Appendix
# Table of Contents

I. Council Documents  
   a. Enacting Legislation  
      2
   b. Organization Chart  
      16

II. Committee Recommendations & Work Products  
    a. Data, Assessment, and Accountability Committee - Common Core Aligned Math Sample Assessment Items  
       19
    b. Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Joint Work Group Recommendations (Data, Assessment, and Accountability Committee and School, College, and Career Readiness Committee)  
       28
    c. Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Committee  
       i. Educator Licensure Steering Group Recommendations  
          34
          1. Grade Span Configuration Recommendations  
          44

III. Council Resolutions  
    a. Resolution on Longitudinal Data System Governance  
       48
    b. Resolution on Lowest Performing Schools  
       51
Enacting Legislation
AN ACT concerning education.

Be it enacted by the People of the State of Illinois, represented in the General Assembly:

Section 5. The School Code is amended by changing Section 1A-4 and adding Section 22-45 as follows:

(105 ILCS 5/1A-4) (from Ch. 122, par. 1A-4)
Sec. 1A-4. Powers and duties of the Board.
A. (Blank).
B. The Board shall determine the qualifications of and appoint a chief education officer, to be known as the State Superintendent of Education, who may be proposed by the Governor and who shall serve at the pleasure of the Board and pursuant to a performance-based contract linked to statewide student performance and academic improvement within Illinois schools. Upon expiration or buyout of the contract of the State Superintendent of Education in office on the effective date of this amendatory Act of the 93rd General Assembly, a State Superintendent of Education shall be appointed by a State Board of Education that includes the 7 new Board members who were appointed to fill seats of members whose terms were terminated on the effective date of this amendatory Act of the 93rd General Assembly. Thereafter, a State Superintendent of Education must, at a minimum, be appointed at the beginning of
each term of a Governor after that Governor has made
appointments to the Board. A performance-based contract issued
for the employment of a State Superintendent of Education
entered into on or after the effective date of this amendatory
Act of the 93rd General Assembly must expire no later than
February 1, 2007, and subsequent contracts must expire no later
than February 1 each 4 years thereafter. No contract shall be
extended or renewed beyond February 1, 2007 and February 1 each
4 years thereafter, but a State Superintendent of Education
shall serve until his or her successor is appointed. Each
contract entered into on or before January 8, 2007 with a State
Superintendent of Education must provide that the State Board
of Education may terminate the contract for cause, and the
State Board of Education shall not thereafter be liable for
further payments under the contract. With regard to this
amendatory Act of the 93rd General Assembly, it is the intent
of the General Assembly that, beginning with the Governor who
takes office on the second Monday of January, 2007, a State
Superintendent of Education be appointed at the beginning of
each term of a Governor after that Governor has made
appointments to the Board. The State Superintendent of
Education shall not serve as a member of the State Board of
Education. The Board shall set the compensation of the State
Superintendent of Education who shall serve as the Board's
chief executive officer. The Board shall also establish the
duties, powers and responsibilities of the State
Superintendent, which shall be included in the State Superintendent's performance-based contract along with the goals and indicators of student performance and academic improvement used to measure the performance and effectiveness of the State Superintendent. The State Board of Education may delegate to the State Superintendent of Education the authority to act on the Board's behalf, provided such delegation is made pursuant to adopted board policy or the powers delegated are ministerial in nature. The State Board may not delegate authority under this Section to the State Superintendent to (1) nonrecognize school districts, (2) withhold State payments as a penalty, or (3) make final decisions under the contested case provisions of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act unless otherwise provided by law.

C. The powers and duties of the State Board of Education shall encompass all duties delegated to the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction on January 12, 1975, except as the law providing for such powers and duties is thereafter amended, and such other powers and duties as the General Assembly shall designate. The Board shall be responsible for the educational policies and guidelines for public schools, pre-school through grade 12 and Vocational Education in the State of Illinois. The Board shall analyze the present and future aims, needs, and requirements of education in the State of Illinois and recommend to the General Assembly the powers which should be exercised by the Board. The Board
shall recommend the passage and the legislation necessary to
determine the appropriate relationship between the Board and local boards of education and the various State agencies and shall recommend desirable modifications in the laws which affect schools.

D. Two members of the Board shall be appointed by the chairperson to serve on a standing joint Education Committee, 2 others shall be appointed from the Board of Higher Education, 2 others shall be appointed by the chairperson of the Illinois Community College Board, and 2 others shall be appointed by the chairperson of the Human Resource Investment Council. The Committee shall be responsible for making recommendations concerning the submission of any workforce development plan or workforce training program required by federal law or under any block grant authority. The Committee will be responsible for developing policy on matters of mutual concern to elementary, secondary and higher education such as Occupational and Career Education, Teacher Preparation and Certification, Educational Finance, Articulation between Elementary, Secondary and Higher Education and Research and Planning. The joint Education Committee shall meet at least quarterly and submit an annual report of its findings, conclusions, and recommendations to the State Board of Education, the Board of Higher Education, the Illinois Community College Board, the Human Resource Investment Council, the Governor, and the General Assembly. All meetings of this Committee shall be official meetings for
reimbursement under this Act. On the effective date of this amendatory Act of the 95th General Assembly, the Joint Education Committee is abolished.

E. Five members of the Board shall constitute a quorum. A majority vote of the members appointed, confirmed and serving on the Board is required to approve any action, except that the 7 new Board members who were appointed to fill seats of members whose terms were terminated on the effective date of this amendatory act of the 93rd General Assembly may vote to approve actions when appointed and serving.

The Board shall prepare and submit to the General Assembly and the Governor on or before January 14, 1976 and annually thereafter a report or reports of its findings and recommendations. Such annual report shall contain a separate section which provides a critique and analysis of the status of education in Illinois and which identifies its specific problems and recommends express solutions therefor. Such annual report also shall contain the following information for the preceding year ending on June 30: each act or omission of a school district of which the State Board of Education has knowledge as a consequence of scheduled, approved visits and which constituted a failure by the district to comply with applicable State or federal laws or regulations relating to public education, the name of such district, the date or dates on which the State Board of Education notified the school district of such act or omission, and what action, if any, the
school district took with respect thereto after being notified thereof by the State Board of Education. The report shall also include the statewide high school dropout rate by grade level, sex and race and the annual student dropout rate of and the number of students who graduate from, transfer from or otherwise leave bilingual programs. The Auditor General shall annually perform a compliance audit of the State Board of Education's performance of the reporting duty imposed by this amendatory Act of 1986. A regular system of communication with other directly related State agencies shall be implemented.

The requirement for reporting to the General Assembly shall be satisfied by filing copies of the report with the Speaker, the Minority Leader and the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the President, the Minority Leader and the Secretary of the Senate and the Legislative Council, as required by Section 3.1 of the General Assembly Organization Act, and filing such additional copies with the State Government Report Distribution Center for the General Assembly as is required under paragraph (t) of Section 7 of the State Library Act.

F. Upon appointment of the 7 new Board members who were appointed to fill seats of members whose terms were terminated on the effective date of this amendatory Act of the 93rd General Assembly, the Board shall review all of its current rules in an effort to streamline procedures, improve efficiency, and eliminate unnecessary forms and paperwork.
Sec. 22-45. Illinois P-20 Council.

(a) The General Assembly finds that preparing Illinoisans for success in school and the workplace requires a continuum of quality education from preschool through graduate school. This State needs a framework to guide education policy and integrate education at every level. A statewide coordinating council to study and make recommendations concerning education at all levels can avoid fragmentation of policies, promote improved teaching and learning, and continue to cultivate and demonstrate strong accountability and efficiency. Establishing an Illinois P-20 Council will develop a statewide agenda that will move the State towards the common goals of improving academic achievement, increasing college access and success, improving use of existing data and measurements, developing improved accountability, promoting lifelong learning, easing the transition to college, and reducing remediation. A pre-kindergarten through grade 20 agenda will strengthen this State's economic competitiveness by producing a highly-skilled workforce. In addition, lifelong learning plans will enhance this State's ability to leverage funding.

(b) There is created the Illinois P-20 Council. The Illinois P-20 Council shall include all of the following members:
(1) The Governor or his or her designee, to serve as chairperson.

(2) Four members of the General Assembly, one appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, one appointed by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, one appointed by the President of the Senate, and one appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate.

(3) Six at-large members appointed by the Governor as follows:
   (A) one representative of civic leaders;
   (B) one representative of local government;
   (C) one representative of trade unions;
   (D) one representative of nonprofit organizations or foundations;
   (E) one representative of parents' organizations; and
   (F) one education research expert.

(4) Five members appointed by statewide business organizations and business trade associations.

(5) Six members appointed by statewide professional organizations and associations representing pre-kindergarten through grade 20 teachers, community college faculty, and public university faculty.

(6) Two members appointed by associations representing local school administrators and school board members.
(7) One member representing community colleges, appointed by the Illinois Council of Community College Presidents.

(8) One member representing 4-year independent colleges and universities, appointed by a statewide organization representing private institutions of higher learning.

(9) One member representing public 4-year universities, appointed jointly by the university presidents and chancellors.

(10) Ex-officio members from the following State agencies, boards, commissions, and councils:

(A) The State Superintendent of Education or his or her designee.

(B) The Executive Director of the Board of Higher Education or his or her designee.

(C) The President and Chief Executive Officer of the Illinois Community College Board or his or her designee.

(D) The Executive Director of the Illinois Student Assistance Commission or his or her designee.

(E) The Co-chairpersons of the Illinois Workforce Investment Board or their designee.

(F) The Director of Commerce and Economic Opportunity or his or her designee.

(G) The Chairperson of the Illinois Early Learning
Council or his or her designee.

(H) The President of the Illinois Mathematics and Science Academy or his or her designee.

Ex-officio members shall have no vote on the Illinois P-20 Council.

Appointed members shall serve for staggered terms expiring on July 1 of the first, second, or third calendar year following their appointments or until their successors are appointed and have qualified. Staggered terms shall be determined by lot at the organizing meeting of the Illinois P-20 Council.

Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner as original appointments, and any member so appointed shall serve during the remainder of the term for which the vacancy occurred.

(c) The Illinois P-20 Council shall be funded through State appropriations to support staff activities, research, data-collection, and dissemination. The Illinois P-20 Council shall be staffed by the Office of the Governor, in coordination with relevant State agencies, boards, and commissions. The Illinois Education Research Council shall provide research and coordinate research collection activities for the Illinois P-20 Council.

(d) The Illinois P-20 Council shall have all of the following duties:

(1) To make recommendations to do all of the following:

(A) Coordinate pre-kindergarten through grade 20
(graduate school) education in this State through working at the intersections of educational systems to promote collaborative infrastructure.

(B) Coordinate and leverage strategies, actions, legislation, policies, and resources of all stakeholders to support fundamental and lasting improvement in this State's public schools, community colleges, and universities.

(C) Better align the high school curriculum with postsecondary expectations.

(D) Better align assessments across all levels of education.

(E) Reduce the need for students entering institutions of higher education to take remedial courses.

(F) Smooth the transition from high school to college.

(G) Improve high school and college graduation rates.

(H) Improve the rigor and relevance of academic standards for college and workforce readiness.

(I) Better align college and university teaching programs with the needs of Illinois schools.

(2) To advise the Governor, the General Assembly, the State's education and higher education agencies, and the State's workforce and economic development boards and
agencies on policies related to lifelong learning for Illinois students and families.

(3) To articulate a framework for systemic educational improvement that will enable every student to meet or exceed Illinois learning standards and be well-prepared to succeed in the workforce and community.

(4) To provide an estimated fiscal impact for implementation of all Council recommendations.

(e) The chairperson of the Illinois P-20 Council may authorize the creation of working groups focusing on areas of interest to Illinois educational and workforce development, including without limitation the following areas:

(1) Preparation, recruitment, and certification of highly qualified teachers.

(2) Mentoring and induction of highly qualified teachers.

(3) The diversity of highly qualified teachers.

(4) Funding for highly qualified teachers, including developing a strategic and collaborative plan to seek federal and private grants to support initiatives targeting teacher preparation and its impact on student achievement.

(5) Highly effective administrators.

(6) Illinois birth through age 3 education, pre-kindergarten, and early childhood education.

(7) The assessment, alignment, outreach, and network
of college and workforce readiness efforts.

(8) Alternative routes to college access.

(9) Research data and accountability.

The chairperson of the Illinois P-20 Council may designate Council members to serve as working group chairpersons. Working groups may invite organizations and individuals representing pre-kindergarten through grade 20 interests to participate in discussions, data collection, and dissemination.

(110 ILCS 205/9.10 rep.)

Section 10. The Board of Higher Education Act is amended by repealing Section 9.10.
Organization Chart
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Data, Assessment, and Accountability Committee
Common Core Aligned Math Sample Assessment Items
The following graph represents the path of a football punted by Bart Bigfoot. The x-axis is the number of seconds and the y-axis is the height of the ball in feet. Use the graph to answer the following questions.

1. How high off the ground is the ball when he kicks it?
2. What is the hang time of the punt? (How long is it in the air).
3. How high is the punt at point A?
4. Why is the slope of the line between 0 and 1 seconds steeper than between 1 and 2 seconds?
5. How long does it take the punt to get to its maximum height?
6. How high is the ball 5 seconds after it is kicked?
7. Estimate how far the punt will go.

If Bart kicks the ball 60 yards with a hang time of 5.3 seconds, draw a graph that charts the distance traveled each second from the time the ball was punted.
FLY OR DRIVE

56NUMBMS/HS

Frank Fenway has convinced his grandfather to travel from Chicago to Boston to see the White Sox play the Red Sox. Here is what he has been able to discover.

a. Distance from Chicago to Boston is 1011 miles
b. The national average for the price of gas is $4.10 per gallon
c. Air fare is $434 round trip
d. The average speed limit between Boston and Chicago is 60 miles per hour

1. What other information does Frank need to calculate if it is cheaper to fly or to drive to Boston?

2. Calculate the cost per mile to fly and to drive based on the information you have in points a to b above.

3. If Frank’s mom and dad joined them would it be cheaper to fly or drive?
Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oil Changes Per Year</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost Of Repairs (dollars)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Graph the data and labels your axis.

2. Graph a line that most closely fits the data points.

3. What does the y intercept represent?

4. What does the x intercept represent?

5. If you got 9 oil changes per year, how much would you expect to pay in engine repairs?

6. If another data point of 7 oil changes with $1500 repair costs is added to the graph, how would the new point effect the line you drew?

7. Make a general statement about the relationship between oil changes and the cost of engine repair.

REFRIGERATOR

Molly Cule is buying a new refrigerator. Model F costs $1800 initially and is estimated to use 420 kilowatt-hours of electricity each year. Model G costs $1700 and the estimated kilowatt usage is not known. Electricity costs $0.10 per kilowatt-hour.

1) To the nearest dollar, what will be the total cost of buying and using Model F for two years?
   (A) 1800  (B) 1842  (C) 1858  (D) 1884  (E) 1912

2) For Model G, which of the following estimated usages of kilowatt hours per year will make the total cost of buying and using the refrigerator between $1980 and $2020 over a period of 6 years? (There may be more than one correct answer.)
   (A) 420  (B) 460  (C) 480  (D) 520  (E) 550

3) If the estimated kilowatt-hours per year for Model G is 550, after how many years will the total cost for buying and using Model G be equal to the total cost for Model F? (Enter your answer to the nearest tenth of a year.)
CONCESSION STAND

Pete Zah and Candy Barr sell concessions during the Crystal Lake Raiders Home games. The table below charts their sales for the first five games. Use this information to answer the questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Popcorn</th>
<th>Pizza</th>
<th>Nachos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>320 bags</td>
<td>389 slices</td>
<td>417 orders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>462 bags</td>
<td>549 slices</td>
<td>399 orders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3</td>
<td>457 bags</td>
<td>534 slices</td>
<td>530 orders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 4</td>
<td>398 bags</td>
<td>653 slices</td>
<td>520 orders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. During the first four games which day had the highest attendance? Justify your answer based on the data given.
2. Based on the data given predict how much of each item will be sold for the fifth game. Explain how you arrived at this conclusion.
3. Construct a graph using the data chart above and include game five calculations from question 2.

COIN PYRAMID
G24ModHS

Benny likes to stack coins in the shape of a 3-sided pyramid. Below is a top-view of his stacks of coins.

1. If Benny builds a pyramid 6 levels high, how many coins would be on the bottom level?
2. If Benny has 140 coins, how tall will his pyramid be? Give your answer as the number levels of coins it would contain.
3. Benny uses the remaining coins to complete a second smaller pyramid. Of the coins he has left from the second pyramid, he constructs a third pyramid. If he continues in this way, how many pyramids will he create?
BOX PLOTS
CS – S.ID.3
PS – 3

The following represent box plots displaying information on the employee wages for five small businesses.

1. Identify the box plot that most closely represents the following statement: At our business, the pay starts out very low, but steadily increases based on number of years that employees have worked here.

2. Identify the box plot that most closely represents the following statement: Everyone at our company makes about the same amount, except the new hire who makes significantly less.

3. Choose one of the remaining box plots and construct a situation that is modeled by the box plot you chose.
1. The wind turbines in the picture have a length of 200 feet. Each blade makes a rotation every five seconds. Calculate the tip speed of one of the blades. (Tip speed is how fast the outer point of the blade is moving in miles per hour).

2. If the length of the blade is reduced by 20% and the wind speed stays the same, would the blades rotate faster or slower? Why?

3. If the length of the blades are increased by 20% and the period of rotation is still 5 seconds, what is the new tip speed?

*Three-blade wind turbines are most efficient when the ratio of the speed of the rotor tip to the wind speed is approximately 7.*

4. Assuming the massive wind turbines you see driving in Illinois are efficiently designed, and as you are driving, you hear that the wind is 20 mph. Explain how you would calculate the length of one of the blades.

5. You hear that the wind speed is increasing with sustained gusts of up to 30 mph, but it appears that the blades are not rotating any faster. What can you conclude.

6. With efficient turbines, the ratio of wind speed to wind energy produced is cubed. In other words, doubling wind speed increases wind energy production by eight times! Assuming the wind turbine in question 1 was efficiently designed for all wind speeds, graph the energy production or the turbine for every 10 mile an hour increase from 20 to 150 mph?
AND THE WINNER IS  
G23StatMS

**Math Practices:** Reason Abstractly and Quantitatively & Construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others.

Four classes took the same test which had 100 points. An A was 90 to 100, B 80 – 89, C 70 79, D 60 – 69 and F 50 -59.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class 1</th>
<th>Class 2</th>
<th>Class 3</th>
<th>Class 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. What is the mean, median, mode and range for each class?

2. In Class 1 and Class 2, the teacher found that the individual with the highest score cheated! In Class 1, the teacher gives the student a zero. In Class 2, the teacher gives the student an F (50). What are the new mean, median, mode and range for Class 1 and 2.

3. In Class 4, describe what would happen if the person with the top score got caught cheating and the teacher assigned an F.

4. Graph the data.

5. Only one class gets a pizza party for performing best on the test. You are in Class 1. After analyzing the data, what reasons could you give for Class 1 earning the reward. (Extended Response)

6. Use the data to make a case for which class did the best.

7. Create a graph that makes the case for which class did the best.
Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Joint Work Group Recommendations

(Data, Assessment, and Accountability Committee and School, College, and Career Readiness Committee)
Policy Framework for Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness
January 2013

The Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness (PWR) Committee is a joint committee established by Illinois’ P-20 Council to combine the efforts of the Subcommittees on College and Career Readiness and Data, Assessment, and Accountability. It comprises agencies, education stakeholders, and community and business leaders from across the state.

Too many Illinois students who graduate high school are not “college and career ready.” As a result, they must enroll in remedial classes, thereby delaying them from taking credit-bearing classes and making it significantly more likely that they will drop out before completing postsecondary. In addition, careers today require a more sophisticated set of skills. To increase the number of students ready for “college and career,” Illinois must provide students with clearer, more consistent expectations and a wider array of high-quality, relevant, and realistic course and work-based learning options. They also require more effective support as they move through their education and transition to their chosen career.

The PWR Committee’s mission is to increase students' opportunities for success in college and career by developing indicators and recommending policies to tighten and support transitions across the P-20 spectrum. To these ends, the Committee has examined existing and impending college and career readiness initiatives around the state, as well as identified common barriers to student success.

To support the P-20 Council’s goal of increasing “the proportion of adults in Illinois with high-quality degrees and credentials to 60% by the year 2025,” the PWR Committee has developed six “Key Success Factors” to support improved support for students’ transition to postsecondary and the workforce. These Key Success Factors focus on the transitions across the P-20 system from middle school through postsecondary completion and career entry. The PWR Committee has also begun developing a set of specific possible policy options that will be included in a subsequent report.

Key Success Factors for Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness

Key Success Factor #1 - Systemic Approach to Personalized Learning Plans: Help youth and adult learners create a personalized learning plan that will allow them tailor their learning experiences to their areas of interest and career goals.

- Develop a statewide approach to personalized learning plans.
- Help all students begin to developing a personalized learning plan in middle school and use it to help guide them through high school and postsecondary to career.
- Support students in maintaining and adjusting their personalized learning plans as needed as their interests and career goals evolve.
- Provide students with meaningful counseling to help them develop their plans.
**Key Success Factor #2—High School Graduation and Support:** Ensure high school graduation signifies preparation for college and career and provide support so students stay “on-track” to graduate.1

- Ensure high school graduation requirements include student demonstration of readiness for the challenges of college and career.
- Provide students who are having trouble or have fallen behind with the support they need to graduate.
- Provide students with multiple ways to meet graduation requirements and ensure that these options are high quality, tailored to their interests, and allow them to learn relevant skills in realistic settings.

**Key Success Factor #3 - Postsecondary Alignment and Early College Credit:** Ensure that expectations for students are consistent across high school and postsecondary and increase opportunities for students to earn college credit in high school.

- Ensure students graduating from high school are prepared to enroll in postsecondary without remediation.
- Improve remedial options for students who are “at-risk” to fail a credit-bearing course in postsecondary.
- Increase opportunities for students to earn college credit in high school and streamline acceptance of said credit, so that students are further along the road to postsecondary graduation.

**Key Success Factor #4 - Credit Acquisition:** Allow for the development of innovative approaches to earn and transfer high school and postsecondary credit.

- Develop more ways for students to earn credit by demonstrating their knowledge and skills in a given area.
- Ensure that more students have access to high-quality course options and career education tailored to their interests.

**Key Success Factor #5 - Work-Based Learning:**2 Provide students with career exploration opportunities and work-based learning options in middle school, high school, and postsecondary.

- Inform students about a wide variety of career options, work-based learning opportunities, and the paths into and through postsecondary and career.
- Provide students with career exploration opportunities tailored to their areas of interest, as stated in their personalized learning plans.

---

1 A personalized learning plan (PLP) leverages student interests and experiences to help shape course options and career exploration. A PLP is for all students and is entirely separate from an Individualized Education Program, though the two may work in tandem.

2 Work-based learning can include options such as career awareness, career exploration, career preparation, and on-the-job training. For greater detail, see the P-20 Council’s College & Career Readiness Committee’s September 16, 2011 Work-Based Learning Report.
• Support students in their understanding of how postsecondary can provide them with a broader array of career options.
• Create and support statewide work-based learning assessments.
• Incentivize the creation and expansion of work-based learning opportunities for students through direct engagement with employers.

**Key Success Factor #6 - State and Local System Support:** Foster ongoing engagement between schools and business communities and ensure the proper governance structures and funding strategies to support collaboration.
• Develop a funding strategy to implement career education and specialization through the Illinois Pathways program.
• Continue to develop a governance structure to support Illinois Pathways’ ongoing development and implementation.
Educator Licensure Steering Group Recommendations

(Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Committee)
History and Purpose

The Educator Licensure Steering Group was formed by the Illinois P-20 Council at the request of Superintendent Chris Koch to advise the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) and other Illinois policymakers on educator licensure and teacher preparation as a result of changes to the Illinois licensure structure that are included in Public Act 97-0607. The new Illinois licensure structure, which takes effect July 1, 2013, streamlines how teachers are licensed in Illinois, reducing the number of Illinois certifications from 66 to 3 with the opportunity to earn endorsements based on grade span, content area and student population. Illinois will develop new standards for endorsements previously covered by other certificates. The new endorsements will also include implementation of the Common Core, the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards (IPTS), Test of Academic Proficiency, Social-Emotional Learning Standards (SEL), the edTPA, the Elementary and Middle School Content Standards and other initiatives. These changes necessitated a systemic examination of how teachers are identified and prepared in Illinois, in order to ensure that we have coherent recommendations for strategies and practices that will identify and develop a highly-qualified, culturally and linguistically diverse teacher candidate pool who possess the competencies necessary to ensure success for Illinois students.

The Steering Group is comprised of multiple stakeholders including state agencies such as ISBE, the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE), Illinois Community College Board (ICCB), public/private colleges and universities that prepare teachers, districts, local education agencies, professional organizations, unions, field practitioners and policy/advocacy groups.

As a preliminary piece of the work, the Educator Licensure Steering Group also assisted ISBE with convening a meeting of stakeholders in order to recommend options for potential grade span configuration to build on the work of the Elementary and Middle School Advisory Group (EMAG), and the Early Childhood Advisory Group (ECAG). These recommendations were submitted to ISBE on June 8, 2012.  

Following those recommendations, the Educator Licensure Steering Group formed two subcommittees that engaged additional stakeholders in exploring recommendations in two key focus areas: 1) Partnerships and Clinical Experience and 2) Educator Pipeline. These focus
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1 Grade Span Configuration Recommendations can be found at http://www2.illinois.gov/gov/P20/Pages/COMM9.aspx.
areas built on existing reform initiatives locally and nationally and on successes and best practices already in place in Illinois teacher preparation programs.

The Steering Group and subcommittee members reviewed research as well as national and Illinois trends and standards. The Steering Group also conducted surveys of over 2500+ non-tenured teachers, cooperating teachers, school and district administrators and faculty of colleges and universities. The Steering Group held public meetings and webinars to engage stakeholders, discuss findings and draft potential recommendations.

**Key Findings**

Illinois teachers need to be rigorously prepared to address the changing demographics and needs of students in Illinois, as well as the increasing rigor of state and national standards and global competition. While Illinois teacher preparation programs already prepare many high-quality teachers, the implementation of the Common Core, Illinois Professional Teaching Standards, and other reform initiatives significantly raises the bar for both Illinois students and teachers. These initiatives demand that teachers improve content knowledge, pedagogy and the ability to serve an increasingly diverse student population in Illinois. Higher standards for teacher performance in Illinois also mean that teacher preparation programs, districts, and other stakeholders have a key role with setting up aspiring teachers for success.

Research from the field indicates that strong partnerships between preparation programs, districts, and other stakeholders are key to strengthening the rigor and relevance of teacher training. NCATE, in their 2009 *Blue Ribbon Report on Clinical Preparation and Partnerships For Improved Student Learning*, and the 2010 report from the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, *The Clinical Preparation of Teachers: A Policy Brief* recommend strengthening partnerships between programs, districts, and other stakeholders to improve teacher recruitment and preparation, and through program design that is grounded in and well-integrated with clinical practice. This research was also supported by the Steering Group’s survey of 2500+ practitioners and faculty of Illinois teacher preparation programs. They also shared multiple recommendations that aligned with the research on how partnerships between districts, programs, teachers and other partners, could be strengthened to enhance the quality of clinical experiences through clinical practice-centered program design, and improved structures and supports for teacher candidates, school sites, cooperating teachers and faculty supervision.

---
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Illinois must also do more to improve its educator pipeline, including the diversity and quality of future educators and addressing teacher endorsement shortage areas. Higher education costs, current public perception of teachers, lower teacher morale and lower compensation relative to other professions, make teaching careers less desirable for both college students and those changing careers. In addition, while increasing numbers of Illinois students are ethnically, culturally and linguistically diverse, the majority of Illinois educators are overwhelmingly white, female and monolingual. For example, in 2012, 49 percent of the state’s 2.1 million public school students were racially and ethnically diverse while just 16.7 percent of teachers similarly were diverse. Nearly 1 in 4 students in Illinois (22%) speak a language other than English in the home while nearly one out of every 10 students has been designated at one point as an English Language Learner (ELL), an amazing 83% growth over the last 15 years. And while Illinois has made gains in recruiting more racially, culturally and linguistically diverse teachers, more improvements are needed with identification, equity of resources for higher education, preparation, placement, and retention, which are historically lower for minority teachers, and create barriers to the profession.

At the same time, teachers and administrators report wanting more training and support for teaching in diverse schools and supporting the needs of socio-economically, culturally and linguistically diverse learners. Research shows that a diverse teacher workforce trained in culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy positively impacts minority student achievement and can help close the achievement gap.

Development of Key Success Factors and Recommendations for Teacher Identification and Preparation in Illinois

Based on the Educator Licensure Steering Group’s research review, key findings and survey recommendations, the Educator Licensure Steering Group reviewed components of teacher identification and preparation including:

- Partnerships
- Program Design, including clinical experience
- School sites, leadership and cooperating teachers
- Faculty supervision
- Teacher candidate assessment and support
- Building an educator pipeline

This review drove development of consensus Key Success Factors for teacher preparation in Illinois. These Key Success Factors define quality factors that are necessary for development of education policies and practices to address teacher shortage, diversity, and quality of education in Illinois.

---
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a high-quality, diverse teacher candidate pool with the essential competencies necessary for teacher candidate and student success in Illinois.

Based on these Key Success Factors, the Steering Group identified specific recommendations for ISBE to inform rules for teacher licensure and preparation in Illinois based on Public Act 97-0607 as well as drafted additional statewide policy recommendations. These recommendations are intended to:

- Influence adoption of key success factors which enable the development of teachers who can meet the needs of students;
- Encourage systemic and programmatic innovation in Illinois;
- Empower districts, units/programs and other partners and stakeholders to develop solutions to meet local needs;
- Acknowledge the constraints of units/programs, districts and other partners engaged in teacher preparation.

Key Success Factors and Recommendations

**Key Success Factor I**: Partnerships are opportunities for meaningful collaboration among P-12 districts and schools, community colleges, teacher preparation units and programs, other college divisions, local education agencies, unions and other stakeholders to address the needs of future educators, teacher candidates and students. This includes:

i. P-12 districts and schools that are fully engaged in preparing the next generation of teachers.

ii. Units/programs, districts and other partners’ collaboration in the design and supervision of teacher preparation programs, including clinical experience.

iii. Partnerships between P-12 districts, community colleges and 4-year colleges/universities, and among college divisions (e.g. College of Education and College of Arts and Sciences) to support recruitment and retention (e.g. alignment of curriculum between community colleges and teacher preparation programs).

iv. Guidelines for collaboration that build on existing partnerships with clear roles and expectations for the partnership.

**Steering Group Recommendations**

- Partnerships should be the primary vehicle for units/programs, districts and other stakeholders, to demonstrate mutual engagement and collaboration in the implementation and evaluation of the Key Success Factors outlined in this report. This also includes these recommendations:

  i. Units and districts should be required to incorporate partnerships. Partnerships should include P-12 districts, community colleges, other college divisions and 4-year colleges/universities, as appropriate, in the comprehensive design, implementation,
execution and continuous improvement of teacher recruitment and preparation. While units may have multiple district partners for teacher preparation and/or clinical experience, units/programs should be required to engage a minimum of one district partnership that will engage and collaborate in the design, implementation and evaluation of the Success Factors.

ii. Partnerships should be developed at the unit level in order to strategically and coherently leverage partnerships across multiple programs. Units should be required to have an Advisory Committee which includes district partners, community colleges, teachers and other relevant partners.

iii. Partnerships between units/programs, districts, community colleges, and teachers should be required to demonstrate collaboration in the design and supervision of the overall program, including clinical experience.

iv. Partnerships should demonstrate that they have clearly defined roles and expectations for each partner, including a written agreement or Memorandum of Understanding. This also includes evidence of unit/program and district collaboration to identify and provide district information and data that supports program design, implementation and continuous improvement efforts (e.g. district challenges, student population performance, and alignment opportunities).

v. ISBE should engage stakeholders in the development of a rubric which will guide the development and evaluation of Memoranda of Understanding that meet state requirements for those partners a) engaged as primary partners in design and supervision of programs or b) as partners in providing field or clinical experience to teacher candidates.

Key Success Factor II: A rigorous program is designed to increase the competency of teachers to implement research and evidence-based instructional strategies that meet the needs of diverse learners, including those with diverse cultural, linguistic, cognitive, and physical needs. This includes:

i. Program design and partnerships between units/programs, districts and other partners that demonstrate collaboration in designing and delivering clinical experiences that promote development and assessment of the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards and other standards (i.e. Content standards, Social-Emotional Learning Standards, assessed through edTPA) as well as performing the role of a teacher.

ii. Field and clinical experiences that are fully integrated into and supported by coursework that exposes teaching candidates to a wide variety of learning environments, including opportunities to work in diverse schools and with diverse students (e.g., race and ethnicity, socioeconomic status, special education, gifted, English language learners (ELL), etc.)

iii. Teacher candidate engagement in authentic learning experiences that encompass an annual, school-year cycle for students and teachers. An annual, school year cycle includes the regular events and activities of students and teachers that occur during an entire school year in a classroom or school. This includes activities such as setting
up a classroom, implementing classroom norms and routines, proctoring interim and state student assessments, etc.

**Steering Group Recommendations**

- This Success Factor and our recommendations acknowledge that programs are already required to align with the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards, which were adopted in 2010, the Social-Emotional Learning Standards, Content Standards, and assuring that teacher candidates demonstrate proficiency in standards assessed by the edTPA, which will be implemented in 2013 and required for educator licensure by 2015. In addition to these current requirements, the Steering Group also recommends that programs be required to demonstrate evidence of this success factor including:

  i. Units/programs should be required to demonstrate collaboration with districts and other relevant partners in the design and delivery of clinical experiences that incorporate opportunities for teacher candidates to develop all of the required standards including the IPTS, Content Standards, SEL, those assessed by edTPA and in performing the role of a teacher.

  ii. Units/programs should be required to demonstrate that the design of clinical experiences engages teacher candidates in authentic learning experiences that encompass an annual, school-year cycle for students and teachers. Programs should have flexibility in how they design clinical experiences to meet this requirement, and does not require a full-time school year of student teaching.

  iii. Programs should be required to demonstrate that field and clinical experience is fully integrated into and supported by coursework which exposes teaching candidates to a wide variety of learning environments, including opportunities to work in diverse schools and with diverse students (e.g., race and ethnicity, socioeconomic status, special education, gifted, English language learners, gender).

**Additional Policy Recommendations**

- ISBE should continue to monitor program, teacher candidate and student outcomes to ensure that the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards and teacher preparation programs are effectively preparing teacher candidates to address the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse learners.

- Information and data on how programs and districts collaborate to design and deliver clinical learning experiences as well as performance outcomes should be collected in order to be able to disseminate best practices to the field.

⇒ **Success Factor III**: Units/programs have access to school sites, cooperating teachers and faculty supervision that promote a positive learning environment for teacher candidates and students. This includes:
i. District collaboration with units and other partners that directs the optimal staffing, design and structure of clinical experience within schools and classrooms.

ii. Unit and district/school collaboration to identify and select cooperating teachers based on high-quality instructional practices, overall performance and ability to develop adult learners and through engagement with teachers and unions.

iii. Cooperating teachers that are formally trained and have access to a wide variety of supports according to standards that develop efficacy.

iv. Frequent collaboration between faculty supervisors, schools and cooperating teachers to guide effective clinical experiences and interventions.

v. Faculty supervisors who are rigorously selected to ensure they can support the needs of teacher candidates in developing high-quality instructional methods and practices.

vi. Faculty supervisors that are trained and have access to a wide variety of supports that develop efficacy in coaching, assessing and providing support for teacher candidates.

**Steering Group Recommendations**

- Program design and partnerships between units/programs and districts/schools should demonstrate evidence of this Success Factor. This includes:

  i. Partnerships between units and districts should demonstrate evidence of collaboration in developing specific selection criteria and methods for identifying cooperating teachers based on high-quality instructional practices, overall performance and ability to develop adult learners. The selection criteria should include, but is not limited to:
     a. Evidence of high quality instructional practices (as defined by the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards)
     b. Evidence of positive impact on student growth
     c. Minimum 3 years of teaching experience

  ii. Partnerships between units and districts should demonstrate collaboration in providing formal training and supports for cooperating teachers to develop efficacy. This includes, but is not limited to:
     a. Clearly defined expectations for school sites, cooperating teachers and teacher candidates
     b. Assessment of teacher candidates
     c. Providing feedback to teacher candidates
     d. Mentoring skills that are aligned to the Illinois Guidelines for Teacher Mentoring
     e. Program philosophy and curriculum
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iii. Units/programs should be required to demonstrate that they have selection criteria in place for faculty supervisors who are directly supervising teacher candidates during clinical experience. Selection criteria should include, but is not limited to:
   a. Evidence of ability to develop and support teacher candidates
   b. Evidence of strong instructional skills (as defined by the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards)
   c. Previous P-12 teaching experience

iv. Units should collaborate with district partners to ensure consistency between cooperating teachers and faculty supervisors and demonstrate that they have training and supports in place for faculty supervisors to develop efficacy in coaching, assessing and providing support for teacher candidates.

v. Partnerships between units/programs and districts should be required to demonstrate evidence of expectations for faculty supervisors in collaborating with schools and cooperating teachers to guide effective clinical experiences and interventions. This evidence should include the definition and frequency of collaboration expected of all faculty supervisors engaged in supervising clinical experience.

⇒ **Success Factor IV**: Teacher candidates have frequent, meaningful and standards-based assessments, including the use of observations, in order to assess readiness and provide opportunities for meaningful reflection and feedback. This also includes:

   i. Programs and school sites that provide opportunities for engagement in professional learning communities, peer networks and collaboration.
   ii. Unit/program and district collaboration to facilitate cooperating teacher, teacher candidate and faculty supervisor understanding of expectations for teacher performance, including tools used for performance evaluation by districts (e.g. instructional frameworks and student growth models).

**Steering Group Recommendations**

- Program design and partnerships between units/programs and districts/schools should demonstrate evidence of this Success Factor. This includes:

  i. Programs should demonstrate evidence of frequent, meaningful and standards-based assessments throughout the program, including the use of observations, in order to assess readiness and provide opportunities for reflection and meaningful feedback.

  ii. Partnerships between units/programs and districts/schools should be required to provide evidence of opportunities for engagement in professional learning communities, peer networks and collaboration.

  iii. Partnerships between districts and units/programs should demonstrate evidence of cooperating teacher, teacher candidate and clinical faculty supervisor understanding of expectations for teacher performance, including tools used for performance
evaluation used by districts such as instructional frameworks and student growth models (e.g. training on evaluation requirements, requirement for teacher candidates to complete an evaluation, etc.).

Key Success Factor V: Partnerships between the state of Illinois, ISBE, P-12 districts, community colleges, units/programs and other stakeholders develop and implement strategies that support the recruitment, selection, preparation and retention of a highly qualified, culturally and linguistically diverse teacher candidate pool. This also includes:

i. Providing opportunities for early field experiences for teacher candidates to inform career choices.
ii. Developing strategies that educate and guide teacher candidates in identifying career choices which consider trends in job placements and changing student demographics.
iii. Creating a positive and nurturing climate that supports teaching as a noble profession in Illinois.
iv. Providing incentives to attract and retain high-quality and diverse teachers to Illinois.

Steering Group Recommendations

- Units/programs should demonstrate evidence that teacher candidates have opportunities to participate in field experiences prior to or early in the program in order to inform career choices.

Other Policy Recommendations

- The Illinois State Board of Education should improve how it collects and reports educator supply and demand data in order to provide more relevant information to teacher candidates, teachers, districts, programs and others.
- ISBE, P-12 districts, community colleges, units/programs and other stakeholders should be encouraged to develop strategies to educate and guide future educators in identifying education as a career choice and in providing information and data to educate and guide teacher candidates in identifying career choices which consider trends in job placement and changing student demographics.
- Through the P-20 Illinois Pathways Initiative, the Illinois P-20 Council should take a lead role in exploring the launch of the Education Learning Exchange which would enable development of robust partnerships in order to support a highly qualified, diverse pool of future educators along the career pathway from P-12 student to educator.

About the Illinois Learning Exchange

The P-20 Illinois Pathways Initiative aims to improve education, workforce and economic development coordination in an effort to build diverse, effective talent pipelines throughout
the state. Through this initiative, Illinois recently awarded contracts to five Learning Exchanges in Science, Technology, Engineering and Math fields. These STEM Learning Exchanges are developing talent pipelines by providing curricular resources, assessment tools and professional development to support students in career exploration and development.

The current challenges to developing a diverse educator pipeline outlined in our key findings, along with current research, show that career development in middle/high schools is critical to a diverse, high-quality teacher candidate pool. In addition, data also shows that diverse teachers, who often are recruited/placed in hard to staff schools, have higher turnover rates. Engagement of multiple stakeholders and resources at each step of the career pathway from K-12 student to educator are necessary to address these gaps within the challenging context outlined in our key findings.

With the central role that partnerships, including K-12 districts/schools, community colleges, teacher preparation programs and other stakeholders (e.g., unions, Regional Offices of Education, community-based organizations) play at each stage of teacher identification and preparation based on our recommendations, the Learning Exchange could support each step of the career pathway through a coalition between stakeholders to create a meta-partnership of resources and tools using the elements of the Learning Exchange, including professional development, career development resources and curricula, best practices and tools. This would include providing resources and tools to partnerships for education career development in P-12 districts/schools, as well as support for teacher preparation, placement and retention.
### Glossary of Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Committee</td>
<td>A committee appointed by an accredited College of Education or individual program consisting of partners and/or stakeholders who advise the unit or individual program on issues of teacher preparation program design, implementation, supervision, operation, evaluation and continuous improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Experience</td>
<td>Student teaching or internships that provide candidates with an intensive and extensive culminating activity. Candidates are immersed in the learning community and are provided opportunities to develop and demonstrate competence in the professional roles for which they are preparing. (NCATE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperating Teacher</td>
<td>Cooperating teacher means a teacher employed in a public or nonpublic school who is supervising and mentoring a teacher candidate in a clinical placement or teaching internship for the purpose of fulfilling clinical experience requirements of an approved educator preparation program. (NCATE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse Learners</td>
<td>According the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards, diverse learners includes race and ethnicity, socioeconomic status, special education, gifted, English language learners (ELL), sexual orientation, gender, gender identity) (ISBE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse Schools</td>
<td>Diverse schools means schools with specific geographic and/or demographic needs (e.g. rural, urban, serves a substantial portion of low-income students, students of color, English language learners, and/or students with disabilities, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Experience</td>
<td>A variety of early and ongoing field-based opportunities in which candidates may observe, assist, tutor, instruct, and/or conduct research. Field experiences may occur at off-campus settings such as schools, community centers, or homeless shelters. (NCATE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
<td>A written agreement between two partners which clearly outlines the roles and expectations for each partner, how the partnership will operate, and how the partnership will be evaluated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>A partnership is a mutual, written agreement or memorandum of understanding between two or more entities for the purposes of teacher candidate recruitment and/or teacher preparation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>A program is an individual teacher preparation program that leads to a Professional Educator License and specific endorsement (e.g. Early Childhood, Elementary Education, Special Education, etc.). This includes the program administration and faculty, as well as partnerships with districts, schools or others, in the preparation of teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Site</td>
<td>School site means a public or nonpublic school and the school’s leadership team which is involved in the supervision and mentoring of a teacher candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>A unit is the institution or college, school, department, or other administrative body within the institution that is primarily responsible for the initial and continuing preparation of teachers and other education professionals. (ISBE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Educator Licensure Steering Group – Grade Span Configuration Recommendations

(Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Committee)
History and Purpose

As part of overall reform efforts, including Public Act 97-0607, Illinois is reconfiguring the educator licensure system in an effort to simplify and strengthen the process for qualifying educators. In order to ensure that teachers are rigorously prepared to meet the needs of students, Illinois will develop new standards for endorsements previously covered by other certificates in alignment with other state initiatives such as adoption of the Common Core, adoption of the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards (IPTS), and Illinois Social-Emotional standards.

Through the work of the Elementary/Middle School Advisory Group (EMAG) and Early Childhood Advisory group (ECAG), Illinois has been developing new content standards for teachers (based on Common Core, IPTS, and Social/Emotional Standards) and to recommend options for potential grade span configuration. ISBE requested that the Illinois P-20 Council convene a meeting of a wide group of Illinois stakeholders, including districts, higher education, advocacy groups, professional associations, researchers, and others in order to build on that work and advise ISBE on options that will best address the needs of students, educators and administrators.

A one-day meeting was held on June 8, 2012 at the ISBE offices in Springfield. The meeting allowed for public comment period. Minutes from the meeting as well as written comments are posted on the P-20 Council website at: http://www2.illinois.gov/gov/P20/Pages/COMM9.aspx

Impact of Grade Span Configuration

Illinois teachers need to be more rigorously prepared to address the development needs of students, understand the content they are teaching and apply best practices in pedagogy. The new grade span configuration has implications for teacher preparation, district staffing and employment processes, program design and teacher candidate recruitment. These impacts include:

*Content Knowledge and Alignment to the Common Core.* Teachers need increased depth in their knowledge of content and related pedagogy that aligns with the Common Core and with respect to how students learn and apply skills. Potential program length and cost make it prohibitively difficult to provide the wide range of content needed for both self-contained elementary classrooms along with the deeper content specialization required for middle school departmentalization.

*Development Needs.* Students across age spans have unique development needs. There is national recognition of the importance of the developmental continuum from Birth-Age 8 to address the specific needs of young learners which is critical to later school success. Grade span configuration needs to ensure that teachers of early elementary grades have a depth of understanding of early childhood development and developmentally appropriate practices. Likewise, a focus on the developmental needs of middle grade students and early adolescents is also critical to ensure that teachers in all grades can address the needs of students through developmentally appropriate practices.
District Staffing and Employment. Districts and schools will be affected by the new grade span configuration in terms of teacher hiring, reassignment and reductions in force (RIF) requirements due to SB7. Districts need flexibility in attracting and assigning teachers, especially in smaller schools or rural districts. And although current teachers will be grandfathered, it is important that ISBE recognize and monitor the impact of grade span configuration changes on how RIF requirements are applied.

Program Design, Length and Availability. Programs must be designed that can balance the need for rigorous preparation and clinical experiences with what can reasonably be addressed a typical 4-year program. In addition, universities have scarce resources that must be considered. With too much overlap or too narrow specialization, some programs, such early childhood or middle school programs may become less attractive to both universities and students based on trends in student preferences, enrollment and resources/faculty available. This could have an adverse impact on the future availability of highly trained teachers.

Options for Grade Span Configuration

While a consensus for recommendations was not reached at the Illinois P-20 Council Grade Span Configuration meeting, two options are presented that help address these concerns outlined, along with challenges ISBE should recognize in considering rules for implementation.

Grade Span Option 1:

- **Early Childhood**: Birth-Grade 3
- **Elementary**: Grades 2-6
- **Middle School**: Grades 6-8
- **High School**: Grades 9-12

- **Strengths**: Guarantees that the teachers in early grades have strong foundation in early childhood education from Birth-grade 3. Some overlap between Early Childhood, Elementary, Middle School and High School acknowledging the range of diverse developmental and academic needs of students in a given grade. Allows for some flexibility for districts and schools.

- **Challenges**: Too much specialization could have a negative effective on teachers pursuing middle school endorsement reducing the number of those teachers.

Grade Span Option 2:

- **Early Childhood**: Pre-K-Grade 2
- **Elementary**: Grades 1-6
- **Middle School**: Grades 5-8
- **High School**: Grades 8-12

- **Strengths**: Wider range of grades in elementary with more flexibility for programs and districts. Pre-K starting point versus Birth is more reasonable in what can be reasonably covered in a program (even though courses could cover development from Birth-Age 8). Overlap ensures greater knowledge of range of diverse student developmental and academic needs in a given grade. Encourages collaboration between different programs in providing robust coursework within their education programs.

- **Challenges**: Somewhat inconsistent with developmental research which supports continuum from Birth- Age 8 (Grade 3). Overlap of Middle School endorsement for Grade 5 could only be for departmentalized grades. Likewise, Elementary endorsement covering Grade 6 could be for self-contained classrooms only. Significant differences in standards and curriculum between middle school and high school resulting in challenges in preparing teachers adequately for a high school endorsement.
Council Resolutions
Resolution on Longitudinal Data System Governance
Illinois P-20 Council
Longitudinal Data System Resolution

WHEREAS, Public Act 96-0107 provides for the State Education Authorities to develop a P-20 Longitudinal Data System by June 30th, 2013; and

WHEREAS, during 2012, the P-20 Council has worked with the agencies and the Governor’s office to support development of governance that will allow for the completion and long-term viability of this project; and

WHEREAS, the P-20 Council continues to support and encourage the development of the State Longitudinal Data System, including, as declared in Public Act 96-0107, a system and project that:

• Can improve school districts and institutions of higher learning instructional and educational decision-making;
• Ensures that this State bases education policy decisions on valid, objective measures of student outcomes;
• Coordinates efforts of Illinois Early Learning Council to develop recommendations regarding the establishment of a unified data collection system for public early childhood education and development programs and services throughout this State with the Longitudinal Data System; and
• Develops partnerships between State education agencies and entities with expertise in education research, including school districts, institutions of higher learning, and research organizations; and

WHEREAS, the agencies have reported significant progress on this project, including the development of a data warehouse in the K-12 environment; the establishment of a higher education consortium for the purposes of data sharing, research, and analysis; the contracting for the development of unified data collection system for early childhood; and the successful grant application to connect workforce systems; and

WHEREAS, there is a statutory requirement for a report to the P-20 Council and legislative leaders on the objectives of the Longitudinal Data System, ongoing reports should provide status of the objectives outlined in statute including reducing the data collection burden on schools and institutions, providing data and tools that support instruction and continuous improvement, and ensuring that data links occur across the P-20 spectrum, including teacher preparation, early childhood and the workforce; and

WHEREAS, there is value in ongoing coordination with the P-20 Council, Illinois Collaborative for Education Policy Research, and other stakeholders to collaborate on policy questions, implementation, and data access and reporting, and to monitor ongoing progress to achieve and sustain the statutory objectives

WHEREAS, collaboration should continue to support the establishment of a common identifier system, development of systems for storage, analysis, and reporting of cross-agency data, and recommendations for budgeting and staffing; and
WHEREAS, the P-20 Council looks to ensure the development of the data systems necessary to answer critical questions about the education system and provide tools for instructional improvement, appropriate governance, with both agency and non-agency representation, and coordination will be supported and sustained over time; therefore, let it be

RESOLVED, that the P-20 Council urges the State Education Authorities together with the P-20 Council to establish governance and oversight of the Longitudinal Data System and develop legislation to codify the role of governance to promote long-term sustainability, accountability, and legislative support.
Resolution on Lowest Performing Schools
Dear Superintendent Koch,

We write today to call attention to Illinois’ efforts to improve the state’s lowest-performing schools that serve many of our most vulnerable students.

The P-20 Council focused on this important issue during our recent meeting when Advance Illinois Executive Director Robin Steans presented the analysis titled *Improving Our Lowest-Performing Schools, Illinois Progress Report 2011-12*. We discussed the report’s findings and recommendations with an eye toward how Illinois might support additional schools in need. As a council, we wanted to share our thoughts with you and the Illinois State Board of Education.

First and foremost, we commend you and your team for ISBE’s work to improve Illinois’ lowest-performing schools. This is a difficult, demanding undertaking. The state administrators, district leaders and school staff who drive these improvement efforts have our support and our thanks.

These schools face dramatic challenges. Students enrolled in the state’s lowest-performing schools are more likely to live in poverty, arrive to school academically behind and require special education services. For this reason, we believe these schools might require more attention and resources if they are to sustain the improvement over time.

The Council would like to request that ISBE consider the following recommendations:

- **Examine which improvement strategies work effectively in low-performing schools.** If ISBE has not done so already, we strongly encourage the state agency to put in place a formal evaluation of how millions in federal School Improvement Grants have been spent, and to identify the most and the least impactful strategies to inform longer-term change.

- **Share the best practices culled from the initial school improvement efforts.** The strategies developed might benefit other schools that confront similar challenges.

- **Add educators, data analysts and other staff vital to this work.** If ISBE is to effectively engage with struggling schools and districts, they need a dedicated staff with the expertise and ability to do this work.

In closing, we thank you for the time and attention that you are directing to students in our state’s lowest-performing schools. We are confident that comprehensive reforms in these schools can take root if they are supported and sustained over time.

Sincerely,

Miguel del Valle
Chair
Illinois P-20 Council

Dr. Lizanne Destefano
Coordinator, Leadership Committee
Illinois P-20 Council