AYP calculations to show that schools have met adequate yearly progress. He furthermore asserted that this category need not be included because it is not a requirement of the NCLB law or a part of Illinois’ approved accountability plan.

Mr. Buckler concluded by stating that ISBE needs to seriously rethink the reversal of their stance on multi-race as a AYP hurdle as this would put even more pressure on schools to meet AYP at a time when they feel that no one is in their corner.

Ron Gidwitz then thanked Mr. Buckler for pointing out this issue and expressed to the Superintendent that he believed that this may be something that the State Board needs to look at. Superintendent Schiller stated that staff has looked at this. He stated that the issue is students who are not of one race. Instead of having the “other” category, the category is being called “multi-race.” Dr. Schiller went on to say that the reason behind including the multi-race category in AYP calculations is that there may be enough students (40) to be considered as a subgroup. In addition, Dr. Schiller asserted that ISBE cannot establish this group and then discount these students entirely for purposes of calculating AYP.

In response, Mr. Buckler stated that this is not an issue of leaving students out of the data reporting. This is an issue of whether ISBE should require schools to count these students in their AYP calculations. Dr. Schiller and Mr. Gidwitz then thanked Mr. Buckler for his comments.

<p><u>Approval of Minutes</u></p>	<p>Ms. Turkal then requested a motion to approve the minutes from the State Board's January meeting. Mr. Gidwitz moved that the Illinois State Board of Education approve the minutes of the January 21-22, 2004 meeting as published. The motion was seconded by Dean Clark. The motion passed as all members present voted yes.</p>
<p><u>Discussion*/Action Items</u></p>	<p>Vice-Chair Turkal then stated that she would ask the Superintendent to summarize each item on the agenda. She asserted that after this summary was complete, she would ask for a motion and a second to then allow for Board discussion. Lastly, Ms. Turkal stated that once discussion was complete she would request the Board to take appropriate action.</p>
<p><u>Approval of Revised Policies and Guidelines for Nonpublic School Recognition</u></p>	<p>Ms. Turkal announced that the first item for Board discussion and action would be the Approval of Revised Policies and Guidelines for Nonpublic School Recognition. Dr. Schiller stated that ISBE has been working collaboratively with the Nonpublic School Recognition Advisory Committee in reviewing and revising the policies and guidelines for the registration and recognition of nonpublic schools in Illinois. Dr. Schiller then requested that Don Full, Accountability Division Administrator and the representatives from the Nonpublic School Recognition Advisory Committee come forward to present the revised policies and guidelines for Nonpublic School Recognition.</p> <p>Don Full commenced by introducing Zack Wickmann of the Catholic Conference of Illinois and Cynthia Kuck of the Illinois Coalition of Nonpublic Schools. Mr. Full stated that Gary Arnold, current Executive Director of the Illinois Coalition of Nonpublic Schools, could not be present but called to express his support of the revised policies and guidelines. Mr. Full stated that the policies and guidelines have been in existence since 1975. Furthermore, as changes have been made, the advisory committee has always been involved. According to Mr. Full, the committee represents various constituencies from non-public schools and organizations across the state.</p> <p>Mr. Full then asserted that he would like to discuss the proposed updates, changes, and language additions to the current policy. According to Mr. Full, the most radical change was the addition of an alternative process for recognizing nonpublic schools. Mr. Full stated that due to</p>

financial constraints placed on ISBE because of budget cuts, Dr. Schiller and staff suggested that an alternative recognition method be established. Mr. Full asserted that the new policy allows for accrediting agencies, outside of ISBE, to register and recognize nonpublic schools as long as these agencies' guidelines align with those of ISBE. If it is found that the proposed accrediting agency meets the guidelines and requirements, then that agency would be approved to grant recognition to nonpublic schools. According to Mr. Full, this would then eliminate duplication between ISBE and the other accrediting agencies. However, Mr. Full stated that not all of the nonpublic schools will choose this option as some of them still would like to have a "stamp of approval" from ISBE.

Ms. Turkal inquired as to whether there would be a cost to school districts if they choose to go through the recognition process with another agency. Mr. Full stated that yes there would be a cost the school district would have to pay. Ms. Turkal then asserted that some of the smaller districts would not be able to afford the service.

Mr. Gidwitz asked whether these new policies and guidelines would add to our current administrative rules. Mr. Full responded by saying no. He stated that these revisions do not go through the rules process at all as they are only policies and guidelines.

Dean Clark inquired as to how long the recognition process lasts. Mr. Full replied by stating that there is a regular review cycle that takes place. However, some of these details are still being refined.

Joyce Karon asked if many districts were seeking accreditation and recognition from the North Central Association. Dr. Kuck stated that a few have begun to go in this direction, with the exception of the parochial schools.

Mr. Turkal inquired as to when the policies and guidelines would take effect. Mr. Full stated that, if approved, the policies and guidelines would be in effect the next school year.

Dr. Steiner asked if the nonpublic school recognition program was in danger of being cut again this year. The

	<p>Superintendent replied by saying that the agency is unsure of the decisions that will be made by the Governor and the legislators. Mr. Full also stated that ISBE does not have an appropriation for Nonpublic School Recognition as the program is in the Accountability line and receives funding from the state in this manner. Mr. Wickmann stated that legislation was signed recently by the Governor requiring nonpublic school recognition. Therefore, it is the hope of the committee that funding will continue to be available.</p> <p>As there were no more questions or comments, Ms. Turkal requested a motion to approve the revised policies and guidelines for Nonpublic School Recognition. Joyce Karon then made the following motion:</p> <p>Whereas Article 26-1 of the Illinois School Code provides an exemption from attendance at public schools for any child attending a private or parochial school where children are taught the branches of education taught to children of corresponding age and grade in the public schools and; Whereas the Illinois State Board of Education has historically conducted voluntary nonpublic school registration and recognition programs to ensure the comparability specified in Article 26-1 and; Whereas the Illinois State Board of Education has previously convened a Nonpublic School Recognition Committee to develop policy and guidelines for the implementation of its registration and recognition programs; I move that the revised Policy and Guidelines recommended by the present Nonpublic School Recognition Advisory Committee be approved and adopted by the Illinois State Board of Education.</p> <p>The motion was seconded by Janet Steiner. As all members present voted affirmatively, the motion passed. Ms. Turkal and Dr. Schiller then thanked Mr. Wickmann and Dr. Kuck for coming to present and discuss the revised policies and guidelines.</p>
<p><u>Approval of Revised SES Provider Criteria</u></p>	<p>Vice-Chair Turkal then called for agenda item: Approval of Revised SES Provider Criteria. She stated that the purpose of this agenda item would be to respond to Board members' request that the criteria for approving the Supplemental Educational Service Providers adopted by the State Board of Education on September 19, 2002</p>

include information regarding the capacity of providers as it relates to number of students.

At the Superintendent's request, Don Full proceeded to explain the proposed revisions to the SES Provider Criteria. Mr. Full stated that the proposed revisions would require that providers include in their application for approval information regarding the total number of students they can serve. He also asserted that if the revised provider criteria were approved, ISBE would also contact existing providers and request that they provide the agency with information regarding their minimum and maximum service capacity.

Mr. Full stated that the agency never entertained a minimum number of students a provider had to be able to serve. According to Mr. Full, the purpose of revising the criteria is to receive more information on the number of students the providers are able to serve. It would then be left up to districts and providers to collaboratively work together to make sure the students who need the services are provided with assistance. Mr. Full stated that the districts and providers must enter into an agreement. The authority does not lie with the state to say that a provider must serve a certain number of students. The state is now trying to only provide more information to parents as to the capacity of the providers.

Ron Gidwitz stated that the intent was not to limit the providers by their capacity. However, board members requested information on the capacity of all providers so that our agency and school districts would have the ability to let parents know where their children can take advantage of the services that they need and qualify for in their area. In concluding, Mr. Gidwitz stated that he believed that it would be in our best interest to have a diversified pool of providers, as the intent of the law was drafted and to know what their capacity is.

Joyce Karon stated that one of the issues raised at the last Board meeting was that there were not enough SES providers. She stated that Gregory Kazarian then inquired as to if the agency was aware of the capacity of the providers. Dr. Schiller agreed and inquired of Mr. Full if our agency has checked with other states regarding their capacity to service students who need supplemental

educational services. Mr. Full stated replied affirmatively by stating that staff surveyed Ohio, Iowa, Wisconsin, Kentucky, and Michigan. According to Mr. Full, none of those states have any criteria relative to capacity as far as numbers to serve. Several of the states have more providers than Illinois while Iowa has considerably less. With regard to the states that have a much larger number of providers, it was found that these states have summarily approved school districts as providers as well as intermediate service centers as a whole. However, Illinois has required that all providers apply on an individual basis.

Beverly Turkal asserted that it was her belief that there were some districts, as discussed at the last Board meeting, who do not have the capacity to service all of the children who qualify for the supplemental educational services. Dr. Schiller said that yes, there are some districts who are unable to provide services to all of the children due to a lack of capacity with current providers and the need to have more providers in the area to service the children's needs. He offered the example of Chicago who lacks capacity to service all of the children who need and qualify for supplemental educational services. Dean Clark then inquired if the Chicago School District itself can be a provider. Mr. Full replied that yes, Chicago is on the approved list of providers and can serve as a provider to the students who need services.

Dr. Steiner inquired as to whether parents have the "last word" in choosing a provider to service their children's educational needs. Mr. Full responded affirmatively and stated that the schools and districts are encouraged to help in the selection process but the parents do indeed have the last say.

Ms. Turkal then requested a motion to approve the revised Supplemental Educational Services (SES) provider criteria. Dean Clark made the following motion:

Whereas the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 requires the state education agency to promote maximum participation by supplemental educational service providers to ensure that parents have as many choices as possible in selecting a provider for their children, and;

	<p>Whereas the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 requires the state education agency to develop and apply objective criteria in the approval of potential providers, I move that the Criteria for Approving Supplemental Educational Service Providers be revised to include information regarding the number of students a provider can serve as specified in the underlined portion of Attachment 1, Section G.</p> <p>The motion was seconded by Ronald Gidwitz. The motion passed as all members present voted yes.</p>
<p><u>Approval of Additional SES Providers</u></p>	<p>Ms. Turkal then stated that the next item for Board discussion and action would be the Approval of Additional SES Providers. Dr. Schiller stated that there were two more providers to add to the current list of approved SES providers. If approved, the providers that would be added to the list include: Failure Free Reading and Gateway Learning Center. Failure Free Reading is a program based out of Concord, North Carolina that would be available to all eligible schools and districts in the state. The Gateway Learning Center would provide reading and math instruction to eligible students in the Park Forest area. Both providers would serve students in grades 1-12.</p> <p>Ms. Turkal then requested a motion to approve the proposed providers. Ronald Gidwitz made the following motion:</p> <p>Whereas the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 requires that the State Board of Education promote maximum participation of supplemental educational service providers and maintain an updated list of approved providers, I move that Failure Free Reading and Gateway Learning Center, be approved for addition to the Illinois list of approved supplemental educational service providers.</p> <p>The motion was seconded by Dean Clark. As all members present voted affirmatively, the motion passed.</p>
<p><u>Approval of English Language Learner Proficiency</u></p>	<p>The next agenda item was the Approval of English Language Learner Proficiency Standards. Ms. Turkal asserted that the purpose of this item would be for the Board to adopt the proposed English Language</p>

<p><u>Standards</u></p>	<p>Proficiency Standards and understand the process for disseminating and using the adopted standards in 2004 and beyond.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller stated that in January the draft standards were brought before the Board with a detailed presentation which described and analyzed the content of the English Language Learner Proficiency Standards. He then requested that Karen Mulattieri, Division Administrator for English Language Learning (ELL) give a brief overview of the standards. Ms. Mulattieri commenced by stating that the No Child Left Behind Act sets goals for Limited English Proficiency students for both academic achievement and English language proficiency, and furthermore requires under Title I and Title III language proficiency testing. Title III requires ISBE to describe how the agency would establish standards and objectives for raising the level of English proficiency.</p> <p>Ms. Mulattieri then stated that back in July of 2003, the English Language Learner staff commenced a group of practitioners from across Illinois to review and propose changes to the English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards and performance indicators as many of the standards and performance indicators did not meet the requirements of the NCLB law. Ms. Mulattieri also asserted that staff enlisted the assistance of the Wisconsin (WIDA) Consortium who was also working on drafting ELP standards. Thus, Illinois requested to work in collaboration with the consortium to draft the revised standards and align them with the Illinois Learning Standards. Thus, in October 2003, Illinois met with the WIDA consortium. The consortium reviewed the enhancements made by Illinois and approved the document as the official ELP standards for the consortium. At that point, the ELL staff brought the standards to the State Board to consider adopting the standards.</p> <p>Ms. Mulattieri stated that upon approval of the standards for adoption, the standards will be submitted in the Annual USDE English Language Performance Report on April 30. Upon approval, the ELL staff would disseminate the standards and performance indicators to the districts in May or June, with in-service training following in the next school year. She stated that so far, these standards have</p>
--------------------------------	--

	<p>been very well received by teachers in the field. In concluding, Ms. Mulattieri stated that the ELP Standards are driving the creation of test items for language proficiency testing in grades K-12 in 2005.</p> <p>Ms. Turkal then requested a motion to approve the standards. Joyce Karon stated that the standards were right on target and included all of the necessary elements. She then moved that the Illinois State Board of Education hereby adopt the WIDA English Language Proficiency Standards for instructional use in Illinois with the limited English proficient students in grades K-12 as discussed during the January 2004 meeting. These standards will be part of the instructional programs serving limited English proficient students as outlined in 105 ILSCS 5/14C-2. The motion was seconded by Ronald Gidwitz. All members present voted yes. Therefore, the motion passed.</p>
<p><u>Approval of New Program Proposal—Rockford College</u></p>	<p>The next item for Board discussion and action was the Approval of New Program Proposal—Rockford College. Ms. Turkal stated that the purpose of the agenda item would be for the Board to consider approval of the alternative certification program proposed by Rockford College. Dr. Schiller stated that this proposed alternative certification program, which has been developed by Rockford college, is designed for individuals who already have a bachelor’s degree but desire to teach. The Superintendent further asserted that the program would be of benefit in areas of teacher shortage, especially in the areas of bilingual, foreign language, and secondary math instruction. This program was also reviewed and unanimously approved by the State Teacher Certification Board.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller then requested that representatives from Rockford college, who were standing by on the phone, to introduce themselves to the Board. The following representatives were on the line: Dr. Debra Drew, Certification Officer, Mrs. Ann Caton, Education Department Chair, and Dr. Ellen Bueschel, Rockford Board of Education Interim Superintendent. Dr. Schiller thanked the representatives for being available and asked if they had anything further to add about the program. It was stated that the proposed alternative certification program is one of high standards as the candidates in the</p>

alternative certification programs must meet the established policies for admission to Rockford College's graduate program and the State's requirements for alternative certification programs.

Dr. Steiner then inquired as to how many faculty members serve in the graduate program. It was stated that the faculty members for the education program and graduate alternative certification program teach in both programs. Thus, the total faculty is made up of six members.

Ms. Turkal inquired as to whether Rockford would be planning to promote their program statewide. The representatives stated that this program was intended solely for use in the Rockford Public Schools.

As there were no more questions or comments, Vice-Chair Turkal requested a motion to approve the program proposal from Rockford College. Ronald Gidwitz then moved that the Illinois State Board of Education hereby find that the alternative certification program submitted by Rockford College is consistent with the requirements in 105 ILCS 5/21-5c of the School Code, as well as all applicable standards. He also moved that the State Board approve the alternative certification program as proposed and authorize the institution to conduct programs and recommend candidates for certification in the following areas:

- Type 03 Elementary Education
- Type 03 Elementary Education with a bilingual option
- Type 09 Secondary Education with a bilingual option
- Type 09 Secondary Education:
 - Mathematics
 - Science (Biology, Chemistry)
- Type 10 Special K-12
 - Foreign Languages (French, German, Spanish).

The motion was seconded by Joyce Karon. The motion passed as all members present voted yes.

Acceptance of ISBE Monthly Vice-Chair Turkal announced the next agenda item: Acceptance of ISBE Monthly Reports. She stated that

<p><u>Reports</u></p>	<p>the purposed of the agenda item would be for the Board to review the provided standard reports with key information on fiscal and administrative activities of the state agency. Dr. Schiller stated that the reports within the Board packet were the normal monthly reports that are provided to the Board. He asserted that the agency headcount as recorded on the February report was at 495. Dr. Schiller stated that the agency has funding for about 501. In addition, he stated that between the time of February 29 and June, there will be about 14 retirements. The agency is also still engaged in the process of hiring individuals for the Nonpublic School Recognition and Private Business Vocational School programs.</p> <p>As there were no questions on the reports, Ms. Turkal asked that a motion be made to accept the ISBE Monthly Reports. Thus, Joyce Karon moved that the Illinois State Board of Education accept the financial, agency operations, and budget status reports presented during the February 2004 meeting. The motion was seconded by Dean Clark. The motion passed as all members presented voted affirmatively.</p>
<p><u>2004 Legislative Agenda*</u></p>	<p>Ms. Turkal then stated that the Board would discuss the legislative agenda for the 2004 session. Dr. Schiller then requested that Peter Leonis, Director of Governmental Relations give an overview of the 2004 Legislative Agenda. Mr. Leonis stated that in terms of the process, things are moving along very slowly this year. There have been a record number of bills that have been introduced. However, not many of them have made it out of the Rules Committee. Mr. Leonis asserted that many bills are being deferred due to the Governor's Education Proposal and the bills that relate to his proposal.</p> <p>Mr. Leonis stated that all legislation that was discussed at the last State Board meeting has been introduced with regard to the State Board's agenda. According to Mr. Leonis, the most substantive bill to make it out the Rules Committee was SB 2774 which proposes to raise the high school graduation requirements beginning in the 2008-2009 school year. He said that he expects to hear more on this bill in the upcoming weeks. Lastly, Mr. Leonis proclaimed that more news related to education and the agency would most likely be forthcoming after the Governor's Budget Address. Ms. Turkal and Dr. Schiller</p>

	then thanked Mr. Leonis for his report.
<u>Announcements and Reports</u>	Ms. Turkal then requested the Superintendent give his report.
<u>Superintendent</u>	The Superintendent commenced by stating that he believed that it would be in the Board's best interest to have a Finance Committee Meeting following the Governor's Budget Address to discuss ISBE's response and review the FY 05 Budget Options. Dr. Schiller stated that the meeting could be set up within the week by teleconference.
	Ms. Turkal then called for other reports and announcements.
<u>Board Operations</u>	Ms. Karon announced that some Board members would not be in attendance at the March Board meeting due to scheduling conflicts with the established date of the meeting (March 17-18). Dr. Schiller asserted that possibly other arrangements can be discussed.
<u>Education Policy/ Planning</u>	Mr. Kazarian stated that the Education Policy Planning Committee would decide after the Governor's Budget Address if there would be a need to meet as a committee before the next scheduled meeting.
<u>Closed Session</u>	Ms. Turkal inquired as to whether there was a need for a closed session meeting. Ronald Gidwitz moved that the Illinois State Board of Education go into closed session under the exceptions set forth in the Open Meetings Act of the State of Illinois as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 2 (c) (1) for the purpose of discussing information regarding appointment, employment, compensation, discipline, performance, or dismissal of an employee. • Section 2 (c) (11) for the purpose of discussing litigation. <p>The motion was seconded by Dean Clark. The motion passed as all members present voted yes.</p>
<u>Adjournment</u>	After the closed session ended, the meeting officially adjourned at 10:35 a.m.
	Please contact the Illinois State Board of Education office in Springfield at 217/782-7497 for an audio tape of the meeting.

Respectfully Submitted,

Richard Sandsmark
Secretary

Dr. Janet Steiner
Chair