Illinois State Board of Education  
Innovations and Improvements Division

CCOP Meeting  
September 23, 2010  
Springfield, Crowne Plaza

Chair: Larry McVey     Secretary: Ava Harston     ISBE Consultant: Cheryl Ivy

MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Chairman Larry McVey. Roll call was taken with a quorum established.

Members Present: Lynn Childs, Shirley Fowlkes, Bernadette Anderson, Patrisha Viniard, Larry McVey, Darryl Morrison, Judith Green, Joyce McEwen, Pat Walkup, Judith Johnson (10 present)

Proxy: Nancy Christesen, Ava Harston, Barb Vlasvich, Cynthia Garcia, Christianne Darsh, Joanne Planek, John Palan, Brenda Jones (8 proxies)

Members Absent: Leotis Swopes, Donna Boros, Jeff Fritchtnitch, Kayleen Irizarry, Jackie Daniels, Grover Webb, Sheba Seif (7 absent)

ISBE Staff: Monique Chism, Cheryl Ivy, Marcie Johnson, Melina Wright, Marti Woelfle (5 present)

Visitors: Chris Hampsey, Assistant Principal Lincoln Magnet School

1. Minutes were presented by Chair McVey, with a move to approve made by Shirley Pearson-Fowlkes and second made by Joyce McEwan. Minutes were approved by membership.

2. Introductions of ISBE staff in attendance was completed by Cheryl Ivy.

3. CCOP By-Laws: Chair McVey began a review of CCOP By-Laws:
   a. Read Mission Statement and Purpose – All agreed to statements with no discussion

   b. Reviewed Article II: Membership with following discussion regarding attendance/participation:
      • It was noted that it is sometimes hard to get away from the office and that administrators must often prioritize travel time. Some wondered if meetings could be held by conference calls.
      • It was noted that federal law requires 3-4 regular meetings on site, but that additional meetings between regularly scheduled meetings could be called electronically.
• It was recommended that an email be sent in advance of the electronic meeting so that the time could be reserved by members in their daily schedule.
• It was suggested that a conference call /electronic meeting would have been helpful as ISBE worked on the SIP (103 (g)) grant.
• It was noted that attendance at CCOP is important because the ideas generated through group discussion is helpful to all concerned.
• The possibility of using ISBE’s V-Tel Room for CCOP meetings was discussed. It was suggested that future meetings for the 2010-2011 school year be held in the V-Tel room if available on that date but that beginning with the 2011-2012 school year, all meetings (with exception of February meeting in Chicago) will utilize the V-Tel Room in order to ensure participation from a greater number of members.

c. Reviewed Article III: Terms of Membership and Communication
• Bylaws indicate that members may be replaced when fail to attend or send proxy for two consecutive meetings.
• Noted that bylaws allows for a process to remove members from CCOP who fail to attend.
• A chart has been developed that tracks member attendance at CCOP meetings. It was suggested that this chart be updated to include the most recent meeting and that ISBE staff would then contact members who have failed to attend to determine continued interest in membership. (Cheryl Ivy to call and determine level of interest an commitment, and then a letter would be sent thanking those who “resign” under the signature of the Division Administrator.
• It was suggested that the most recent copy of the bylaws be sent electronically to all CCOP members for their review. Continued review and revision of the bylaws will be on the agenda for the next meeting.
• It was suggested that CCOP minutes be posted on the website.

d. Reviewed Communication of CCOP between ISBE and Field:
• In the past, minutes of CCOP meetings were typed and sent to ISBE contact, who then forwarded with meeting date reminder about 2-4 weeks in advance of each meeting.
• Some alternative suggestions for distribution of minutes was discussed:
  a. CCOP minutes could be posted on the ISBE website.
  b. CCOP minutes could be posted on the “Members Only” portion of the IATD website.
  c. Cheryl Ivy indicated that she would send minutes to all CCOP members as soon as she receives them from the CCOP Secretary.

e. ISBE staff discussed the role of CCOP:
• While the purpose of CCOP is to provide input and support to ISBE – it was noted that CCOP needs to facilitate communication between the field and ISBE. Members in CCOP are to be representative of their groups or districts within their geographical area – which will include getting input from them on various issues.
• It was noted that it is not the role of CCOP to share the information gained at the meetings, but any information that needs to be disbursed must be done by ISBE
through appropriate channels. CCOP members are unable to ensure information
would reach all districts and schools across the state.
• CCOP members will take new information learned and share with colleagues to
ensure they are able to report back comprehensive impact of the issues concerned –
especially when there are areas of confusion or frustration in the field.
• CCOP members typically have input into the agenda prior to each meeting.
  Solicitation of agenda items is secured electronically.
• CCOP members wanted to know how this body could better serve ISBE. The
  Monique indicated that communication is vital and that membership could help by
  communicating when there are matters of concern across the state regarding NCLB.
• It was noted that district superintendents need to know more about NCLB/Title I (not
  a cash cow!). Monique suggested that we make a stronger push to invite
  Superintendents to the Fall Conference.
• It was suggested that the State Superintendent announce and recommend the Fall
  Conference, and perhaps include information about CCOP in the Weekly Newsletter.
• It was suggested that the minutes of CCOP be placed on the “Members Only”
  portion of the IATD website.
• It was also noted that CCOP must comply with the Open Meetings Act – advertising
  the meeting and agenda in advance as required by law. (not certain what actual law
  indicates)

4. **Agency Update / Brainstorming – School Improvement Grant 1003 (g)**
   a. **SIP 1003 (g) 2010-2011**
      • $146.6 million available for 2010-2011 (Regular and ARRA funds)
      • Designated for lowest performing schools (Tier I and Tier II).
      • Currently 100 schools in Tier I or Tier II.
      • Awards range from $50,000-$2,000,000 per year – contingent upon progress.
      • District must select one of 4 models for school intervention
         • Turnaround model
         • Restart model
         • School closure
         • Transformation model
      • Timeline:
         a. December, 2009: ISBE started with draft RFP from USDE
         b. March, 2010: ISBE began working with Tier I and Tier II identified schools,
            using USDE’s draft RFP. Sixteen (16) districts were invited to apply.
         c. March, 2010: submitted RFP to USDE including the draft RFP from ISBE
         d. June, 2010: SIP 1003 (g) RFP from USDE finalized
         e. Had to re-submit grant to USDE six (6) times
            • Unclear expectations from USDE regarding planning time for LEA.
              USDE did not allow for any planning time.
            • Required grammatical changes (changing “i.e.” to “ex.”)
         f. June 14, 2010: official RFP from ISBE sent to districts
            • Districts had 30 days to complete and submit RFP
         g. July, 2010: Review process in layers
h. August, 2010: Announced awardees (5 districts: Chicago, Thornton, Peoria, DePue, Egyptian / 10 schools)

i. Approximately $100 million available to roll over to 2011-2012

j. NOTE: CCOP members questioned the process used to notify eligible districts of this grant. ISBE sent letters of invitation to the identified schools, had face-to-face group meetings, had webinars, and provided individual technical assistance as requested.

b. SIP 1003 (g) 2011-2012

- Anticipate approximately $100 million for distribution (with carryover)
- State must re-apply to USDE for funds – even though formula-funded grant
- New application to be posted from USDE within next 2 weeks
- USDE expectation is that ISBE will apply, be approved in manner to award grants to districts in January, 2011 – for implementation in 2011-2012.

 NOTE: Considerable discussion of the need for increased technical support for these targeted districts – as they often have a difficult time with the process needed to identify needs and potential solutions.
- Discussion continued over need to provide follow-up to districts who applied for the last round unsuccessfully, and to eligible districts who failed to apply. ISBE noted that all but one of the unsuccessful districts had requested Readers Comments.
- It was noted that the Readers Comments were too generic and needed to contain greater detail and that ISBE needed to automatically send the Comments to all unsuccessful districts. Discussion included need for Scoring Rubric in RFP to include explanations with a deeper understanding and clarity of what ISBE is looking for within the indicators.
- As a competitive grant, there is not an appeals process for unsuccessful districts.

c. Technical support provided to eligible districts included

a. a meeting with training from Mass Insight on how to select Lead and Supporting Partners.

b. Bidder webinar

c. Needs assessment document and training

d. Center for Innovation and Improvement held separate webinars for each Lead Partner on the ISBE approved list.

e. ISBE provided districts with access to a variety of electronic resources including handbook, video, and a Frequently Asked Questions document

f. ISBE consultants provided personal support through question and answers

d. Lead Partners for SIP 1003 (g)

- ISBE maintains list of approved Lead and Supporting Partner vendors
- District must select at least one Lead Partner and may select an additional Supporting Partner.
- Lead Partner to maintain representative on site in the school every day.
- If local district wishes to use a partner not on the approved list then the district and vendor can make application to ISBE for approval.
- Discussion ensued regarding lack of real options within selection of Lead and Supporting Partners due to:
a. Lead Partners that restricted their participation by geography (Chicago only)
b. Lead Partners that had served as partners in Comprehensive School Reform with minimal / average success (lacked rigor needed for level of change and improvement required)
c. Some potential Lead Partners were unable to find the RFP for application as an approved vendor on the ISBE website.

- Question was raised as to what ISBE sees in the future for Lead Partners. Will they be used to “take over” schools when local districts are unable to make the necessary changes (especially in metropolitan areas of significant need)? ISBE indicated that:
  a. Federal law requires the option of a state “take over” when a local district fails to make the necessary improvements.
  b. ISBE does not currently have the capacity to “take over” a district.
  c. Early this year a local district was ready to relinquish district management to ISBE, and discussion included the possible use of a Lead Partner as a potential way to increase State capacity to work with lower performing schools and districts. Discussions in this specific case yielded other alternatives for the district to pursue at this time.

- Plans to provide more effective recruitment of Lead and Supporting Partners was discussed – with an attempt to provide a greater window for application and making the RFP for Lead and Supporting Partners more easily available on the ISBE website.

**e. Evaluation of SIP 1003 (g)**

- ISBE will provide a monthly check-in with the Lead and Supporting Partners
- ISBE identified 9 leading indicators to evaluate success (found on website)
  a. Number of minutes within the school year
  b. Student participation rate on ISAT or PSAE in reading/language arts, and in mathematics, by student subgroup;
  c. Dropout rate;
  d. Student attendance rate;
  e. Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes;
  f. Discipline incidents;
  g. Truants;
  h. Distribution of teachers by performance level on the LEA’s teacher evaluation system; and
  i. Teacher attendance rate.

- ISBE required qualitative and quantitative response to above indicators.
- ISBE will issue an RFP for an outside evaluator for the Lead and Supporting Partners program.
- USDE will also provide an evaluation of the Lead and Supporting Partners.

**f. MISC re SIP 1003 (g)**

- Discussion between CCOP member who applied for SIP 1003 (g) and a CCOP member who served as a reader for the grants reflected that the Scoring rubric and the Readers Comments did not appear to align with the grant. Readers comments were often general and repetitive.
• Grant does require community engagement.
  • It was noted that it is important for the local district to involve the union/association from the very beginning and to include representation throughout the entire process.
    a. Difficult to get unions/associations to sign-off on the grant.
    b. Some signed-off, but indicated grant approval would require renegotiations.
    c. Suggested possibility of having districts with union support provide presentations at the next initial orientation meeting for new round of funding. Perhaps offering SIP 1003 (g) guidelines in the morning with a panel of previously funded applicants in the afternoon.
• ISBE met with each of the approved applicants in the approved district – meeting included district administration, union/association representation, teachers and representatives from the community.
• ISBE questioned whether the RFP was clear and did it support the thinking process for model selection. Discussion reflected that RFP was “OK”.
• ISBE noted that district level of capacity and commitment were key factors in the selection process. Many of the districts were unable to identify their problems or propose any solutions.
• Review current SIP 1003 (g) and send any comments or recommendations for change to Marti Woelfle and Cheryl Ivy by Friday, October 1, 2010.

5. Agency Update / Brainstorming – Race to the Top
   a. ISBE has applied for both rounds of Race to the Top funding, unsuccessfully.
   b. Readers’ Comments from USDE indicted areas of weakness as:
      • only 48.5% of local districts signed on to the RFP (required minimum of 50%?)
      • a lack of clarity of description details (but were required to maintain page limits)
   c. Different readers scored Round 1 and Round 2. Areas that Round 1 readers scored high, were scored low on the second round.
   d. Outreach for Race to Top to local districts was channeled through ROEs.
   e. Discussion revealed that the diversity of ROE strengths and expertise does not establish them as a good distribution source for information (at least as they are currently structured).
   f. Suggested that information provided through ROEs should include a deadline for distribution with a return response required to ISBE by an second deadline.
   g. General consensus was that Race to the Top was not as well publicized as the School Improvement Grant 1003 (g).
   h. It was noted that there was a collective feeling of relief across the state when IL was not awarded the grant. This was believed to be a sign that many did not really know or understand the purpose of the grant, and were afraid of the increased paperwork and reporting responsibilities associated with the grant.
   i. However, general discussion reflected the belief that some of the ideas in the Race to the Top grant are good and that ISBE needs to implement them anyway – working to prepare staff, unions/associations, and parents for the changes that will be coming.
   j. Discussion reflected a need for ISBE to provide general direction and technical support to districts that initiate a change to the National Evaluation Instrument.
   k. Round 3 funding for Race to the Top may or may not be offered depending upon federal budget constrictions and changes within reauthorization. (New round rumored to be competitive for states and will include district applications at the federal level.)
6. **Agency Update / Brainstorming – Reauthorization Update**
   a. Federal level is currently working on language.
   b. Democrats will not release language until they have ensured votes for passage.
   c. Some highly controversial items that were previously included in the language has since been taken off the table – such as formula funding for early childhood.
   d. The four school intervention models may not be the focus of reauthorization - which may increase the list of options and allow districts to select from a menu of “turnaround choices”.
   e. There have been 171 different bills sent to Congress regarding reauthorization – with an increase number of the proposed grants based on competitive funding (instead of categorical).
   f. Title I will probably remain as a formula based, categorical grant.
   g. Trend is that the bar is being raised higher and the ability to meet the bar will require dramatic shifts in how we do business.
   h. Best guess for final reauthorization is Summer, 2011.

7. **New Business**
   a. Slate of officers for 2010-2011 was presented and approved as follows:
      - Chair Elect: Bernadette Anderson
      - Secretary Elect: Trish Viniard
      - Judith Johnson approved, Shirley Fowlkes seconded and membership approved.
   b. Rising Star is a new initiative adopted by ISBE.
      - Based on research of Dr. Sam Redding
      - Has been used in 6 different states (statewide in Virginia?) with significant results
      - To be used by Statewide System of Support as they streamline their focus to be specific to targeted schools.
      - Is based on indicators of effectiveness instead of the deficit model which focuses on areas of need.
      - Engages schools in conversations on effective practices.
      - Discussion noted the need for strong consultants to make Rising Star successful – and that the consultants in many ROEs, RESPROs, etc. lack the skills necessary to bring rigor to the conversation.
      - ISBE will bring 200 Rising Star coaches together for training at least 4 times per year.
      - Districts will use building teams to meet with RESPRO Rising Star staff on a weekly basis.
   c. Use of V-Tel to increase participation in CCOP
      - Not available for next meeting (December 1st)
      - Will not be used for February meeting in conjunction with NCLB Conference in Chicago
      - Will be used for rest of meetings this year when room is available.
      - Will be used for all meetings in 2011-2012 (except for February meeting in conjunction with NCLB conference in Chicago).
      - NOTE for future reference: the IATD Annual Fall Conference will be September 21-22, 2011. Carol Tomlinson (differentiation) and Rita Pierson (diversity and achievement gap) will be the keynote speakers.
   d. Next meeting will be December 1, 2010 at Crowne Plaza.
      - Tentative agenda:
Continued review of bylaws
USDE Monitoring Report
Reauthorization update (Rich Long)
Update of progress of SIG 1003 (g)
Rising Star

- Copies of bylaws will be sent to all members for the purpose of review prior to the next meeting.
- Any proposed items for the agenda will be sent to Cheryl Ivy before November 1, 2010.
- Review current SIP 1003 (g) and send any comments or recommendations for change to Marti Woelfle and Cheryl Ivy by Friday, October 1, 2010.
- Recommend we have conference call with Dr. Richard Long (International Reading Association, National Title I Directors) at next meeting.

Daryl Morrison moved to adjourn, Bernadette Anderson seconded – membership approved.

Respectfully Submitted by Lynn Childs, Substitute Secretary