

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
100 North First Street
Springfield, Illinois

December 13-14, 2006

NOTE: Staff presentations and detailed Board discussion typically take place during Committee meetings one month prior to State Board action in the plenary session.

Wednesday, December 13, 2006

- 10:30 a.m. Education Policy Planning Committee**
Board Room, 4th Floor
1-866-297-6391 (*listen only*); Confirmation # 1 6 4 7 3 2 5 6
- 11:30 a.m. Lunch Break**
- 12:00 p.m. Finance and Audit Committee**
Board Room, 4th Floor
1-866-297-6391 (*listen only*); Confirmation # 1 6 4 7 3 2 5 6
- 1:00 p.m. Ad Hoc Rules Committee of the Whole**
Board Room, 4th Floor
1-866-297-6391 (*listen only*); Confirmation # 1 6 4 7 3 2 5 6
- 3:00 p.m. Governmental Relations Committee of the Whole**
Board Room, 4th Floor
1-866-297-6391 (*listen only*); Confirmation # 1 6 4 7 3 2 5 6

* The meeting will begin at the conclusion of the previous session.

Thursday, December 14, 2006

- 8:00 a.m. Board Operations Committee**
Board Room, 4th Floor
1-866-297-6391 (*listen only*); Confirmation # 1 6 4 7 3 2 5 9
- 9:00 a.m. ISBE Plenary Session**
Board Room, 4th Floor, 100 North First Street, Springfield, IL
1-866-297-6391 (*listen only*); Confirmation # 1 6 4 7 3 2 5 9

NOTE: Chairman Ruiz will call for a break in the Board Plenary Session on Thursday at which time the Board will go into closed session.

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, Phone: 217-782-2221; TTY/TDD: 17-782-1900; Fax: 217-785-3972.

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Board Room

100 North First Street, Springfield, Illinois

Thursday, December 14, 2006

9:00 a.m.

Public Conference Call Number: 1-866-297-6391 (listen only); Confirmation #: 1 6 4 7 3 2 5 9

The Plenary Session will also be audio broadcast via the Internet.

NOTE: Staff presentations and detailed Board discussion typically take place during Committee meetings one month prior to State Board action in the plenary session.

Plenary Business Meeting

A. Roll Call/Pledge of Allegiance

B. Resolutions & Recognition

C. Public Participation

D. Superintendent's Report

*** Consent Agenda**

All action consideration items listed with an asterisk (*) are considered to be routine and will be enacted in one motion and vote. Any board member who wishes separate discussion on any item listed on the consent agenda may remove that item from the consent agenda, in which event, the item will be considered in its normal sequence.

Action Considerations

*1. Approval of Minutes

a. November 19, 2006 (**pp. 4-13**)

*2. Rules for Initial Review

a. Part 1 (Public Schools Evaluation, Recognition and Supervision) (**pp. 14-20**)

*3. Rules for Adoption

a. New Part 227 (Gifted Education) (**pp. 21-38**)

b. New Part 232 (Summer Bridges) (**pp. 39-49**)

c. New Part 270 (Advanced Placement) (**pp. 50-58**)

*4. Recommendations from Teacher Certification Board

a. Institutional Accreditation and Program Approvals

1) Trinity International University Accreditation and Program Approval (**pp. 59-61**)

2) Blackburn College Unit Accreditation and Program Approval (**pp. 62-64**)

3) Northwestern University Unit Accreditation and Program Approval (**pp. 65-68**)

4) The School of Art Institute of Chicago Unit Accreditation and Program Approval (**pp. 65-68**)

5) University of Chicago Unit Accreditation and Program Approval (**pp. 69-71**)

b. New Teacher Preparation Programs (**pp. 72-77**)

1) Dominican University New Teacher Preparation Programs

2) Northern Illinois University New Teacher Preparation Programs

3) University of Illinois-Chicago New Teacher Preparation Programs

4) University of Illinois-Springfield New Teacher Preparation Programs

*5. Approval of Draft State Board 2006 Annual Report (**pp. 78-143**)

(end of consent agenda)

6. Rules for Adoption

a. Part 226 (Special Education) (**p. 144**)

7. Proposed Spring 2007 Legislation (**pp. 145-154**)

8. Approval of Draft Criteria for State Superintendent (**pp. 155-156**)

E. Announcements and Reports

1. Presentation from Commission on Government Forecasting and Accountability (**pp. 157-180**)
2. IBHE Liaison Report (*Dr. Proshanta Nandi*)
3. Superintendent's Announcements
4. Chairman's Report
5. Committee Reports

F. Information Items

1. SBE Fiscal & Administrative Monthly Reports (**pp. 181-196**)

G. Adjourn

NOTE: Chairman Ruiz may call for a break in the Board Plenary Session at which time the Board will go into closed session.

**Illinois State Board of Education Meeting
MINUTES
December 14, 2006
Illinois State Board of Education
100 North First Street, Springfield, Illinois**

<p>ROLL CALL/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE</p>	<p>Mr. Jesse Ruiz, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 9:50 a.m. Chairman Ruiz asked Ms. Jean Ladage, Assistant to the Board, to call the roll. A quorum was present. Dr. Christopher Koch, Interim State Superintendent of Education, was also in attendance.</p> <p>The Board members, Dr. Koch, and anyone who wished to join them faced the American flag and recited the Pledge of Allegiance.</p> <p>Chairman Ruiz announced that the Board meeting was being audio-cast live over the Internet.</p> <p><u>Members Present:</u> Mr. Jesse Ruiz, Chairman Dr. Christopher Ward, Vice Chairman Dr. Vinni Hall, Secretary Dr. Andrea Brown Dr. David Fields Mr. Edward Geppert, Jr. Ms. Brenda Holmes Ms. Joyce Karon</p> <p><u>Members Absent:</u> Mr. Dean Clark</p>
<p>RESOLUTIONS & RECOGNITION</p>	<p>Superintendent Koch recognized Ms. Linda Jamali who has moved from Acting Division Administrator of Certification to Division Administrator. Ms. Jamali commented on how pleased she was to have the position and thanked Ginger Reynolds for her recommendation and support. Ms. Jamali also thanked the dedicated staff in Certification for all their hard work.</p> <p>Chairman Ruiz acknowledged Dr. Christopher Koch, Interim State Superintendent of Education and welcomed him to his first board meeting.</p> <p>Dr. Koch introduced and welcomed Mr. John Herner, Division Administrator for Special Education Services as of December 2006. Mr. Herner has been the State Director of Special Education in Ohio for nine years, as well as a teacher and administrator.</p>
<p>PUBLIC PARTICIPATION</p>	<p>Ms. Bev Johns, Member of the Board of Directors of the Learning Disabilities Association of Illinois (LDA) spoke on behalf of herself and Ms. Penny Richards, a board member of LDA who was unable to attend the meeting. Ms. Johns stated that LDA is in strong opposition to removal of case load and categories in class size. LDA also opposes the new mandate for RTI (Response to Intervention) because there are no mandated IEP meetings, no requirements for notification to parents and no proper supervision of the program. LDA has been told that RTI is a local general education initiative and is not required by the Federal IDEA 2004 Regulations. Ms. Johns asked that we do not require that local agencies use RTI.</p> <p>Mr. Rodney Estvan, Education Outreach Coordinator for Access Living of Metro Chicago addressed the Part 226 proposed regulations. Access Living is pleased with the 30% rule for class size. Mr. Estvan commented that Access</p>

	<p>Living supports the general concept of RTI but does have concerns on how RTI will be implemented for the schools that are failing or under reconstitution. They also have concerns with the measurement of Adequate Yearly Progress and how it will be determined. Access Living would like to see a case load standard addressed specifically and not through the ad hoc elimination process of caseloads.</p> <p>Mr. Ken Swanson, President of the Illinois Education Association asked that the Board be aware that the positions the IEA has taken are based on rigorous review of the Part 226 proposals and intense discussion among IEA members and staff who are experienced with special education policy matters. IEA applauds the decision on the 30/40 class size provisions, but is strongly opposed to the proposed changes in rules regarding scientific research-based interventions and the elimination of special education class size/case load guidelines by disability category. With regard to the system of category identification, it harms everyone involved to create a situation in which the collective diversity of needs in a classroom exceeds a teacher's ability to effectively meet those needs. Isolated concerns of the current system can be addressed on a case-by-case basis. In regards to RTI, the goal in Illinois should be for the state to remain aligned with federal guidelines. Mr. Swanson asked that the Board please consider the IEA's perspective when making their decisions on the proposed changes.</p> <p>Mr. Tim Thomas, Superintendent of North Suburban Special Education District (NSSSED) informed the Board that there are nineteen different school districts that make up NSSSED and they have been involved in RTI problem solving practices for more than five years. Mr. Thomas commented that NSSSED strongly supports the ISBE proposed special education rules related to RTI and class size. These changes will create more opportunity to help students with special needs much earlier. NSSSED hopes the changes will be implemented in an appropriate and timely way.</p>
<p>SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT</p> <p>Consent Agenda Items And Motions</p>	<p>Chairman Ruiz commented that all items listed with an asterisk (*) on the agenda are considered to be routine and will be enacted in one motion and vote. Any board members who wishes separate discussion on any item listed on the consent agenda may remove that item from the consent agenda , in which the event, the item will be considered in its normal sequence.</p> <p>Superintendent Koch gave the Board members a brief summary on the items on the consent agenda. Dr. Koch then asked General Counsel Darren Reisberg to summarize the proposed action on rules.</p> <p>Mr. Reisberg reported to the Board regarding the rules for initial review and the rules for adoption. Mr. Reisberg noted that there is a proposed change to Part 1 (Public Schools Evaluation, Recognition and Supervision) for initial review regarding enrollment of immigrant pupils. Also up for adoption are: Part 227 (Gifted Education), New Part 232 (Summer Bridges) and Part 270 (Advanced Placement). Mr. Reisberg commented that the Ad Hoc Rules Committee also briefly discussed the status of the nutrition program, potential rulemaking and a lengthy debate about the Part 226 Special Education rules up for adoption.</p> <p>Joyce Karon asked for clarification on Trinity International University findings by the State Teacher Certification Board. Ms. Marti Woelfle of Certification stated that Trinity International University was found to have standards that were not met after reviewing all of the materials that were presented by the accreditation</p>

	<p>team as well as the institution. Ms. Woelfe stated that it is the recommendation of the State Teacher Certification Board that "Accreditation with Conditions" is assigned along with a focused visit. Ms. Wolfe noted that there is a common theme for the areas of improvement and it has more to do with a fiscal resource issue, rather than not preparing quality candidates.</p> <p>Mr. Geppert asked if it was found that the creation of the data information base is a problem for schools. Ms. Woelfle stated that the system is now a standard-based performance assessment. Standard #2 requires that institutions create an assessment system to confirm that the candidates meet state standards, their institutional standards, and if applicable national standards. Unfortunately, our certification teams are finding that many institutions are still in the development stages and have not reached the point where they are making decisions based on the data they have collected.</p> <p>Chairman Ruiz asked for a motion regarding the consent agenda.</p> <p><u>Motion</u> Dr. Ward moved that the State Board of Education approves the consent agenda items as presented. Ms. Karon seconded the motion and it passed with a unanimous voice vote. Dr. Hall abstained from the vote on agenda item D.4.b.3. University of Illinois-Chicago New Teacher Preparation Program. She indicated that she wished to vote Yes in regards to the rest of the consent agenda.</p> <p>The following motions were approved by action taken in the consent agenda motion:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Approval of the Minutes</u></p> <p>The State Board of Education hereby approves the minutes for the meeting of November 16, 2006.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Rules for Initial Review</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Part 1 (Public Schools Evaluation, Recognition and Supervision)</p> <p>The State Board of Education hereby authorizes solicitation of public comment on the proposed rulemaking for:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Public Schools Evaluation, Recognition and Supervision (23 Illinois Administrative Code 1),</p> <p>including publication of the proposed amendment in the <u>Illinois Register</u>.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Rules for Adoption</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">New Part 227 (Gifted Education)</p> <p>The State Board of Education hereby adopts the proposed rulemaking for: Gifted Education (23 Illinois Administrative Code 227). Further, the Board authorizes the State Superintendent of Education to make such technical or nonsubstantive changes as the State Superintendent may deem necessary in response to suggestions or objections of the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Rules for Adoption</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">New Part 232 (Summer Bridges)</p> <p>The State Board of Education hereby adopts the proposed rulemaking for: Summer Bridges Program (23 Illinois Administrative Code 232). Further, the Board authorizes the State Superintendent of Education to make</p>
--	--

**Institutional
Accreditation and
Programs Approval**

such technical or nonsubstantive changes as the State Superintendent may deem necessary in response to suggestions or objections of the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules.

**Rules for Adoption
New Part 270 (Advanced Placement)**

The State Board of Education hereby adopts the proposed rulemaking for:
Advanced Placement (23 Illinois Administrative Code 270).

Further, the Board authorizes the State Superintendent of Education to make such technical or nonsubstantive changes as the State Superintendent may deem necessary in response to suggestions or objections of the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules.

**Institutional Accreditation and Programs Approval
Trinity International University Accreditation & Program Approval**

The State Board of Education hereby assigns the status of "accreditation with conditions" with a focused visit addressing the unmet standard and additional areas for improvement within two years after the semester when the conditions were issued. This action is in accordance with Section 25.125 (j) (2) (C) of the State Board's administrative rules and authorizes the institution to conduct its programs and recommend candidates for certification by entitlement until the time of the institution's focused review in spring 2009.

**Institutional Accreditation and Programs Approval
Blackburn College Unit Accreditation & Approval Program**

The State Board of Education hereby assigns the status of "continuing accreditation" to Blackburn College. This action is in accordance with Section 25.125 (j) (3) (B) and (C) of the State Board's administrative rules and authorizes the institution to conduct its programs and recommend candidates for certification by entitlement until the time of the institution's next scheduled review. This review will occur in 2013.

**Institutional Accreditation and Programs Approval
Northwestern University Unit Accreditation & Program Approval**

The State Board of Education hereby assigns the status of "continuing accreditation" to Northwestern University. This action is in accordance with Section 25.125 (j) (1) of the State Board's administrative rules and authorizes the institution to conduct its programs and recommend candidates for certification by entitlement until the time of the institution's next scheduled review. This review will occur in 2013.

**Institutional Accreditation and Programs Approval
The School of Art Institute of Chicago Unit Accreditation &
Program Approval**

The State Board of Education hereby assigns the status of "continuing accreditation" to The School of the Art Institute of Chicago. This action is in accordance with Section 25.125 (j) (1) of the State Board's administrative rules and authorizes the institution to conduct its programs and recommend candidates for certification by entitlement until the time of the institution's next scheduled review. This review will occur in 2013.

**New Teacher
Preparation Programs**

**Institutional Accreditation and Programs Approval
University of Chicago Unit Accreditation and Program Approval**

The State Board of Education hereby assigns the status of "continuing accreditation" to the University of Chicago. This action is in accordance with Section 25.125 (j) (3) (B) and (C) of the State Board's administrative rules and authorizes the institution to conduct its programs and recommend candidates for certification by entitlement until the time of the institution's next scheduled review. This review will occur in 2013.

**New Teacher Preparation Programs
Dominican University New Teacher Preparation Program
Northern Illinois University New Teacher Preparation Programs
University of Illinois-Chicago New Teacher Preparation Programs
University of Illinois-Springfield New Teacher Preparation Programs**

The State Board of Education provisionally approves the School Social Worker program for Dominican University, thereby authorizing the university to conduct the program and to recommend candidates for certification by entitlement until the time of the institution's next accreditation review.

The State Board of Education provisionally approves the Director of Special Education program for Northern Illinois University, thereby authorizing the university to conduct the program and to recommend candidates for certification by entitlement until the time of the institution's next accreditation review

The State Board of Education provisionally approves the Early Childhood Education Alternative Certification program for the University of Illinois at Chicago, thereby authorizing the university to conduct the program and to recommend candidates for certification by entitlement until the time of the institution's next accreditation review.

The State Board of Education provisionally approves the Learning Behavior Specialist II: Bilingual Special Education Specialist program for the University of Illinois at Chicago, thereby authorizing the university to conduct the program and to recommend candidates for certification by entitlement until the time of the institution's next accreditation review

The State Board of Education provisionally approves the Learning Behavior Specialist II: Technology Specialist program for the University of Illinois at Chicago, thereby authorizing the university to conduct the program and to recommend candidates for certification by entitlement until the time of the institution's next accreditation review

Further, the State Board of Education provisionally approves the Chief School Business Official program for the University of Illinois at Springfield, thereby authorizing the university to conduct the program and to recommend candidates for certification by entitlement until the time of institution's next accreditation review.

**Approval of the Draft
State Board 2006 Annual
Report**

Approval of Draft State Board 2006 Annual Report

The Illinois State Board of Education hereby approves the Draft 2006 Annual Report pending the inclusion of the *Condition of Education* narrative based on 2006 assessment results; and *Local Resources* for 2005-2006.

END OF THE CONSENT AGENDA

<p>Proposed Spring 2007 Legislation</p>	<p>Ms. Holmes shared with the Board a summary prepared by agency staff of the legislative proposals for 2007 that will impact the agency and school districts throughout the state. There are 29 proposals on the summary that were reviewed by the Governmental Relations Committee.</p> <p><u>Motion</u> Brenda Holmes moved that the Governmental Relations Committee recommends the following legislative proposals for endorsement by the State Board of Education:</p> <p>Proposal # 04, No Attendance Penalty-Interrupted Day Proposal # 05, Parent Teacher Conferences Proposal # 07, General State Aid-22 Payments Proposal # 08, Financial Oversight Panel Proposal # 09, Health/Life/Safety P-Tell Proposal # 12, Reading Improvement Block Grant Proposal # 15, Legal/Governmental Relations Proposal # 17, Eliminate Continuing Education Units (CEU) Proposal # 19, Eliminate Out-of-State Testing Waivers Proposal # 25, Fee for Duplicate Certificate Proposal # 27, General Obligation Debt Limitation</p> <p>Further, the committee recommends that staff pursue other legislative proposals if vehicles become available for the following issues:</p> <p>Proposal # 06, Special Education Personnel-180 Days Proposal # 10, PA 94-1019 Clean-Up Proposal # 11, Article 11E Re-Org Incentives Fix Proposal # 13, Educator Supply & Demand Report Changes Proposal # 18, Fee Increases for Certificates/Endorsements (As Amended) Proposal # 20, Eliminate the Alternative Math–Science Certificates Proposal # 21, Combine Resident Teachers Certification & Illinois Teacher Corps Proposal # 22, Combine and Revise Alternative Certification Statutes Proposal # 23, School Breakfast Program</p> <p>Dr. Fields seconded the motion and it passed with a unanimous voice call vote. Chairman Ruiz noted that these proposals will be drafted for introduction during the Spring 2007 Session.</p>
<p>Approval of Draft Criteria for State Superintendent</p>	<p>Dr. Ward noted that the “Characteristics Desired - State Superintendent of Education” criteria document is the result of various interviews and hearings conducted across the state by the search firm Hazard, Young, Attea and Associates.</p> <p><u>Motion</u> Dr. Ward moved that the State Board of Education approves the criteria for the position of State Superintendent of Education. Mr. Geppert seconded the motion and it passed with a unanimous voice vote.</p> <p>WHEREAS in July 2006, the State Board of Education contracted with Hazard, Young, Attea and Associates to conduct a search for a new State Superintendent of Education; and</p> <p>WHEREAS the State Board of Education instructed Hazard, Young and Attea</p>

	<p>to conduct meetings with stakeholders to ascertain an overall listing of criteria for candidates to fill the position of State Superintendent of Education.</p> <p>THEREFORE, I move that the State Board of Education approve the criteria for the position of State Superintendent of Education as drafted by Hazard Young and Attea.</p> <p>Characteristics Desired - State Superintendent of Education The Illinois State Board of Education seeks an experienced educational leader who has been a teacher and administrator at the elementary, secondary and/or college level(s). The sought after individual will place the interests of students as a priority at all times and has demonstrates the ability to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address the educational and political responsibilities of the position, while placing the educational needs of students ahead of political expediency. • Communicate effectively with all stakeholders, both internal and external to the Agency. • Lead and manage a complex organization through a strong leadership team that builds capacity within the organization. • Improve student performance through a comprehensive system of standards and assessment and the implementation of proven methods that address the achievement gap, and by encouraging local districts to access resources available at the local, regional, state and federal levels. • Build consensus and rally support for sustainable change. • Be responsive to the needs of all students, local districts, Regional Offices of Education and other constituents. • Understand the requirements of federal and state laws and regulations, as well as the impact on student learning, and oppose laws and regulations that deter the ability to maximize student learning. • Build positive relationships with constituents who are internal and external to the organization. • Work successfully with the Governor, State Legislature, Congress and the U.S. Department of Education. • Develop processes and procedures necessary to provide consistency in decision-making and to ensure effective and efficient operations. • Facilitate the Governor and State Board in defining and articulating a vision for the State, and provide the leadership to implement the vision through effective short and long term strategic planning. <p>The State Board seeks an individual who has a commitment to equitable opportunities for all students, through understanding of school finance and the resultant inequities of current funding mechanism, and a commitment to take leadership in securing additional resources and the development of a new formula that will ensure that additional funding will contribute to greater equity across the state. The Board also seeks a leader who is collaborative yet decisive, who demonstrates integrity, objectivity, fairness and vision and who establishes high expectations for self and others.</p> <p>An earned doctorate from an accredited institution is preferred.</p>
<p>ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REPORTS: Illinois Board of Higher Education Liaison Report</p>	<p>Chairman Ruiz introduced Dr. Phoshanta Nandi who has been joining our Board meetings as a representative from the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE). Dr. Nandi commented on how pleased that IBHE is to have Ms. Karon as an ISBE representative at their board meetings. She has proven to be a productive member and her contributions to the meetings are appreciated. Dr. Nandi commented Judy Erwin, Executive Director, has been appointed for a three-year term. Dr. Nandi recommended to the Board that Ms. Erwin and Dr. Koch meet on a regular basis to exchange views and to keep the boards</p>

	<p>updated on their meetings and arising issues. Dr. Nandi noted that IBHE has approved a doctrine degree program for the University of Illinois – Chicago in hopes of helping minimize the shortage of nurses in Illinois. They also discussed globalization and the workforce. Ms. Karon also commented that the IBHE board is now in the process of developing their strategic plan. Chairman Ruiz thanked Ms. Karon and Dr. Nandi for creating this informational link between both boards.</p>
<p>Superintendent’s Announcements</p> <p>Chairman’s Report</p>	<p>Chairman Ruiz reported that he participated in the following meetings since the last Board meeting.</p> <p>November 12-19 Visited Israel and toured various schools November 29 Attended the Re-Enrolling Students Task Force, Springfield December 7 Panel Moderator for the Illinois Legislative Latino Caucus Conference. December 6 Attended the Re-Enrolling Student Task Force, Edwardsville December 12 Attended the 30th Annual Statewide Conference for Teachers Serving Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Students December 12 Attended the Re-Enrolling Student Task Force, Aurora</p>
<p>Committee Reports</p>	<p>Board Operations Committee of the Whole Dr. Chris Ward reported that he and the following committee members were in attendance: Dr. Fields, Dr. Hall, Ms. Karon and Chairman Ruiz. Other members in attendance were Dr. Brown, Mr. Geppert and Ms. Holmes. The committee discussed the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approved the minutes for the November 2006 Board Operations Committee Meeting. • Discussed and reviewed the changes to Open Meetings Act. • Darren Reisberg updated the Board on the future revisions to the Bylaws. • Reviewed and finalized meeting locations for the 2007 Board meetings. • Discussed the timeframe deadline for the Superintendent Search. <p>Education Policy Planning Committee Dr. Fields reported that he and the following committee members were in attendance: Dr. Brown, Mr. Geppert, Dr. Hall, and Ms. Karon. Other members in attendance were, Dr. Ward, Ms. Holmes and Chairman Ruiz. The committee discussed the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approved the minutes for the November 2006 Education Policy Planning Committee Meeting. • Becky McCabe reviewed with the committee the performance descriptors for the Illinois Alternate Assessment. • Becky McCabe and Dana Kinley informed the committee of the Coalition for Illinois High Schools Mission and Goals statement. • Becky Watts and Ronny Wickenhauser discussed the Draft 2006 State Board of Education Annual Report with the committee. • Ms. Holmes asked that at the conclusion of each Committee Meeting the committees preview their next month’s agenda items for planning purposes. • Ms. Karon reminded everyone that we need to be aware of when information/data is ready so that we can begin the preparation of annual reports to ensure that they are ready on time.

Finance and Audit Committee of the Whole

Mr. Geppert reported that he and the following committee members were in attendance: Dr. Brown and Ms. Holmes. Also in attendance were Chairman Ruiz, Dr. Ward, Ms. Karon, Dr. Hall, and Dr. Fields. The committee discussed the following topics:

- Daryl Morrison of IEA spoke in support of funding for National Board Certified Teachers and Polly Poskin of ICASA spoke in support of Bullying Prevention Programs during public participation.
- Linda Mitchell and Ronny Wickenhauser discussed the FY 2008 budget with the committee.
- Deb Vespa reported on the FY 2006 Capital Needs Assessment Survey Report.
- Approved the minutes for the November 2006 Finance & Audit Committee Meeting.
- Mr. Geppert commented that the January 2007 committee meeting will include the presentation and development of FY 2008 education budget.

Governmental Relations Committee of the Whole

Ms. Holmes reported that she and the following committee members were in attendance: Chairman Ruiz & Dr. Ward. Ms. Holmes reported that the members of the committee discussed the following topics:

- Approved the minutes for the November 2006 Governmental Relations committee meeting.
- Paula Purdue from the Chicago Public Education Fund addressed the committee during public participation on National Board Certified Teachers.
- Winnie Tuthill and Shelley Helton reported on the recommendations for the Cumulative Waiver Report.
- Discussed educational concerns with education stakeholders that were invited to the committee meeting.
- Ms. Holmes commented that at January 2007 Committee Meeting we will continue to review legislative proposals as introduced and prepare to work with the newly elected General Assembly.

Chairman Ruiz thanked Brenda Holmes for inviting the following education stakeholders to the Governmental Relations Committee meeting:

ILLINOIS ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

Dr. Randy Tinder, President
Mr. Brent Clark, Executive Director
Ms. Diane Hendren, Governmental Relations Specialist

ILLINOIS ASSOCIATION SCHOOL BOARDS

Ms. Marie Slater, President (*unable to attend*)
Dr. Mike Johnson, Executive Director
Mr. Ben Schwarm, Associate Executive Director

ILLINOIS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Mr. Ken Swanson, President
Mr. Jo Anderson, Executive Director
Jim Reed, Director of Governmental Relations

(continued)

	<p style="text-align: center;">ILLINOIS FEDERATION OF TEACHERS Mr. James Dougherty, President (<i>unable to attend</i>) Mr. Ray Mackey, Chief of Staff Mr. Steve Preckwinkle, Director of Political Activities</p>
Superintendents Report	<p>Dr. Koch thanked Board members and staff for making him feel welcome and helping him adjust in his first few weeks as Interim Superintendent. He also thanked Becky Watts for helping with the release of the agency's first internal new letter. The newsletter recognizes staff and communicates what is happening at the Board meetings.</p> <p>December 8 Attended the Teachers Retirement Systems Board Meeting. December 12 Spoke at the 30th Annual Statewide Conference for Teachers Serving Linguistically & Culturally Diverse Students. December 12 Provided the opening comments at the Governor's Parent Task Force.</p>
Members' Reports	<p>Ms. Holmes attended Winter Steering Committee of the Education Commission of the States in Denver, Colorado on November 11-12, 2006.</p> <p>Dr. Hall moderated the Early Childhood Panel at the Joint Annual Conference on November 18, 2006. Kay Henderson was also in attendance.</p> <p>Dr. Ward participated, along with Mr. Geppert, in the Budget Hearing held in Chicago. Dr. Ward thanked Mr. Geppert on behalf of the Board for all of his efforts in making the budget requests more manageable.</p> <p>Ms. Karon attended the IBHE meeting on December 5, 2006, at Harold Washington College in Chicago. Ms. Karon also had the opportunity to attend the Annual ED-RED Council Meeting on December 6, 2006 in Park Ridge.</p> <p>Mr. Geppert commented on the large participation at the Chicago Budget Hearing and thanked everyone for their attendance at the budget hearings. He also thanked Dr. Brown for hosting the southern Illinois hearing in Marion and Linda Mitchell, Ronny Wickenhauser and Jean Ladage for their assistance with the meetings.</p>
Rules for Adoption Part 226 (Special Education)	<p>Dr. Koch stated that the Ad Hoc Rules Committee of the Whole met yesterday and was reconvened this morning to address Part 226 (Special Education). Staff provided an overview of the main changes and discussed class size. Over the course of the committee meeting, Board members requested modification of some of the language, which staff drafted presented during this plenary session. Dr. Koch asked Sally Vogl to review the suggested language of Part 226 with the Board.</p> <p><i>Displayed below are the additional changes to Section 226.130 that were adopted.</i></p> <p>Section 226.130 Additional Procedures for Students Suspected of or Having a Specific Learning Disability In addition to the requirements set forth in Sections 226.110 and 226.120 of this Part, the district shall adhere to the procedures set forth at 34 CFR 300.307, 300.308, 300.309, 300.310, and 300.311 when evaluating a student who is suspected of, or who has previously been identified as having, a specific learning disability as described in 34 CFR 300.8. <u>By the beginning of the 2008-09 school year, each</u> Each district shall <u>implement the use of</u> a process that</p>

determines if the child responds to scientific, research-based intervention as part of the evaluation procedures described in 34 CFR 300.304. The scientific, research-based interventions may be used to determine whether a student has a specific learning disability. In addition, a district may use a severe discrepancy between intellectual ability and achievement for determining whether a child has a specific learning disability.

The following displays the additional changes to Section 226.730 that were adopted.

Section 226.730 Class Size for 2008-09 and Beyond

- a) When a student's IEP calls for services in a general education classroom, the student must be served in a class that is composed of students of whom at least 70 percent are without IEPs, that utilizes the general curriculum, that is taught by an instructor certified for general education, and that is not designated as a general remedial classroom.
- b) Class size means the total number of students an educator serves during any class ~~period~~. As used in this subsection (b), "class" means any circumstance where at least one special education teacher is assigned and provides instruction and/or therapy exclusively to students with IEPs. In the formation of special education classes, consideration shall be given to the age of the students, the nature and severity of their disabilities, the educational needs of the students, and the degree of intervention necessary, subject to the limitations of this subsection (b).
 - 1) Except as provided in subsection (b)(5) of this Section, classes ~~Classes~~ in which all the students are removed from the regular education classroom for less than 20 percent of the school day shall have at least one qualified teacher for each 15 students in attendance during any given class ~~period~~. However, the district may increase the class size by a maximum of two students when a paraprofessional is provided for the entire class ~~period~~.
 - 2) Except as provided in subsection (b)(5) of this Section, each ~~Each~~ class in which any student is removed from the regular education classroom for 20-60 percent of the school day shall have at least one qualified teacher for each ten students in attendance during that class ~~period~~. However, the district may increase the class size by a maximum of five students when a paraprofessional is provided for the entire class ~~period~~.
 - 3) Except as provided in subsection (b)(5) of this Section, each ~~Each~~ class in which any student is removed from the regular education classroom for more than 60 percent of the school day shall have at least one qualified teacher for each eight students in attendance during that class ~~period~~. However, the district may increase the class size by a maximum of five students when a paraprofessional is provided for the entire class ~~period~~.
 - 4) Each class for children ages three through five shall have at least one qualified teacher for each five students in attendance during that class ~~period~~. However, the district may increase the class size by a maximum of five students when a paraprofessional is provided for the entire class ~~period~~.

- 5) For any school year in which the amount of State reimbursement for teachers identified in Section 14-13.01 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/14-13.01] exceeds the amount in effect on January 1, 2007, by at least 100 percent and no corresponding reduction has been made in other State sources of support for special education:
- A) The maximum class size stated in subsection (b)(1) of this Section shall be 13 rather than 15;
 - B) The maximum class size stated in subsection (b)(2) of this Section shall be eight rather than 10; and
 - C) The maximum class size stated in subsection (b)(3) of this Section shall be six rather than eight.
- 6) The provisions of subsections ~~(b)(1)-(5)~~ ~~(b)(1)-(4)~~ of this Section notwithstanding, class size shall be limited according to the needs of the students for individualized instruction and services.
- c) The maximum class sizes set forth in subsection (b) of this Section shall, if necessary, be further restricted at the local level to account for the activities and services in which the affected educators participate in order to provide students with IEPs the free, appropriate public education to which they are entitled. Each entity subject to this Part shall, in cooperation with its affected employees or their exclusive representative, as applicable, adopt and place into effect, no later than the beginning of the 2007-08 ~~2008-09~~ school year, a policy stating how staffing decisions will be made so that all services required under students' IEPs, as well as all needed ancillary and support services, can be provided at the requisite level of intensity. Each policy shall encompass, but need not be limited to:
 - 1) individualized instruction;
 - 2) consultative services and other collaboration among staff members;
 - 3) attendance at IEP meetings and other staff conferences; and
 - 4) paperwork and reporting.

MOTION
Rules for Adoption
Part 226
(Special Education)

Motion

Mr. Geppert moved that the State Board of Education adopts the proposed rulemaking for:

Special Education (23 Illinois Administrative Code 226).

Further, the Board authorizes the State Superintendent of Education to make such technical or nonsubstantive changes as the State Superintendent may deem necessary in response to suggestions or objections of the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules. Dr. Fields seconded the motion and it

	<p>passed with a unanimous voice vote. Dr. Brown voted “no”.</p> <p>Dr. Hall commented that this has been a troublesome experience for her being a former special education teacher. She has great respect for the people in the field who have to do this work as well as ISBE staff. Dr. Hall stated that she has concerns about funds provided by the federal government, and school districts that do not have the money to make the changes; but she does realize that changes need to be made.</p> <p>Dr. Ward asked Superintendent Koch if he is confident that we are improving services to students in special education with the changes we are proposing today. Dr. Koch indicated that he felt absolutely confident the Board would be proceeding down the right course for students with disabilities. Dr. Fields agreed with Superintendent Koch and that in a few years we will look back and believe that we made the right decision in trying to address the needs of disabled children.</p> <p>Dr. Brown stated that, unlike the original document, she does not think that the revised version speaks well of Illinois for Special Education. She indicated that when children are at stake, the intent of the law should not be postponed another year. Dr. Brown stated that we have enough going on with federal laws, and to supersede those laws at the state level is not something she is comfortable with. She stated that she feels districts resent the fact that they are not given the freedom and flexibility to do things in the best way.</p>
<p>Presentation from the Commission on Government Forecasting and Accountability</p>	<p>Mr. Ronny Wichenhauser, Division Administrator for Budget and Financial Management introduced Mr. Dan Long, Executive Director and Mr. Jim Muschinske, Revenue Manager for Commission on Governmental Forecasting and Accountability. Ms. Holmes noted that Mr. Long and Mr. Muschinske staff a bipartisan joint legislative commission and are reporting to us the same forecasting and accountability information which is shared with the legislatures. <i>(The handout distributed and discussed is available for viewing with the packet dated: December 14, 2006.)</i></p> <p>Ms. Holmes asked if the sale of the lottery is included in the projection presented. Mr. Muschinske indicated that it was not included because they had not seen a report on how the revenues were derived.</p> <p>Ms. Holmes stated that a panel discussion had determined that our sales tax is based on an industrial model, as opposed to a service model; and with the sale of services rising at a steady rate would it be a more lucrative source of revenue to tax services instead of what we are taxing now. Mr. Muschinske stated that if you included services in the sales base you would generate a considerable amount of revenue, how much would be determined by the amount of services you were able to tax over the years.</p> <p>Member Holmes asked if Mr. Long or Mr. Muschinske would like to make any comments on the pension situation. Mr. Muschinske stated that the pension issue is a serious problem for the state and is consuming a lot of our revenue growth, but it did not happen over night. The commission has published reports on the financial condition of the pension system and determined that the 90% funding ratio is an appropriate goal. The Governor’s Commission on Pensions recommended defined contribution plan for new employees. The constitution will not allow any changes to the benefits of current employees but they can have an impact when new employees are hired. The best way to make changes to the pension system is through legislation, for example SB 94 made</p>

	major changes to the teacher's retirement system.
Closed Session	<p>Ms. Karon moved that the Board break for lunch and then enter into closed session under the exceptions set forth in the Open Meetings Act of the State of Illinois as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Section c 1 for the purpose of considering the appointment, employment, compensation, performance or dismissal of an employee; Section c 11 for the purpose of considering pending or probable litigation against or affecting the Board; and</p> <p>Ms. Karon further moved that the Board might invite anyone they wish to have included in this closed session.</p> <p>Dr. Hall seconded the motion and it was passed with a unanimous roll call vote.</p> <p>The open meeting recessed at 11:55 a.m. and the Board went into closed session at 12:40 p.m. The open meeting reconvened at 1:35 p.m.</p>
Information Items	Chairman Ruiz asked that the Board members please read the State Board of Education Fiscal and Administrative Monthly Reports printed in the Board meeting materials each month for information purposes.
Motion for Adjournment	Dr. Hall moved that the meeting be adjourned. Mr. Geppert seconded the motion and it passed with unanimous voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 1:40 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dr. Vinni Hall
Board Secretary

Mr. Jesse Ruiz
Chairman

Board Operations Committee Meeting of the Whole
Thursday, December 14, 2006
8:00 a.m.
Board Conference Room
Public Conference Call Access Number: 1-866-297-6391 (*listen only*)
Confirmation # 1 6 4 7 3 2 5 9

AGENDA

- 1 Public Participation
2. Discussion Items
 - a. Minutes of the October Board Operations Committee Meeting (**pp. 2-3**)
 - b. Review New Nominations for Resolutions of Recognition (*Jean Ladage*) (**p. 4**)
 - c. Bylaw Review: Proposed Revisions and Discussion of Officer Elections and Committee Appointments (*Darren Reisberg*) (**pp. 5-31**)
 - d. Development of Agendas for Board and Committee Meetings (*Chris Ward*) (**p. 32**)
 - e. 2007 Meeting Locations (*Jean Ladage*) (**pp. 33-34**)
 - 1) June 2007 location
 - 2) August 9, 2007, one-day meeting location
 - 3) 2007 Retreat location
 - 4) September 2007 location
 - 5) October 2007 location
4. Additional Items
5. Adjourn

NOTE: At the conclusion of any discussion item in which the committee is ready to make a decision, a discussion item may be immediately moved for a decision.

* Items listed with an asterisk (*) will be discussed in committee and Board action may be taken in the plenary session.

**BOARD OPERATIONS COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
MINUTES**

Thursday, December 14, 2006
Springfield, Illinois

Committee Members Present

Chris Ward, Committee Chair
David Fields, Committee Member
Vinni Hall, Committee Member
Joyce Karon, Committee Member
Jesse Ruiz, Committee Member
Andrea Brown, Board Member
Ed Geppert, Board Member
Brenda Holmes, Board Member

Members Absent

Dean Clark, Board Member

Staff Present

Jean Ladage
Darren Reisberg

Dr. Chris Ward called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. and asked members to introduce themselves for purposes of roll call. (See above.)

1. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

None

2.a. COMMITTEE MINUTES

Dr. David Fields moved that the minutes of the Board Operations Committee for the October committee meeting be approved. Ms. Karon seconded the motion. The motion to approve the committee minutes passed with voice vote approval.

2.b. REVIEW NEW NOMINATIONS FOR RESOLUTIONS OF RECOGNITION.

Dr. Ward indicated there were no new nominations for recognition.

2.c. BYLAWS REVIEW

Dr. Ward asked Darren Reisberg to review the recommendations for revisions in the Bylaws. Mr. Reisberg indicated that the proposed changes are in the cover memo in this month's committee packet. He commented that the primary change in the bylaws involves the new requirements of physical presence of Board members at the meeting site(s) as outlined in Article 5-C. There is a procedure proposed for the Board to determine at the outset of each meeting as to whether or not a Board member is allowed to attend by "other means."

Dr. Ward tied in committee agenda item 2.d. and asked for discussion on agenda development which had been done by conference calls in the past.

Mr. Geppert voiced concern about the cumbersome process which would allow additional members to join in a discussion when a quorum is already present at the meeting site. Mr. Reisberg responded that the process is frustrating, but that requirement is set forth in statute. Ms. Karon inquired as to whether there might be any clean-up of the statute. She cited increased travel costs and reduced efficiency of the Board's calling of an emergency or special meeting for a single agenda item. Ms. Karon indicated that she would recommend that we pursue a change if the opportunity arises.

It was suggested that at the end of each committee meeting, members and staff discuss the next month's proposed agenda. Members agreed and added that electronic means of setting the agendas should be sufficient. Mr. Reisberg confirmed that a blanket email to all members can be sent, with members responding only to the committee chair or Board Operations chair regarding comments or suggestions.

Mr. Reisberg provided an example for the Board to allow consideration of a Board member's request to participate in a meeting, provided that the reason for that alternate participation meets the requirements within the law:

- (a) personal illness or disability;
- (b) employment purposes or the business of the public body; or
- (c) a family or other emergency.

If a member wishes to attend a meeting by other means, the member must electronically notify the staff Board Secretary within 24 hours before the meeting unless advance notice is impractical. The Board or committee must then take a roll call vote at the outset of the meeting to determine whether to permit such member to attend by other means. The requesting member may vote and such vote shall be counted towards the majority required for permission. Any member attending a meeting by other means must identify himself or herself any time he or she speaks during such meeting.

Mr. Ruiz suggested that committee meetings might fall within an exception to the statute under Sec. 7(d) as the Board's committees are bodies that do not have authority to make binding recommendations or determinations or to take any other substantive action.

Dr. Ward indicated that he would work with Darren Reisberg and Jean Ladage to coordinate the agenda preparation plan.

Board Officer Elections

Mr. Reisberg directed the Board's attention to page 7 of the Board Operations packet which outlined proposed procedures for the 2007 election of Board officers. There were no questions.

- Chairperson Ruiz will appoint a nominating committee in advance of the January Board meeting, and announce the members of that committee as part of his announcements at the January meeting;
- Should the nominating committee consist of more than two Board members, any meeting of the committee must comply with the Open Meetings Act.
- The nominating committee will send a memorandum to Board members in advance of the February meeting recommending a slate of elective officers to the Board for its consideration.
- The Board will then take a roll call vote as an action item during the Plenary Session of the February Board meeting, with Board members having the right to add nominations from the floor.
- As with any action of the Board, election will require a majority of Board members (i.e., five).

2.e. MEETING DATES AND LOCATION

Dr. Ward asked the Board to consider the cost of moving around the state. Although it is well-received, it is costly.

During discussion, the following issues were taken into consideration.

- June and December are difficult months to schedule sleeping rooms in Chicago.
- The Board of Higher Education recently took action to shift their schedule from going out into various communities in order to be more fiscally responsible.
- Even when travel funds were more plentiful, the Board typically held meetings in Chicago, Springfield and one alternative setting.
- Reducing alternative meeting sites allows for a reduction in staff travel cost, as well as a reduction in staff travel time in order to be available for a 15-minute discussion on an agenda topic.
- The Board Retreat could also be moved to Springfield.
- November conflicts with Veto Session which is an issue for staff.

In conclusion, the following calendar will be recommended for approval at the January 2007 Board meeting.

January – Chicago (hotel rooms and JRTC conference rooms are secured)
February through June – Springfield
August one-day meeting – Springfield
Retreat – Springfield
September – Springfield
October – Mt. Vernon
*November & December – Springfield

* Following the announcement of Veto Session dates, the November meeting may be changed to Chicago, pending availability of accommodations.

3. Decision Items

Some items were moved from discussion to immediate decision per above notes.

4. Additional Items

Dr. Ward reviewed the dates for the State Superintendent interview process.

Search Calendar

February 6	Interview Seminar for Board members (begin at 2:00 p.m.)
February 6	Board receives candidate slate
February 6-8	Board interviews candidates
February 8	Board meets to identify semi-finalists
February 20	Board interviews semi-finalists
February 22	following Board meeting – Board meets in closed session to identify preferred candidate
February 24-27	(2) Board members visit home site of finalist, if appropriate
February 28	Announcement of appointment (<i>tentative</i>)

5. Adjourn

Dr. Hall moved to adjourn the committee meeting. Dr. Fields seconded the motion and the meeting adjourned at 8:35 a.m.

Education Policy Planning Committee
Wednesday, December 13, 2006
10:30 a.m.
Board Room

Public Conference Call Access Number: 1-866-297-6391 (*listen only*)
Confirmation # 1 6 4 7 3 2 5 6

AGENDA

1. Public Participation
2. Minutes of the November Education Policy Planning Committee Meeting (**pp. 2-4**)
3. Illinois Alternate Assessment – Descriptors and Alignment (*Becky McCabe*) (**pp. 5-6**)
4. Illinois Standards Achievement Test – Descriptors (*Becky McCabe*) (**pp. 7-8**)
5. Language Arts Assessment for Grade 11 (*Becky McCabe*) (**pp. 9-10**)
6. Coalition for Illinois High Schools Mission and Goals Statement (*Becky McCabe and Dana Kinley*) (**pp. 11-13**)
7. State Board Draft Annual Report (*Becky Watts & Ronny Wickenhauser*) (**Plenary pp. 78-143**)
8. Additional Items

* Items listed with an asterisk (*) will be discussed in committee and Board action may be taken in the plenary session.

**EDUCATION POLICY PLANNING COMMITTEE
MINUTES**

December 13, 2006
10:30 a.m.
Board Room, 4th Floor
100 North First Street
Springfield, Illinois

Committee Members Present

Dave Fields, Chair
Andrea Brown
Ed Geppert
Vinni Hall
Joyce Karon

Other Board Members Present

Brenda Holmes
Jesse Ruiz
Chris Ward

Others

Interim Superintendent Koch
Darren Reisberg
Ginger Reynolds

Board Members Absent

Dean Clark

The Education Policy Planning Committee meeting convened at 10:33 a.m.

1. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:** There was no public participation.

2. **MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 2006 EPPC MEETING:** The Committee approved the minutes for the November 2006 EPPC Meeting.

3. **ILLINOIS ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT – DESCRIPTORS AND ALIGNMENT (Becky McCabe):** Becky McCabe was present to provide the IAA descriptors to the Committee for discussion, per USDE’s peer review process and she stated that this item will be presented to the Board in January for their approval.

Becky also stated the Committees which are involved with the IAA and ISAT and they are the Special Education Advisory Committee and with ISAT, we have our Contents folks and a Language Arts Committee, as well as the State Testing Review Committee.

Becky further stated that with regard to IAA, we are in the process of completing that contract for the portfolio and these descriptors go with that portfolio. We will later bring you the descriptors that will go with the new Assessment for Reading, Math and Science.

4. **ILLINOIS STANDARDS ACHIEVEMENT TEST – DESCRIPTORS (Becky McCabe):** Becky McCabe was also in attendance to present the ISAT Descriptors to the Committee for their discussion, per the USDE’s peer review process and also stated that this item will be presented to the Board in January for their approval.

5. **LANGUAGE ARTS ASSESSMENT FOR GRADE 11 (Becky McCabe):** Becky McCabe, along with Judie Steinhauer, presented to the Committee the recommendations for the Board to approve a change in the PSAE Framework and IMAGE for Grade 11 so that Goal 2 of the Reading in the Illinois

Learning Standards will not be included in state testing at Grade 11 starting with the 2007 PSAE test administration, per USDE's peer review process. Becky stated that this item will also be presented to the Board in January for their approval.

Board Member Brenda Holmes asked about the definition of "literature". Becky and Judie gave the Committee this clarification between high school and Grades 3 through 8.

- 6. COALITION FOR ILLINOIS HIGH SCHOOLS MISSION AND GOALS STATEMENT (Becky McCabe and Dana Kinley):** Ginger Reynolds began by stating that Becky McCabe and Dana Kinley were in attendance to bring this Mission and Goals Statement to the Committee for their discussion on whether the Committee would like to sign off on this or not at this time to continue their participation in the Coalition.

There was some discussion from the Committee about some of the beliefs under the "Mission" section.

Board Member Chris Ward stated how he believes in the Coalition and partnering but is somewhat concerned that the Mission needs to have more rigor and that he sees a lack of focus on raising student achievement.

Board Chair Jesse Ruiz asked about having a work plan. The Committee discussed seeing a work plan before signing off on this. Becky stated that the work plan may take a couple of months to receive.

The Committee voted to sign on to the Mission and Goals statement, but that they need to look in to a work plan.

- 7. STATE BOARD DRAFT ANNUAL REPORT (Becky Watts and Ronny Wickenhauser):** Becky Watts began by stating that ISBE is still working on two primary pieces of data and that we will work with Connie Wise and her division to get this information to the Committee.

Andrea Brown asked if the Accountability/School Recognition monitors their piece for accuracy. Ginger Reynolds responded in that she may need to talk to Robert Wolfe about this issue.

Ronny suggested to Brenda Holmes (to go through her Committee) that the issue of maybe getting a legislative proposal to move the date back for this report because a lot of this information is not available to give the Board members ample time to review.

Ed Geppert also commented about a certain Committee under the Accountability/School Recognition section on page 3 of this item in the plenary packet. Becky Watts stated that she will get this information to the Board by tomorrow (December 14th).

Brenda Holmes complimented Becky Watts and staff on the excellent layout of this report.

Andrea Brown also stated that public libraries should have access to this document. Dave Fields agreed that everyone should have access to this.

- 8. ADDITIONAL ITEMS:** Brenda Holmes suggested, in terms of a new way of planning the Committee agendas, having each Committee discuss additional agenda items at the conclusion of their Committee meetings for the next month's Board Meeting. The board members agreed that this would be very helpful for planning purposes.

ADJOURNMENT: Vinni Hall moved to adjourn the EPPC meeting and the Committee seconded the motion. The EPPC meeting adjourned at 11:22 a.m.

Finance & Audit Committee of the Whole
Wednesday, December 13, 2006
12:00 p.m.
Board Room

Public Conference Call Access Number: 1-866-297-6391 (*listen only*)
Confirmation # 1 6 4 7 3 2 5 6

AGENDA

1. Public Participation
2. Discussion Items
 - a. FY 2008 Budget discussion (*Linda Mitchell & Ronny Wickenhauser*) **(p. 4)**
 - b. FY 2006 Capital Needs Assessment Survey Report (*Deb Vespa*) **(p. 5)**
3. Decision Items
 - a. Minutes of the November Finance and Audit Committee Meeting **(pp. 2-3)**
4. Additional Items
5. Adjourn

NOTE: At the conclusion of any discussion item in which the committee is ready to make a decision, a discussion item may be immediately moved for a decision.

* Items listed with an asterisk (*) will be discussed in committee and Board action may be taken in the plenary session.

FINANCE & AUDIT COMMITTEE MINUTES

December 13, 2006
Springfield, Illinois

Committee Members Present

Ed Geppert, Chair
Brenda Holmes
Andrea Brown

Other Board Members

Chris Ward
Vinni Hall
Joyce Karon
David Fields
Jesse Ruiz

Staff Present

Chris Koch
Linda Riley Mitchell
Ronny Wickenhauser
Deb Vespa
Darren Reisberg
Ginger Reynolds
Don Evans
Becky Watts
Jean Ladage

1. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

Daryl Morrison for Bob Blade from IEA seeking continued funding for National Board Certified Teachers.

Polly Poskin from ICASA seeking a \$1M increase for fiscal year 2008 funding. If they received an additional \$500,000 or the full \$1M they could add 11 more schools throughout the state to the Bullying Prevention Program.

2. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. FY08 Budget discussion

Linda Mitchell gave an update on the budget timeline for 2008. She stated that the budget hearings had been concluded and there would be a summary of the requests. Ms. Mitchell told the committee that the Commission on Government Forecasting and Accountability would be giving a presentation on the revenue outlook for Illinois during the plenary session. Ms. Mitchell also stated that ISBE would be prepared to make a recommendation to the General Assembly and Governor in January for the budget for fiscal year 2008.

Ronny Wickenhauser discussed the materials in the Board packet on the budget for fiscal year 2008 including a spreadsheet on the appropriation history for the agency that includes year to year changes, the budget development sheet for all funds, the agency operational needs, mandated categorical options, agency staffing needs, programs which are prorated within ISBE's budget, and budget hearing request summary.

Ed Geppert discussed the Governor's spending plan for education.

B. FY06 Capital needs assessment survey report to the General Assembly and Governor's Office

Deb Vespa discussed the Capital needs assessment report to the Governor and to the General Assembly for the capital needs of school districts throughout Illinois. The report is prepared every two years in conjunction with the Capital Development Board. The FY04 survey was provided to the committee for comparative purposes. Ms. Vespa noted that there were fewer respondents to the most recent survey, possibly due to the lack of capital funding in recent years. Ms. Vespa noted that she would be meeting with the Capital Development Board on December 15, 2006 to finalize the data.

3. DECISION ITEMS

A. Minutes of the November Finance and Audit Committee Meeting

Motion to accept the November minutes approved.

4. Additional Items

None

5. Adjourn

Governmental Relations Committee of the Whole
Wednesday, December 13, 2006
3:00 p.m.

Board Room

Public Conference Call Access Number: 1-866-297-6391 (*listen only*)
Confirmation # 1 6 4 7 3 2 5 6

AGENDA

1. Public Participation
2. Minutes of the November Governmental Relations Committee Meeting (**pp. 2-4**)
- *3. Legislative Proposals (*Josh Jacobs & Nicole Wills*) (**pp. 5-202**)
4. Cumulative Waiver Report (*Winnie Tuthill*) (**pp. 203-216**)
5. Conversation with Invited Education Stakeholders (*Brenda Holmes*) (**p. 217**)
6. Additional Items

* Items listed with an asterisk (*) will be discussed in committee and action may be taken in the plenary session.

**GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
MINUTES**

December 13, 2006
Springfield, Illinois

Committee Members Present

Brenda Holmes, Chair
Chris Ward
Jesse Ruiz

Other Board Members

Joyce Karon
Vinni Hall
Ed Geppert
Dave Fields
Andrea Brown

Board Members Absent

Dean Clark

Others

Supt. Chris Koch
Jean Ladage
Darren Reisberg
Josh Jacobs
Nicole Wills
Marsha Moffett
Linda Jamali
Kathi Best
Deb Vespa
Ginger Reynolds
John Herner

Invited Guests at the table

Diane Hendren IASA
Brent Clark, IASA
Randy Tinder, IASA
Ray Mackey, IFT
Steve Preckwinkle, IFT
Jim Reed, IEA
Jo Anderson, IEA
Mike Johnson, IASB
Ben Schwarm, IASB

1. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

Paula Johnson Purdue (Chicago Public Education Fund): Expressed concerns with the legislative proposal that would make changes to the requirements for the stipend for National Board Teachers. Ms. Purdue expressed concerns that to change the way stipends are disseminated currently would prove to be a disincentive and the Funds' belief that the current means for receiving the stipend should continue to remain unchanged.

2. INFORMATION ITEM

The November Governmental Relations committee notes were made a part of the record. The motion was made by Dr. Chris Ward and seconded by Chairman Jessie Ruiz.

3. CONVERSATION WITH INVITED EDUCATION STAKEHOLDERS:

The Governmental Relations committee invited the Executive Directors, Presidents and Legislative Directors from the Illinois Education Association, Illinois Federation of Teachers, the Illinois Association of School Administrators and the Illinois Association of School Boards to appear before the committee to discuss major issues in education in Illinois. Topics discussed include:

- Superintendent's search;
- Delay in the delivery of ISAT scores;
- Requesting a waiver from the U.S. Department of Education for AYP sanctions because of the delay in ISAT scores;
- Reading improvement initiatives;
- The addition of unfunded mandates on school districts and the lack of funding for existing mandates;
- General State Aid (GSA) being increased to the Education Funding Advisory Board's (EFAB) recommended level;
- Increasing the reimbursement amount for Special Education Personnel;
- Mentoring;

- Individual organizations legislative priorities (including GSA, special education funding, mentoring, health/life/safety issues);
- Merit pay versus incentive pay for educators;
- Executive Directors of the various education organizations meeting as a group with the Superintendent on a regular basis to discuss major issues; and,
- A suggestion by Chairman Ruiz that the group meet again in six months

4. **CUMULATIVE WAIVER REPORT**

The Cumulative Waiver Report is due to the Legislature in February. The Committee adopted the report and made suggestions for legislative change included in the report include eliminating the need for holiday waivers, supporting legislation dealing with parent-teacher conference waivers and supporting an increase to the maximum allowable fee charged for driver's education. The Board agreed to amend the draft report slightly to specifically recommend a \$250 maximum for a driver's education increase.

5. **2007 LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS – ISBE LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS**

The Committee discussed legislative proposals that had been submitted by agency divisions. The committee identified eleven proposals as agency priorities (listed below as "Priority 1"). Nine other proposals are considered "Priority 2", which can be pursued if Governmental Relations staff has the time and resources. Other proposals are temporarily on hold until further discussions can be held at a later date and one proposal (#28) is on hold indefinitely for this legislative session.

Priority 1

- (Funding) No Attendance Penalty - Interrupted Day - Proposal #4
- (Funding) Parent Teacher Conferences - Proposal #5
- (Funding) General State Aid - 22 Payments - Proposal #7
- (School Support) - Financial Oversight Panels - Proposal #8
- (School Support) - H/L/S P-TELL Exemptions - Proposal #9
- (Curriculum) - Reading Improvement Block Grant - Proposal #12
- (Legal/Gov Relations) - School Holiday Waivers - Proposal #15
- (Certification) - Eliminate CEU - Proposal #17
- (Certification) - Eliminate out-of-state testing waivers - Proposal #19
- (Certification) - Fee for Duplicate Certificate - Proposal #25
- (School Support) - General Obligation Debt Limitation - Proposal #27

Priority 2

- (Funding) - Special Education Personnel - 180 Days - Proposal #6
- (School Support) - PA 94-1019 Clean-up - Proposal #10
- (School Support) - Article 11E reorganization incentives - Proposal #11
- (Data Analysis) - Educator Supply & Demand Report Changes - Proposal #13
- (Certification) - Fee increases for certificates/endorsements - Proposal #18
- (Certification) - Eliminate the Alternative Math-Science Certificate - Proposal #20
- (Certification) - Combine Resident Teacher Certification and Illinois Teacher Corps - Proposal #21
- (Certification) - Combine and Revise Alternative Certification Statutes - Proposal #22
- (Nutrition) - School Breakfast Program - Proposal #23

To be discussed further in January

- (Gov. Relations) - Obsolete & Duplicative Round 2 - Proposal #14
Statutes proposed to be included will be discussed in January
- (Certification) - NBPTS - required mentoring - Proposal #16
A meeting will be called to address this proposal
- (Special Education) - Textbook Publication Technology - Proposal #24
To be discussed in January when language is ready.
- (Certification) - Retired HQ Teachers Returning to Work - Proposal #26
More time is needed to discover total implications of this legislation.

Hold Indefinitely right now

- (School Support) School Construction - Proposal #28

Other

(Budget) - SBE Federal Indirect Cost Recovery Fund - Proposal #1

Will see about including this legislation in the BIMP bill

(Budget) - General State Aid/All Kids Calculations - Proposal #2

Will see about including this legislation in the BIMP bill

(Budget) - Technology Immersion Pilot Project sunset extension - Proposal #3

Lt. Governor's office has indicated they will proceed with legislation to extend the sunset.

The Board is supportive of the measure.

6. **ADJOURN:** Board Chairman Jesse Ruiz made the motion to adjourn and it was seconded by Dr. Chris Ward.

Ad Hoc Rules Committee of the Whole

Wednesday, December 13, 2006

1:00 p.m.

(This meeting will begin at the conclusion of the previous session.)

Board Room

Public Conference Call Access Number: 1-866-297-6391 (*listen only*)

Confirmation # 1 6 4 7 3 2 5 6

AGENDA

1. Public Participation
- *2 Rules for Initial Review
 - a. Part 1 (Public Schools Evaluation, Recognition and Supervision) (**Plenary pp. 14-20**)
(*Darren Reisberg*)
- *3 Rules for Adoption
 - a. Part 226 (Special Education) (*John Herner & Beth Hanselman*) (**Plenary p. 144**)
 - b. New Part 227 (Gifted Education) (*Myron Mason & Carol McCue*) (**Plenary pp. 21-38**)
 - c. New Part 232 (Summer Bridges) (*Myron Mason & Sharryon Dunbar*) (**Plenary pp. 39-49**)
 - d. New Part 270 (Advanced Placement) (*Dana Kinley*) (**Plenary pp. 50-58**)
4. Discussion Item
 - a. Nutrition Programs (*Chris Schmitt & Roxanne Ramage*) (**pp. 2-5**)
- 5 Adjourn

* Items listed with an asterisk (*) will be discussed in committee and action may be taken in the plenary session.

Ad Hoc Rules Committee of the Whole

Wednesday, December 13, 2006

1:00 p.m.

State Board of Education Office
100 North First Street
Springfield, Illinois

Committee Members Present

Jesse Ruiz
Andrea Brown
David Fields
Ed Geppert
Vinni Hall
Brenda Holmes
Joyce Karon
Chris Ward

Absent

Dean Clark

Others

Christopher Koch
Darren Reisberg
Sally Vogl
Irma Martinez Snopek
Myron Mason
Carol McCue
Sharryon Dunbar
Ginger Reynolds
Dana Kinley

Chairman Ruiz called the meeting to order at 1:10 p.m.

- 1. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:** The Chairman noted that 18 individuals had signed up to speak to the Board. He indicated that the allotted time would be divided among them but that those representing the same organization were requested to appear as a group. Everyone from Valley View School District was therefore invited to come to the speakers' table first.

This group included Matt Barbini, Johnnie Thomas, Faith Dahlquist, Megan Healy, Dana Smith, and Michelle Stoehrmann, all of whom were involved in some aspect of the implementation of "Response to Intervention" (Rtl) or "Problem-Solving". Mr. Barbini characterized Rtl as a very student-centered, proactive way to deliver services to all students in a time-sensitive and data-driven manner. He described the size and diversity of the Valley View school system and advocated Rtl as vehicle for decision-making because (1) it "honors" IDEA and NCLB; (2) it provides a structure for decision-making at all levels; and (3) it is good for students, in that they are given the services they need when they need them instead of waiting for them to fail first. He indicated that the district and its partners had trained thousands of general education and special education teachers as well as providers of related services.

Ms. Healy, a general education teacher, described Rtl as an "amazing" way to get to know each student. She felt it resulted in her ability to see each one's reading needs and "take ownership" of addressing those needs. As evidence of these benefits, she noted the advances that had been made by one student in 3 months. Ms. Stoehrmann, a special education teacher, stated that the information collected via Rtl is a vital tool in the preparation of appropriate IEPs. Mr. Thomas, the assistant director of special education, noted that this same information makes it much easier to communicate with parents because they can look at concrete data and performance charts. Mr. Smith then noted the speed with which a particular student had begun to receive services based on Rtl and contrasted that with the more typical approach. Finally, Ms. Dahlquist, a principal, noted that change sometimes required "a push". In light of the benefits of Rtl, she urged not permitting any other option, fearing that if there were a choice (i.e., the "discrepancy model") the implementation of Rtl would be delayed.

Brenda Holmes inquired regarding the union affiliation of these educators, who responded that they were represented by the Illinois Federation of Teachers. To Ms. Holmes' question regarding the number of students in her class, Ms. Healy indicated the class size was 26. Ms. Holmes asked Ms. Healy about the training she had received and her access to special education staff when needed. She replied that she had had little specific training in Rtl but that a good deal of

the necessary knowledge came from understanding differentiated instruction. In other words, she considered this approach “just how you run a classroom”. She acknowledged that she had needed to learn how to implement it in the first year but stated it had “come very easily” and that it “completely fits in”.

Ms. Holmes followed up by noting that 26 is a fair number of students to serve and asked whether Ms. Healy felt able to “be all things to all students” with so many. Ms. Healy replied that the RtI approach tells her what each student needs. She described keeping individual charts and feeling “accomplished” because of seeing students’ gains in response to instruction. She explained that, when needed, Ms. Stoehrmann provided support for the students in her class who had IEPs.

Vinni Hall wished to know whether the district had adopted a special assessment tool and whether more materials were being provided than before. Ms. Healy indicated that some tools had been in place all along but two additional reading programs had been introduced. Andrea Brown asked how long Ms. Healy had been using differentiated instruction and how long the district had been emphasizing it. She indicated that the district had taken it up about two years ago, and others confirmed that there had been training for a combined general education and special education initiative.

David Fields asked Ms. Healy whether she, as a regular education teacher, would point to any negatives. Ms. Healy replied that the assessment aspect might be viewed as negative but that she saw it as one-on-one time with her students. She indicated that it took, on average, one minute to make a curriculum-based assessment decision for a student, or perhaps 10-15 minutes for a group of half a dozen children. Mr. Barbini mentioned that in January 840 students’ literacy skills would be benchmarked, and by the following week all the teachers (general education, special education, and bilingual) would be using this information to help determine their students’ placement in reading groups. Then progress would be monitored and interventions could be developed accordingly.

Dr. Hall asked whether any students had not been successful, and Ms. Healy indicated there had been some. In those cases further testing would be done and it would be much more targeted in light of the information already available. Ms. Stoehrmann added that it was vital to know what interventions already had or had not worked for each child, and the parents would already have been involved and aware of their child’s situation.

The next group to testify represented Indian Prairie School District 204. First to speak was Leighton Helwig, a problem-solving coach with nine years’ teaching experience. He stated that one of his biggest frustrations as a teacher had not been with class size but rather with how to approach making decisions for students who were struggling. He described weekly team meetings addressing students’ problems out of which no real improvement plans had emerged. Then the district had begun conducting training in problem-solving, at which time “the light bulb went off”. His support for RtI arose from several factors, including its provision of a structure by which teachers can make the best educational decisions for students; the “routine of data collection”; the potential for more timely intervention; and the review of factors outside the learner, including the instruction being provided. He concluded by stating that the biggest point in favor of RtI was “that it works”.

Lisa Davidson, a Ph.D. candidate in school psychology, stated her belief that current practices of evaluating and placing students in special education were failing and stressed her determination not to repeat the mistakes of the past. She noted research showing that monitoring students’ progress, close attention to data, and flexible services provide the best educational opportunities to all students. Teachers and administrators from District 204, including Kimberly Marran, Lynn Reilley, and Emily Scheuchenzuber, also spoke in support of RtI and problem-solving as preferable to the “wait-to-fail” model by which students had previously been determined eligible for special education. They described the use of charts and graphs depicting students’ progress and the students’ response to being able to “see their lines move” as they tracked their own

growth. It was noted that RtI involves a change in how educators think about planning, rather than requiring additional planning, and that the outcomes are worth the change.

Ms. Holmes again inquired as to these teachers' union affiliation, which was with the Illinois Education Association. She then asked a two-part question: what does it take for a district to implement RtI; and how can smaller districts, i.e., those without all the resources that are available to the larger suburban districts, do the same thing? The answers involved the use of time, although not necessarily additional time, and the involvement of parents and the community. Andrea Brown asked several follow-up questions regarding training and transfer of the information to other districts, and Vinni Hall inquired as to the assessment tools and interventions used. The teachers described these and the strategies that had been used to ensure that all staff would understand each tool and program. They further stressed that any extra time they had spent was extremely worthwhile in terms of improved student performance. Mr. Helwig, the problem-solving coach, described seeing teachers' reluctance change to excitement.

Bridget Helmholtz of the Illinois Association of Private Special Education Centers expressed her members' concern for the implications of a point that had been raised in the summary and analysis of public comment. She requested assurances from ISBE that the rules affecting those entities (i.e., Part 401, Special Education Facilities Under Section 14-7.02 of the School Code) would be reviewed and amended as necessary to reflect their correct relationship to Part 226, including any relevant distinctions. She noted that there are important differences between school districts' programs and those offered in the facilities under Part 401, because districts must generally be unable to provide an appropriate program for a child because of the child's complex needs before the child can be placed into one of the facilities instead. Therefore, exact equality in the two sets of rules would be inappropriate, and only through different requirements could an equally appropriate education be offered.

Ms. Helmholtz asked for an expression on the record of ISBE's intent to involve her member facilities in a detailed review of Part 401, in order to ensure appropriate acknowledgment of the distinctions that should apply. Dr. Koch and Sally Vogl responded by explaining the context of the discussion found in the summary and analysis and assured both Ms. Helmholtz and the Board that Part 401 would be reviewed as a matter of course when the revisions to Part 226 were nearing completion. Brenda Holmes noted the request for the affected facilities to be involved in the review, and Dr. Koch affirmed this would occur so that there would be no unintended effects on them.

Judy Hackett, an assistant superintendent also serving as President of the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE), noted the amount of testimony already heard on RtI and elected to focus her remarks on Sections 226.730 and 226.731 instead. She stated that a great deal of study on the issues of class size and case load had been done by her organization and others in recent years and that the provisions in the current rules were more prescriptive than those of many other states. She characterized the language as very prescriptive, very categorical, and out of date in that it promotes reliance on disability labels in decision-making rather than focusing on students' individual needs. She pointed out that the teacher certification system and higher education approaches had changed to focus on strategies for meeting standards instead. She concluded by applauding the proposed changes, which she considered to be very reflective of public comment.

Ms. Holmes asked Ms. Hackett what she had heard from teachers on this subject. Ms. Hackett responded that there had not been significant objections voiced by teachers in her large district with regard to class size, nor had she seen many teachers present at the public hearings she had attended. She expressed support for the concept of local decision-making on case load based on "what makes sense" from a student-centered perspective. Chairman Ruiz asked how many of the hearings she had attended, to which she responded that she had been present at six.

Bev Johns, Chair of the Illinois Special Education Coalition (ISELA), pointed out that the Board would be making history with its action on the amendments to Part 226. She stated that this could be bad history or positive history if the Board sent the rules back to the drawing board. In her view, adoption of the rules would set special education back 40 years. She stated that there were reasons for case load and class size limits and for categorical programs, pointing particularly to the lack of services experienced by students with disabilities at the time rules were originally written in the 1970s. She warned against returning to a situation in which all children with disabilities were grouped together without consideration of their needs, which had not worked. She also stated that the amendments would delay or even refuse the identification of students as having disabilities.

Ms. Johns felt that the elimination of caseload limitations would intensify the shortage of special education teachers and that students placed in general education settings would then suffer because the general education teachers would not have access to the necessary support from special educators. She indicated that the proposed mandate for RtI would place additional demands on general education teachers without additional funding other than grant funds. She repeated her point that the Board could do harm or good by adopting or rejecting the proposed amendments and stated further that she had attended four of the hearings and felt the summary did not reflect the testimony given. She requested that the Board “think long and hard” because children could not afford for a mistake to be made.

Brenda Holmes noted that the previous presenters had not created the impression that services being provided in those districts were similar to the situation of 40 years ago and asked Ms. Johns how to explain these divergent points of view. Ms. Johns noted that the districts represented were receiving grant funds for implementation (of RtI) and expressed her concern for those that had no such funds. She also referred to two “horror stories” of which she had been made aware in recent days. While not asserting that these arose in the districts represented at the meeting, she stated that instances had occurred in districts where RtI was being implemented.

Ms. Holmes asked the district representatives to clarify whether they were, in fact, receiving targeted grant funds to facilitate the implementation of RtI; they indicated that this was not the case. She then asked Ms. Johns whether, in her opinion, ISBE should start over with this rulemaking, i.e., that there was nothing in the proposal that should be kept. Ms. Johns replied that she had only had the materials in hand for a few days.

Andrea Brown indicated that she was aware of instances during the 1960s and 1970s such as those Ms. Johns had pointed to but highlighted the difference between those earlier times and the current situation in which parents and teachers, in addition to administrators, are represented on IEP teams and children’s individual needs are required to guide the choices that are made. She stated the importance of trust in that system and her belief that there must be leeway for consideration of context and individual need at the local level when class size and case load are under consideration.

Ms. Johns responded by pointing to the serious financial issues that many districts face and the pressures that operate when hiring decisions are made under those circumstances. Her concern was that cuts could be made in special education if no limit on case load were in place. Dr. Brown stated her concern, on the other hand, that when “numbers drive things”, less attention would be paid to students’ specific needs. In the age of differentiated instruction, she believed it more appropriate to look across the continuum of needs being served by an individual teacher in order to determine what that individual’s case load should be. She reiterated her sense of the problem of trust.

Ms. Johns wished to refute the idea that monitoring of case load is difficult on the basis that such monitoring is the job of ISBE. She pointed to the parallel difficulty of monitoring the quality of services being provided when a teacher has a large number of students on his/her caseload. The

discussion concluded with Dr. Brown's acknowledgment that "horror stories" had occurred in the past but that expectations were very different in current times.

Daryl Morrison of the Illinois Education Association also spoke on the rules for special education. He noted that a position statement had been submitted to Board members by the IEA and confined his presentation to re-emphasizing three points. He first expressed his organization's support for the reversal of the proposed change in the definition of "general education classroom". On the other hand, the IEA was opposed to the new language in Section 226.730 calling for district-level policies on case load. In particular, Mr. Morrison believed ISBE would have monitoring difficulties related to this provision. Finally, he stated that the IEA was not opposed to Rtl *per se* but was opposed to the requirement for all districts to use that approach. He asked that the Board let the unions work with ISBE to find out more about it before implementing this requirement.

Ms. Holmes asked Mr. Morrison for his definition of appropriate monitoring of local case load policies. His response centered on the availability of resources for each district to implement a research-based system of intervention and to determine the effectiveness of the model. Ms. Karon then asked whether he believed ISBE was able to monitor the current system. The answer was "no", and Mr. Morrison also noted there were other areas of concern that could be brought up. The relationship of monitoring to the agency's budget was noted, and Ms. Karon pointed out that some problems would be missed in any system. The parent's role in advocating for appropriate services was mentioned by Dr. Ward. Mr. Morrison concluded by reiterating the IEA's opposition to use of the word "shall", i.e., the imposition of a mandate. Dr. Brown emphasized that Rtl was only one of the scientifically based models for evaluation of students that could be used, that the mandate was for a data-based determination of students' needs rather than for Rtl specifically, and that this was entirely in keeping with the No Child Left Behind Act.

Sue Walter, Union Professional Development Director for the Illinois Federation of Teachers, thanked the Board for reconsidering the definition of "general education classroom" and noted that the IFT still had concerns with the two other major issues Mr. Morrison had also addressed. She felt teachers would have more recourse under the current system of class size limits and stressed the difficulty in monitoring class composition under the proposal, as well as the implementation of some 800 local policies on case load. She acknowledged that insertion of that new provision had been an attempt to respond to the problem but reiterated the sense that the current limits provide the only protection for educators. She expressed the same concern as voiced by the IEA regarding the proposed requirement for Rtl or a similar, research-based model of intervention because of the need for funding for training and the time involved.

Erika Lindley, Executive Director of ED-RED, indicated that she had planned to speak in favor of Rtl but that the earlier presentations had made that unnecessary. Instead, she focused her comments on the new formula for class size, which relies on the intensity of need and in her view would allow districts to group students in ways that make sense to them. She also expressed support for the provision calling for local district policies on case load that would take into account the time needed for various critical functions. She believed this would ensure that districts use best practices in ways that are locally appropriate. She stated that ED-RED expects high-quality instruction for all students and noted the need for professional development for all teachers. She closed by encouraging the State Board to support funding for Rtl resources and training so that the necessary foundation would be in place.

Ms. Holmes asked whether, in formulating its position, ED-RED had taken into consideration the issues outlined by the teachers' unions with regard to resources, monitoring, and major changes. Ms. Lindley replied in the affirmative. Her member cooperatives did not believe the new class sizes would be an issue and would offer them needed flexibility to group students in appropriate ways.

Christine Martin, an IEA member, school psychologist and problem-solving coach in (Indian Prairie) District 204, and regional coordinator for Illinois ASPIRE, expressed support for Rtl and scientifically based interventions. She stated that Rtl was the right thing for kids because, "We've spent too long admiring problems... and blaming parents, tests, and students for skills not being learned". She characterized Rtl as an opportunity to focus on things that educators have the power to change and described students' achievement gains in schools where teachers had taken advantage of this opportunity. She believed what matters is not the label put on a child but rather what the child needs and "what we as educators are going to do about it."

Ms. Martin went on to state that Rtl could be implemented and implemented well, that staff who were actually implementing it liked it, and that it resulted in large amounts of gain in short periods of time. For example, she noted that students in classrooms where Rtl was implemented had nearly twice the reading gains as similar students in other classrooms in her district. She indicated that, even if it did take more time or educators did not like it, it would still be the right thing to do. However, she believed it did not require more time or money; it only would require educators to do things differently. In her opinion, "It's time to do what works."

Ed Geppert asked what currently prevents a school district from using Rtl. Ms. Martin indicated that the rule requiring use of the discrepancy model provides a disincentive to implement another procedure as well, since the tendency is to do what is required. Mr. Geppert asked about the difference made by changing the wording between the version that had been originally proposed and the version presented for adoption, and Dr. Koch clarified that the meaning was still to require scientifically based intervention and to permit additional use of the discrepancy model. The change was being recommended for the sake of clarity and not to change the original meaning. Mr. Geppert then reiterated that there is currently no requirement that would prohibit a district from using Rtl or a similar model.

It was agreed that the order of the remaining agenda items would be changed somewhat by moving the discussion of Part 226 (Item 3a) to the end since it would involve the lengthiest discussion. It was also noted that only some 35 minutes were available before the Committee would need to take a recess for another meeting to which external participants had been invited. The rules discussion would need to resume at the conclusion of that other session.

2. RULES FOR INITIAL REVIEW

PART 1 (Public Schools Evaluation, Recognition and Supervision)

Darren Reisberg introduced Irma Snopek, a staff attorney, to provide an overview of the proposed amendment to Part 1. Ms. Snopek recalled the amendment that had been made to Section 1.240 approximately 18 months previously to prohibit districts from denying enrollment to undocumented students. She stated that, while very useful, that rule had not proven sufficient and that complaints continued to arise regarding inappropriate enrollment practices affecting immigrant students. Some districts were continuing to ask about students' immigration status, while others were requiring residency to be demonstrated by means of documents not generally available to those students. These occurrences had proven the need to amend the rule again to be more specific.

Ms. Holmes asked whether districts may require proof of residency as long as they do not require documents such as a Social Security card or driver's license. Mr. Reisberg answered that they absolutely are permitted to do so and clarified that no change was being made in districts' ability to require residency as a condition of enrollment. A "fine line" was identified, i.e., that immigration status should have no impact on the question of residency.

Joyce Karon asked for clarification of how these requirements affect students transferring from other districts, particularly with regard to how many forms of documentation could be requested. Mr. Reisberg reiterated that the new rule would not preclude any district from requiring multiple

documents as proof of residency; it would simply require that the documentation requested not consist solely of items that immigrant students would not have. Examples were discussed, and it was suggested that the Superintendent share this information in the weekly message to help districts avoid complaints.

Ms. Snopek stated that problems had unfortunately continued to occur even when the information was widely disseminated. Ms. Holmes noted that the rule would give ISBE better authority for addressing these problems.

3. RULES FOR ADOPTION

PART 227 (Gifted Education)

Mr. Reisberg reminded the Board that initial review of Part 227 had occurred in March and that the rules were now ready for adoption. He introduced Carol McCue and Myron Mason to provide the background on this rulemaking. Ms. McCue noted the work of the Gifted Advisory Council in helping to define what would be expected of programs once funding became available. She described some of the improvements that had been made in the rules when compared to the version repealed several years previously, such as attention to underserved groups and particularly the needs of students who also have disabilities.

Ms. McCue outlined the rules' provisions for a competitive grant process based on locally developed plans. The goal was to achieve high quality in funded programs while leaving sufficient flexibility at the local level. Ms. McCue also pointed to the various options under which teachers would be considered qualified to serve in funded programs, including some that would honor the work of professionals in programs that have been operating without state funding. Finally, she noted the provision for statewide activities to be conducted by ISBE in years when an appropriation is insufficient to fund a grant competition and indicated that the Advisory Council would have a strong role in developing ideas for those activities, especially professional development.

PART 232 (Summer Bridges Program)

Sharryon Dunbar joined Mr. Mason to discuss this set of rules, which had undergone initial review in September. Ms. Dunbar described the origins and growth of the program, indicating that it was designed to serve students who were not succeeding and that over the years it had been very successful.

PART 270 (Advanced Placement)

Division Administrator Dana Kinley presented an overview of this set of rules, which the Board had first reviewed in September. She noted the issue that had been raised during the public comment period with regard to the required percentage of grant funds to be used specifically for training provided by the College Board. After exploration of this matter, it had been agreed that the proposed percentage could be reduced to 20 instead of 50. Districts would have the latitude to exceed that percentage if they so chose.

Joyce Karon followed up on the reduction and Ms. Kinley clarified that some districts might find that spending more directly on College Board training would be most appropriate, while others could determine that a better use might be local in-service training, collaboration meetings, etc. Vinni Hall noted that the change had been made in response to just one comment, and Ginger Reynolds noted her own experience in working with the College Board, some issues of capacity within that organization, and her assessment that the argument made by the commenter had been compelling. The possibility of "propagating" College Board training at the local level was noted. In response to questions from Chris Ward, it was also clarified that these grant funds could not be used to offset costs for providing the program *per se* and that the program had been designed to promote greater access to these courses on the part of students from low-income backgrounds.

4. DISCUSSION ITEM

Darren Reisberg introduced this item by recalling that the Board had requested an update on current developments related to nutrition standards.

Christine Schmitt, Division Administrator for Nutrition Programs, noted that an overview had been presented in the Board packet, providing information on the federal regulations, Illinois rules, and local wellness policies. An additional document setting out guidance for schools on these matters was handed out. Ms. Schmitt stated that staff in the regional offices of education were being trained, as well as district staff.

Ms. Schmitt also noted that she and her staff expected to be presenting additional amendments to the rules for School Food Service once the report of the School Wellness Policy Task Force was available. She indicated that the report was expected to be available by the end of December and that the law required there to be a Board goal on this subject. Further comparative information would be prepared to assist in the development of that goal.

Brenda Holmes expressed appreciation for the background materials that had been provided and asked Ms. Schmitt to confirm her impression that, although revisions might be initiated in response to the Task Force's recommendations, the Board would not be compelled to accept those revisions. Ms. Schmitt agreed. Ms. Holmes asked the Chairman and General Counsel Reisberg whether it would be appropriate to solicit assistance from some of the individuals who had provided testimony on the prior amendments, to help the Board avoid making changes in a vacuum. Mr. Reisberg discussed the rule language and its meaning connected with a timeframe for revising the rules.

The Committee recessed at 2:55 p.m. and reconvened at 8:40 a.m. on the morning of Thursday, December 14, to consider agenda item 3.a.

3. RULES FOR ADOPTION, continued

PART 226 (Special Education)

Dr. Koch introduced the discussion by reflecting on the lengthy rulemaking process that had been conducted and the amount of input that had been received and considered. He noted that it had been clear from the outset that it would be impossible to satisfy all the interested parties and outlined the agency's efforts to identify reasonable responses, stating that the large volume of public comment had been taken very seriously. He thanked the members of the public for the input that had been provided. He introduced Dr. John Herner and Division Administrator Beth Hanselmann to go into more detail on the key changes in the rules, with particular attention to the provisions for class size and case load. He stressed that these two concepts were different and were intentionally being treated separately in the rules. He reminded the Board that the rules would continue to limit class size but stated his belief that case load was more appropriately a local determination. With regard to RtI, he noted the requirement in federal law for data-based decisions, stating that identification and placement problems in Illinois demonstrated the need for this move.

Dr. Herner, as a recent arrival on ISBE's staff from out of state, characterized the Board's rulemaking process as the most thorough, most responsive, and most transparent that he had ever seen and commended the Board for that. He proceeded to outline the types of changes that were being made as part of this rulemaking with regard to nomenclature, the definition of "developmental delay", timelines for certain procedural steps, scientific research-based intervention, the composition of the IEP Team, the definition of "general education classroom", and new class size maximums for school years beginning with 2008-09. In explaining research-based intervention, Dr. Herner noted relevant requirements as stated in the federal regulations

but indicated that talking about legal requirements seemed superfluous in light of the preceding day's testimony in terms of what it meant for students.

Ms. Hanselmann noted the comparative information that had been provided on the current and proposed versions addressing class size. She clarified that the maximum class sizes had been and would continue to be stated by class period and that ISBE would continue to be able to monitor compliance with these requirements. She noted that the title of Section 226.730 was being changed to eliminate the notion that case load and class size were synonymous and pointed out that case load had not been consistently defined across districts. Rather, ISBE recognized that it was sometimes a bargaining issue at the local level, leading to the addition of Section 226.730(c) to require local policies on staffing needs. She stated that the elements to be included represented best practice. With regard to ISBE's monitoring of case load, she indicated that submission of these policies would not be required except when violations were alleged. In those instances the local policies would be reviewed and districts would be required to demonstrate how they permitted the provision of all the required services under students' IEPs.

Dr. Herner provided his perspective on the move away from class size maximums stated on the basis of disability categories. He recalled the fairly recent use of course descriptions such as "LD Math" in another state and noted that these designations implied that arithmetic, for example, is different for students who have disabilities. He emphasized that this did not make sense and went on to point out that the approach taken in the proposed rules would permit flexible delivery of service to students according to their needs.

Ed Geppert expressed gratitude to Dr. Koch and the staff for the effort that had gone into the development of the rules. He described the proposal as "visionary" in its concept of the integration of general education and special education but cautioned against "missionary zeal" about moving quickly in a new direction. He was reluctant to impose yet more requirements on public school staff and moved a revision to Section 226.130 to defer implementation of the requirement for use of a process such as RtI until the 2008-09 school year. Dr. Hall seconded the motion. Mr. Geppert indicated that his proposal arose from the concern that many Illinois districts could not immediately replicate the exciting successes achieved by the Valley View and Indian Prairie districts. He advocated allowing time for the necessary training for all school districts and indicated his willingness to seek the inclusion of funding for that purpose in ISBE's budget. This phase-in would permit Illinois to reach the visionary goal without the missionary zeal.

Mr. Geppert went on to propose a second revision that would involve Section 226.730. He moved deletion of the word "period" from subsection (b) and decreasing the class size maximums stated in subsections (b)(1) through (b)(4) to 13, 8, 6, and 4, respectively. Dr. Hall seconded the motion and Mr. Geppert then spoke to his reasons for these amendments. He expressed uncertainty as to the reason for use of the word "period" and indicated there might be some potential for its manipulation. He advocated consistent use of the term "class" rather than "class period" throughout this Section.

On the other aspect of the changes, Mr. Geppert indicated that lowering the maximums for each type of class would place the numbers in the middle of the current range. This would not be dramatically different from the original proposal but would send the message that more individualized instruction for students is desired. He expressed the hope of success for a legislative initiative that would double personnel reimbursement for special education.

Chairman Ruiz confirmed that staff had a clear understanding of the revisions that had just been discussed so that the plenary session could begin while they were being committed to writing. Discussion of the proposals then ensued. Andrea Brown expressed a desire not to allow perfect to be the enemy of good. While agreeing with the notion that not all districts were equally prepared for the implementation of models such as RtI, she noted the considerable amount of professional development that had already taken place on teaching reading and focusing on

scientifically based instruction. With regard to class size, she expressed the desirability of local options for placing students appropriately while still maintaining some fundamental protections. She indicated that in her opinion the staff had done a thorough job of investigation the options.

5. ADJOURNMENT

Dr. Hall moved to adjourn the meeting and Mr. Geppert seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 a.m.