**Modeling Effective Collaboration on the Alignment of Standards and Assessment Based on the Common Core Standards (CCSS) Among High Schools, Community Colleges and Four-Year Institutions**

**Documenting the Early Work of the Central Illinois Common Core Alignment Consortium (CICCAC)**

Adopted in 2010 by the National Governors Association (NGA) and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSSO), forty six states, two territories and the District of Columbia are now participating in the use of the CCSS. The original purpose of the CCSS was to provide consistency across the states of what knowledge, skills and abilities students are expected to learn in subjects such as English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics (and eventually Science and Social Studies) in order for them to be competitive in a global economy. Much of the focus has been on the implementation of the standards in K-12 schools with the emphasis that the new standards are designed to assure students are ‘college and career ready’.

However, the vision of the CCSS, in which higher education was an active partner, was much broader at not only ensuring the success of students in elementary and secondary education, but subsequently, in postsecondary education as a result of higher standards and aligned expectations between secondary and postsecondary education. To achieve this outcome requires that higher education not only be informed of the CCSS but also engaged as a full partner in its implementation. With this in mind, the American Council on Education (ACE) recommended four key areas where actions by higher education are needed, including:

* Aligning key school-to-college policies, including more targeted college readiness supports to help students make the transition;
* Developing assessments and aligning with placement policies;
* Aligning K-12 and higher education curricula (e.g., developmental courses, bridge courses, dual credit courses, and first-year postsecondary courses); and,
* Preparing new and existing teachers (including the inclusion of Arts and Sciences faculty).

The work aligning the implementation of the CCSS between higher education and K-12 schools in McLean County began much more organically – beginning with a vision by administrators at Illinois State University (ISU), Heartland Community College (Heartland), and the University Lab Schools – but which branched out into a multi-county regional effort between higher education and its K-12 school partners. This work is evolving, but funded by a seed grant from the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) in spring and summer of 2013, the work has formally begun by focusing on two key areas: 1) aligning K-12 and higher education curricula (in developmental and first year math courses, and in general education courses); and, 2) preparing new and existing teachers[[1]](#footnote-1). This case study write up documents the work that has occurred from April to September 2013 among a regional partnership that began a collective impact effort to integrate and align their work and resources around the need to address pressing issues related to the adoption of the new CCSS.

**How the Work Began**

The work of the CICCAC began locally in December 2011 when a working group of faculty and administrators from Heartland, ISU and University High School started meeting to develop a framework for collaboration to facilitate a smooth transition from high school to college. The work began with the interest of Dr. Jonathan Rosenthal, then serving as the Interim Assistant Vice President for Enrollment Management and Academic Services at ISU, to work closer with Heartland and local school districts to make the transition to higher education and between higher education institutions more seamless. This work was further validated by a workshop that participants attended hosted by the Educational Policy Improvement Center (EPIC) on Bridging the Gap, sponsored by ICCB and IBHE.

The local framework that developed included an examination of curriculum, faculty expectations, and student work informed by the CCSS with a particular focus on reducing remediation at the post-secondary level. Realizing that this work could be strengthened by expanding the involvement of additional districts and postsecondary institutions, more stakeholders were brought to the table. Most relevant, though, was the inclusion of the Dewitt/Livingston/McLean County Regional Office of Education (ROE), who was currently working with a core group of secondary math faculty representing districts throughout the region, to assist with their implementation of the CCSS in high school math.

Before moving forward, though, representatives of this work decided to convene a meeting of local key stakeholders, including higher education and K-12 administrators. The meeting was held on October 31, 2012 and invited to the meeting was representatives from ISU, including the Provost Office, the School of Teaching and Learning, and the Center for the Study of Education Policy (CSEP); Illinois Wesleyan University (IWU); Heartland; Lincoln College; Dewitt/Livingston/McLean County ROE #17; and superintendents from the University Lab School, McLean County Unit #5 School District, Bloomington District #87, and Olympia School District[[2]](#footnote-2). As a result of the first meeting, staff at CSEP worked to develop a concept paper (Appendix A) that was distributed to everyone who attended the first meeting. The purpose of the concept paper was to define the problem that the regional effort was trying to address. The regional group was convened[[3]](#footnote-3) a second time on January 24, 2013, to further discuss priorities and next steps. See Appendix B for the agenda.

Learning about a funding option from the IBHE, the CSEP at ISU, representing the CICCAC, put together a proposal for funding to support its local work. In February 2013, the proposal was submitted to the IBHE and funded effective April 2013. The grant proposal went from April 2013 through September 30, 2013 and the short time period for the grant limited the ability to create new initiatives with the funding. Instead, the funding was directed at building from existing work with the majority of funding used for stakeholder engagement and convenings, with in-kind contributions made by each member of the alignment planning team. To help coordinate this work, an Alignment Planning Team (APT)[[4]](#footnote-4) was put together that collectively oversaw all aspects of grant activities, including planning and management.

**Scope of Funded Work**

Funding from the IBHE grant allowed the initial work started in Summer 2012 by ISU, Heartland, and University High School to expand into a broad, region-wide strategy that added the participation of Dewitt/Livingston/McLean County ROE, Olympia School District, McLean County Unit #5, IWU, and Lincoln College, as well as teacher education and general education faculty from Heartland, IWU, and ISU. This project also tapped into the existing work that is occurring with Dewitt/Livingston/McLean County ROE #17 and a group of secondary math teachers from throughout the region who have been working on implementing the CCSS. Intended through this work was the incorporation of participation by faculty and administrators from regional higher education institutions as well as administrators and teachers from districts throughout the region.

The goals of the funded project included:

* Goal 1: To broaden the work on regional math faculty collaboration to include postsecondary faculty/staff at ISU, Heartland, and IWU that teach developmental math, first year math, and math education courses.
* Goal 2: To create a deeper understanding among postsecondary faculty that prepare PreK-12 teachers on how the CCSS and PARCC assessments will impact teaching pedagogy, content, and assessment.
* Goal 3: To introduce college-level faculty with teaching and administrative responsibilities for General Education to the CCSS in Math, ELA, and Science.

Activities Aligned with the Goals

These goals were addressed through the following activities:

**Goal One:** Addressing the first goal – ***To broaden the work on regional math faculty collaboration to include postsecondary faculty/staff at ISU, Heartland, and IWU that teach developmental math, first year math, and math education courses*** – the main objective was to create a shared agreement between secondary and postsecondary faculty on, “What is college ready (and how would we know it if we saw it)”?  In doing this, Janet Moore (Instructor in University College at ISU), Jeremy McClure (Instructional Chair of Math and Science Department at Heartland), and Jeff Hill (Superintendent of the University Lab Schools) took the lead in conducting internal processes within their institutions on identifying the essential CCSS that high school students need to master to be prepared for credit bearing courses at ISU and Heartland. ISU and Heartland both took different approaches to doing this. At ISU, Janet Moore went through the math requirements for three first year math courses (ISU Math 104, ISU Math 113, and ISU Math 119) and identified common core math standards required for students to master prior to enrolling in ISU Math 104 as well as those common core math standards that students need to be exposed to before enrolling in ISU Math 104, Math 113, or Math 199. See Appendix C for the results of the gap analysis of the CCSS and these three courses.

Heartland embarked in the same gap analysis and created a chart of the 53 Common Core Math Content Standards and 8 Standards for Math Practice. Based on the assumption that the highest level of Math developmental courses should closely align with the CCSS standards for 11/12 grade, Jeremy McClure from Heartland asked its Heartland Math Task Force members to assess how closely related each of the standards were to the desired outcomes (objectives) of the developmental math course listed. Appendix D includes the results of this gap analysis. The results of both exercises were then shared with the math department chair at University High School who convened a team of secondary math teachers to decide which format would be most accessible for secondary math teachers to help identify what higher education has identified as the most essential math content. The team of math teachers thought that the format used by the ISU faculty was the most helpful. The next step was to combine the work of both institutional committees into one document. This document – titled Common Core Pre-Requisite Standards -

was created and is included in Appendix E.

The next step of this work will involve bringing the postsecondary faculty together with a group of secondary math teachers that are being convened by the ROE for the purpose of helping regional teachers understand what higher education faculty regionally have identified as essential math content in the Common Core for preparing students for postsecondary education (identified through the Common Core Pre-Requisite Standards). A future goal of this work is to look at assessments and placement criteria with math as a result of the CCSS and PARCC assessments. Compass is currently used by both institutions to place students in appropriate credit or non-credit bearing courses; however, there has not been a conversation about what Compass is assessing or how what it is assessing aligns with the Math CCSS. There is also an IBHE requirement for entering credit - bearing courses. Using the new Common Core Math standards as well as conversations around competency-based education, a next step will also be to examine math requirements for postsecondary courses and if policy changes might be suggested for requirements for entering credit-bearing courses.

**Goal Two:** With the goal ***to create a deeper understanding among postsecondary faculty that prepare PreK-12 teachers on how the CCSS and PARCC assessments will impact teaching pedagogy, content, and assessment***, staff at the ROE worked with staff in the ISU College of Education to convene a steering committee made up of teacher education faculty and K-12 teachers throughout the region. The Steering Committee was charged with planning an event to raise general awareness for higher education teacher education faculty on the CCSS, to bring in different perspectives from the field on what aspiring teachers need to know about the common core, as well as to map out strategies and roles between higher education and K-12 teachers (e.g., student teacher supervisors) on preparing aspiring teachers on the common core.

To do this, Diane Wolf (ROE) and Barbara Meyer (School of Teaching and Learning, ISU) brought together an August 14th Steering Committee[[5]](#footnote-5) of K-12 supervising teachers, clinical faculty, supervising teachers, and teacher education faculty to plan a regional workshop on August 14th for 200 supervising, cooperating, and instructing teachers and principals on integrating the common core curriculum into teacher preparation. This was the first time that cooperating teachers and supervising faculty had come together to talk collaboratively about strengthening the student teaching experience. The team met on July 9, 2013 and August 7, 2013. By incorporating a large group of teachers and faculty in the planning work, this assured that the August 14th regional meeting was designed to the needs of those being served. It also created a larger investment in the success of the work by those who are responsible for making it happen.

As a result, the August 14th meeting focused on the topic of the CCSS and Teacher Education and was well attended by K-12 teachers and administrators (including principals and central administrators) and higher education faculty (from Heartland and ISU’s teacher education faculty, as well as faculty in other departments (e.g., Communications). The participants at the meeting were asked to identify some next steps for integrating the CCSS into teacher preparation programs, especially the clinical experience and had a rich dialogue not only about the common core but what is good teaching in general. Appendix F includes the agenda, the RSVP list of over 150 attendees, the talking circle exercise, and feedback from the meeting.

The August 14th Steering Committee is going to come together in October to review the data collected at the meeting and map out next steps for this work. As a possible next step with this work, some ideas have been explored regarding more frequent exchanges between K-12 teachers and teacher education faculty to build current teaching practices and needs around the CCSS into the teacher education courses as well as utilizing teacher education faculty as substitutes in the classes.

**Goal Three**: In order ***to introduce college-level faculty with teaching and administrative responsibilities for General Education to the CCSS in Math, ELA, and Science***, staff on this grant held an all-day meeting on August 1st among faculty from ISU, Heartland, and Lincoln College on the CCSS. The purpose of the meeting was to present introductory information to faculty on the CCSS, including the history of its development, what they are and how they are different from the current learning standards in Illinois, as well as a deeper look at the ELA and Math CCSS. Appendix G includes the agenda, power point presentations, and meeting attendees. The day-long workshop did a nice job of not only engaging participants in learning more about the common core but also with developing next steps for how higher education should respond to the implementation of these new standards in K-12 schools.

In response, participants came up with several suggestions for next steps. One promising suggestion was the need to provide faculty development by Teaching and Learning Centers on campuses around the pedagogical approach that maintains the engagement of students who have been exposed to the CCSS in higher education. Faculty at the meeting overwhelmingly agreed that the CCSS push a deeper, more engaged approach to teaching and learning that K-12 students will be used to and expecting once they hit higher education campuses. Preparing faculty for the types of learning styles and abilities that they will see when the “Common Core Generation” students come on campus will be necessary. One suggestion was to seek funding for the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Technology (CTLT) at ISU to serve faculty at ISU and the cooperating institutions in integrating new pedagogy and approaches to align with the spirit of CCSS. Further exploration would also look into whether an institutional faculty development center (like CTLT) could provide faculty development and support to faculty at other higher education institutions. If this is not possible, separate funding might be needed to support faculty development centers located at IWU, Heartland, and Lincoln College.

Another strategy suggested would be to coordinate exchanges or joint professional development sessions between higher education faculty and K-12 teachers that allow for the sharing of information and teaching strategies. Faculty throughout the summer’s activities commented about the little opportunities that they have to interact with teachers and administrators in nearby districts regarding the work that they are doing that will have an impact on the teaching and learning that will also occur in higher education. In response to this, further work with this initiative may seek to coordinate faculty exchanges with teachers and administrators in the field.

**Additional Activities Outside of Grant**

In addition to activities for meeting these goals, four other related activities have occurred, although not funded by this grant.

First, through a Illinois Race to the Top STEM College and Career Readiness (CCR) initiative, Heartland Community College received funding aimed at connecting remedial education to programs of study efforts. Utilizing the STEM CCR model, Heartland’s scope of work was to:

* Diagnose college readiness through the administration of college placement and assessment pre and posttests;
* Provide interventions targeted towards medium to low need junior and senior level high school students;
* Align high school and college curriculum and facilitate other alignments efforts;
* Provide students with academic and non-academic student support services; and,
* Evaluate the performance of the interventions.

To do this, Heartland conducted a Summer Bridge program from June 3-27, targeting low-need students based off their initial attempt at the COMPASS Placement Test.  Students participated in the four week course, which met for two hours a day twice a week.  Using *MyFoundationsLab*, a Pearson Education product, students reviewed content from Intermediate Algebra by watching video lectures and completing online activities and assignments.

Heartland math faculty then worked with the Director of Assessment at Heartland to identify students who had placed within the last 6 months into the predetermined range of “low need” in COMPASS. With the Community Education department, Heartland math faculty created and mailed flyers to approximately 90 qualifying students with information on the Summer Bridge program. They also distributed the flyers to Unit 5 advisors who were asked to meet with students individually to explain the program and its benefits.

In addition to computer based learning, students also participated in mini-lectures and student success workshops.  Four mini-lectures were conducted, which focused on topics such as factoring, operations with rational expressions, solving linear, quadratic, and rational expressions, rules for exponents, graphing, and solving systems of equations.  Student success workshops were held to discuss reading strategies for word problems, test taking and study strategies, and the role academic advisors play in degree selection and completion.

A barrier encountered during this project, though, was the amount of time available to plan and implement this program.  Heartland targeted students from the Unit 5 school district but meeting with faculty and administrators took time to plan out the program.  Once a plan was in place for the summer offering, it was already late in the school year and this affected the number of students that Heartland was able to recruit into the program.  Heartland planned for a group of 30-40 students from three different high schools, but ended up with a group of just 13. Of the 13 that enrolled, 12 took the post-test in COMPASS and 3 successfully placed into a college level course. 10 out of the 12 improved but not enough to place into a transfer course.

Second, using funding outside of the grant, the ISU School of Teaching and Learning created a CCAT (Common Core Associate Training) class, taught by Christine Paxson, curriculum coordinator for the Metcalf Laboratory School, that consisted of six workshops that teacher education faculty and teacher candidates (students) together took on the CCSS. See Appendix H for the flier for the workshops. Four faculty and six ISU teacher candidates were paid $1000 stipends to participate in the course, which consisted of attending all six class sessions and completing on-line activities. Content in the course covered:

* Background of the Common Core
  + ELA and Math
* How do deconstruct the CCSS
* Information on the PARCC Assessment
* Discussion on Standards-Based Grading
* Discussion on Technology Integration

The course used a Google platform for the instruction and assignments were all shared with the other participants through the Google platform so that the faculty and students could use the shared resources as they begin teaching to the K-12 students or ISU students. Several of the faculty members in the class indicated that they were mirroring their instruction off of the content and style of the course. Based on funding availability, this may be a course that could be offered again.

Third, as a strategy for sharing this work statewide, Diane Wolf (ROE) Deputy Regional Superintendent, and Jonathan Rosenthal, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education at ISU, presented on a panel at the PARCC Assessment Summit for Higher Education, sponsored by the IBHE, Illinois Community College Board (ICCB), and ISBE, on September 13, 2013. Information about this conference can be found at: <http://www.ibhe.org/TTTS/default.htm>.

Lastly, in an effort to further bridge collaboration, the CSEP is co-sponsoring with IBHE and ISBE a conference entitled ***Common Visions, Common Goals*** on **Thursday, October 17, 2013** at ISU’s Bone Student Center that is targeted to higher education and will focus on partnerships and preparations in Illinois schools, colleges, and universities as a result of the new CCSS and assessments.  Information about the conference can be found at: <http://education.illinoisstate.edu/csep/events.shtml>.

**Lessons Learned**

The early work of the *CICCAC*included some successful strategies that will have a greater impact on sustainability of this work even after the initial funding ends. These strategies included:

* **Collective impact** – By bringing together high level leaders within multiple organizations, the message was clear that this work is important and that developing partnering strategies would make it more meaningful and sustainable. There was also a significant level of trust between the stakeholders involved with the project, which assisted with the coordination and implementation of this work.
* **Resource sharing** – The seed money provided by the IBHE was helpful at mobilizing the work, though many administrators and faculty dedicated in-kind support and time. To continue the work will require the coordination of existing and new resources through a collaborative effort to streamline activities.
* **Tying into existing work** – The work began by a series of meetings and conversations started locally and was expanded upon by aligning it to and building from existing work (such as the work of the ROE, to assist secondary math teachers regionally with the implementation of the common core).
* **Bringing together local experts** – Instead of using funding to bring in a national speaker to talk about the CCSS or PARCC assessments, the alignment planning team thought that it would be more beneficial to hear from local teachers and administrators. Not only was this a more cost effective approach, but these individuals had greater credibility with local teachers and faculty.
* **Involving participants with planning in order to secure buy-in** – A steering committee of teacher education faculty, clinical supervisors, and supervising teachers planned and prepared for the August 14th Regional Event that brought together over 200 faculty, teachers, and administrators from the area. Not only did the involvement of teachers and faculty help with greater buy-in for the need for this work, but also with promoting the event to their colleagues. As another example, this work was all planned and overseen by the Alignment Planning Team assuring that multiple perspectives were represented in every piece of this work.
* **Using persistence and patience to keep the work going** – The work of this collaborative began almost a year and a half before these grant-funded activities occurred, showing that collaborative work, especially work that is deep and more meaningful, often takes time. The high level attention that the work received from top-level administrators from a number of organizations kept attention to the work, but also at times lengthened the time between meetings due to other time commitments.

**Challenges**

While the early work of this consortium has proven successful on many levels, some challenges have also been presented. The primary challenge was with timing, both with the short time-line with which the grant was funded and finding time among all of the stakeholders to plan and hold events. Recognizing this, a key strategy was to capitalize on work that was already started and to build that work around times when they could get the best participation among the participants, rather than make this work yet another thing that teachers, administrators, and faculty had to attend. A longer time period with the grant would have allowed for deeper implementation of activities as well as broader scope of work.

The second challenge of the grant was the limited staffing support with the grant, due primarily to the short-timeline on the grant. Future funding, if secured, would be used to fund a staff person to coordinate the activities at a regional level – engaging more of the *CICCAC* into the work of the Alignment Planning Team.

Another larger challenge was the timing in which national standards and assessments are being rolled out – particularly the *Next Generation Science Standards*, Social Studies Standards, and PARCC assessments – which limited the scope in which this work could be focused to only ELA and Math. As a result, this work will need to be revisited as each of these new threads of the common core and its assessments are phased in. The ‘unknowns’ around the PARCC assessments also provided challenges to identifying what are the links of the standards to standardized testing as well college admission and placement policies.

**Next Steps**

In the very least, the seed money provided by this grant provided an opportunity to bring together many different stakeholders doing similar work around the CCSS but to different audiences (K-12 teachers, aspiring teachers, general education faculty, and developmental education faculty). In bringing together leadership from each of these areas, this project has had a collective impact on the depth and breadth that has been reached in the last few months to fold higher education into the Common Core conversations and implementation.

While the ROE is providing district and school-based support on implementing the CCSS, teachers and faculty that participated in events through this grant expressed deep desire to continue with these conversations collaboratively at a regional level. Higher education faculty expressed gratitude at the opportunity to work with K-12 teachers, who could better inform them more on the standards as they have already begun the process of implementing them. K-12 teachers talked about the real value of discussing the CCSS and strategies for implementation with their colleagues in other schools and districts, in which they do not often have the opportunity. More importantly, though, teachers and faculty said that one of the most beneficial parts of the Common Core events was the opportunity to learn and reflect on what is good teaching and learning and how does the spirit of the CCSS fit with the kinds of teaching and learning that we want to see in all of our classrooms and schools.

To keep the momentum of this project, the **CCSS Alignment Planning Team** has identified existing resources that could be tapped to keep the work going. This includes:

* Funding to the ROE by ISBE to work with K-12 teachers on the implementation of CCSS, using state funding to continue to build on the collaborative work that has been started. A short-term strategy for this may also be partnering with the Consortium for Education Change (CEC), a professional development organization in Illinois and recent recipient for funding from Illinois Education Association (IEA), to offer professional development to teachers on the CCSS. The regional common core work will provide a natural network for CEC/IEA to bring more in-depth common core training to local P-12 teachers and teacher education faculty.
* Based on institutional funding availability, ISU may also offer again the Common Core Associate Training, in which faculty and teacher education candidates were able to learn together about the CCSS, PARRC assessments, and curriculum resources.
* Using institutional funding from the Provost Office at ISU, the Provost Office will further engage faculty at ISU with the revised general education curriculum and assessments. This work will involve helping faculty to feel more ownership and involvement with the General Education curriculum and assessment rather than just their course that they teach within the curriculum. Funding from the Provost Office will also be provided to the CTLT at ISU to provide training and support to General Education faculty around the CCSS, the different kind of assessments that will result from the states, as well as different types of grading. This will include modeling different pedagogical approaches.
* The ROE, ISU Laboratory Schools, and the Mathematics Departments at ISU and Heartland submitted a local letter of intent (LOI) for funding to continue the work around the math alignment, including working together with area high schools to answer the question: “What does it mean to be college ready in math?” using the CCSS to describe mastery. Funding was also sought to work on the alignment issues in the college placement process as well as the IBHE requirements for entering credit-bearing courses.

1. The focus of addressing the common core standards in teacher education was integrated into the scope of the work based on the perceptions of dissatisfaction and disconnect among some local school districts with how higher education was preparing teacher education candidates on the common core standards. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. In attendance at the October 31, 2012 meeting were: Jonathan Rosenthal (ISU), Jeff Hill (University Lab Schools), Rick Pearce (Heartland), Jeremy McClure (Heartland),Tom McCulley (Heartland), Brad Hutchison (Olympia School District), Gary Niehaus (Unit #5), Sandy Wilson (Unit #5), Norm Durflinger (ISU), Erika Hunt (ISU), and Barry Reilly (District #87). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. In attendance at the January 24, 2013 meeting were: Diane Wolf (ROE), who facilitated the meeting, Jonathan Rosenthal (ISU), Jeff Hill (University Lab Schools), Rick Pearce (Heartland), Jeremy McClure (Heartland), Tom McCulley (Heartland), Brad Hutchison (Olympia School District), Barbara Meyer (ISU), Pamm Ambrose (ISU), Norm Durflinger (ISU), Erika Hunt (ISU). Interested in attending but unable to attend were Gary Niehaus (Unit #5 School District) and Jonathan Green (IWU). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The APT was made up of: Diane Wolf (Regional Office of Education); Barbara Meyer (School of Teaching and Learning, Illinois State University); Jonathan Rosenthal (Provost Office, Illinois State University); Jeff Hill (Superintendent, Laboratory Schools); Jeremy McClure (Math Department, Heartland Community College); Janet Moore (Developmental Math, Illinois State University); Kevin Thompson (Math Department, University High School); Deborah Garrahy (Teacher Education Center, Illinois State University); Brad Hutchison (Education Administration and Foundations, Illinois State University); and Erika Hunt (Center for the Study of Education Policy)

   [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Serving on the Steering Committee were: Terry Husband (Assistant Professor, School of Teaching and Learning); Sherry Sanden (Assistant Professor, School of Teaching and Learning); Sharon Alberts (Teacher, Heyworth Elementary School); Jennifer Love (Teacher, Olympia Middle School); Cathy Weber (Curriculum Director, Ridgeview CUSD #19); Carly Morales (Math Coach, Regional Office of Education); Debra Honegger (Literacy Coach, Regional Office of Education); Jennifer Burns (Teacher, Cedar Ridge Elementary School); Susan Cortesi (Teacher, Bloomington High School); Jason Klokkenga (Teacher, Normal West High School); Karen Ritacco (Teacher, Sheridan Elementary School); and Gary Weilbacher (Associate Professor, School of Teaching and Learning). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)