ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
March 20, 2002

Agenda Topic: Action Regarding the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, PL 107-110

Materials:
Agency Work Plan for NCLB
State Plans/Applications strategy (as a part of the overall plan)
Synopsis of Federal Register notice of March 6, 2002 regarding State plans/applications (attached)
NCLB Alert #1, Bulletin # 1, Contact List and Funds (attached)

Staff Contact(s): Christopher Koch
Gail Lieberman

Purpose of Agenda Item
Moving from an overview of No Child Left Behind (NCLB), PL 107-110, and a discussion of state legislative issues at the last meeting, the Board will discuss planning and policy issues relating to NCLB.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
State Board members will understand the federal law, and be able to discuss and plan with the State Superintendent for changes necessary for agency implementation of the federal law. The dialogue in March builds upon the earlier board reports and discussions.

Background Information
NCLB, which reauthorized the 1994 version of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, is one of the most important pieces of federal education reform legislation in several decades. The Board and the Superintendent have recognized that many provisions of NCLB parallel the direction and intent of Illinois school reform:
- Creating a system that is fully aligned with state learning standards;
- Ensuring that every student is taught by highly qualified teachers; and
- Assuring that every school and district are accountable for every student’s progress.

Timeframe
Public Law 107-110 was signed into law by President Bush on January 8, 2002. The following timelines flow from the law. There are no final rules or guidance available yet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCLB Timelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002 School Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant workshops are being held from March 19, 2002 to April 12, 2002 on NCLB and how to apply in Illinois for the federal funding pursuant to NCLB for 2002-03.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District employment decisions are affected by NCLB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Employment of new paraprofessionals employed with Title I funds must use new federal employment criteria intended to ensure that all personnel are “highly qualified.” Aides/paraprofessionals who are employed after the enactment of ESEA 2001 (i.e., after January 2002) to work in a program funded by Title I must be “highly-qualified.” This does not include interpreters or those whose responsibilities are parent responsibility. The federal definition of highly-qualified includes three</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
options:
- completion of two years of post-secondary study;
- an earned Associate’s (or higher) degree; or
- meets “a rigorous standard of quality and can demonstrate, through a formal state or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing and mathematics.
  - Teachers that are newly hired to work in Title I-funded programs after the start of the 2002-2003 school year must be “highly qualified,” in other words, they must hold certification/endorsement directly related to the subject and grade level they are teaching.

√This year’s April 2002 ISAT and PSAE scores will provide the foundation for determining progress over the 12-year period. This baseline data will be used for measuring progress toward the goal of 100% proficiency by 2013-2014.

√Planning for the 2002-03 school year, the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) timeline is “ticking" in terms of the 12 year clock, as of the end of 2001-2002.
  - The spring 2002 data will be used for determining what schools are in a Title I "school improvement" or "corrective action" status in terms of having made AYP over the past two years.
  - Title I schools which are in a "school improvement" or "corrective action" status and have not made AYP will need to offer parents in the school public school choice for 2002-03 for their students to attend a better-performing public school within the district.
  - Those schools need to plan accordingly in terms of their Title I grant application for use of funds (see grant instructions) for 2002-03.

√May 28, 2002 is the date by which the State Board of Education must submit its plans to USDE for meeting the new federal requirements.

2002-2003 School Year

√Noncompetitive grants, such as Title I, must be used in accord with the new law as of the beginning of the school year. Grant applications are available in March 2002. Program operations in school districts in 2002-2003 must follow the requirements as delineated in the grant applications and instructions.

√Schools and districts will be notified prior to the beginning of the school year (with a 30-day window for corrections) of their school improvement status pursuant to student assessment results from the April 2002 tests.

√Any teachers hired with Title I funds must meet requirements of a “highly qualified" teacher by the beginning of the school year.

√Any paraprofessionals employed with Title I funds must meet new standards of quality when employed after January 8, 2002.

√ISBE must ensure that public school choice is offered for those schools/districts which are in "school improvement" status and not making AYP.

√The State Board of Education is required to identify, evaluate and make available a list of external providers of supplemental education services.

√Planning for the 2003-04 school year, since the clock is ticking means for schools in "school improvement" or "corrective actions" status:
  - schools will need to offer public school choice in 2003-04;
  - such schools will also now have to the opportunity for supplemental educational services to parents of students currently offered public school choice in 2002-03.
  - They need to plan accordingly in terms of their Title I grant application for use of funds (see grant instructions).
States and districts must *begin reporting* their progress toward ensuring all teachers are "highly qualified." Additionally, ISBE must report annually to USDE the progress in meeting measurable objectives at the LEA and school level, and other data.

States must set annual yearly progress/annual measurable objectives, based on 2001-2002 (for Illinois, spring 2002) data.

All states must participate in the National Assessment of Education Progress for the selected schools as of 2002-03. Schools, if selected by the National Center for Education Statistics, with assessments in grades 4 and 8 in reading, math or writing, must participate.

Districts must do an annual assessment of English proficiency of all English Language Learners.

Not later than the beginning of the 2002-2003 school year, the State shall prepare and disseminate an annual state, district and school report card. (Illinois currently does so with report cards due no later than October 31st).

Schools that receive Title I funds must provide *timely notice* to a parent whose child has been assigned to or taught for four or more weeks by a teacher who is not highly qualified.

The state must prepare and disseminate an *annual report* that includes professional qualification of teachers, the percentage of teachers with emergency or provisional credentials, and the percentage of classes in the state not taught by highly qualified teachers.

ISBE must *submit a plan* that includes steps it will take to ensure poor and minority children are not taught at higher rates than other children by inexperienced, uncertified or out of field teachers.

LEAs must *notify parents* of children who attend Title I schools that they may request information about the professional qualifications of classroom teachers.

Student assessment continues as is, with development of testing for additional grades beginning in 2002-03.

### 2003-04 School Year

- ISBE must ensure that public school choice is offered for those schools/districts which are in "school improvement" status for the first year.
- ISBE must ensure that public school choice and supplemental education services are offered for those schools/districts which are in "school improvement" or "corrective action" status and offered public school choice/supplemental educational services in 2002-03.

### 2004-05 School Year

- Existing paraprofessionals in a program funded by Title I must be "highly qualified" by 2004-05.

### 2005-06 School Year

- States must have standards for science (Illinois does).
- SEAs and LEAs must ensure that all teachers are highly qualified by 2005-06.
- Annual statewide assessments for reading and mathematics in grades 3-8 must be in place.

### 2007-08 School Year

- Annual science assessments must be in place in at least one of each of the following grade spans -- 3-5, 6-9, and 10-12 (Illinois already does).

### 2013-2014 School Year

- Schools, districts and the state must make AYP toward having all students proficient in reading and mathematics by the 2013-14 school year.

**Work Plan**
NCLB provides many opportunities to strengthen Illinois’ reform efforts, while providing new flexibility, support and resources for school districts.

To take full advantage of these opportunities, the State Board will engage in a cross-agency, comprehensive work plan, merging staff knowledge and skills with expert field advisement, to create a unified approach to NCLB implementation.

To take full advantage of the opportunities and challenges offered Illinois by NCLB, a cross-agency work group was formed and has been meeting since the end of December. A comprehensive work plan (see attachment #1) delineates the work to be done. Most of the work being done and due "now" means intense work on this task across the agency, and then over a longer period of time at the state and local level (see State plan information below).

State Plans/Applications Strategy (see attachment #2)
Since the last board meeting, staff has consulted with the Title I practitioners group as required (met on February 22nd and is meeting again on March 26th) and the Education Partners Advisory group. Notes were emailed to both parties, and contact names/emails shared so that individuals could indicate if they wished to be part of the ad hoc topical team workgroups.

In terms of timeframes, the State plans are due May 28, 2002 across nearly all of NCLB. The plan for Reading First is due May 29, 2002 if Illinois wants funds by July 1st. The plan for homeless student services does not yet have a date specified. Therefore it is anticipated that the Board will be looking at information across NCLB in the following fashion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Action Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss definition of highly qualified teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss paraprofessional qualifications issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on reading plan and technology in full plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on assessment/AYP, and accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on assessment/AYP, and accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on 21st CCLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on 21st CCLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on &quot;persistently dangerous schools&quot; policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on • Even Start • Migrant • Neglected/Delinquent • English Language Learning • Supplemental Education Services • Innovative Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communications Plan
Based on discussions with the Board in January and February, specific requirements of the law and the need to inform districts about their responsibilities under the law, staff has developed a plan for communication and consultation with a variety of Illinois stakeholders. This includes special bulletins, an "alert" email message for obtaining feedback, meetings with selected groups, special website, etc. There is an agency email address for NCLB, NCLB@isbe.net.

Messages
Effectively communicate the requirements of the new No Child Left Behind, (NCLB) Act to schools, districts, parents, external partners and all those affected by the new law in clear, concise, consistent messages that outline what schools, districts and ISBE must do to meet the new requirements and the timelines involved. We will seek input from educators, parents and other partners on these important issues and identify what assistance ISBE can offer.

The audiences are superintendents, district and building administrators, teachers, local board members, parents, Regional Offices of Education, higher education community, external partners, and education organizations.

Vehicles
• Special Bulletins - will cover topical areas such as adequate yearly progress, school choice, etc.
• Alerts - will advise our audiences of breaking news or seek their input on specific issues.
• Articles, guest columns
• Press releases, radio interviews, letters to the editor
• ISBE staff presentations, information packets

Distribution Mechanisms
• NCLB web page - www.isbe.net/nclb - is ISBE’s official NCLB site. Here all messages, bulletins and alerts will be posted along with other NCLB web site resources.
• ISBE list serves - to superintendents, ROEs, directors of special education, principals, external partners
• News media – print and electronic
• Regional Offices of Education – local communication networks
• Education organizations and external partners – mailing lists, list serves, websites, publications
• Direct mail

Feedback Mechanism
NCLB e-mail account NCLB@isbe.net will provide our audiences the opportunity to respond to specific requests for input regarding some aspect of NCLB, as well as a place to make general comments and pose questions.

At the end of this document are Attachments #2-5, which represent direct emails to the field. On March 1st, the first NCLB message was e-mailed to district superintendents, regional superintendents and directors of special education. It set the tone for future communications from ISBE via bulletins, alerts and other materials designed to help the field understand and meet these new requirements, while ISBE seeks input on issues. On March 15th, the first
NCLB Special Bulletin was e-mailed to district superintendents, regional superintendents and directors of special education. Also on March 15th the NCLB website went online. It contains all information distributed by ISBE, both current and archived, as well as links to additional resources.

As in prior years, the Illinois State Board of Education will hold a series of regional meetings on applying for federal and state grants. Beginning with a discussion of NCLB, the content of the meetings will address the changes in applications from prior years. More information on the workshops can be found at http://www.isbe.net/TITLE-GRANTS/Workshops.htm.

**Action—Legislative; Approval on Financial Matter; Program and Plans; Policy LEGISLATIVE**

Pursuant to the Board dialogue in February, staff drafted language for legislative changes which were perceived as immediate action needed, or the minimum changes needed to come into compliance with the federal law at this time. ISBE feels that these changes are needed at this time due to the fact that NCLB must be implemented in the 2002-2003 school year. An amendment to SB 1983 passed out of the Senate Education Committee on March 6, 2002 which would accomplish three requirements of NCLB.

1. **NCLB** requires states to participate in the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in reading and mathematics every other year, beginning in 2002-2003. ISBE is proposing that Illinois law be changed to require the school selected on a sample basis by the National Center for Education Statistics participate in the program if selected. We know this is the situation at least in Indiana, Arizona, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Massachusetts, Michigan, North Carolina, Nevada, Ohio, Oklahoma, Washington, Virginia, West Virginia and Utah. This legislative change is consistent with the newly-required federal grant assurance that LEAs must sign as part of receiving funding -- that the LEA will participate, if schools are selected, in the State National Assessment of Educational Progress in 4th and 8th grade reading and mathematics.

When the sampling is done, the district is not selected but rather one or more schools within the district are selected. About 150 schools were selected in Illinois in 2002, out of over 4,200 schools. Each test takes 90 minutes of student time. Any given student would take a single test, e.g., reading although there could be several different tests administered within a given school. The tests are not administered by local educators but rather by consultants from Westat and paid for by NAEP.

NAEP is a national assessment of all major subjects funded by the U.S. Department of Education and designed to give a picture of competence in meeting national standards. In 1990, NAEP began to offer the option for states to participate in a state by state comparison with national scores. Illinois has only been able to participate in the state NAEP twice – once in 1990 at grade 8 mathematics and the other in 2000 in grades 4 and 8 mathematics and science. In the other years, the required sample quota was not met and therefore there were no state data. We are attempting to fully participate in the 2002 reading and writing NAEP tests. At this time, it has not been determined whether Illinois met the minimum participation requirement for state scores.

A 70% participate rate of randomly-selected schools is necessary for Illinois data to be recognized as “legitimate” in terms of accurately representing the state achievement on
NAEP. Participation of schools has been a problem in Illinois due to a lack of incentives, a lack of time, and a concern regarding over-testing. As previously mentioned, it is not known whether there will be a sufficient sample until the testing is actually completed this year. Results of the NAEP are published annually in major national publications including Education Week. The purpose of the NAEP requirement under NCLB is to determine whether the state standards are comparable to the national ones. For example, if a state says that 90% of the students are meeting reading standards, but NAEP data show that only 25% of the students are meeting standards, there will be questions about the adequacy of state standards in gaining and maintaining approval of state plans.

2. **NCLB** requires increased notification of parents of students who are placed in bilingual education programs. While Illinois already has had a system of notification, there are additional provisions added by **NCLB**. For instance, parents need to be notified of why students are being recommended for bilingual education, what their English proficiency is, and what the differences are between the bilingual program and regular education program. These notification procedures need to be in place by the 2002-2003 school year.

3. **NCLB** requires extensive information to be provided to parents and the general public. As a result, ISBE anticipates that the school report card will expand from about 13 pages to about 25 pages due to the additional disaggregated data. As one means of public dissemination, ISBE is proposing that districts which maintain web sites be able to post the report card on their web site rather than having to send individual report cards to each household, except upon request. For those that do not have web sites, individual report cards must be made available in the usual fashion.

**PROGRAM, PLANS and POLICY**

**Student Assessment**

*Program and Plan Information*

The agency will be seeking a five year contract as of July 2002 for the continuation of ISAT and related activities. Information from the fall 2001 Triple I focus groups was considered in the preparation of the document as was input from the Assessment Technical Advisory Committee. There are several major aspects to the proposed contract:

- **Assessment.** The contractor will build on the current ISAT, adding assessment development, scoring activities, development procedures, reports and documents, in grades 3-8 and 11 in current tests and all additions (reading and mathematics, grades 4, 6, and 7 as outlined in the federal law). Data will be collected in such a way so as to allow districts to compare student achievement in reading and math for grades 3-8.

- **Resources for use at the local district.** The contractor will support the analysis of assessment data, provide feedback to LEAs to plan/provide appropriate instruction, and provide professional development. This includes but is not limited to the release of items with item level information at the individual, school, district, and state level.

- **Online.** The contractor will research, plan and pilot computer-based testing both for improved items and delivery and retrieval, and costing out bringing this to full scale.

- **Additional High School Information.** There will also be an option for the development of additional reading and math assessments at grades 9 and 10, to be used at the choice of districts for instructional purposes at the high school level.
Informationally, the Technical Advisory Committee is composed of 25 members from throughout Illinois, university and local district personnel, who have strong technical expertise in testing and measurement (e.g., University of Illinois Champaign, Southern Illinois University, University of Chicago, and Northern Illinois University as well as major LUDA districts including Chicago and the suburbs). Dr. Robert Linn, the Co-director of CRESST from the University of Colorado, has also returned to the committee; more members will be recruited with national experience in testing and measurement. The remainder of the Committee is comprised of superintendents, district staff and principals who have major responsibilities in administering the tests and interpreting results. The committee reviews all technical procedures as well as reporting formats. They review all technical documents and give advice on other documents including the current RFSP, and have reviewed the proposed RFSP in general terms.

The Assessment Division is also working with a contractor to implement a small scale study to look at the multiple issues involved with the assessment of non-public school students across the state (e.g., voluntary testing, reporting and so on). This came about as a result of the Chicago Archdiocese deciding not to participate in a pilot effort this year but the broad issue still remains to be addressed.

**Reading**

**Program and Plan Information**

One of the newer parts in *NCLB* is Title I, Reading First. The law has five specific purposes which the application must address within the overall Illinois context. They are to:

- provide assistance in establishing reading programs for students in K-3 that are based on scientifically based reading research, to ensure that every student can read at grade level or above not later than the end of grade 3.
- provide assistance in preparing all teachers through professional development and other support so the teachers can identify specific reading barriers facing their students and have the tools to effectively help their students learn to read.
- provide assistance in selecting or administering screening, diagnostic, and classroom-based instructional reading assessments.
- provide assistance in selecting or developing effective instructional materials (including classroom-based materials to assist teachers in implementing the essential components of reading instruction), programs, learning systems, and strategies to implement methods that have been proven to prevent or remediate reading failure.
- strengthen coordination among schools, early literacy programs, and family literacy programs to improve reading achievement for all children.

The application must provide a coherent plan that provides direction for ongoing screening and diagnostic assessment of students (at least 3 times a year) and for curriculum and instruction strategies that are research-based. The plan also must have a strong accountability/evaluation component that shows how Illinois will assure all students will be reading at "grade level" by the end of 3rd grade.

The application process requires the use of a Reading and Literacy Partnership Council, co-chaired by the Governor and the State Superintendent of Education. The council is to coordinate the development and implementation of the application. The council is being named (in part similar to the one created for the Reading Excellence Act funds, in 2000), and
is to meet on April 2, 2002 for the first time. We are using an external contractor to assist us in the preparation of this application, which is due to UDSE on May 29, 2002.

Illinois can build on what we have done in the recent past in reading. We have developed classroom materials (e.g., materials such as the reading kits that went to PreK-2, 3, principals and other teachers; the ones in the works for 4-8, and updates for others; the professional development from the Meeting the Challenge Workshops for Prek-2 and 3-5, on the Illinois Snapshot of Early Learning (ISEL); and diagnostic information such as ISEL for K-1, and the related planned upcoming activities).

We are also building on knowledge gained through the Reading Excellence Act (REA) grant in Illinois. The 2000 grant was used to serve 16 districts in Illinois. Those districts have a year remaining in their grant, ending in 2003. The Reading First language builds on and strengthens the REA. Some of the major components of the Reading First requirements include instructional content based on the five essential components of reading instruction, assessment strategies for screening, diagnosing, and measuring progress, and strong professional development. Standards and accountability are the foundation of the Reading First classroom. The goal is to increase student achievement. Everything must align to state standards, be research-based, and have rigorous measures for accountability.

Both REA and Reading First focus on schools with significant numbers of children not meeting standards. However, one difference between REA and Reading First legislation is that the new Reading First legislation allows ISBE to provide professional development in early reading instruction and assessment for all teachers in the state.

Teacher Quality
Program and Plan Information
The purpose of this section of the law is to provide grants to State educational agencies, local educational agencies, State agencies for higher education, and eligible partnerships in order to increase student academic achievement through strategies such as improving teacher and principal quality and increasing the number of highly qualified teachers in the classroom and highly qualified principals and assistant principals in schools; and hold local educational agencies and schools accountable for improvements in student academic achievement.

There are several requirements that must be met, in addition to the application for/usage of funds at the state and local level. While the initial focus is on personnel employed with Title I funds, and thus the handle from USDE, it expands to all personnel and the State level as well.

Regarding personnel in Title I-funded programs:
• Beginning on January 8, 2002, school districts shall ensure that all paraprofessionals hired and working in a program supported with Title I funds shall have:
  o Completed at least two years postsecondary study;
  o Obtained an associate’s (or higher degree); or
  o Met a rigorous standard of quality and can demonstrate, through a formal state or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing and mathematics.
• School districts shall ensure that existing paraprofessionals hired into programs supported by Title I funds meet the above requirements by 2005-2006.
Beginning in the 2002-2003 school year, school districts shall ensure that all newly hired teachers hired and working in a program supported by Title 1 funds meet the following requirements:

- Public elementary and secondary teachers must be fully certified by the state and must not have had any certification requirements waived on an emergency basis.
- New elementary school teachers must have at least a bachelor’s degree and have passed the Basic Skills test and the Content Knowledge test.
- New middle grade level teachers must have at least a bachelor’s degree and pass the Basic Skills test and the Content Knowledge test, and have 18 semester hours in the major subject assigned to teach. In addition, if a middle grade level teacher is assigned to teach in more than one area, the teacher must have 9 semester hours of coursework in the other instructional area(s).
- New secondary teachers must have at least a bachelor’s degree and pass the Basic Skills test and the Content Knowledge test, have 24 semester hours in the subject matter area and specific coursework preparation in any subject area that the teacher may be assigned to teach.
- Existing public elementary, middle and secondary teachers must have at least a bachelor’s degree and meet the requirements described above, or demonstrate competency in all subjects taught. A state evaluation standard is to be used to judge competency. This standard must provide objective information about the teacher’s knowledge in the subject taught and can consider, but not use as a primary criterion, time spent teaching the subject.

The applications to USDE include a lengthy description of activities the State will undertake to be in compliance with NCLB. There are administrative funds that may be used for State implementation of the activities (generally about 5% but in the case of Title II funds, 1% for administration and 1.5% for leadership (reforming certification, mentoring, intensive professional development, alternative certification, recruitment, etc). These funds need to supplement, not supplant. Also, 2.5% of these funds go to IBHE for partnership work.

Now, here is the hard part. The federal definition was confusing so staff chose to delineate the language of "highly qualified" within the Illinois context and terms. Stated below, under the policy heading, is a suggested definition, consistent with the federal one and in alignment with state law and rules. Staff asks that the State Board of Education affirm this definition so it may be used within the State plan.

In terms of how this translates in action at the state and local levels, NCLB requires states to provide data on teachers who are teaching out of field. Once teachers in this category have been identified, states must assure that a plan is in place to move these personnel to a highly qualified status in their teaching field. Consequently, states must develop a means of assisting districts in identifying the teachers who do not meet the federal definition of a highly qualified teacher, and assure the federal government that these personnel will move to the full qualifications by 2005-06.

New teachers must have either passed a state exam in the subject(s) they are assigned to teach or the teacher must have a major in the subjects(s) they are assigned to teach. Illinois certification requirements that align to the federal definition will allow experienced teachers a variety of ways to meet the federal definition of a highly qualified teacher:
The teacher has a major in the subject assigned to teach;
The teacher passed a state exam in the subject assigned to teach;
The teacher has an endorsement on the certificate for the subject assigned to teach;
The teacher has no endorsement in the subject, but, at the time of receipt of a certificate qualifying them for the grade level, the teacher met the qualifications for the subject in Part I of the Title 23 Illinois Administrative Code as it existed at the time.

District administrators will be expected to review the assignment of staff in each fundamental learning area assignment (core academic areas). Staff members who are found to be teaching out of field must either be re-assigned to positions they are qualified to teach or must be included in a district plan designed to move the teacher into a highly qualified status by 2005-06.

ISBE will provide guidelines for the district plans with options on how to assist teachers in moving to the highly qualified status. Options will most likely include:
- Alignment of professional development activities towards subjects being taught or;
- College coursework aligned to subjects being taught or;
- Attainment of an endorsement in subjects being taught or;
- Successful completion of content exam in subject being taught or;
- Some combination of the first and second options.

These options are among the topics to discuss with external partners in the next two weeks. Once the collaboration with partners is established, final guidelines will be developed.

**Policy**

The State Board needs to affirm a definition of "high quality" teachers. The suggested one is:

**Illinois Definition of a Highly Qualified Teacher**

- Each early childhood, elementary, middle level and secondary teacher shall hold a valid certificate for the grade levels to be taught

- Each elementary teacher shall have formal training in university coursework in each basic instructional area to be taught.

- Each middle grade level teacher must have 18 semester hours in the major subject s/he is assigned to teach. In addition, if a middle grade level teacher is assigned to teach in two areas, additional coursework is required with specific courses identified in Part I of the 23 Illinois Administrative Code.

- Secondary teachers must have 24 semester hours in the subject matter area and specific coursework preparation in any subject area that the teacher may be assigned to teach as outlined in Part I of the 23 Illinois Administrative Code.

- Teachers may receive endorsements on certificates which allow them to teach additional subjects. These endorsements require specific coursework depending on the endorsement as described in the 23 Illinois Administrative Code. Teachers are evaluated with a uniform state standard of transcript review to determine eligibility for endorsements.
• Teachers with K-12 certificates have specific subject matter endorsements and may teach only that subject, unless the teacher holds additional certificates. The subject area endorsement requires endorsements in the area of specialization with specific course requirements outlined in Part I of the 23 Illinois Administrative Code.

• All candidates seeking Initial Illinois educator certification must pass the Illinois Certification Testing System Basic Skills test. In 2000-2001, the Basic Skills test was enhanced with new test standards, new test items, and new passing scores. Since 1988, all candidates must also successfully complete a test of content knowledge related to their subject matter concentration.

• Beginning July 2003, in addition to successfully completing tests of basic skills and content knowledge, teacher candidates will also need to successfully complete a test of “common-core knowledge” which will assess them on the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards (which include special education standards and pedagogy), Language Arts Standards for All teachers and Technology Standards for All teachers.

• Beginning July 2004, new content tests aligned with the new teacher standards will also be required. Tests will be required in not only the major field of study, but also each area of endorsement on certificates.

Technology
Program and Plan Information
The primary goal is to improve student academic achievement through the use of technology in elementary and secondary schools. It also designed to assist all students to become technologically literate by the end of the 8th grade and encourage integration of technology resources and systems with professional development and curriculum development to promote research-based instructional methods that can be replicated.

Like the 21st Century Community Learning Centers, the state can choose an individual or a consolidated application. If the former, the individual application must include strategies for improving academic achievement; goals; steps to increase accessibility; accountability measures; Innovative delivery strategies; non-supplant assurance; professional and curricular development; technical assistance; technology resources and systems; strategies for financing technology; strategies for parental involvement; competitive grant description; integration of technology with curricula and instruction; incentives; and support. If the latter, the application must provide “descriptions, information, assurances, and other materials that are absolutely necessary for the consideration of the consolidated State plan or consolidated State application.” Staff are considering the consolidated application approach.

Up to 5% of the technology allocation may be used to carry out state-level activities and to assist local efforts to carry out the purposes of the program. No more than 60% of this 5% may be used for administrative purposes. The State must distribute 50% of the remainder, on a formula basis, to eligible LEAs that have submitted applications. Eligibility will be primarily based upon the Title I poverty count. The State must distribute 50% of the remainder on a competitive basis to eligible local entities that have submitted applications.
The focus of the grant will be addressing high need LEAs, defined as those LEAs with the highest numbers or percentages of children from families with incomes below the poverty line and having one or more schools identified in "school improvement" or "corrective action" status of NCLB, or has a substantial need for assistance in acquiring and using technology.

The projected allocation for Illinois is $25,692,598. Of that, 5% would be $1,284,630; the administrative portion is therefore $770,778 and the remaining state leadership activities. Then 50% of remainder (after 5% deducted) is $12,203,984 for formula grants, and the same amount is available for the competitive grants. In comparison, under the previous ESEA funding, the State distributed approximately $17 million annually through competitive grants only. Local grantees must use at least 25% for professional development activities.

In terms of planning, an organizational group has been identified and has commenced activities to address the current draft of the State Plan for Technology in P – 12 Education to insure specifics of NCLB are included. Beyond the organizational group, a practitioners group will be identified to insure we are accurately meeting the needs of the locals.

In addition, staff is working to identify long-term strategies to implement to improve student academic achievement, especially in reading and math, by integrating technology into school curricula and instruction. These strategies should focus on student access to technology, staff development to integrate technology into teaching and learning, and accountability for the use of technology. Key activities that ISBE would conduct or sponsor to help high-need LEAs would revolve around acquiring technology through public-private sector initiatives, fully integrating technology into their school curricula and instruction, and developing performance measurement systems to ascertain the effectiveness of educational technology.

21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC)
Program and Plan Information
The 21st CCLC program is to create community learning centers that provide students (and families) with academic enrichment opportunities as well as additional activities designed to complement their regular academic program. These centers must provide a range of high-quality services to support student learning and development, including tutoring and mentoring, homework help, academic enrichment (such as hands-on science or technology programs), community service opportunities, as well as music, arts, sports and cultural activities. At the same time, centers help working parents by providing a safe environment for students when school is not in session.

The law’s specific purposes are to:
• provide opportunities for academic enrichment, including providing tutorial services to help students, particularly students who attend low-performing schools, to meet State and local student performance standards in core academic subjects;
• offer students a broad array of additional services, programs, and activities that are designed to reinforce and complement their regular academic program; and
• offer families of these students opportunities for literacy and related education.

During federal FY2001, USDE administered 1,587 grants totaling $869,563,148. Of these grants, Illinois received 43 totaling $23,169,488 for an average award of $538,825, with 190 individual centers participating, serving a total of nearly 8,000 students and 4,000 adults (first,
second and third year grants all in that figure). These existing grantees will continue to be funded by USDE until their current funding cycle (three years) has expired. Illinois is eligible to receive $12.5 million in 2002-03; next year it should be $24 million and so on, until the existing grantees are paid in full. States now will be accountable to the USDE for ensuring that all statutory requirements are met. In addition, up to five percent of the allocation may be spent by the state for administrative responsibilities.

*NCLB* made several significant changes to ensure that the program focuses on helping children in high-needs schools succeed academically through the use of scientifically based practice and extended learning time. *NCLB* provides flexibility in how funds can be used to support higher academic achievement, and dramatically expands eligibility for 21st CCLC funding to public and private educational and youth-serving organizations. *NCLB* now allows in addition to public elementary or secondary schools the use of community based organizations and faith-based organizations.

Issues to consider in the planning process, in addition to a prescribed planning process, are:

- States must give priority to applications for projects that will serve children in schools designated as in need of "school improvement" and that are submitted jointly by school districts receiving Title I funds and community-based organizations.
- States now have the discretion to award grants to local organizations for a period of 3 to 5 years, with a minimum grant award of $50,000/year.
- States may determine the size and scope of individual grants in order to assure reasonable expectation of successful implementation of program elements.
- States must develop performance indicators and performance measures that it can use to evaluate programs and activities.
- States must require local grantees to implement programs that meet specific principles of effectiveness.
- Grantees must evaluate to assess progress toward achieving the goal of providing high-quality opportunities for academic enrichment.
- States *may* now require local grantees to match funds. Under the previous law no match was required. If the ISBE elects to require matching funds, the amount of the match must be based on a sliding scale relative to the poverty of the population to be targeted and the ability of the applicant to obtain matching funds.

ISBE may submit its application for 21st CCLC either as part of the consolidated ESEA application (pursuant to the March 6, 2002 federal register) or as a stand-alone application. Staff are proceeding with the application as part of the consolidated plan.

*Policy*

States *may* now require local grantees to match funds. Under the previous law no match was required. If the ISBE elects to require matching funds, the amount of the match must be based on a sliding scale relative to the poverty of the population to be targeted and the ability of the applicant to obtain matching funds. Staff recommend that we do not require a match, given the poverty scenario of the local recipient area (whether the applicant is a school district, community-based or faith-based organization serving that community).

*School Choices*

*Persistently Dangerous Schools*
Policy
The State Board of Education must sign an assurance as part of the State Plan that it has in place a policy on "persistently dangerous schools." The law in Title IX is: SEC. 9532. Unsafe School Choice Option. (a) Unsafe School Choice Policy. Each State receiving funds under this Act shall establish and implement a statewide policy requiring that a student attending a persistently dangerous public elementary school or secondary school, as determined by the State in consultation with a representative sample of local educational agencies, or who becomes a victim of a violent criminal offense, as determined by State law, while in or on the grounds of a public elementary school or secondary school that the student attends, be allowed to attend a safe public elementary school or secondary school within the local educational agency, including a public charter school. (b) CERTIFICATION- As a condition of receiving funds under this Act, a State shall certify in writing to the Secretary that the State is in compliance with this section.

The State Board of Education staff are working with an advisory group as required to review information and develop a policy statement on this issue. It is anticipated that the policy will be available for April action.

Public School Choice Policy or Other Action
Within Title I of NCLB, a cascade of school improvement tasks is outlined. The law is: A local educational agency shall identify for school improvement any elementary school or secondary school served under this part that fails, for 2 consecutive years, to make adequate yearly progress as defined in the State’s plan under section 1111(b)(2). The identification described in subparagraph (A) shall take place before the beginning of the school year following such failure to make adequate yearly progress.

Public School Choice - In the case of a school identified for school improvement under this paragraph, the local educational agency shall, not later than the first day of the school year following such identification, provide all students enrolled in the school with the option to transfer to another public school served by the local educational agency, which may include a public charter school, that has not been identified for school improvement under this paragraph, unless such an option is prohibited by State law. In providing students the option to transfer to another public school, the local educational agency shall give priority to the lowest achieving children from low-income families, as determined by the local educational agency for purposes of allocating funds to schools under section 1113(c)(1). Students who use the option to transfer under subparagraph (E) and paragraph (5)(A), (7)(C)(i), or (8)(A)(i) or subsection (c)(10)(C)(vii) shall be enrolled in classes and other activities in the public school to which the students transfer in the same manner as all other children at the public school.

Additionally, the school district must provide, or shall pay for the provision of, transportation for the student to the public school the student attends.

The State Board of Education staff are working with an advisory group as required to review information and develop a statement on this issue. It is anticipated that the policy will be available for April action. Additionally, Chicago #299 has proposed a statutory change which would prohibit transfers of students outlined above to overcrowded schools, schools
with an academic acceptance criteria unless the student meets that criteria, or in violation of desegregation orders.

**Supplemental Education Services**

*Program and Plan Information*

Again relating to schools in school improvement or corrective action status, the LEA serving such school shall arrange for the provision of supplemental educational services to eligible children in the school from a provider with a demonstrated record of effectiveness, that is selected by the parents and approved for that purpose by ISBE. An annual notice provision from the LEAs to the parents is required. If space is limited, there needs to be a fair and equitable procedure for serving students.

In terms of process, the LEA enters into an agreement with a provider once selected by the parents. The agreement details are delineated somewhat in NCLB. The agreement delineates the statement of specific achievement goals, how progress will be measured, timetable, reporting procedures, termination of service procedures, payment by the LEA to the provider, and so on. Among the services that could be offered are tutorial services, learning assessments, test skill training, computer access and training, and so on.

ISBE through a public process must promote maximum participation by providers, develop and apply objective criteria to potential providers, maintain an updated list of approved providers statewide by district from which parents may select, and develop, implement, and publicly report on standards and techniques for monitoring the quality and effectiveness of the services offered by approved providers under this subsection, and for withdrawing approval from providers that fail, for 2 consecutive years, regarding student academic achievement. ISBE could use state leadership funds from Title V to supplement locally available funds for this purpose.
Attachments

1. Agency Work Plan
2. State Plans and Applications Strategy
3. Synopsis of *Federal Register* Notice of March 6, 2002
4. *No Child Left Behind* Alert #1
5. *No Child Left Behind* Special Bulletin #1
6. *No Child Left Behind* Points of Contact
7. Federal Education Entitlement Funds for 2002-03
Attachment #1

Staff Work Plan on HR 1, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (PL 107-110)

- Overall coordination of planning and implementation by Chris Koch and Lynne Haeffele.
- Planning/coordination team working on an ongoing basis.
- Intensive communication with as many parties as possible, using every venue.
- Topical planning teams to prepare State plans/applications (e.g., Title II on teacher quality, Technology), including use of resource teams available across the board, e.g., data and participation), including appropriate partners for planning as required and desired, e.g., Governor's Office, Title I Committee of Practitioners.
- State policy development and action by the State Board of Education, e.g., "persistently dangerous schools."
- Ongoing dialogue with the State Board of Education itself and staff of the Governor's office.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Requirement</th>
<th>Illinois Requirement/Action</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Now -- March-May</strong></td>
<td><strong>while General Assembly is in</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation by selected sample of schools in NAEP’s biennial assessment of reading and math at grades 4 and 8.</td>
<td>Require participation of selected.</td>
<td>Law Rules</td>
<td>Change in law <strong>now</strong>, to be in place for 2002-03. Rules thereafter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require LEAs to provide information on district website.</td>
<td>Change law regarding the provision of the school report card (required to be on web site) state reporting requirements.</td>
<td>Law Plan</td>
<td>Change in law <strong>now</strong>, effective for fall 2002. Dialogue; write in 2002 Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notify parents of children placed in bilingual programs of additional information</td>
<td>State law must be expanded, given the additional provisions, and rules modified accordingly.</td>
<td>Law Public Information Plan</td>
<td>Change law <strong>now</strong> for 2002-03 school year. Dialogue; write</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before the current notice provisions.</td>
<td>LEAs must expand notice provisions.</td>
<td>Rules</td>
<td>in 2002 Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Before May 28, 2002</strong></td>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>February thru end of May 2002.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall coordination and submittal of consolidated state applications and other individual applications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a consolidated State plan for all other federal fund areas e.g., Title I (such as basic Title I, Even Start, Neglected and Delinquent, Migrant); Title II (teacher quality); Title III (English Language Learners); Title IV (Safe and Drug-Free); and Title V (Innovation).</td>
<td>This will need to align to the new federal requirements.</td>
<td>Plan Grant process</td>
<td>Now. Dialogue; write in 2002 Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify/use reading programs based on scientifically-based research/training; technical assistance for teachers. Funding for screening, diagnostic and classroom based reading assessment. Prepare and submit a State plan for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois will need a state application by May 29th for Reading First. It will build on state action to date plus Reading Excellence Act grant experience of the last two years, working with a statewide planning team.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan Admin. Rules</td>
<td>Now. Dialogue; write in 2002 Plan due 5/29/02.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading First; implement.</td>
<td>Prepare and submit a State plan for technology; implement as part of overall.</td>
<td>Illinois has a State plan in draft form. This will need to align to the new federal requirements.</td>
<td>Plan Grant process</td>
<td>Now. Dialogue; write in 2002 Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decide whether or not to participate in the State Flexibility program.</td>
<td>A letter of intent is due, followed by an application thereupon.</td>
<td>Discussion Letter of intent Plan Grant process</td>
<td>Formal letter by 5/15/02. Plan due thereafter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a State plan for 21st Century Community Learning Center as part of overall. Implement to award funds competitively.</td>
<td>A new application process must occur, including awards possible to faith-based and community-based organizations.</td>
<td>Plan Grant process</td>
<td>Now. Dialogue; write in 2002 Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools must have a crisis management plan for responding to violent or traumatic incidents on school grounds.</td>
<td>Illinois has foundation for meeting the requirement (e.g., crisis handbook distributed to all schools, safe school audit resource). Grant applications for 2002-03 will have this requirement as an assurance.</td>
<td>Public Information Assurance</td>
<td>Already prepared and In 2002 grant assurance package.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Title II plan, work plan to ensure that all teachers in core academic areas are highly-qualified in the area of teaching assignment by 2005-06.</td>
<td>Define highly-qualified for Illinois and develop plan to ensure appropriate certification/assignments for all teachers. Many steps already taken to improve teacher quality in Illinois.</td>
<td>Public Information Plan</td>
<td>Now. Dialogue; write in 2002 Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delineate sanctions and rewards State uses for accountability of student achievement.</td>
<td>Reward system by State is generally not in place; will need to expand. RULES</td>
<td>Plan Rules</td>
<td>Now. Dialogue; write in 2002 Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that students are making adequate yearly progress annually and that all students (100%) are meeting state standards within 12 years.</td>
<td>Revise warning and watch list timelines and procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before School Begins</td>
<td>ISBE must return school status data/scores prior to the beginning of school. Districts have 30 days in which to correct data if not accurate.</td>
<td>Annually inform districts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the beginning of the school year (every year applicable)</td>
<td>Annually inform districts. Public Information Link to school designation system. Rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless student services must be provided.</td>
<td>Federal and state laws now match, and will be emphasized to LEAs.</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notify public/parents of right to information</td>
<td>LEAs need to know of this federal requirement.</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Notify parents regarding student privacy in certain areas.</th>
<th>LEAs need to know of this federal requirement.</th>
<th>Public Information Plan</th>
<th>Now. Dialogue; write in 2002 Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Notify parents of status of schools (e.g., school improvement status).</td>
<td>LEAs need to know of this federal requirement</td>
<td>Public Information Plan</td>
<td>Now. Dialogue; write in 2002 Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Notify parents of their right to request information regarding professional qualifications of the student’s classroom teachers.</td>
<td>LEAs need to know of this federal requirement</td>
<td>Public Information Plan</td>
<td>Now. Dialogue; write in 2002 Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Provide the opportunity for students who attend “persistently dangerous” schools to transfer to another school in district.</td>
<td>Define “persistently dangerous” and develop policy. State plan for implementation as part of federal requirements for a mid-May document.</td>
<td>Policy Plan Admin. Public Information</td>
<td>Board policy in <strong>Spring 2002</strong>, for use in 2002 Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Provide the opportunity for students attending schools that are identified as low-performing with option to transfer to a better-performing school within the district in 2nd year +</td>
<td>Adopt policies and procedures for implementation, including transportation.</td>
<td>Policy Plan Admin. Public Information</td>
<td>Board policy in <strong>Spring 2002</strong>, for use in 2002 Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy</strong></td>
<td><strong>Plan</strong></td>
<td><strong>Admin.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Public Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Provide students attending schools that are identified as low-performing with option of supplemental educational services in 3rd year+ on AEWL.**

Institute system for identification, screening, evaluating and listing providers of supplemental educational services (on an ongoing basis).

**Provide disaggregated data by designated categories; align federal and state requirements.**

**Ongoing**

**Collect data on a school-level basis, and report/analyze at the state level for many purposes.**

State action in terms of a data warehouse, plus ongoing data analysis.

**Annual testing in math and reading at grades 3-8 and once in high school.**

Test development, piloting etc until tests commence 2005-06.

**NCLB agency work group.**

Coordination Ongoing

**Participation in NAEP as of 2003 when sampled.**

**General information.**

**Agency NCLB website.**


State action in terms of a data warehouse, plus ongoing data analysis.

Contract. Admin. Data Plan

Coordination Ongoing

Admin.

Public Information March 1st -- on

Public Information March 15th -- on
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsible Entity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing speakers' bureau.</td>
<td>Public Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video-telecast information.</td>
<td>Public Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued work to ensure all teachers highly qualified per plan.</td>
<td>Plan Admin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued work to ensure all paraprofessionals in Title I-funded programs are highly qualified.</td>
<td>Plan Admin.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Maintain as is**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsible Entity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Long-Term**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsible Entity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that all students meet proficiency.</td>
<td>Data Admin.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The purpose of the draft guidance document is to seek comments prior to final issuance. Comments are requested by April 5th but preferred by March 25th. To receive federal FY02 program funds on a timely basis, a State Educational Agency's (SEA) application would need to be received no later than May 28, 2002.

Purpose of Consolidated State Applications. As viewed by USDE, the purpose of applications and reports is the opportunity for SEAs to communicate to the public, policymakers and others the basis on which State officials responsible for implementing the new law propose to hold themselves accountable for ensuring that no child is left behind.

Process. Before they can implement their Elementary and Secondary Education (ESEA) programs, States need to apply for and receive federal funding. In 1994, the ESEA allowed each SEA in consultation with the Governor to apply for ESEA program funds on the basis of a consolidated State plan or application. ESEA continues the authority for LEAs to receive program funding through submission of consolidated local plans or applications. Consolidated applications can be a tool to promote state and local flexibility in exchange for greater State and local accountability for increased state achievement. SEAs would be required to provide information and data in their consolidated applications that would be the baseline for State reporting in their annual performance reports. States would have flexibility to develop targets for measuring progress that fits individual State contexts. All applications and reports focus on student achievement.

Programs to be Included in new Consolidated Application (plus comments):
- Title I, Basic (in current consolidated application of June 1996, following the 1994 last reauthorization)
- Title I, Even Start (current)
- Title I, Migrant (current)
- Title I, Neglected and Delinquent (current)
- Title I, Comprehensive School Reform (formerly a competitive application)
- Title II, Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund (current, but significant change)
- Title II, Enhancing Education Through Technology
- Title III, English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement and Academic Achievement
- Title IV, Safe and Drug Free (current)
- Title IV, Community Service (for Expelled and Suspended Youth) Grants (new)
- Title IV, 21st Century Community Learning Centers (new)
- Title V, Innovative Programs (current)
- Title VI, Rural and Low Income Schools (new)

Two program areas included in ESEA that are not listed above are Title X, Homeless; Title I, Reading First; and State Flexibility. The Reading First application is due by May 29, 2002. No date has been set as of 3/6/02 for the Homeless application. The State Flexibility program has a letter of intent due by May 15, 2002. Two of the listed program areas can submit applications as part of the consolidated application, or not -- 21st CCLC and Technology.

The Secretary may designate other programs for inclusion in a consolidated state application.

USDE Proposal for the Content of the Applications. Successful student academic performance depends upon the opportunity to attend schools that:
- Provide instruction to all students that lead to gains in achievement for all students;
- Have highly qualified teachers and principals;
- Provide a learning environment that is safe and drug free and conducive to learning; and
- Are accountable to the public for results.
States must integrate these principles. It is suggested that States adopt:

- Six overall performance goals that cut across the ESEA programs;
- Core indicators for measuring progress towards these goals; and
- Performance targets that define when satisfactory progress occurs.

It is also proposed that States provide certain minimum information per program area.

In the area of **performance goals**, USDE identifies 6 goals that they propose each SEA adopt. They are:

1. All students will reach high standards at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading and math by 2013-14.
2. By 2013-14, all students will be proficient in reading by the end of the 3rd grade.
3. All LEP students will become proficient in English.
4. By 2005-06., all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
5. All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free and conducive to learning.
6. All students will graduate from high school.

States would use **performance indicators** to measure their progress in meeting the ESEA performance goals. USDE would require each SEA that submits a consolidated application to adopt, at minimum, USDE’s core set of indicators for the above goals.

**Performance targets** define the progress a State expects to make at specified points in time with respect to each indicator. USDE states that States would define and adopt its own performance targets.

Finally, the accountability plan relies upon **collection of data** that explain how well States are succeeding in meeting their performance targets. The consolidated application needs to describe timelines and benchmarks for securing these data, as well as their data source, and baseline information as applicable. The annual performance reports (e.g., like the IASA Performance Report due March 31, 2002) would provide updated data on their progress in meeting their performance targets as well as other data requested by USDE.

**Other Requirements in the Consolidated Application.** There are some general and specific requirements that must be met:

- A description of key strategies States would use to implement the ESEA programs.
- Key programmatic and fiscal information.
- Assurances of the State's compliance to all program requirements.

SEAs are required to maintain documentation of compliance with all program requirements.

**Data Management Reform**

USDE will work with SEAs and LEAs to establish data standards for performance indicators and other information, including ways to collect and electronically record useful baseline and follow-up data through an internet based format. States are encouraged to report their assessment data using common formats and measures.

They propose that each SEA submit a consolidated application to USDE by May 2002 with at least the following:

- A statement that it has adopted the minimum core ESEA goals and performance indicators that the department will establish and agrees to adopt for inclusion in the following years consolidated application its own performance targets for these indicators.
- A description of the key activities & initiatives the state will carry out with ESEA state-level administrative and activity funds, including activities to help achieve their performance targets, i.e., info about the state’s standards, assessment and accountability system (such as timelines in May 2002 and other info and evidence at a later date), subgranting processes, technical assistance, monitoring, professional development and other coordinating activities
- the individual ESEA program descriptions that USDE needs to ensure program integrity.

States that have adopted performance targets that link to these performance indicators would be encouraged to submit them with their applications along with baseline data. If they do not submit their ESEA performance targets and associated baseline data by May 2002, they would have to do so by May 2003 in order to make timely awards of federal FY03 funds.
Public Participation Process. Section 9304(a) (7) of the ESEA provides for public comment on the State application by requiring, as one of the SEA's general assurances, that "before the [consolidated application] was submitted to the Secretary, the State afforded a reasonable opportunity for public comment on the application and considered such comment."

Performance Goals, Performance Indicators, and State Performance Targets. The proposed system of accountability for NCLB is built on several key elements:

1. "Performance goals" that the Department has established. These goals reflect the basic purposes of the ESEA and the programs included in the consolidated application.
2. "Performance indicators" that the Department has established for each ESEA performance goal. States would use these indicators to measure their progress in meeting the ESEA performance goals.
3. "Performance targets" that each State would establish. The performance targets define the progress a State expects to make at specified points in time with respect to each indicator.

USDE identifies six performance goals that are central to the purposes of the ESEA programs, and performance indicators for each of these performance goals. Each State must adopt this set of six performance goals and corresponding performance indicators. However, a State may include additional performance goals and indicators in its application if it desires to do so.

Performance goal 1: All students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading and mathematics by 2013-2014.

1.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of students in Title I schools, in the aggregate and for each subgroup, who are at or above the proficient level in reading on the State's assessment.
1.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of students in Title I schools, in the aggregate and in each subgroup, who are at or above the proficient level in mathematics on the State's assessment.
1.3 Performance indicator: The percentage of Title I schools that make adequate yearly progress in reading and mathematics.
1.4 Performance indicator: The percentage of migrant students who are enrolled in schools in need of improvement.
1.5 Performance indicator: The percentage of students that meet or exceed State standards for student literacy in technology.

Performance goal 2: By 2013-2014, all students will be proficient in reading by the end of the third grade.

2.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of students in third grade reading at grade level or above.

Performance goal 3: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English.

3.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of children identified as limited English proficient that have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.

Performance goal 4: By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

4.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of classes being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in "high-poverty" schools (as the term is defined in section 1111(h) (1) (C) (viii) of the ESEA).
4.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development (See definition of "professional development" in section 9101 (34)).
4.3 Performance indicator: The percentage of teachers qualified to use technology for instruction.

Performance goal 5: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.

5.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of students who carried a weapon (for example, a gun, knife, or club) on school property (in the 30 days prior to the survey).
5.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of students who engaged in a physical fight on school property (in the 12 months preceding the survey).
5.3 Performance indicator: The percentage of students offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property (in the 12 months preceding the survey).
5.4 Performance indicator: The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State.

5.5 Performance indicator: The number of schools in which all students are able to work from a networked computer.

Performance Goal 6: All students will graduate from high school.

6.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of students who complete high school, disaggregated by poverty, limited English proficient and migrant status, and major ethnic and racial group membership.

6.2 Performance indicator: The number of students who drop out of school after entering grades 7 through 12, disaggregated by the poverty, limited English proficient and migrant status, and major ethnic and racial group membership.

State Activities to Implement ESEA Programs. SEAs are expected to conduct activities (or reflect on those already conducted) to ensure effective implementation of the ESEA programs included in their consolidated applications. Many of the activities may serve multiple programs. In responding to the items in this section, SEAs would indicate the ESEA programs that will benefit from the activities it describes. Where applicable, States may include web references, electronic files, or other existing documentation to comply with the requirements listed in the application.

1. Describe the State's system of standards, assessments, and accountability and provide evidence that it meets the requirements of the ESEA.

   a. Provide evidence that the State has adopted challenging content standards in mathematics and reading/language arts in accordance with Title I, Part A of the ESEA, where not previously submitted. If the State has modified its currently approved content standards in mathematics, reading, or language arts, submit evidence that the modified standards meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1). The Department will issue guidance on what kind of evidence it will expect to see.

   b. Provide evidence that the State has adopted challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1) or, if these standards have yet to be adopted, submit a timeline for their development and submit evidence when it is available, but no later than May 2005.

   c. Provide a detailed timeline, in accord with their schedule, for the development and implementation, in consultation with LEAs, of assessments that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required subjects and grade levels. When assessments are in place, provide evidence that they meet those requirements.

   d. Provide a detailed timeline, in accord with their schedule, for setting, in consultation with LEAs, academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading or language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1). When academic achievement standards have been set, provide evidence that they have been adopted and meet those requirements.

   e. Describe how the State defines its adequate yearly progress "starting point" for the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the State's proficient level (or provide a timeline for determining the starting point and for submitting this information).

   f. Provide the State's definition of adequate yearly progress (or provide a timeline for determining the definition and for submitting the definition) including

      i. For the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the State's proficient level, provide the starting point percentage; the intermediate goals; the timeline; and annual objectives.

      ii. Current high school graduation rate and target rate.

      iii. One other academic indicator, applicable to elementary schools, and its target.

      iv. Any other (optional) indicators and their targets.

   g. Provide evidence that the State has a single accountability system that uses the same criteria, based primarily on assessments consistent with section 1111(b), for determining whether a school has made adequate yearly progress, regardless of whether the school receives Title I, Part A or other Federal funds.

   h. Identify the languages present in the student population to be assessed, languages in which the State administers assessments, and languages in which the State will need to administer assessments.

   i. Provide evidence that, beginning not later than the school year 2002-2003, LEAs will provide for an annual assessment of English proficiency that meets the requirements of section 1111(b)(7).

   j. Describe the status of the State's effort to establish standards and annual measurable achievement objectives that relate to the development and attainment of English proficiency by limited English proficient children. These standards and objectives must be derived from the domains of speaking, listening, reading, writing, and comprehension, and be aligned with the State academic content and student academic achievement standards
as required by section 1111(b)(1) of the ESEA. If they are not yet established, describe the State’s plan and timeline for completing the development of these standards and achievement objectives.

2. Describe key procedures, selection criteria, and priorities the State will use to award competitive subgrants (or contracts) to the entities and for the activities required by the program statutes of applicable programs included in the consolidated application. States should include a description of how, for each program, these selection criteria and priorities will promote improved academic achievement. Applicable included programs are Even Start Family Literacy; Education of Migrant Children; Prevention and Intervention for Children Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk--Local Agency Programs; Comprehensive School Reform; Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund--subgrants to eligible partnerships; Enhanced Education Through Technology; Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities--reservation for the Governor; Community Service Grants; and 21st Century Community Learning Centers.

3. Describe how the State will monitor and provide professional development and technical assistance to LEAs, schools, and other subgrantees to help them implement their programs and meet the States’ (and those entities’ own) performance goals and objectives. This should include a description of assistance the SEA will provide to LEAs, schools, and other subgrantees in identifying and implementing effective instructional programs and practices based on scientific research.

4. Describe the Statewide system of support under section 1117 to ensure that all schools meet the State’s academic content and student achievement standards, including how the State will provide assistance to low-performing schools.

5. Describe the activities the State will conduct to--
   a. Help Title I schools make effective use of schoolwide programs to improve the achievement of all students;
   b. Ensure that all teachers, particularly those in high-poverty areas and those in schools in need of improvement, are highly qualified. This description should include the help States will provide to LEAs and schools to:
      i. Conduct effective professional development activities;
      ii. Recruit and hire highly qualified teachers, including those licensed or certified through alternative routes; and
      iii. Retain highly qualified teachers.
   c. Help LEAs with a high need for technology, high percentages or numbers of children in poverty, and low-performing schools to form partnerships with other LEAs, institutions of higher education (IHEs), libraries, and other private and public profit and non-profit entities with technology expertise to improve the use of technology in instruction.
   d. Promote parental and community participation in schools.
   e. Secure the baseline and follow-up data discussed in the “Framework for ESEA Accountability” section.

6. Briefly describe how State officials and staff will coordinate the various ESEA-funded programs and State-level activities the State administers, and how the State will coordinate with other organizations, such as businesses, IHEs, nonprofit organizations and other State agencies, and with other Federal programs (including those authorized by Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act, the Head Start Act, the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, and the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act).

7. Describe the strategies the State will use to determine, on a regular basis, whether LEAs, schools, and other subgrantees are making satisfactory progress in meeting State and local goals and desired program outcomes. In doing so, the SEA should also describe how it will use data it gathers from subgrantees on how well they are meeting State performance targets, and the actions the State will take to determine or revise interventions for any LEAs, schools, and other subgrantees that are not making substantial progress.

Key Programmatic and Fiscal Information. USDE has an overall responsibility for ensuring the programmatic and fiscal integrity of the ESEA programs. To meet this responsibility, the Department proposes that before it would award FY 2002 program funds on the basis of a consolidated application, it would need to review and approve information on how the State would comply with a few key requirements of the individual ESEA programs included in the application. In particular, the Department would need the SEA to respond to the following:

Program Requirements
1. Title I, Part B, Subpart 3--Even Start Family Literacy
   a. Describe how the SEA will use its indicators of program quality to monitor, evaluate, and improve its projects, and to decide whether to continue operating them.
b. Describe what constitutes sufficient program progress when the SEA makes continuation awards.

c. Explain how the State's Even Start projects will provide assistance to low-income families participating in the program to help children in those families to achieve to the applicable State content and student achievement standards.

2. Title I, Part C--Education of Migrant Children

a. Describe the process the State will use to develop, implement, and document a comprehensive needs assessment that identifies the special educational and related needs of migrant children.

b. Describe the State's priorities for the use of migrant education program funds in order to meet the State's performance targets for indicators 1.1, 1.2, and 2.1 as appendix A (as well as 1.4, 6.1, and 6.2 that expressly include migrant students), and how they relate to the State's assessment of needs for services.

c. Describe how the State will determine the amount of any subgrants the State will award to local operating agencies, taking into account the numbers and needs of migratory children, the statutory priority for service in section 1304(d), and the availability of funds from other Federal, State, and local programs.

d. Describe how the State will promote continuity of education and the interstate and intrastate coordination of services for migratory children.

e. Describe the State's plan to evaluate the effectiveness of its migrant education program and projects.

3. Title I, Part D--Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk

a. Describe the program goals, performance indicators, performance objectives, and data sources that the State has established for its use in assessing the effectiveness of the program in improving the academic and vocational and technical skills of students participating in the program.

b. Describe how the SEA is assisting projects funded under the program in facilitating the transition of children and youth from correctional facilities to locally operated programs.

4. Title I, Part F--Comprehensive School Reform

a. Describe the process the State educational agency will use to ensure that programs funded include and integrate all eleven required components of a comprehensive school reform program.

b. Describe the percentage of schools that participate in the Comprehensive School Reform program (CSR) meeting or exceeding the proficient level of performance on State assessments in reading and mathematics.

5. Title II, Part A--Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund

a. If not fully addressed in the State's response to the information on performance goals, indicators, and targets in Appendix A, describe the remainder of the State's annual measurable objectives under section 1119(a) (2).

b. Describe how the SEA will hold LEAs accountable both for (1) meeting the annual measurable objectives described in section 1119(a)(2) of the ESEA, and (2) ensuring that the professional development the LEAs offer their teachers and other instructional staff is consistent with the definition of "professional development" in section 9101(34).

6. Title II, Part D--Enhanced Education through Technology

a. Provide a brief summary of the SEA's long-term strategies for improving student academic achievement, including technology literacy, through the effective use of technology in the classroom, and the capacity of teachers to integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction.

b. Describe key activities that the SEA will conduct or sponsor with the funds it retains at the State level. These may include such activities as provision of distance learning in rigorous academic courses or curricula; the establishment or support of public-private initiatives for the acquisition of technology by high-need LEAs; and the development of performance measurement systems to determine the effectiveness of educational technology programs.

c. Provide a brief description of how:
   i. The SEA will ensure that students and teachers, particularly those in the schools of high-need LEAs, have increased access to technology, and
   ii. The SEA will coordinate the application and award process for State discretionary grant and formula grant funds under this program.

7. Title III, Part A--English Language Acquisition and Language Enhancement
a. Describe how the SEA will ensure that subgrantees use program funds only to carry out activities that reflect scientifically based research on the education of limited English proficient children while allowing those grantees flexibility (to the extent permitted under State law) to select and implement such activities in a manner that they determine best reflects local needs and circumstances.

b. Describe how the SEA will hold subgrantees accountable for meeting all annual measurable achievement objectives for limited English proficient children, and making adequate yearly progress for limited English proficient children.

8. Title IV, Part A--Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities
a. Describe the key strategies in the State’s comprehensive plan for the use of funds by the SEA and the Governor of the State to provide safe, orderly, and drug-free schools and communities through programs and activities that:
   i. Complement and support activities of LEAs under section 4115(b) of the ESEA;
   ii. Comply with the principles of effectiveness under section 4115(a); and
   iii. Otherwise are in accordance with the purpose of Title IV, Part A.

9. Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2--Rural and Low-Income School Program
a. Describe how the State elects to make awards under the Rural and Low-Income School Program:
   i. By formula proportionate to the numbers of students in eligible districts;
   ii. Competitively (please explain any priorities for the competition); or
   iii. By a State-designed formula that results in equal or greater assistance being awarded to school districts that serve higher concentrations of poor students.

Fiscal Information.
1. Consolidated Administered Funds. Does the SEA plan to consolidate State-level administrative funds? If yes, please provide information and analysis concerning Federal and other funding that demonstrates that Federal funds constitute less than half of the funds used to support the SEA. If yes, are there any programs whose funds are available for administration that the SEA will not consolidate? Please describe your plans for any additional uses of funds.

2. Transferability. Does the State plan to transfer non-administrative State-level ESEA funds under the provisions of the State and Local Transferability Act (sections 6121 to 6123 of the ESEA)? If so, please list the funds and the amounts and percentages to be transferred, the program from which funds are to be transferred, and the program into which funds are to be transferred.

3. Program Specific Fiscal Information
a. Title I, Part A--Improving Basic Programs Operated By LEAs.
   i. Identify the amount of the reservation in section 1003(a) for school improvement that the State will use for State-level activities and describe those activities.
   ii. For the 95 percent of the reservation in section 1003(a) that must be made available to LEAs, describe how the SEA will allocate funds to assist LEAs in complying with the school improvement, corrective action, and restructuring requirements of section 1116 and identify any SEA requirements for use of those funds.
   iii. Identify what part, if any, of State administrative funds the SEA will use for assessment development under section 1116 and identify any SEA requirements for use of those funds.
   iv. Describe the State’s procedures for distributing funds for schools to use for supplemental services under section 1116(e) (7), and identify the amount of funds those schools will receive.
   v. Describe how the State will use funds awarded under section 6113(b) (1) for the development and implementation of State assessments in accordance with section 6111(b) (1).

b. Title I, Part B--Even Start Family Literacy. Identify the amount of the reservation under subsection 1233(a) that the State will use for each category of State-level activities listed in that section, and describe how the SEA will carry out those activities.

c. Title I, Part C--Education of Migratory Children. Identify the amount of funds that the SEA will retain from its Migrant Education Program (MEP) allocation, under section 200.41 of the Title I regulations (34 CFR 200.41), to carry out administrative and program functions that are unique to the MEP, and describe how the SEA will use those funds.
d. Title I, Part D--Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk. Describe how the funds reserved under section 1418 will be used for transition services for students leaving institutions for schools served by LEAs, or postsecondary institutions or vocational and technical training programs.

e. Title II, Part A--Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund.
i. Identify the amount of the State's total allocation for Title II, Part A funds that would be reserved for administration and planning (administration) costs under section 2113(d) and the amount of those funds that would be provided to the SEA and State agency for higher education (SAHE), respectively. The total amount that a State may reserve for administration may not exceed 1 percent of the State's total allocation under Part A of Title II.

ii. Describe how the SEA will use funds reserved for State activities described in section 2113(c) of the ESEA to meet the teacher professional development and paraprofessional requirements in section 1119.

f. Title III, Part A--English Language Acquisition and Language Enhancement

In order that the Department may make FY 2002 State program allocations, provide the most recent data available on:

i. A total amount not to exceed 5 percent of the State's allotment may be reserved by the State under section 3111(b)(2) to carry out one or more of the following categories of State-level activities: professional development; planning, evaluation, administration, and interagency coordination; technical assistance; and providing recognition to subgrantees that have exceeded their annual measurable achievement objectives. Specify the percentage of the State's allotment that the State will reserve and the percentage of the reserved funds that the State will use for each of the categories of activities.

ii. A total amount not to exceed 15 percent of the State's allotment must be reserved by the State under section 3114(d)(1) to award subgrants to eligible entities that have experienced a significant increase in the percentage or number of immigrant children and youth. Specify the percentage of the State's allotment that the State will reserve for these subgrants.

iii. The number of limited English proficient children in the State. (See definitions of "child" in section 3301(1), and "limited English proficient" in section 9101(25).)

vi. The most recent data available on the number of immigrant children and youth in the State. (See definition of "immigrant children and youth" in section 3301(6).)

g. Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1, Section 4112(a)--Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities: Reservation of State Funds for the Governor

i. The Governor may reserve up to 20 percent of the State's allocation under this program to award competitive grants or contracts. Indicate the percentage of the State's allocation that is to be reserved for the Governor's program.

ii. The Governor may administer these funds directly or designate an appropriate State agency to receive the funds and administer this allocation. Provide the name of the entity designated to receive these funds, contact information for that entity (the name of the head of the designated agency, address, telephone number) and the "DUNS" number that should be used to award these funds.

h. Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2, Section 4126--Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities: Community Service Grants.
The statute provides for grants to States to carry out programs under which students expelled or suspended from school are required to perform community service. The Department proposes to award funds available under this program to State educational agencies, after they have consulted with their Governors. SEAs and LEAs in some States are already implementing community service activities for students, and we believe that awards to SEAs are most likely to result in the integration of these program funds into a more comprehensive, coordinated strategy. Although the statutory language for this program would permit the Department to award grants to a Governor, or to another entity designated by the Governor, we believe that most students eligible to benefit from this program are likely to be served by SEAs or LEAs. Describe how funds will be used by the designated entity(ies) to develop and implement a community service program for suspended and expelled students.
i. Title V, Part A --Innovative Programs
   i. In accordance with section 5112(a) (1) of the ESEA, provide the SEA's formula for distributing program funds to LEAs. Include information on how the SEA will adjust its formula to provide higher per-pupil allocations to LEAs that have the greatest numbers or percentages of children whose education imposes a higher-than-average cost per child, such as:
      o Children living in areas with concentrations of economically disadvantaged families;
      o Children from economically disadvantaged families; and
      o Children living in sparsely populated areas.
   ii. Identify the amount the State will reserve for State-level activities under section 5121, and describe those activities.

Assurances. There will be some general ones required. They provide that:

a. Each such program will be administered in accordance with all applicable statutes, regulations, program plans, and applications;

   b.i. The control of funds provided under each such program and title to property acquired with program funds will be in a public agency, a nonprofit private agency, institution, or organization, or an Indian tribe, if the law authorizing the program provides for assistance to those entities; and
   ii. The public agency, nonprofit private agency, institution, or organization, or Indian tribe will administer those funds and property to the extent required by the authorizing law;

   c. The State will adopt and use proper methods of administering each such program, including:
      i. The enforcement of any obligations imposed by law on agencies, institutions, organizations, and other recipients responsible for carrying out each program;
      ii. The correction of deficiencies in program operations that are identified through audits, monitoring, or evaluation; and
      iii. The adoption of written procedures for the receipt and resolution of complaints alleging violations of law in the administration of the programs;

   d. The State will cooperate in carrying out any evaluation of each such program conducted by or for the Secretary or other Federal officials;

   e. The State will use such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as will ensure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State under each such program;

   f. The State will:
      i. Make reports to the Secretary as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to perform the Secretary's duties under each such program; and
      ii. Maintain such records, provide such information to the Secretary, and afford such access to the records as the Secretary may find necessary to carry out the Secretary's duties; and

   g. Before the plan or application was submitted to the Secretary, the State afforded a reasonable opportunity for public comment on the plan or application and considered such comment.

ESEA Specific Assurances and Crosscutting Declaration. Each SEA that submits a consolidated application also must provide an assurance that they will--

a. Comply with all requirements of the ESEA programs included in their consolidated applications, whether or not the program statute identifies these requirements as a description or assurance that States would have addressed, absent this consolidated application, in a program-specific plan or application, and

b. Maintain records of their compliance with each of those requirements.
3. Cross-Cutting Declaration: Certification of Compliance with Unsafe School Choice Option Requirements. The State certifies that it has established and implemented a Statewide policy requiring that students attending persistently dangerous public elementary or secondary schools, as determined by the State (in consultation with a representative sample of local educational agencies), or who become victims of violent criminal offenses, as determined by State law, while in or on the grounds of public elementary and secondary schools that the students attend, be allowed to choose to attend a different, safe public elementary or secondary school (which may include a public charter school) within the local educational agency.
The first No Child Left Behind Special Bulletin from the Illinois State Board of Education is now available at www.isbe.net/htmls/news.htm. This bulletin is the first in a continuing series to cover key provisions of NCLB. It contains a timeline and specific information about funding, key ISBE contacts and actions of immediate concern to school districts.

All these bulletins will be available online. If you do not have access to the web, please call ISBE at 217/782-4321 for a copy. The format will vary depending on the topics covered, but bulletins will be identified by date. You will be notified by e-mail, when a new bulletin is available.

The overall purpose of the NCLB bulletins is to provide educators, state and local policymakers and the citizens of Illinois with information about the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, which was formerly known as HR1 and took effect January 8, 2002.

We encourage you to read the complete text of the bulletin available at www.isbe.net/htmls/news.htm

Other documents available online include:

- NCLB Timelines
- NCLB Program Funding List
- NCLB Contacts

NCLB Alert: You will receive an NCLB Alert by e-mail when there is “breaking news” or when we need your input on a specific issue that requires your immediate attention or action.

Resources

ISBE Home Page – http://www.isbe.net
ISBE No Child Left Behind e-mail – NCLB@isbe.net
Technical Problems – http://www.isbe.net/ISBEFORM.htm
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State Superintendent of Education
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No Child Left Behind
Special Bulletin —March 14, 2002

This *No Child Left Behind* Special Bulletin is the first in a continuing series from the Illinois State Board of Education. The bulletin is designed to provide educators, state and local policymakers and the citizens of Illinois with information about the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB), which was formerly known as HR 1 and took effect January 8, 2002. We hope the bulletin will help you understand the requirements of the new law and what actions you must take to comply with it. As we go forward, we will seek your input on specific issues.

This issue focuses on an overview of the key requirements in the law, suggests resources where you can find more specific information about these requirements and identifies the requirements that have the most immediate impact on school districts and the State of Illinois.

The next NCLB Special Bulletin will focus on the requirements for the 2002-2003 school year. Subsequent bulletins will cover specific topics such as adequate yearly progress (AYP), teacher quality, reading, funding, etc. Our deadline to submit state plans and applications to the federal government in order to receive funding for 2002-03 in a timely manner and for meeting the new law is May 28. Between now and that date, we will be distributing information to you as quickly and comprehensively as possible.

We encourage you to share these bulletins with others in your school, district, organization or community who may not be on our mailing list. People who wish to be added to this list should forward their name, position, school district or organization name, address, city, state, zip code, and e-mail address to NCLB@isbe.net.

The U.S. Department of Education is continuing to interpret specific aspects of the law. During the coming months, new questions undoubtedly will arise. We will do our best to provide definitive information and answers to your questions as completely and quickly as possible.

**Mark Your Calendars**

**Now** – The date when the law is in effect (subject to any later dates cited in the law). (See the “Illinois ‘to do’ List” below.)

**After January 8, 2002** - Any new hires of paraprofessionals in Title I-funded positions must meet the new standards in the law.

**2001-2002 School Year** – Baseline year for measuring progress toward 100 percent of Illinois students meeting the state standards by 2013-2014. The 2002 ISAT and PSAE scores will provide the foundation for determining progress over the 12-year period.

**May 28, 2002** – The date by which the State Board must submit plans to USDE for meeting the new federal education fund requirements for the following school year.

**2002-2003 School Year** – The date by which schools, school districts and the State of Illinois and the State Board must implement various aspects of the law unless otherwise cited in the law.
2002-2003 - Schools selected by the National Center for Education Statistics to administer the National Assessment of Education Progress in grades 4 and 8 must participate.

2004-2005 - All current paraprofessionals employed in Title-I funded positions must be fully credentialed.

2005-2006 - All teachers must be highly qualified.

2005-2006 - Illinois must administer state assessments for grades 3-8 in reading and mathematics and once at the high school level.

2007-2008 - Illinois must administer state assessments for three grade levels in science matching our current administration of science assessments.

2013-2014 School Year – The date by which all Illinois students must reach 100 percent proficiency in state standards.

For more information go to <NCLB Timelines>.

The Immediate Illinois “To Do” List

The No Child Left Behind Act has immediate implications for schools, school districts, the State of Illinois and the State Board. Each of the following requirements is followed by comments in italics. This is not an all-inclusive list but represents the issues we believe are of most critical importance to your current planning and decision-making.

Personnel Decisions

Paraprofessional Requirements: Paraprofessionals who are employed after the enactment of NCLB (i.e., after January 8, 2002) to work in a Title I-funded position must be “highly qualified.” The federal definition of highly qualified includes three options:

- two years of post secondary study;
- an associate’s (or higher) degree; or
- a passing score on the formal state or local academic assessment that measures knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing and mathematics.

Paraprofessionals employed in a Title I-funded position prior to the enactment of NCLB must be “highly qualified” consistent with the above requirements within four years.

Regardless of the hiring date, all paraprofessionals in Title I-funded positions must have earned a high school diploma or its equivalent.

To the best of our knowledge, these paraprofessional qualifications apply only to those who work in Title I fully or partially funded positions. We are awaiting clarification from the Department of Education on this requirement. We do not believe this requirement includes aides for programs that are not Title I funded, such as is the case for many special education aides.

During its March meeting, the State Board will consider strategies for defining the third option – i.e., “formal state or local academic assessment” – as well as strategies for helping local school districts bring current paraprofessionals and others up to a high standard of quality. We welcome your suggestions on this topic.
Meanwhile, school districts are advised to do the following: (1) ensure that newly hired paraprofessionals for Title I-funded positions have two years of post-graduate study or an associate’s or higher degree and (2) ensure that students are taught by fully qualified teachers.

**Teacher Requirement:** Teachers that are hired to work in Title I-funded positions after the start of the 2002-2003 school year must be “highly qualified” – that is, they must hold certification/endorsement directly related to the subject and grade level they are teaching.

*Illinois school districts that are now selecting and hiring teachers to work in Title I-funded positions for the next school year are urged to only hire teachers who have appropriate certification or endorsement as described above.*

Beginning next school year, school districts are required to certify that all teachers in a language instruction educational program for limited-English-proficient students are fluent in English and any other language used by the program, including written and oral communication skills.

*School districts hiring teachers for bilingual programs next year are urged to hire only teachers who can meet this requirement.*

**State Assessment**

Requirements:

- The spring 2002 ISAT and PSAE achievement results will establish the baseline for determining adequate yearly progress (AYP) over the next 12 years.
- The spring 2002 ISAT data will also be used for determining whether those Title I schools that have been identified as having “school improvement” or “corrective action” status have made adequate yearly progress over the past two years.

*Although the 2002 assessment data is the overall baseline, the progress of Title I schools that have been given school improvement/corrective action status will be evaluated against their 2000-2001 achievement levels. Schools in this group that do not show adequate improvement on this year’s assessment will be immediately subject to the accountability provisions of the NCLB law (see Accountability Section below).*

*Because the spring state assessment data will have both immediate and long-term impact, school districts are urged to ensure that all students participate in the appropriate assessments.*

**Accountability**

Requirements:

- States are required to define **adequate yearly progress** (AYP) and to develop a timeline for meeting the requirement that 100 percent of students meet proficiency in standards by 2013-2014.
- Title I-funded schools that fail to make adequate yearly progress for two consecutive years must give parents of the students attending these schools an opportunity for transfer to a higher-achieving public school in the district (public school choice). The district is responsible for paying for or providing transportation and may use a portion of its Title I funds for this purpose.
- Such schools that fail to meet AYP for three consecutive years must offer public school choice and offer families the opportunity to enroll in externally provided supplemental educational services paid for by the student’s per capita share of the school’s Title I enrollment.
• Additional accountability provisions apply after the fourth and fifth consecutive years of failing to make AYP.
• These provisions have an immediate impact on Illinois Title I-funded schools that have previously been designated for “school improvement” or “corrective action” status. These schools may be required to provide public school choice or choice and supplemental educational services beginning in the fall of 2002-2003.

These provisions have significant implications for all Illinois schools, school districts and the Illinois State Board of Education. An upcoming NCLB special bulletin will look at this issue in more depth. You may also refer to the web sites listed below.

The most immediate impact will be on those Title I-funded schools already identified as not making “adequate yearly progress” under the 1994 Elementary and Secondary Education Act provisions. Depending on their current status and the results of the 2002 spring assessment, schools in this category will be subject to the public school choice and supplemental educational services provisions.

The State Board is required to identify, evaluate and produce a list of external providers of supplemental services. This list must be made available by the 2002-2003 school year. The State Board will develop policies, with your input, on the issues associated with AYP, including public school choice. If you have questions in the meantime, please contact us through NCLB@isbe.net.

Overview and Highlights of NCLB

NCLB was signed into law January 8, 2002. It is the latest revision of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and is regarded as the most significant federal education policy initiative in a generation.

The overall purpose of the law is to ensure that each child in America is able to meet the high learning standards of the state where he or she lives. The specific goals of the law, as spelled out in the Federal Register issued on March 6, 2002, are:

• All students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading and mathematics by 2013-2014.
• By 2013-2014, all students will be proficient in reading by the end of the third grade.
• All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English.
• By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
• All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free and conducive to learning.
• All students will graduate from high school.

To help schools and districts meet these goals, the law provides a blend of requirements, incentives and resources. The requirements include:

• Annual testing of all students against state standards in reading and mathematics in grades 3-8 and in science at three times in a student’s school career (including once in high school).
• “Verification” of each state’s assessment system via required participation (every other year) by selected districts in the NAEP test.
• Aggregate and disaggregate analysis and reporting of student achievement results.
• A state definition and timeline for determining whether a school, district and the state are making “adequate yearly progress” (AYP) toward the goal of 100 percent of students meeting state standards by the 2013-2014 school year.
• Technical assistance and then sanctions for schools, districts and the state for failure to make AYP.
• Highly qualified teachers in core academic subjects by 2005-2006.
• Highly qualified aides or paraprofessionals.
• Support for students not meeting standards and/or for those who have special needs (e.g., homeless, limited-English-proficiency).
• The use of “scientifically-based” programs and strategies.

NCLB will provide nearly $1 billion annually in additional funding over the next five years to help states and districts strengthen K-3 reading programs, before- and after-school programs, charter schools, reading readiness for preschool children, teacher professional development and education technology. For more information go to the <NCLB Program Funding List>. In addition, the law gives local districts and the state some flexibility in combining funds to meet identified priorities. State plans must be completed by May 28, 2002, with input from external partners.

Information Resources

To find out more about the No Child Left Behind requirements, visit the following web sites:

U.S. Department of Education  

White House  
http://www.whitehouse.gov/infocus/education/

House Committee on Education and the Workforce  

Education Commission of the States  

Ohio Department of Education  
http://www.ode.state.oh.us/esea/

Each of these sites includes a summary of the provisions of the NCLB. The Education Commission of the States site offers some commentary and additional information.

As mentioned in the State Board’s introductory NCLB message last week, many questions still remain about the meaning of some of the law’s requirements. As we receive clarification from the USDE, we will share the information with you.

Meanwhile, the NCLB law is in effect and many of its provisions require immediate attention by local districts and the state. A letter from Secretary of Education Rod Paige indicated that the Department does not “intend to waive fundamental requirements on standards, assessments, adequate yearly progress and accountability in the new law.”

ISBE Contacts

For a contact list of ISBE staff assigned by topical area go to <NCLB Contacts>.

Regional Meetings

As in prior years, the Illinois State Board of Education will hold a series of regional meetings on applying for federal and state grants. Beginning with a discussion of NCLB, the content of the
meetings will address the changes in applications from prior years. More information on the workshops can be found at http://www.isbe.net/TITLE-GRANTS/Workshops.htm.

Resources

ISBE Home Page – http://www.isbe.net
ISBE No Child Left Behind e-mail – NCLB@isbe.net
Technical Problems – http://www.isbe.net/ISBEFORM.htm

Respicio F. Vazquez
State Superintendent of Education

Ronald J. Gidwitz
Chairman
Illinois State Board of Education

Illinois State Board of Education
Making Illinois Schools Second to None
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**No Child Left Behind Act of 2002**

Points of Contact for Specific Information

For general information, e-mail NCLB@isbe.net.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCLB Issue</th>
<th>Contact Name (Click to e-mail)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Testing and School Support</strong></td>
<td><strong>Carmen Pfeiffer</strong> (Student Testing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Testing, System of Support</td>
<td><strong>Sheryl Poggi</strong> (System of Support)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality Teachers, Principals and Paraprofessionals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Patricia Ryan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Quality, Title II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mathematics and Science</strong></td>
<td><strong>Richard Miguel</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics, Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading</strong></td>
<td><strong>Linda Basden</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading FIRST, Early Reading FIRST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Choice</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tanya Patton</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public School Choice, Supplemental Education Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homeless Students</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gary Dickirson</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Student Services, Title X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grants</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sharon Roberts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Issues, Federal Grants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educating Disadvantaged Youth</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sharon Roberts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I-Basic, Neglected and Delinquent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovative Programs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sharon Roberts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title V, Comprehensive School Reform</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extended Learning</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sharon Roberts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st Century Grants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Myron Mason</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Safety, Persistently Dangerous Schools, Title IV Part A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Proficiency</strong></td>
<td><strong>Boon Lee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners, Bilingual Education, Title III, Migrant Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology</strong></td>
<td><strong>Richard DeHart</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology, Title II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Analysis</strong></td>
<td><strong>Connie Wise</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td><strong>Frank Whitney</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fiscal Issues</strong></td>
<td><strong>David McDermott</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gary Anderson</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lee Patton</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Information</strong></td>
<td><strong>Kim Knauer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report Cards</strong></td>
<td><strong>Connie Wise</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Flex</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gail Lieberman</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Plans</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gail Lieberman</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 2002 Federal Education Entitlement Grants in Illinois

## Funding Levels for Selected Education Programs

($ in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding for Selected Education Programs</th>
<th>Illinois in 2001-02</th>
<th>Illinois in 2002-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Entitlement Funds Pursuant to NCLB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I (Basic Grants)</td>
<td>$366.7</td>
<td>$434.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even Start</td>
<td>$9.22</td>
<td>$9.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading First State Grants*</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>$32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Education</td>
<td>$2.1</td>
<td>$2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglected and Delinquent</td>
<td>$2.7</td>
<td>$2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive School Reform</td>
<td>$8.3</td>
<td>$9.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Size Reduction</td>
<td>$67.8</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eisenhower Professional Development</td>
<td>$17.8</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Quality State Grants**</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>$115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe and Drug-Free Schools</td>
<td>$17.5</td>
<td>$19.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st Century Learning Centers</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>$12.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service for Expelled/Suspended Youth</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>$2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Technology State Grants</td>
<td>$17.1</td>
<td>$25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Acquisition</td>
<td>$8.26</td>
<td>$19.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation State Grants</td>
<td>$16.4</td>
<td>$16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assessments</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>$12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Education</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>$1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>$1.4</td>
<td>$2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$535.28</td>
<td>$716.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Entitlement Funds Other Than NCLB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Grants to States</td>
<td>$280</td>
<td>$336.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education State Grants</td>
<td>$41.1</td>
<td>$44.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education Tech-Prep</td>
<td>$4.0</td>
<td>$4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$325.1</td>
<td>$384.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>$860.38</td>
<td>$1100.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Exclusive of Reading Excellence Act competitive grant
** = Exclusive of the Teacher Education Quality competitive grant