Illinois State Board of Education
Consolidated Committee of Practitioners
ISBE Video-Conferencing
November 30, 2011

Call to Order Bernadette Anderson, Chair - 10:18 AM

Roll Call
Proxy: Jackie Daniels, Judith Green, Joanne Planek, Patricia Sullivan Viniard, Leotis Swopes
Not attending with notice: Joyce McEwen
Absent: Ricardo Johnson and Kimberly Thomas

Springfield – Darryl Morrison, Judith Johnson, Bernadette Anderson, Donna Boros, Sandra Duckworth, Lynn Childs, Cynthia Garcia, Mary Ann Manos, Larry McVey, Karen Meucci
ISBE staff: Melina Wright
Chicago - Daniel Tully, Nancy Christensen, Yolanda Coleman, Shirley Fowlkes, Ava Harston, Vinest Steele; ISBE Staff Cheryl Ivy
Resigned: Jeff Fritchtnitch,

Quorum Present

Minutes September 20, 2011 CCOP Meeting
Motion to Approve - Lynn Childs
Vinenst Steele - Second
Minutes Approved

Discussion with Richard Long – Title I Reauthorization Updates
Funding as it relates to Elementary Education
· Funding for current fiscal year 12 – there is no spending yet
· Funding cap runs out December 16th Congress will have to act
· Debate now amongst House members - Tea party want to lower overall spending level of annually appropriated funds
· Democrats want to keep the same funding but not really - they want an increase within the funding for emergencies e.g. floods which have been expensive
· Cut of 15.5% when Congress appropriates money so planning can occur – put additional funds by advancing funding e.g. Title I is forward funded - money is to be spent in next fiscal year
· This means making decisions now to fund in the future
· Oct 1st very specific language was to cut 1.5% which means roughly $330 million dollars. USDE has changed position and feels congress can put that money back in but the likelihood is small, the pot is only so big and will provide funding for everything but entitlements
· Senate wants to appropriate spending plan for Education overall
· House sent the Senate proposals to level funds for Title I and put money in for RttT’s and i3
· Obama administration believes Title I funds are important but not vehicles for change
· USDE views their ideas of RttT’s as an example of the fundamental way to effect change thru
competition as the funding between states that won is significantly different
• Funding will be hard to come by thru FY 15
• House of Representatives do not like Obama’s education initiatives
• Federal role is an important ideological way of appropriating funds
• House proposes increased funding by not funding RttT’s in neighborhoods and prefer the money to go directly to their districts
• Title I receives support because it goes to most districts
• Fed role is incredibly important to House Republicans who want the states and locals to make their own education decisions, they have not worked out flexibility issues
• FY 13 funding – Super committee failed to come up with plan to reduce spending by more than $1 trillion
• Projected $4 trillion over next 4 years – expecting growth of 60% of all overall Fed spending due to Super committee’s failure
• Automatic sequestration of 10% to Defense and 85% to nondefense like Title I, cut of 8% will hit big programs – 70% of funding is IDEA, Title I and Pell
• Automatic sequestration will not be impacted until after Nov 12 elections which is FY 13

**ESEA Reauthorization**
• Senate Reauthorization committee passed a bill Sen. Harkin mentioned discussing some of House ideas as amendments
• Committee accepted 23 amendments but it will take time to get Reauthorization done especially with the Title I Formula
• Formula fights are blood on the floor
• More emphasis has been placed in Title I eligible districts
• Increase in rural poverty have caused inequities
• Formula change causes winners and losers
• House Republicans and Democrats will try to make it equal
• SIG increase in state decision making – higher requirements will increase because of bottom 5% mandated to highly prescriptive rules by the Feds
• Continuation of NCLB requirements is an issue
• College and Career Readiness - 44 states have Common Core Standards, the states do not have to use those specific standards, these are just guidelines
• RttT’s can be put in Innovation fund and secondary act is being talked about
• Accountability – no longer suffering by schools that did not make AYP would be required by bottom 5% implications if changed
• ELL and Special Education groups are concerned – want to think about how to look at the unbalance
• NEA put out a 3 page memo on areas of concern and mixed opinions and significant changes that need to be made
· The House is where they have been for months, trying to figure out the Federal role of How and What Feds should be doing
· Providing funds for teachers is okay but no agreement on what disciplines the money should go to – teacher improvement vs. IDEA has to be spent specifically trying to find a way not to LOCK districts into requirements

Bills Passed
· Reduction in Federal programs – last year’s programs
· Bipartisan charter schools bills
· Partisan vote passed a flexibility bill allowing money OUT of Title I to other areas of ESEA
  Democrats are against this
· Under consideration – 4 or 5 separate bills
· College and Career Readings and Principle Evaluations are agreed to

Language under consideration
· Historically the Teach bill is talked about in ESEA but actual funding levels are highly restricted
· Accountability issues are at hub of things – House has not weighed in yet
· NCLB issues e.g. 30% of funds being stripped in the process
· President is essentially making “finding new ways to get around” overt concurrence
· November 2011 and February 2012 waiver applications due
· Congressional review of Peer Review- Fed Government feels there are 4 methods of school reform
· Senate expanded to say a state can draft their own plan BUT how do you get that approved
· Will have people from State agencies to review the state agency waiver request

Other Issues
· Plans for new office of Early Childhood and Secondary Education
· Large number of programs for HHS need a link between EC programs and connection to Elementary schools they will be entering
· NAEYP results showed modest progress on achievement Gap not doing as well as Feds want to see it. Urban results due out Dec 7th
· Look at PISA results which show a lot of writing regarding working with high poverty kids
· Example is that US is not doing any better or worse over last 50 years
· Ontario, Canada and Singapore are doing a lot more wit accountability and flexibility on instruction
· Center for Progress reports adoption of CCS but states do not have the funding to fully implement those standards
· Ideas related to CCS and Title I are significantly different
· Looking ahead - look at USDA websites
• See Title I website for annual meeting next year **Jan 21-24, 2012 Seattle**

**Questions**

What is PISA?
Performance Indicators of Student Achievement - high poverty students
What kind of changes if they change funding?
There is some discussion about going back to low income and low achievement and changing balance of Urban and Rural as growth in voting power of Spanish speaking community are having rural implication. Voting Blocks have changed and with the Peer Review process the Feds decided to take nominations from their staff and external community.

• Likelihood of reauthorization before the 2012 election is low.

• Important that people writing these proposals are still going to be there in 2013

**How much are states investing in waiver process thinking reauthorization may occur?**
Rumor – Administration encouraging leadership in Senate not to go to the vote so waivers can run their course – not surprising Feds have a plan because if states go through a waiver process and reauthorization occurs it will be a mess.

**Any sense of 11 states that applied how radical and are the reforms?**
Richard sated he hasn’t read them. Suggestion to look at for Center for Education website.

**Right now there is concern with November timeline and submitting in February when will the waivers be approved is it Sept. 12?**
• Richard doesn’t know – he will ask
• Waiver is unique in the past, peer reviews has been yes and no only
• Process could be protracted
• This is more of an NSF procedure

**Is there an overwhelming sense of the Administration’s perception to let waivers ride out, so is the climate that most waivers will be approved?**
No, people think this the opportunity to change what is not working.

**Is there a sense that the Feds want to approve waivers that can be implemented?**
Yes and they are going to get burned on some of the issues later e.g. stimulus funding.

**Teacher Evaluation in Indiana?**
Richard stated that they will not be asked to abridge contract but they are not just going to let Tenure keep Bad teachers in their definition in the classroom. Some states are looking to use this as a way to identify weaknesses in teachers to provide PD and not just fire them.

**Are you seeing like in Idaho where legislators took drastic action around tenure by eliminating bargaining rights with nothing much left to negotiate? Are you seeing this across the country as a response around Teacher Evaluation?**
The real discussion is on how to do this fairly and ½ million teachers across country ready to jump in especially in high needs areas, we will see new models to scale.

11:05 AM - Richard signed off due to another meeting.
ISBE Waiver Updates

Melina Wright introduced Maribeth Carlini – see ESEA Flexibility Waiver Overview PowerPoint

- In September President Obama put the waiver proposal in place
- Remember that this flexibility is not a free pass but a commitment to be smarter for states on how schools can improve
- State must still comply with NCLB but can focus efforts differently inadvertently became a barrier with stumbling blocks

Slide 2
- Will start piloting in 2012-2013 year with implementing statewide in 2014 Il has influence/College Board is bringing models

Slide 3
- All students access rigorous standards with success

Slide 4
- Teacher will have an opportunity to look at student growth and expand what they are doing a little bit more.
- Teachers were frustrated with current Evaluation system. Teachers can target instruction to student needs and allow teachers to move away from teaching to the test to having modalities they can use
- Growth models are not supposed to be used as 50%

Melina – ISBE does not know which model will be used for student growth/no talk of averaging/can be put on table but has not been discussed/do not have to use the same assessments for evaluation and accountability/not a blanket caveat, system will be designed within the box that the Feds have established/ISBE does not have the data

Slide 5
- Suggestion is to create a simple assessment tool not just scores but add next steps for parents to use and support student growth.
  Melina stated there is a whole committee working on IL report cards, separate from the federal initiative.
- If a parent looks at a set of 4th grade standards they can see that their 4th grade child can be looked at as proficient across the nation, parents will be able to pull down the standards to see what students know and should be able to next school year/this is the PARCC assessment that will be developed
- Clarification - This slide is not referring to IL report card but to the assessment.
- Prior to this flexibility NCLB did not differentiate between failing schools
Will take more measures into consideration to create a more accurate look at each school.

Slide 6
• All 10 provisions are applied together and will be granted as 10 together
• In IL if granted flexibility AYP will be waived for 2012 and waiver can be extended to 2014 with the hope ESEA will be reauthorized
• Federal remediation will be gone but the state must have remediations to be imposed
• State could decide to offer Choice, SES, or some other kind of restructuring
• State would be exempt from Fed school improvement status regulations

Slide 7
• Rural LEA’s can use money not tied to AYP

Slide 8
• Intent is to use the funding for ESEA just with more flexibility
• Currently state did not have the authority to tap into this money – see 7 e.g. financial rewards to Reward Schools
  Melina stated CA estimates that it will cost $3 billion to just apply for the waiver.
  IL has not been implementing HQT plans in recent years the waiver will relieve IL from this provision.

Slide 9
• Ability to transfer of funds with Title I

Slide 10
Principle 1 – College and Career Ready Expectations for All Students

Slide 11
Principle 2- State developed Differentiated Recognition, Accountability and Support

Slide 12
Principle 3 – Supporting Effective Instruction and Leadership
Want to make sure there is a commitment with systems based on research
IL has the support

Slide 13
Principle 4 – Reducing Duplication and Unnecessary Burden
• Streamlining data collections, identify barriers to funding issues, removing cumbersome reporting that have nothing to do with student outcomes
Melina Wright:
• IL will submit in February 2012 for a Spring Peer review
  Monique Chism is a reviewer and is in DC to review for current waiver applications.
• The Waiver Application document will be the Principles with each section addressed
• Career and Technical Education will be included along with ELL and Special Education
• State School Officers were able to share information because this is NOT COMPETITIVE best practices are being shared
• IL will still calculate AYP for each school to determine focus, designation and reward.
  Targets will change; Feds have drawn a box which IL will work within those parameters.
• Focus on subgroups – 10% of schools within the state
• Total number of Focus Schools must represent at least 105 of Title I schools in the state
• Focus between highest number of subgroups and lowest within schools gaps.
• Priority schools places a priority on ALL students
• Lowest performing school in the state total number must be 5% lowest schools in the state
• EITHER Focus or Priority – NOT BOTH
• Priority can be akin to SIG
• Focus is one level above Corrective Action type of school.
• Priority will be more stringent than Focused
• Principle 3 says what your accountability system will look like
• Principles 1 and 2 are off and running in IL
• There are different approaches to designating schools.
• ISBE is looking for “what happens when” feedback.
• Legislative changes will be part of the waiver application process.
• After waiver is submitted ISBE will be working with General Assembly to modify statutes.
• This is cumbersome waiver process we need to work together.
• Drafts will be sent to CCOP for feedback.

Answers to Questions from Melina Wright
• It is Superintendents’ choice to submit draft of waiver proposals
• ISBE cannot say now if they are going into SES as a need there is currently a yes/no decision
• CCOP represents the split of SES decisions/desires
• No decision regarding declaring subgroup percentages, if the comment period says subgroup size is too small then it will be on the table.
• One of challenges of waiver is that it is trying to shift our way of thinking regarding AYP and subgroups and achievement gaps. There is currently no methodology to approach this.
  Subgroup Disaggregation and Achievement Gaps are the Themes that run through the entire waiver.
  Comment: Each subgroup affects the scores of the entire school.
• We cannot change the accommodations we must work with them therefore we must work around them.
There is conversation around Special Education and ELL as groups that were brought to the Senate table.

- Lowering 40-% poverty rate?
- Theory is that school-wide flexibility should be awarded to more schools.
- ISBE can provide more technical assistance and support school-wide with the flexibility in the waiver.
- 10 items under Highly Qualified
- CPS was hurt with HQ because of letters that had to go out to parents.
- State was supposed to do more monitoring regarding HQ and this flexibility will allow IL not to hold districts to account for HQ status.

Clarification concerning the Chair-elect:
Chair-elect is Ava Harston and Patricia Sullivan Viniard is Secretary-elect-

Motion for convene the Nominating Committee by Lynn Childs
Second by Shirley Fowlkes
Nomination Committee – Dr. Steele, Chair; Yolanda Coleman, Donna Boros and Karen Meucci

The Nomination committee will
1. Appoint Chair-elect for 2011-2012 and to serve 2012-2013;
2. Appoint the Secretary-elect who will serve through 2012-2013 and

Planning of the CCOP Presentation for NCLB conference in February to be held
11 AM on Tuesday February 7, 2012
Use Lynn’s 2011 PowerPoint to begin discussion
Description of CCOP Presentation for new members
Cheryl sent the 2011 PowerPoint and brochure to volunteers of the CCOP NCLB Presentation Committee: Bernadette Anderson, Lynn Childs, Dr. Vinest Steele, Shirley Fowlkes, Nancy Christensen and Ava Harston

New Business
Jeff Frichtnitch submitted a resignation letter.
Suggestion for recommendation from CCOP to replace resignation
Cheryl Ivy will review previous letters.
Check By-Laws for attendance
Check website for certification changes

Next Meeting:
Sheraton Chicago Hotel and Towers
February 6, 2012, Monday to begin at Noon
Lincoln Room
**Agenda for February meeting**

Waivers
System of Support Update as it relates to waivers
Update on Licensing
Review CCOP Presentation at NCLB 2012 Conference
Set a June meeting date

**Adjourn at 1:11 PM**

Motion - Shirley Fowlkes
Second - Nancy Christensen

Respectfully submitted,

Ava Harston
CCOP Secretary