NOTE: Staff presentations and detailed Board discussion typically take place during Committee meetings one month prior to State Board action in the plenary session.

**Wednesday, December 13, 2006**

10:30 a.m.  
**Education Policy Planning Committee**  
Board Room, 4th Floor  
1-866-297-6391 (listen only); Confirmation # 1 6 4 7 3 2 5 6

11:30 a.m.  
**Lunch Break**

12:00 p.m.  
**Finance and Audit Committee**  
Board Room, 4th Floor  
1-866-297-6391 (listen only); Confirmation # 1 6 4 7 3 2 5 6

1:00 p.m.  
**Ad Hoc Rules Committee of the Whole**  
Board Room, 4th Floor  
1-866-297-6391 (listen only); Confirmation # 1 6 4 7 3 2 5 6

3:00 p.m.  
**Governmental Relations Committee of the Whole**  
Board Room, 4th Floor  
1-866-297-6391 (listen only); Confirmation # 1 6 4 7 3 2 5 6

* The meeting will begin at the conclusion of the previous session.

**Thursday, December 14, 2006**

8:00 a.m.  
**Board Operations Committee**  
Board Room, 4th Floor  
1-866-297-6391 (listen only); Confirmation # 1 6 4 7 3 2 5 9

9:00 a.m.  
**ISBE Plenary Session**  
Board Room, 4th Floor, 100 North First Street, Springfield, IL  
1-866-297-6391 (listen only); Confirmation # 1 6 4 7 3 2 5 9

**NOTE:** Chairman Ruiz will call for a break in the Board Plenary Session on Thursday at which time the Board will go into closed session.

All State Board of Education meetings listed on this agenda will be accessible to persons with disabilities. Persons planning to attend who need special accommodations should contact the Board office no later than the date prior to the meeting. Contact the Superintendent’s office at the State Board of Education, Phone: 217-782-2221; TTY/TDD: 17-782-1900; Fax: 217-785-3972.
Plenary Business Meeting

A. Roll Call/Pledge of Allegiance
B. Resolutions & Recognition
C. Public Participation
D. Superintendent’s Report
   * Consent Agenda
      All action consideration items listed with an asterisk (*) are considered to be routine and will be enacted in one motion and vote. Any board member who wishes separate discussion on any item listed on the consent agenda may remove that item from the consent agenda, in which event, the item will be considered in its normal sequence.

Action Considerations

*1. Approval of Minutes
   a. November 19, 2006 (pp. 4-13)

*2. Rules for Initial Review
   a. Part 1 (Public Schools Evaluation, Recognition and Supervision) (pp. 14-20)

*3. Rules for Adoption
   a. New Part 227 (Gifted Education) (pp. 21-38)
   b. New Part 232 (Summer Bridges) (pp. 39-49)
   c. New Part 270 (Advanced Placement) (pp. 50-58)

*4. Recommendations from Teacher Certification Board
   a. Institutional Accreditation and Program Approvals
      1) Trinity International University Accreditation and Program Approval (pp. 59-61)
      2) Blackburn College Unit Accreditation and Program Approval (pp. 62-64)
      3) Northwestern University Unit Accreditation and Program Approval (pp. 65-68)
      4) The School of Art Institute of Chicago Unit Accreditation and Program Approval (pp. 65-68)
      5) University of Chicago Unit Accreditation and Program Approval (pp. 69-71)
   b. New Teacher Preparation Programs (pp. 72-77)
      1) Dominican University New Teacher Preparation Programs
      2) Northern Illinois University New Teacher Preparation Programs
      3) University of Illinois-Chicago New Teacher Preparation Programs
      4) University of Illinois-Springfield New Teacher Preparation Programs

*5. Approval of Draft State Board 2006 Annual Report (pp. 78-143)

(end of consent agenda)

6. Rules for Adoption
   a. Part 226 (Special Education) (p. 144)

7. Proposed Spring 2007 Legislation (pp. 145-154)

8. Approval of Draft Criteria for State Superintendent (pp. 155-156)
E. Announcements and Reports
   1. Presentation from Commission on Government Forecasting and Accountability *(pp. 157-180)*
   2. IBHE Liaison Report *(Dr. Proshanta Nandi)*
   3. Superintendent's Announcements
   4. Chairman's Report
   5. Committee Reports

F. Information Items
   1. SBE Fiscal & Administrative Monthly Reports *(pp. 181-196)*

G. Adjourn

**NOTE:** Chairman Ruiz may call for a break in the Board Plenary Session at which time the Board will go into closed session.
Illinois State Board of Education Meeting
MINUTES
November 16, 2006
Illinois State Board of Education
100 North First Street, Springfield, Illinois

ROLL CALL/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
Dr. Chris Ward, Vice Chairman, called the meeting to order at 9:45 a.m. Chairman Ruiz asked Ms. Jean Ladage, Assistant to the Board, to call the roll. A quorum was present. Dr. Randy Dunn, State Superintendent of Education, was also in attendance.

The Board members, Dr. Dunn, and anyone who wished to join them faced the American flag and recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

Vice Chairman Ward announced that the Board meeting was being audio-cast live over the Internet.

Members Present:
- Dr. Christopher Ward, Vice Chairman
- Dr. Vinni Hall, Secretary
- Dr. Andrea Brown
- Mr. Dean Clark
- Dr. David Fields
- Mr. Edward Geppert, Jr.
- Ms. Brenda Holmes
- Ms. Joyce Karon
- Mr. Jesse Ruiz, Chairman (Chairman Ruiz joined the meeting via conference call for a short time following roll call.)

RESOLUTIONS & RECOGNITION
Dr. Chris Ward, Vice-Chairman introduced and welcomed Mr. Joe Fatheree, 2006-07 Illinois Teacher of the Year. Dr. Ward stated that “Mr. Fatheree’s nomination lists him as an Instructor of Technology at Effingham High School, but he is much more than that. He started out as an English teacher, switched to history, and then to technology. Throughout his transitions there has been one constant; his firm commitment to creating a learning environment that reaches all students, including those who some have already given up on, and to challenge them to fulfill their potential. Joe’s accomplishments in the classroom and the community are numerous and multi-faceted so I am going to ask him to tell you about those himself.”

Mr. Fatheree stated that he grew up in a small impoverished community in Southern Illinois. He is an educator and a filmmaker who owes much of his success to a friend who inspired him to seek education. Joe has always been influenced by children who are at risk and goes out of his way to bring out the best qualities in all students and help them do the same for other students.

Three years ago Joe stated that he started a program after school to adopt a community; theirs’ being Metro East Area. The “No Barriers Project-creating opportunity through education” was designed to help students understand how extreme poverty impacts student success. His first effort was recruiting a group of students to pilot a poverty literacy program. During the program’s first year, students collected over 2500 coats for homeless children living in the East St. Louis Area. In the second year, the students collected over 4000 books and partnered with KCET, a PBS station in St. Louis, to find a literacy expert to take the books into homes of disenfranchised children to help them improve their reading skills. He also formed a partnership with a school in East St. Louis where his students have taught their students literacy skills, technology and film.
They have also discussed the social and civic responsibilities of young adults. Mr. Fatheree commented the students don’t want to leave and go home; they want to stay; and they want to learn. The children that were initially being helped are now helping other children find their way out of poverty. That is what teaching is about, helping kids find their place in the world today. Students participating in this program are learning both academically and socially by gaining insight into other cultures and breaking down the barriers of miscommunication and misunderstanding. Every child on this earth is significant and deserves the right to learn. Joe hopes as Teacher of the Year to challenge teachers to open the door and bring the world into the classroom.

Mr. Fatheree has made several films for PBS and is a recipient of three Emmy Awards. Joe looks forward to developing movies where children can tell their own success stories. Joe stated that we have great things going on in education in this state and he looks forward to speaking this next year and celebrating the great educational happenings in Illinois. He thanked the Board for allowing him speak to them today.

Dr. Vinni Hall commented on what an amazing man Mr. Fatheree is, and how delighted she is to have him representing Illinois as Teacher of the Year.

Ms. Brenda Holmes commented that Mr. Fatheree is a perfect representative for the teachers of Illinois. Ms. Holmes asked that the Board find ways to showcase Mr. Fatheree’s passions and initiatives, and possibly fund and support them. Ms. Holmes also recognized and thanked Ms. Ann Muraro of our Public Information Division for all her help with the Teacher of the Year. Ms. Muraro is the contact person for Joe Fatheree.

Superintendent Dunn introduced Ms. Andrea Wingo, Assistant to the Superintendent and Advisor to the 2006-07 Student Advisory Council. Ms. Wingo will be leading a team of staff directing the 2006-07 Student Advisory Council.

Ms. Wingo recognized the Student Advisory Council members and their elected officials:

- Micah Berman, University of Illinois Laboratory School
- Kent Kiefer, Hamilton County High Schools
- Emma LePere, Belleville West Township High School
- Ryan Ornstein, Grayslake North High School
- Allison Tharp, Newton Community High School
- Andrea Lockley, East Richland High School
- Ariel Austin, King College Prep High School
- Nicholas Diaz, West Leyden High School
- Amy Maldonado, School of Social Justice High School
- Alix Olan, Highland Park High School
- Anna Bittman, New Trier High School (Co-Chairperson)
- Michael Byerley, Lemont High School (2nd Co-Chairperson)
- Joya Anthony, E. St. Louis Senior High School (Vice-Chairperson)
- Stephanie Matos, Carl Schurz High School (Secretary)
- Samuel Schoenburg, Springfield High School (Parliamentarian)

Ms. Anna Bittman, Co-Chairperson introduced the SAC elected officials and commented on how they are looking forward to working with the Board in the future. Ms. Bittman briefly updated the Board on the SAC’s previous year...
projects and discussed upcoming plans for future projects. She also read the Student Advisory Council Mission Statement. Dr. Ward welcomed the SAC and stated that the Board looks forward to hearing from them at future meetings.

**Motion:**
Ms. Joyce Karon moved that the State Board of Education adopt the resolution recognizing Mr. Clyde Frankie and Casey-Westfield High School for their team effort and dedication to providing all students with a quality education following a fire at the school. Ms. Karon further moved that the Board adopt the resolution recognizing the eighteen USDE Blue Ribbon Schools from the State of Illinois. Those schools include:

- Cambridge Elementary School, Cambridge
- Lincoln Middle School, Park Ridge
- North Ward Elementary School, Tuscola
- Paul Butler Junior High School, Oak Brook
- Pleasant Hill Elementary School, Winfield
- Robert Frost Elementary School, Mt. Prospect
- Romona Elementary School, Wilmette
- Saint Anne Catholic School, Barrington
- South Elementary School, Des Plaines
- St. Lawrence O'Toole School, Matteson
- St. Theresa School, Palatine
- St. Thomas of Villanova, Palatine
- Westgate Elementary School, Arlington Heights
- Windsor Elementary School, Loves Park
- York Center Elementary School, Lombard
- Haines Middle School, St. Charles Comm. Unit SD 303
- Jones College Prep High School, Chicago
- Tremont High School, Tremont

Mr. Ed Geppert seconded the motion and it passed with a unanimous voice vote.

**Motion:**
Dr. Vinni Hall moved that the State Board of Education adopt the resolution honoring Dr. Randy J. Dunn. Ms. Joyce Karon seconded the motion and it passed with a unanimous voice vote.

**Resolution**

**Honoring**

**Randy J. Dunn, Ed.D.**

**November 2006**

WHEREAS, Randy J. Dunn, completed his doctoral degree in educational administration at the University of Illinois and his undergraduate studies in education at Illinois State University; and

WHEREAS, he began his education career as a fourth grade teacher in Gibson City, Illinois, later serving as principal at Paw Paw Grade School and Roanoke-Benson Middle School, then serving as Superintendent of the Argenta-Oreana Community Unit School District and the Chester Community Unit School District; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Dunn served as Chair of the Department of Education Administration and Higher Education at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale; and

WHEREAS, he has served as a consultant to school districts throughout Illinois on issues including strategic planning, financial analysis and administrative restructuring; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Dunn accepted the call to serve as Interim State Superintendent of Education in September, 2004, and answered the State
Board’s call to continue to serve as the state’s chief education officer through 2006; and

WHEREAS, during his time as State Superintendent, he led the Agency’s efforts to improve the Agency’s service to and support of Illinois educators while keeping a clear focus on improving student learning; and

WHEREAS, as State Superintendent Dr. Dunn led education in Illinois using an open, inclusive process - seeking input, weighing options, and never failing to make the best decisions for Illinois students; and

WHEREAS, through his expertise, honesty, integrity, openness and warm sense of humor, Agency employees and State Board of Education members quickly learned why Dr. Dunn is held in such high regard by educators throughout Illinois and beyond; and

WHEREAS, from the first students who entered his classroom in Gibson City to the more than two million students in Illinois schools today, Dr. Randy Dunn has served Illinois education wisely and well, making it clear that Illinois’ loss is Kentucky’s gain;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Illinois State Board of Education extends its heartfelt appreciation to Randy J. Dunn on this, the sixteenth day of November, 2006, for his untiring work and dedication and wishes him much success as President of Murray State University.

Chairman Jesse Ruiz addressed Dr. Dunn by phone from Israel. The Chairman thanked Dr. Dunn for his friendship as well as his dedication and hard work, and wished him all the best.

Mr. Dean Clark thanked Dr. Dunn for all the time, effort and energy he has put into making ISBE what it is today. Mr. Clark commented that it is gratifying to see what Randy has done throughout the state and the way he has worked with Board members and staff. Mr. Clark comment on what a great amount of respect Dr. Dunn has throughout the state and thanked him for everything he has done for Illinois.

Mr. Ed Geppert commented that Dr. Dunn has been a great supportive resource in the budget process in regards to information and advice. He has helped build confidence throughout the state in regards to the State Board, and the agency is far better now for him being here.

Dr. Dave Fields commented to Dr. Dunn that success leaves footprints and that Dr. Dunn has certainly left them here in Illinois.

Ms. Brenda Holmes thanked Dr. Dunn not only for the hard work he had contributed to the agency but also helping the Board work together. Brenda wished Dr. Dunn tremendous success at Murray State University.

Dr. Andrea Brown thanked Dr. Dunn and that she will miss him and his ability to be a great interpreter.

Dr. Chris Ward thanked Dr. Dunn for his wisdom and leadership, noting that he is a great human being who has represented himself well throughout Illinois.
Superintendent Dunn thanked everyone for their kind comments and stated that he loves Illinois and will continue to keep track of its developments and continued progress. Dr. Dunn commented the Board has presented great leadership and the staff at the ISBE has been an excellent group of people to work with. Dr. Dunn commented that being the Superintendent of Education for Illinois has been an opportunity of a lifetime and he thanked the Board for the opportunity and their friendship.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Janet Milkovich from Recording for the Blind Dyslexic spoke to the Board on the service improvements that have been made possible by the FY 07 budget funding. She asked that the Board continue to support services for the disabled and noted that there are 310,000 special education students in Illinois and 210,000 of these students do have the capacity to improve their reading comprehension and retention by learning through listening. RFB&D currently serves 9,000 students in the state. Ms. Milkovich asked that the Board increase the FY08 funding to $325,000.00 which would allow RFB&D to renew the memberships of the 100 schools they are now serving and allow them to expand to 100 new schools. Ms. Milkovich said she cannot think of a single school that does not need their services and asked that we continue to support RFB&D.

Ms. Paula Pergament from the Adler Planetarium spoke on the Adler’s Education Programs. Their goal is to inspire interest in science and they work toward achieving this by providing teachers with professional development, classroom materials and giving students unique educational experiences in the classroom. The Adler looks forward to partnering with the ISBE to provide distance learning and educational resources to schools throughout Illinois. She also invited the Board to meet with Adler’s educational staff and to tour the Planetarium when they are traveling in the area. Ms. Pergament thanked the Board for their continued support and allowing her the time to speak to them today.

Ms. Sue Walter, Union Professional Development Director, Staff Liaison and a member of the Illinois Federation of Teachers’ Special Education Task Force thanked the Board for the clarification and in-depth discussion on Part 226 Special Education proposed rules at yesterday’s committee meeting. Ms. Walters stated that IFT is strongly opposed to the proposed language, which would increase the percentage of students with IEPs who can receive services in a general education classroom during a given period from 30% to 40%. This change will affect the quality of services/instruction provided to students with IEPs, as well as students in the general education classroom. The other issue they are strongly opposed to is the proposed language on class size/case load and they urge the State Board to maintain the current Illinois categorical class size/case load numbers with the exception of a resource class size/case load, which they recommend changing to a maximum of 15. Ms. Walters thanked the Board for the opportunity to provide comments on Part 226 Special Education proposed rules.

Dr. Hall commented that Special Education teachers support students with a variety of needs and that too many children in a classroom can be a serious problem.

ANNOUNCEMENT:
Dr. Chris Ward announced that in support of National Recess Week and in conjunction with Cartoon Network’s Operation Rescuing Recess Program, the
Board has received a sort of *public participation via U.S. Mail*. Hundreds – maybe thousands of students have sent hand-written notes and hand-drawn sketches in support of National Recess Week which was celebrated the week of September 18, 2006. The letters are on display in Becky Watt’s office and the Board is encouraged to browse through them. The students emphasized the importance of recess and listed the activities that they enjoy, such as: four-square, basketball, swings, tag, and going down the slides.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPERINTENDENT’S REPORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consent Agenda Items and Motions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chairman Ward commented that all items listed with an asterisk (*) on the agenda are considered to be routine and will be enacted in one motion and vote. Any board members who wishes separate discussion on any item listed on the consent agenda may remove that item from the consent agenda, in which the event, the item will be considered in its normal sequence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent Dunn gave the Board members a brief summary on the items on the consent agenda. Dr. Dunn then asked General Counsel Darren Reisberg to summarize the proposed action on rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Reisberg reported that the only rulemaking coming before the Board today involves changes to Part 1 (Public School Evaluation, Recognition and Supervision) related to school and district improvement plans and updates to the rules on qualifications for supervisory and administrative personnel. The Superintendent is recommending that the Board authorize the solicitation of public comment on this rulemaking, including publication of the proposed amendments in the Illinois Register.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chairman Ward asked for a motion regarding the consent agenda.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval of the Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dean Clark asked that the minutes of October 19, 2006, be corrected to read Maine East High School and Maine South High School under Mr. Michael Pressler’s public participation testimony. The minutes were corrected as requested by Mr. Clark. Dr. David Fields moved that the State Board of Education minutes be approved (as corrected) for the meeting on October 19, 2006. Mr. Dean Clark seconded the motion and it passed with a unanimous voice call vote.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rules for Initial Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1 (Public Schools Evaluation, Recognition and Supervision)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The State Board of Education hereby authorizes the solicitation of public comment on the proposed rulemaking for: Public Schools Evaluation, Recognition and Supervision (23 Illinois Administrative Code 1), including publication of the proposed amendments in the Illinois Register.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amendment to Student Information System Contract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The State Board of Education authorizes the State Superintendent to increase the current contract with IBM up to $595,000 for purposes of additional work, as documented, to be completed on the Student Information System.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END OF THE CONSENT AGENDA
### Financial Plan of Harrisburg CUSD #3

Superintendent Dunn noted that just over a year ago, Harrisburg CUSD #3 was certified in financial distress. Harrisburg submitted their three-year financial plan to the State Board on December 2, 2005. Since that time Harrisburg has hired a new superintendent, Dennis Smith. Superintendent Smith has reviewed the plan and is here today to ask for modifications to the plan. Debbie Vespa, Division Administrator for School Business and Support Services, introduced Superintendent Dennis Smith of Harrisburg Community Unit School District #3.

Superintendent Smith asked to take a minute to thank Dr. Dunn for all he has done to help him better understand education and transition into Southern Illinois.

Superintendent Smith stated that the previous plan was to optimistic which did not encourage the local school board to act quickly to make the changes necessary in order to avoid the oversight panel. The new plan was presented to the Harrisburg Board asking them to consider a Working Cash Bond or cuts in the amount of $425,000.00. Superintendent Smith stated that the Board is currently working on his suggestions and will determine next week if they will run a Cash Bond and what the amount will be. They cannot consider a Cash Bond without it being in the plan, so Superintendent Smith has written it into the plan and specified that it would only be used for debt reduction.

Superintendent Smith stated that school board is aware that they need to do something to help the school district and he intends to see that they do with his help. Deb Vespa also noted that Superintendent Smith is looking into an internal oversight panel to help the district oversee their financial issues.

Ed Geppert complimented Superintendent Smith for coming forward and taking a leadership role to help the district improve their financial status.

**Motion:**
Mr. Ed Geppert moved that the Illinois State Board of Education hereby approves the amended financial plan submitted by Harrisburg Community Unit School District #3. Mr. Dean Clark seconded the motion and it passed with a unanimous voice vote.

### ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REPORTS:

#### Status Report from Hazard. Young, Attea and Associates

Mr. Bill Attea from Hazard, Young, Attea & Associates, Ltd. (HYA) shared with the Board copies of the revised draft of characteristics desired for the state superintendent search. Mr. Attea noted that now that the elections are over HYA will be meeting with the Governor’s staff to update them on the search and ask for their input. HYA is seeking the Board’s approval on the following criteria:

**Revised Draft . . . Characteristics Desired**

*The Illinois State Board of Education seeks an experienced educational leader who has been a teacher and administrator at the elementary, secondary and/or college level(s). The sought after individual will place the interests of students as a priority at all times and has demonstrates the ability to:*

- **Address the educational and political responsibilities of the position, while placing the educational needs of students ahead of political expediency.**
- **Communicate effectively with all stakeholders, both internal and external to the Agency.**
- Lead and manage a complex organization through a strong leadership team that builds capacity within the organization.
- Improve student performance through a comprehensive system of standards and assessment and the implementation of proven methods that address the achievement gap, and by encouraging local districts to access resources available at the local, regional, state and federal levels.
- Build consensus and rally support for sustainable change.
- Be responsive to the needs of all students, local districts, Regional Offices of Education and other constituents.
- Understand the requirements of federal and state laws and regulations, as well as the impact on student learning, and oppose laws and regulations that deter the ability to maximize student learning.
- Build positive relationships with constituents who are internal and external to the organization.
- Work successfully with the Governor, State Legislature, Congress and the U.S. Department of Education.
- Develop processes and procedures necessary to provide consistency in decision-making and to ensure effective and efficient operations.
- Facilitate the Governor and State Board in defining and articulating a vision for the State, and provide the leadership to implement the vision through effective short and long term strategic planning.

The State Board seeks an individual who has a commitment to equitable opportunities for all students, through understanding of school finance and the resultant inequities of current funding mechanism, and a commitment to take leadership in securing additional resources and the development of a new formula that will ensure that additional funding will contribute to greater equity across the state. The Board also seeks a leader who is collaborative yet decisive, who demonstrates integrity, objectivity, fairness and vision and who establishes high expectations for self and others.

An earned doctorate from an accredited institution is preferred.

Joyce asked if the list was in order of importance. Mr. Attea responded by saying that this list is actually the priorities by the constituent groups that HYA had met and interviewed. The list is presented as a totality of what Illinois is looking for in our next Superintendent.

The Board will place approval of the criteria on the December agenda.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board Operations Committee of the Whole</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No meeting this month.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Education Policy Planning Committee**

Dr. Fields reported that he and the following committee members were in attendance: Dr. Andrea Brown, Mr. Ed Geppert, Dr. Vinni Hall, and Ms. Joyce Karon. Dr. David Fields commented that the committee discussed the following topics:

- Approved the minutes for the October 2006 EPPC Meeting
- Dana Kinley and Lizzane DeStefano, U of I, Urbana/Champaign reviewed the results of the of the implementation study of the Illinois Learning Standards with the Committee.
• Connie Wise discussed and reviewed the Statewide Report on Staff and Administrator Demographics.
• Becky McCabe spoke to the Committee on increasing the current contract with IBM for the Student Information System.
• Dr. Dunn and Ginger Reynolds shared a research project on High School Reform from Great Lakes West.

Finance and Audit Committee of the Whole
Mr. Edward Geppert reported that he and the following committee members were in attendance: Dr. Andrea Brown, Ms. Brenda Holmes and Mr. Dean Clark. Mr. Edward Geppert reported that the committee discussed the following topics:
  • Linda Mitchell updated the Committee on the FY 08 budget.
  • Deb Vespa gave an update on the Financial Oversight Panel and School Finance Authorities including the changes in the Harrisburg Financial Plan.
  • Approved the minutes for the October 2006 Committee Meeting.
  • Mr. Geppert noted that five of the eight scheduled budget hearings throughout the state have been held.

Governmental Relations Committee of the Whole
Ms. Brenda Holmes reported that she and the following committee members were in attendance: Mr. Dean Clark, Mr. Jesse Ruiz & Dr. Chris Ward. Ms. Holmes reported that the members of the committee discussed the following topics:
  • Approved the minutes for the September 2006 Governmental Relations Meeting
  • Nicole Wills and Josh Jacobs updated the Board on the upcoming legislative initiatives for the 2006 Veto Session.
  • Nicole and Josh reviewed the 2007 legislative proposals with the Committee and will continue to review on a regular basis.
  • Discussed advocacy issues with the General Assembly and Governors’s Office.

Ad Hoc Rules Committee
Mr. Darren Reisberg reported that all members were in attendance, with the exception of Mr. Ruiz. Mr. Reisberg reported that the members discussed the following topics:
  • Public Participation: Ms. Penny Richards, Ms. Charlotte Desjardins, Ms. Sue Walter from IFT and Daryl Morrison from IEA spoke on Part 226 Special Education Rules.
  • Dr. Chris Koch reviewed and answered questions on Part 226.
  • Reviewed information items on Less Red Tape.

Superintendent’s Announcements
Illinois Board of Higher Education Liaison Report
Dr. Dunn introduced Dr. Proshanta Nandi who has been joining us at the Board meetings as a representative from the Illinois Board of Higher Education. Dr. Nandi spoke on the issues discussed at the Illinois Board of Higher Education meeting on October 10, 2006. Dr. Nandi stated that they discussed the approval of new programs and members were updated on the budget. They also welcomed Dr. Glenn Poshard the new President of Southern Illinois University. Dr. Nandi commented that there is great concern over proprietary education. Many universities are granting doctorate degrees without advisors or oversight, and that this type of educating is here to stay and we are going to have to find ways to work with it and know when to draw the line.
Dr. Nandi commented that on a personal note he is very concerned by the violence in the schools, and feels that as educators we should work together to address this problem. Dr. Nandi asked that we do everything in our power to help reduce the violence and crime in our schools and to provide a safe environment for learning.

Dr. Dunn noted that the Chicago Lighthouse for the Blind is in its centennial year and has chosen to honor the Board with a Centennial Medal which he accepted on their behalf. The Chicago Lighthouse for the Blind is very grateful for the funding they have received in the FY07 budget. Dr. Dunn asked that everyone take a moment to look at the centennial medal on display.

Dr. Dunn commented that Ms. Meta Minton, Director of Public Information, will be leaving the State Board of Education and moving to Florida to be an editor for the Daily Sun Newspaper in Lady Lake, Florida.

**Information Items**  
Vice Chairman Ward asked that the Board members please read the Monthly Status Report on Rulemaking and the State Board of Education Fiscal and Administrative Monthly Reports printed in the Board meeting materials each month for information purposes. There were no inquiries this month regarding these reports.

**Closed Session**  
Dr. Vinni Hall moved that the Board enter into closed session under the exceptions set forth in the Open Meetings Act of the State of Illinois as follows:

- Section c 1 for the purpose of considering the appointment, employment, compensation, performance or dismissal of an employee;
- Section c 3 for the purpose of considering the selection of a person to fill a public office;
- Section c 11 for the purpose of considering pending or probable litigation against or affecting the Board; and

Dr. Hall further moved that the Board might invite anyone they wish to have included in this closed session.

Mr. Dave Fields seconded the motion and it was passed with a unanimous roll call vote.

The open meeting recessed at 11:30 a.m. and the Board went into closed session at 11:40p.m. The open meeting reconvened at 12:25 p.m.

**Motion for Adjournment**  
Ms. Brenda Holmes moved that the meeting be adjourned. Dr. Andrea Brown seconded the motion and it passed with unanimous voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dr. Vinni Hall  
Board Secretary

Mr. Jesse Ruiz  
Chairman

Materials: Recommended Rules

Staff Contact(s): Darren Reisberg, General Counsel

Purpose of Agenda Item
The purpose of this agenda item is to present the proposed amendment to Part 1 for the Board’s initial review.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
The Board will be asked to adopt a motion authorizing the solicitation of public comment on the proposed amendment.

Background Information
Prior to, and during the first few months of, each school year, agency staff receives numerous complaints regarding school districts’ improper enrollment policies and practices and their effect on undocumented children. Specifically, and notwithstanding current law, some school districts require for enrollment that prospective students submit documentation generally unavailable to undocumented persons (e.g., an Illinois driver’s license, Social Security card, voter registration card, public aid card or a document from DHS or DCFS). For example, a school district may require on its enrollment form that a prospective student, whose parent has already provided a lease or mortgage evidencing residency in the district, also provide two items from a list of six—where four of those six items are generally unavailable to undocumented students.

In other instances, school districts simply, albeit inappropriately, inquire into a student’s immigration status. Such practices have a chilling effect on the rights of immigrant students to enroll in public schools, because they create a legitimate fear of deportation and/or other consequences. States such as Pennsylvania and New Jersey have included specific language in their respective administrative codes prohibiting school districts from inquiring into students’ immigration status. Agency staff recommends that ISBE do the same.

While staff believes that current law (such as the United States Supreme Court’s 1982 decision in *Plyler v. Doe* and Section 1.240 of Title 23 of the Illinois Administrative Code) already prohibits such inequitable enrollment practices, this proposed amendment to Part 1 is intended to make these protections more explicit and to provide a concrete standard by which compliance can be gauged.
Analysis and Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action and Communications
Policy Implications: Please see above.
Budget Implications: None.
Legislative Action: None needed.
Communication: Please see “Next Steps” below.

Superintendent’s Recommendation
The Superintendent recommends that the State Board of Education adopt the following motion:

The State Board of Education hereby authorizes solicitation of public comment on the proposed rulemaking for:

Public Schools Evaluation, Recognition and Supervision (23 Illinois Administrative Code 1),

including publication of the proposed amendment in the Illinois Register.

Next Steps
With the Board’s authorization, staff will submit the proposed amendment to the Administrative Code Division for publication in the Illinois Register to elicit public comment. Additional means such as the Superintendent’s message and the agency’s website will also be used to inform interested parties of the opportunity to comment on this rulemaking.
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TITLE 23: EDUCATION AND CULTURAL RESOURCES
SUBTITLE A: EDUCATION
CHAPTER I: STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
SUBCHAPTER a: PUBLIC SCHOOL RECOGNITION

PART 1
PUBLIC SCHOOLS EVALUATION, RECOGNITION AND SUPERVISION

SUBPART A: RECOGNITION REQUIREMENTS

Section
1.10 Public School Accountability Framework
1.20 Operational Requirements
1.30 State Assessment
1.40 Adequate Yearly Progress
1.50 Calculation of Participation Rate
1.60 Subgroups of Students; Inclusion of Relevant Scores
1.70 Additional Indicators for Adequate Yearly Progress
1.75 Student Information System
1.77 Educator Certification System
1.80 Academic Early Warning and Watch Status
1.85 School and District Improvement Plans; Restructuring Plans
1.88 Additional Accountability Requirements for Districts Serving Students of Limited English Proficiency Under Title III
1.90 System of Rewards and Recognition – The Illinois Honor Roll
1.95 Appeals Procedure
1.100 Waiver and Modification of State Board Rules and School Code Mandates

SUBPART B: SCHOOL GOVERNANCE

Section
1.210 Powers and Duties (Repealed)
1.220 Duties of Superintendent (Repealed)
1.230 Board of Education and the School Code (Repealed)
1.240 Equal Opportunities for all Students
1.242 Temporary Exclusion for Failure to Meet Minimum Academic or Attendance Standards
1.245 Waiver of School Fees
1.250 District to Comply with 23 Ill. Adm. Code 180 (Repealed)
NOTICE OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT

1.260  Commemorative Holidays to be Observed by Public Schools (Repealed)
1.270  Book and Material Selection (Repealed)
1.280  Discipline
1.285  Requirements for the Use of Isolated Time Out and Physical Restraint
1.290  Absenteeism and Truancy Policies

SUBPART C: SCHOOL DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION

Section
1.310  Administrative Responsibilities
1.320  Evaluation of Certified Staff in Contractual Continued Service
1.330  Hazardous Materials Training

SUBPART D: THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Section
1.410  Determination of the Instructional Program
1.420  Basic Standards
1.430  Additional Criteria for Elementary Schools
1.440  Additional Criteria for High Schools
1.445  Required Course Substitute
1.450  Special Programs
1.460  Credit Earned Through Proficiency Examinations
1.462  Uniform Annual Consumer Education Proficiency Test
1.465  Ethnic School Foreign Language Credit and Program Approval
1.470  Adult and Continuing Education
1.480  Correctional Institution Educational Programs

SUBPART E: SUPPORT SERVICES

Section
1.510  Transportation
1.515  Training of School Bus Driver Instructors
1.520  School Food Services (Repealed)
1.530  Health Services
1.540  Pupil Personnel Services (Repealed)
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SUBPART F: STAFF CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.610</td>
<td>Personnel Required to be Qualified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.620</td>
<td>Accreditation of Staff (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.630</td>
<td>Noncertificated Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.640</td>
<td>Requirements for Different Certificates (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.650</td>
<td>Transcripts of Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.660</td>
<td>Records of Professional Personnel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBPART G: STAFF QUALIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.705</td>
<td>Minimum Requirements for Teachers (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.710</td>
<td>Requirements for Elementary Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.720</td>
<td>Requirements for Teachers of Middle Grades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.730</td>
<td>Minimum Requirements for Secondary Teachers and Specified Subject Area Teachers in Grades Six (6) and Above through June 30, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.735</td>
<td>Requirements to Take Effect from July 1, 1991, through June 30, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.736</td>
<td>Requirements to Take Effect from July 1, 1994, through June 30, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.737</td>
<td>Minimum Requirements for the Assignment of Teachers in Grades 9 through 12 Beginning July 1, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.740</td>
<td>Standards for Reading through June 30, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.745</td>
<td>Requirements for Reading Teachers and Reading Specialists at all Levels as of July 1, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.750</td>
<td>Standards for Media Services through June 30, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.755</td>
<td>Requirements for Library Information Specialists Beginning July 1, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.760</td>
<td>Standards for Pupil Personnel Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.762</td>
<td>Supervision of Speech-Language Pathology Assistants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.770</td>
<td>Standards for Special Education Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.780</td>
<td>Standards for Teachers in Bilingual Education Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.781</td>
<td>Requirements for Bilingual Education Teachers in Grades K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.782</td>
<td>Requirements for Teachers of English as a Second Language in Grades K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.790</td>
<td>Substitute Teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX A | Professional Staff Certification
APPENDIX B | Certification Quick Reference Chart
APPENDIX C | Glossary of Terms (Repealed)
APPENDIX D | State Goals for Learning
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1.APPENDIX E  Evaluation Criteria - Student Performance and School Improvement Determination (Repealed)
1.APPENDIX F  Criteria for Determination - Student Performance and School Improvement (Repealed)
1.APPENDIX G  Criteria for Determination - State Assessment (Repealed)


Section 1.240 Equal Opportunities for all Students

a) All students within a school district must be provided equal opportunities in all education programs and services provided by the system (see Section 10-20.12 of the School Code).

b) No school system may exclude or segregate any pupil, or discriminate against any pupil on the basis of color, race, nationality, religion, sex, sexual orientation, ancestry, age, marital status, or physical or mental handicap [775 ILCS 5/1-102(A)]. Further, no school system may deny access to its schools or programs to students who lack documentation of their immigration status or legal presence in the United States, and no school system may inquire about the immigration status of a student (Plyler v. Doe, 457. U.S. 202 (1982)). In order to comply with this subsection (b), the documents required by a school system as proof of residency for a student, when taken together, shall not result in a requirement for proof of legal presence such as a Social Security number. That is, the permissible combinations of documents must be sufficiently variable as to afford an opportunity for those who lack proof of legal presence or immigration status to meet the stated requirements.

c) The board of education shall submit periodic reports as required by the State Board of Education detailing pupil attendance, faculty assignments, and actions taken and planned to prevent and eliminate segregation.

(Source: Amended at 31 Ill. Reg. _____, effective ______________)
I L L I N O I S S T A T E B O A R D O F E D U C A T I O N M E E T I N G
December 13-14, 2006

TO: Illinois State Board of Education
FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education (Interim)
Ginger Reynolds, Assistant Superintendent
Darren Reisberg, General Counsel

Agenda Topic: Action Item: Rules for Adoption – New Part Part 227 (Gifted Education)

Materials: Recommended Rules

Staff Contact(s): Carol McCue, Federal Grants and Programs
Myron Mason, Division Administrator

Purpose of Agenda Item
The purpose of this agenda item is to present the proposed new rules for adoption.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
This rulemaking is required as a result of legislative action but is also congruent with Goal 1, Enhancing Literacy.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
The Board will be asked to adopt a motion adopting new Part 227.

Background Information
This rulemaking responds to two public acts from the 2005 legislative session (P.A. 94-151 and P.A. 94-410, which are identical to each other except for one provision not related to gifted education). These Acts re-establish authority for gifted education (again within Article 14A of the School Code), provide for a grant program to be administered by ISBE, require districts that seek state funding to submit plans demonstrating that their programs meet a detailed set of criteria; and assign several administrative functions to ISBE.

A number of the requirements contained in the new Article 14A relative to the content of program descriptions are explicit, while others require further definition through rules. For example, each program is required to include “a fair and equitable decision-making process”. ISBE must state what type of process will be accepted as fair and equitable, and Section 227.20(a)(5) of the proposed rules describes characteristics that we believe are fundamental to fairness.

Another important aspect of the rulemaking task for this program has been to describe the qualifications that should be required of teachers in local programs, because there is currently no certification or endorsement in gifted education. Section 14A-30(16) of the School Code calls for program descriptions to include “a showing that the certified teachers…understand the characteristics and educational needs of children and are able to differentiate the curriculum
and apply instructional methods to meet the needs of children”. Section 227.25 of the proposed rules provides a range of options by which teachers can demonstrate that they have this background and accommodates both college coursework and other forms of professional development that have been or are available. Each teacher is afforded a grace period of three school years within which to complete the qualifications, provided that he or she completes some of the requirements each year.

It could not be predicted with certainty whether an appropriation would be made for this new program for Fiscal Year 2007 or what level of funding might be forthcoming, so it was necessary to initiate rulemaking in order to have rules in place in time for the issuance of grants if funds had been available. We also included provisions for the use of an appropriation that is too small to support local programs at any reasonable level, so that some of the underlying goals of the legislation could be reached through statewide activities instead. As it happens, there was no appropriation for this program this year, so completion of the rulemaking was deferred so that the issue raised in public comment could be carefully considered.

In developing these rules, staff worked closely with the members of the newly constituted Advisory Council on the Education of Gifted and Talented Children, one of whose functions is to advise ISBE on all rules and policies in this area.

These proposed rules were presented for initial review in March of this year and subsequently published in the Illinois Register to elicit public comment. Seven items of correspondence were received, and the issues raised are discussed in the attached Summary and Analysis of Public Comment.

Analysis and Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action and Communications
Policy Implications: Please see above.
Budget Implications: These rules will have no effect unless funds are appropriated for the implementation of this program.
Legislative Action: None needed.
Communication: Please see “Next Steps” below.

Superintendent’s Recommendation
The Superintendent recommends that the State Board of Education adopt the following motion:

The State Board of Education hereby adopts the proposed rulemaking for:

Gifted Education (23 Illinois Administrative Code 227).

Further, the Board authorizes the State Superintendent of Education to make such technical or nonsubstantive changes as the State Superintendent may deem necessary in response to suggestions or objections of the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules.

Next Steps
Notice of the adopted rules will be submitted to the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules to initiate JCAR’s review. When that process is complete, the adopted rules will be filed with the Secretary of State and disseminated as appropriate.
Comment
Most of the commenters who responded to this rulemaking made no specific points about the rules and focused instead on the lack of funding to accompany them. It was stated that the rules would be meaningless without funding and that gifted education is a need, not a privilege. These commenters pointed out the need to realize the potential of gifted children and others of high ability and stated that they deserve an equal opportunity to learn. It was asserted that the failure to fund gifted education amounts to a violation of their right to a free appropriate public education. One commenter indicated that the rules appear to reflect the input of persons with experience in gifted education but expressed concern for the fact that they are being promulgated “just in case” funding becomes available. It was thought “incomprehensible” to leave behind the top 7 or 8 percent of Illinois’ children.

A common thread among these comments was agreement that no child should be left behind and the belief that this principle should be equally applicable to students with high levels of ability. The correspondents pointed not only to the loss to the nation in failing to capitalize on the talents of students but also to concern for the “inappropriate application of their creativity”.

One commenter characterized the rules as comprehensive and stated that they address weaknesses that were present in the former version of the rules (repealed several years ago). The attention to issues of equity was perceived to be positive, and the commenter believed the rules would provide the necessary foundation for building educational opportunity for gifted children. Compliments were expressed for the Illinois Association for Gifted Children (IAGC) and in particular for Sally Walker, who also chairs the Advisory Council on the Education of Gifted and Talented Children. Another commenter expressed concern for districts that experience need for financial support but lack skill in formulating grant proposals, e.g., small rural districts. A workshop was requested to teach staff from “less sophisticated” districts to write grant applications.

One physician wrote that, while changing jobs, he would not consider moving back to Illinois because the educational system recognizes that slow learners need a tailored curriculum but refuses to acknowledge this need on the part of fast learners also. He indicated he would not be willing to subject his child to “years of boredom”.

Analysis
As can be seen, all these comments address aspects of the “landscape” for gifted education in Illinois rather than requesting changes in specific provisions of the rules.

Recommendation
No changes are called for in the comments summarized above.

Comment
A significant amount of detailed information was supplied by one commenter who advocated substantially greater specificity on the subject of students who exhibit both giftedness and disability. These students are referred to as “2e”, or “twice exceptional”, and the correspondent felt that the rules were “totally silent” in terms of defining what would constitute adequate measures to prevent discrimination against students with disabilities in the context of gifted
education programs. The need for accommodations in gifted programming was highlighted, on the basis that students who are gifted but also have disabilities do not always fit the generally accepted model of high-achieving, high-producing students.

The provisions of Part 227 that relate to nondiscrimination were stated to be far too general and vague to be effective in preventing discrimination against twice exceptional students. Section 227.20 was thought to make a “dangerous assumption” that schools know how to provide appropriate consideration to all types of underrepresented groups and that they will “choose to do so in a sufficient and appropriate way”. Similarly, the rules’ approach to ensuring strict fairness in the identification and selection process was appreciated but stated to be ineffective in helping to identify twice exceptional students because strict scoring matrices fail to acknowledge the “diverse nature of giftedness”. The commenter noted that standardized tests often fail to reflect the gifts of students who are creatively gifted, twice exceptional, visual-spatial gifted, and profoundly gifted. As such they are poor indicators of aptitude because the disabilities mask the giftedness. For this reason she recommended against forcing a “one size fits all” identification system onto school districts and proposed a continuum of services instead, ranging from “push-in” differentiation and enrichment through more tailored curricular adjustments including “compacting”, acceleration, grade skipping, and other strategies. Profoundly gifted students should be provided IEPs encompassing curricula and other services tailored to their “wildly divergent” needs.

The need of twice exceptional children for adequate gifted programs was also emphasized in light of the profound emotional and psychological risk they encounter when denied curriculum adjustments that would maximize their strengths. “These children, especially when they also fall into other underserved groups as well, such as bilingual, socio-economically disadvantaged, etc., are desperately at risk for their very lives. The level of frustration caused by the enormous gap between their ability and performance sets them apart from all others in their need for immediate, intense, and accurate intervention.” Further, “Ensuring these children appropriate intervention will turn drop-outs, underachievers, suicides and behavior problems into brilliant, successful leaders, scientists, and artists.” Current shortcomings in training and methods were highlighted, along with ISBE’s obligation to see to it that these are alleviated.

It was noted that, unique among gifted students, twice exceptional students enjoy federal protections and the right to services based on their disabilities. It was also pointed out that states are able to use certain funds provided under IDEA 2004 for services to twice exceptional students. The commenter believed it incumbent upon ISBE to provide much greater guidance to districts for serving these students. She drew comparisons to other states’ regulations and provided suggested changes in language that she believed would improve the rules in this respect.

Finally, the potential return on the investment of time, money, and resources was described as “unparalleled” when savings in terms of special education dollars, crime, and legal fees are considered, not to mention the improvement that could be realized in test scores.

The commenter made quite a number of specific suggestions for text to be included in the rules that would have the effect of stating and emphasizing the obligations of school districts to provide educational programs and services that respond to students’ giftedness as well as their disabilities. She felt that having rules silent on these points would perpetuate districts’ lack of inclination to focus on these students’ needs and their view that gifted programming is a privilege to be earned rather than the appropriate education the students deserve.
Analysis
This commenter is correct that Section 14A-25 of the School Code requires that eligibility for participation in gifted education programs not be conditioned on any other factor than giftedness. We also appreciate the commenter’s evident commitment to an appropriate education for students who are both gifted and disabled, and we acknowledge that ISBE needs to play a stronger role in the coming years in ensuring the availability of programming that will meet their needs.

Much of the detailed text furnished by this commenter, however, is very useful as guidance but not appropriate for inclusion as rules. This is no reflection upon the material provided and is simply a matter of the function of administrative rules, which is purely regulatory. It should be understood that Part 227 fulfills only part of the requirements of the underlying public acts, in that its only purpose is to set forth the requirements for approval of programs as a condition of state funding, should that become available. The rules do not and should not encompass, for example, a description of recommended professional development, both because the statute does not authorize ISBE to regulate staff development related to gifted education and because recommendations and discussions of best practice do not constitute rules. The same applies to other text that contains background discussion on other topics.

Lengthy discussions have occurred to determine to what extent the points so eloquently raised by this commenter require the addition of language to the rules. As we have stated in connection with related points made regarding Part 226 of the rules (Special Education), the right to a free appropriate public education (FAPE) already exists for students who are both gifted and disabled, and this right cannot be made more applicable through additional statements in ISBE’s rules. The problem lies in its implementation rather than in its absence, and it is initiatives outside the scope of Part 227 that can make a difference in implementation at this point. For this reason we do not believe it would be fruitful to make the types of changes suggested, although there is a technical correction that should be made in Section 227.20(a)(2)(A)(iii) to avoid the inadvertent omission of students served under “504 Plans” from consideration. While awaiting the provision of funding, agency staff and members of the advisory council should explore refinements that might be made in the rules that would balance differentiated and targeted consideration of the eligibility of students with disabilities for gifted programming with the overall need for applying the same standard to all students in the decision-making process.

Many of the other goals expressed in these comments are areas to which the advisory council can and will devote its efforts. The development of strategies for ensuring adequate training for staff and the presentation of guidance on methods for accurate assessment of students’ ability when disability is also a factor will bring results independently of the requirements set forth in these rules.

Recommendation
Section 227.20(a)(2)(A)(iii) should be slightly reworded to encompass an additional group of students:

iii) active consideration is given to the potential eligibility of students who are identified as having disabilities who are served in accordance with Individualized Education Programs;

Comment
During the time that has passed since publication of these proposed rules, a nationally normed assessment for teachers of gifted students has become available. This 120-question test is based on understanding and application of knowledge, concepts, methodologies, and skills in gifted education and is designed to determine whether examinees have the knowledge and skills that are necessary for beginning teachers of gifted students. It is the position of the Advisory Council on the Education of Gifted and Talented Students that passage of this examination should be included among the options listed in Section 227.25 (by which teachers can demonstrate that they are qualified to teach in these programs). While reviewing the content of that Section, Council members identified problems with several possible interpretations of the proposed language for the various options; noted that the IAGC self-assessment now only consists of the “knowledge portion” so that there is no portfolio; and also recommended streamlining the presentation of that rule for the sake of clarity.

Analysis

We agree that reliance on a nationally normed assessment specifically designed for this purpose is an appropriate option to add to this rule and that it will be useful to streamline the lists of other options to the greatest extent possible for ease of understanding.

Recommendation

Section 227.25 should be restructured and edited as displayed below:

Section 227.25  Required Qualifications

As a means of demonstrating that he or she understands the characteristics and educational needs of children and is able to differentiate the curriculum and apply instructional methods to meet the needs of the children as required by Section 14A-30(16) of the School Code [105 ILCS 14A-30(16)], and subject to the provisions of Section 227.20(a)(6) of this Part, each teacher who is assigned to provide instruction in a program funded pursuant to this Part shall have completed, or shall be required to complete:

   a) Nine semester hours of college credit from a regionally accredited institution of higher education and demonstrably related to the education of gifted and talented students; or

   b) Both the State and national assessment instruments, namely:

      1) knowledge component and the performance component of the self-assessment developed by the Illinois Association for Gifted Children (IAGC) (which shall be based on the “Professional Teaching Standards for Educators Working with Gifted/Talented Learners” (2002), published by IAGC and posted at www.iagcgifted.org; no later editions of or revisions to these standards are incorporated) with a rating of “experienced” or higher, based on review of the resulting portfolio by a team designated by IAGC; and

      2) the PRAXIS examination for gifted education (Test Code 0357, Educational Testing Service, Rosedale Road, Princeton, New Jersey 08541 (2006)); or
c) Six semester hours of college credit from a regionally accredited institution of higher education and demonstrably related to the education of gifted and talented students and any one of the following additional choices:

1) both the knowledge component and the performance component of the self-assessment referred to in subsection (b)(1) of this Section; or

2) the PRAXIS examination referred to in subsection (b)(2) of this Section; or

3) the Gifted Education Institute offered by the State Board of Education in cooperation with IAGC; or

4) two years of one year's experience teaching in, coordinating, or directing a program for gifted students; or

5) participation in no fewer than two state or national conferences on gifted education, such as those offered by IAGC or the National Association for Gifted Children (NAGC); or

6) professional development activities demonstrably related to the education of gifted and talented students that are sufficient to generate 30 continuing professional development units (CPDUs), as defined and quantified in the rules for certificate renewal (see 23 Ill. Adm. Code 25.875); or

d) Three semester hours of college credit from a regionally accredited institution of higher education and demonstrably related to the education of gifted and talented students and any two of the additional choices listed in subsections (c)(1)-(6) of this Section; or

1) both the knowledge component and the performance component of the self-assessment referred to in subsection (b) of this Section, as well as the associated portfolio; or

2) the Gifted Education Institute offered by the State Board of Education in cooperation with IAGC; or

3) two years' experience teaching in, coordinating, or directing a program for gifted students; or

4) participation in no fewer than two state or national conferences on gifted education and professional development activities demonstrably related to the education of gifted and talented students sufficient to generate 15 CPDUs; or

5) professional development activities demonstrably related to the education of gifted and talented students sufficient to generate 45 CPDUs; or
e) The Gifted Education Institute referred to in subsection (c)(3) (c)(2) of this Section and any two of the additional choices listed in subsection (c) of this Section.

1) both the knowledge component and the performance component of the self-assessment referred to in subsection (b) of this Section, as well as the associated portfolio; or

2) professional development activities demonstrably related to the education of gifted and talented students sufficient to generate 45 CPDUs; or

f) Participation in no fewer than two state or national conferences on gifted education and:

1) both:
   A) the knowledge component and the performance component of the self-assessment referred to in subsection (b) of this Section, as well as the associated portfolio; and
   B) professional development activities demonstrably related to the education of gifted and talented students sufficient to generate 30 CPDUs; or

2) both:
   A) the Gifted Education Institute referred to in subsection (c)(2) of this Section; and
   B) professional development activities demonstrably related to the education of gifted and talented students sufficient to generate 15 CPDUs.
Section 227.10  Purpose and Applicability

This Part establishes the procedure and criteria for approval by the State Board of Education of programs of gifted education under Article 14A of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/Art. 14A] and implements other provisions of that Article. The requirements of this Part apply only to locally developed programs for which State funding is sought. Eligible applicants shall be those entities identified in Section 14A-45 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/14A-45] as well as public university laboratory schools (see 105 ILCS 5/2-3.109a) approved by the State Board of Education pursuant to Section 18-8.05(K) of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/18-8.05(K)], charter schools (see 105 ILCS 5/27A-11.5), and area vocational centers (see 105 ILCS 5/2-3.109b).

Section 227.20  Submission of Proposal; Plan

As used in this Part, a “proposal” means the plan for gifted education that is required under Section 14A-30 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/14A-30], accompanied by the additional materials applicants will be required to submit in response to a Request for Proposals as described in Section 14A-45 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/14A-45] and this Section.
a) When sufficient State funding is expected to be available to support local programs of gifted education, the State Superintendent of Education shall issue a Request for Proposals (RFP). To be considered for funding, an eligible entity shall submit for approval by the State Superintendent a plan for its program that incorporates all the elements required by Section 14A-30 of the School Code and meets the specific requirements of this subsection (a).

1) In order to demonstrate compliance with Section 14A-30(2) of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/14A-30(2)], each plan shall include programs of instruction in English language arts and mathematics and may include programs of instruction in additional subjects. Each plan shall indicate whether the program will be unified across the subjects offered or students will be identified gifted on a subject-by-subject basis and shall provide a description of the curriculum and instructional materials to be used, the grades to be served in the various subjects to be offered, and the program’s approach to the development of higher-level skills, as required by Section 14A-30(11) and (12) of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/14A-30(11) and (12)].

2) In order to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of Section 14A-30 of the School Code related to identification of the students to be served, each plan shall:

A) demonstrate that:

i) three or more assessment measures will be used for each student;

ii) these will include instruments designed to help identify gifted and talented students who are members of underrepresented groups; and

iii) active consideration is given to the potential eligibility of students who are identified as having disabilities;
B) provide evidence that the measures to be used in each curricular area, when taken together, provide equivalent rigor in the identification of students as gifted and talented; and

C) discuss how the measures to be used in each subject area correspond to the level of attainment prerequisite to students’ participation in the program.

3) In order to demonstrate compliance with Section 14A-20 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/14A-20], each plan shall describe the method by which students’ scores on the assessment measures used in each subject area, or across subject areas, as applicable, will be treated to arrive at a composite ranking that identifies the students who have scored in the top 5 percent locally.

4) In order to demonstrate compliance with Sections 14A-25 and 14A-30(7) of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/14A-25 and 14A-30(7)], each plan shall include evidence that:

A) the ranking process for each subject area, or across subject areas, as applicable, is applied in the same manner to the scores achieved by all students;

B) if any program’s capacity is inadequate to serve the entire number of students identified as eligible, the method of selecting those who will participate considers only the composite scores and their ranking;

C) the applicant has a procedure for accommodating students who were not available when the relevant assessment measures were administered but who may be eligible to participate in the program; and

D) in identifying the locations where the program will be offered, consideration has been given to the needs of students who are members of underrepresented groups.
5) In order to demonstrate compliance with the requirement of Section 14A-30(8) of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/14A-30(8)], each plan shall describe the appeals process that will be available when students are not identified as gifted and talented or are not selected to be served by a program, including evidence that each appeal will be considered:

A) by an individual not involved in the original decision and at an equal or higher level of authority within the applicant organization;

B) using information in accordance with the requirements of subsections (a)(3) and (4) of this Section; and

C) in time for the student to be placed into the program at the beginning of the next semester, if the appeal results in the student’s identification and selection.

6) In order to demonstrate compliance with the requirement of Section 14A-30(16) of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/14A-30(16)], each plan shall identify the qualifications held by the teachers who will be assigned to the program, provided that:

A) each teacher employed shall be qualified under Section 227.25 of this Part after no more than three years of teaching in any program funded pursuant to this Part; and

B) each teacher not qualified under Section 227.25 of this Part shall complete some portion of the requirements chosen during each year of the grace period permitted under subsection (a)(6)(A) of this Section.

7) In order to demonstrate compliance with Section 14A-30(9) of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/14A-30(9)], each plan shall:

A) describe the steps the applicant will take to inform parents and other members of the public of:

i) the existence and scope of the program;
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ii) the methods used for identifying students who are gifted and talented and in selecting participants for the program; and

iii) the availability of the appeals process established pursuant to subsection (a)(5) of this Section; and

B) provide a rationale for the applicant’s outreach plans, with specific reference to the linguistic or cultural needs of any segments of the population that may not be readily informed of the program.

b) Each RFP shall describe the format that applicants will be required to follow and any additional information they may be required to submit.

c) Each RFP shall include a budget summary and payment schedule, as well as requiring a narrative budget breakdown, i.e., a detailed explanation of each line item of expenditure that discusses the need for State funds in the context of the applicant’s other available resources.

d) Each RFP shall identify the data recipients will be required to collect and report regarding the achievement of students participating in the program, as well as any other information to be reported and the associated timelines.

e) Each RFP shall include such certification and assurance forms as the State Superintendent may, by law, require.

f) Each RFP shall specify the date by which applications shall be submitted. The deadline established shall provide at least 45 days in which to submit plans that conform to the requirements of Article 14A of the School Code and this Part as applications for funding.

g) Separate proposals for renewal of funding as discussed in Section 227.40(b) of this Part shall be invited and shall contain at least:

1) evidence that the program has complied with all aspects of Article 14A of the School Code and the approved plan;

2) the required data relative to students’ achievement and growth;
3) information on the qualifications and professional development of the teachers employed that will permit verification of compliance with the requirements of Section 227.20(a)(6) of this Part;

4) an updated narrative that discusses the services and materials for which funding is requested and presents evidence of continued need for State support; and

5) an updated budget summary and payment schedule for the renewal year, including a narrative budget breakdown.

h) Incomplete applications shall not be considered.

**Section 227.25 Required Qualifications**

As a means of demonstrating that he or she understands the characteristics and educational needs of children and is able to differentiate the curriculum and apply instructional methods to meet the needs of the children as required by Section 14A-30(16) of the School Code [105 ILCS 14A-30(16)], and subject to the provisions of Section 227.20(a)(6) of this Part, each teacher who is assigned to provide instruction in a program funded pursuant to this Part shall have completed, or shall be required to complete:

a) Nine semester hours of college credit from a regionally accredited institution of higher education and demonstrably related to the education of gifted and talented students; or

b) Both the State and national assessment instruments, namely:

1) the self-assessment developed by the Illinois Association for Gifted Children (IAGC) (which shall be based on the “Professional Teaching Standards for Educators Working with Gifted/Talented Learners” (2002), published by IAGC and posted at www.iagcgifted.org; no later editions of or revisions to these standards are incorporated) with a rating of “experienced” or higher; and
2) the PRAXIS examination for gifted education (Test Code 0357, Educational Testing Service, Rosedale Road, Princeton, New Jersey 08541 (2006)); or

c) Six semester hours of college credit from a regionally accredited institution of higher education and demonstrably related to the education of gifted and talented students and any one of the following additional choices:

1) the self-assessment referred to in subsection (b)(1) of this Section; or

2) the PRAXIS examination referred to in subsection (b)(2) of this Section; or

3) the Gifted Education Institute offered by the State Board of Education in cooperation with IAGC; or

4) two years of experience teaching in, coordinating, or directing a program for gifted students; or

5) participation in no fewer than two state or national conferences on gifted education, such as those offered by IAGC or the National Association for Gifted Children (NAGC); or

6) professional development activities demonstrably related to the education of gifted and talented students that are sufficient to generate 30 continuing professional development units (CPDUs), as defined and quantified in the rules for certificate renewal (see 23 Ill. Adm. Code 25.875); or

d) Three semester hours of college credit from a regionally accredited institution of higher education and demonstrably related to the education of gifted and talented students and any two of the additional choices listed in subsections (c)(1)-(6) of this Section; or

e) The Gifted Education Institute referred to in subsection (c)(3) of this Section and any two of the additional choices listed in subsection (c) of this Section.

Section 227.30 Criteria for the Review of Initial Applications
Recipients of grants under this Part shall be required to devote State funds to needs and expenditures that are not captured in the per capita amount generally devoted to the education of students at the grade levels to be served by the program. Applications for initial funding shall be evaluated in accordance with the following criteria:

a) Quality of the Plan (60 points)

1) There is a coherent set of strategies for continuity of instruction in the specified subject areas as students progress through the grade levels, and articulation between those portions of the district’s program supported with State funds and the other aspects of the program is evident.

2) The curriculum in the subject areas covered by the program will provide appropriate challenges and learning opportunities for the students who participate.

3) The plan provides evidence that services to gifted students will be integrated effectively into those students’ schedules.

b) Impact and Need (30 points)

1) Decisions about the numbers of students to be served are justified in light of the resources available for meeting the goals of the program.

2) Other sources of funding are limited to such an extent that the applicant will be unable to provide a high-quality program without grant funds under this Part.

c) Staff Capacity (10 points)

1) The plan identifies school staff who are available for assignment and who are qualified to provide instruction in the program or who will attain the required qualifications in the time permitted under Section 227.20(a)(6) of this Part.

2) The proposal includes plans for ongoing professional development for the staff members assigned to the program, as well as others who may be assigned to it in future years.
Section 227.40 Allocation of Funds

a) The State Superintendent of Education shall approve initial applications for funding and make final determinations regarding the amounts to be provided based upon:

1) the total funds appropriated for this initiative;

2) the needs and resources described and the amounts requested in the top-ranked proposals identified in accordance with the criteria set forth in Section 227.30 of this Part; and

3) the need to make programs under this Part available on a statewide basis.

b) It is the intention of the State Board of Education to approve funding for programs under this Part for a three-year period. Funding for the second and third years shall be contingent upon the availability of funds for the program, the evident effectiveness of the grantee’s program and use of State resources, and the evidence presented in the renewal proposal that a sufficient need continues to exist for State funding.

c) A district that has received three years’ funding under this Part may subsequently apply as a new applicant.

Section 227.50 Statewide Activities

a) Funding made available pursuant to Article 14A of the School Code may be used by the State Board of Education for purposes including, but not limited to:

1) upgrading professional development materials and events for personnel statewide who serve gifted students, including the Gifted Education Institute referenced in Section 227.25 of this Part, or making professional development materials and opportunities more widely available;

2) reaching underserved demographic groups or geographic areas of the State;

3) developing and disseminating new knowledge in this field;
4) developing and disseminating materials for use by parents of gifted students;

5) building awareness of and support for gifted education;

6) providing financial resources to support the review of portfolios developed by teachers to demonstrate required qualifications;

7) supporting the administrative functions of ISBE required or authorized pursuant to Section 14A-35 of the School Code [105 ILCS 14A-35]; and

8) other experimental projects and initiatives as outlined in Section 14A-50 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/14A-50].

b) When the funds appropriated under Article 14A of the School Code are sufficient to provide effective support for local programs of gifted education, the State Superintendent of Education may reserve no more than 5 percent of the amount appropriated for the purposes discussed in subsection (a) of this Section. When the State Superintendent of Education determines that the level of service to gifted and talented students statewide can more effectively be increased through statewide activities rather than through support for a small number of local programs, the State Superintendent may devote the entire amount available to these purposes.
TO: Illinois State Board of Education
FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education (Interim)
       Ginger Reynolds, Assistant Superintendent
       Darren Reisberg, General Counsel

Agenda Topic: Action Item: Rules for Adoption – New Part 232 (Summer Bridges Program)

Materials: Recommended Rules

Staff Contact(s): Myron Mason, Division Administrator, Federal Grants and Programs

Purpose of Agenda Item
The purpose of this agenda item is to present the proposed new rules for the Board’s adoption.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
This rulemaking is congruent with Goal 1, Enhancing Literacy.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
The Board will be asked to adopt new Part 232.

Background Information
Summer Bridges (also sometimes referred to as “Extended Learning Opportunities”) is a long-standing program funded with state dollars to improve the achievement of students through Grade 6 who have been recommended for retention in grade, have not met the state standards in reading, or are otherwise considered to be in need of a remedial program to help them succeed. The program is conducted during the summer, and each participating district must offer a 90-hour instructional sequence based upon a uniform curriculum design. Staff development also makes up an important aspect of the program and is required for all professional and paraprofessional staff members who are employed in it.

There is no actual substantive legislation establishing this program, although it is mentioned in passing in two places in the School Code, one of which (Section 1D-1) directs a set percentage of each year’s appropriation to the Chicago Public Schools as part of that district’s general education block grant. The other provision (Section 10-20.9a) mentions a Summer Bridge program as one option that districts may use when they are required to provide a remedial summer program.

The provisions of Sections 232.20 and 232.30 of the proposed rules reflect current practice in terms of choosing the districts that will be eligible for funding and the application procedure they are required to follow. Once the total number of students to be served becomes evident, available funding is distributed on a per-pupil basis. Thus the program is not competitive in the usual sense, in that eligible proposals are not ranked in comparison to one another.
However, because the agency’s discretion comes into play in determining which districts will receive the funding and what the requirements are for participation, rules are needed to provide a firm foundation for these policies.

These new rules were presented for initial review in September of this year and subsequently published in the Illinois Register to elicit public comment. None was received, and the version presented for adoption is identical to that originally proposed.

**Analysis and Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action and Communications**

Policy Implications: Please see above.
Budget Implications: The FY 2007 appropriation for this program exceeds $22 million.
Legislative Action: None needed.
Communication: Please see “Next Steps” below.

**Superintendent’s Recommendation**

The Superintendent recommends that the State Board of Education adopt the following motion:

> The State Board of Education hereby adopts the proposed rulemaking for:

> Summer Bridges Program (23 Illinois Administrative Code 232).

> Further, the Board authorizes the State Superintendent of Education to make such technical or nonsubstantive changes as the State Superintendent may deem necessary in response to suggestions or objections of the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules.

**Next Steps**

Notice of the adopted rules will be submitted to the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules to initiate JCAR’s review. When that process is complete, the adopted rules will be filed with the Secretary of State and disseminated as appropriate.
Section 232.10  Purpose and Applicability

This Part establishes the eligibility criteria, application procedure, programmatic requirements, and method for allocation of funding for the Summer Bridges program referred to in Section 10-20.9a of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/10-20.9a]. The provisions of this Part shall not apply to a school district that receives funding for Summer Bridges as part of its general education block grant pursuant to Section 1D-1 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/1D-1].

Section 232.20  Eligible Applicants

a) Eligible applicants shall be school districts that include one or more schools serving students in pre-kindergarten, kindergarten, or any of Grades 1 through 6
in which 50 percent or more of the students participating in the State assessment under Section 2-3.64 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/2-3.64] have achieved scores indicating that they do not meet State standards in reading. Public university laboratory schools approved by the State Board of Education pursuant to Section 18-8.05(K) of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/18-8.05(K)], area vocational centers, and charter schools shall be eligible under this Part on the same basis as school districts (see 105 ILCS 5/2-3.109a, 2-3.109b, and 27A-11.5, respectively. For purposes of this Part, the term “district” shall be understood to include all these eligible entities).

b) The State Superintendent shall annually identify the eligible districts based upon State assessment scores attained by students in the previous school year. As a prerequisite to participation in the program, eligible districts shall be required to submit letters of intent in accordance with the timeframe established by the State Superintendent, in order to permit calculation of the approximate per-pupil allocation that will be available.

Section 232.30 Application Procedure

a) Each eligible district that has submitted a letter of intent may submit an application, in a format specified by the State Superintendent of Education, including information such as the number of students to be served, the number of teachers to be assigned to the program, the schedule for the program, and the sites where the program will be operated.

b) Each application shall include the budget for the program, including only expenditures conforming to the requirements of Section 232.60 of this Part. Each district’s budget for the program shall reflect the matching share required under Section 232.60 of this Part.

c) The application format for each year’s program shall indicate the approximate amount of the per-pupil allocation and shall include such certifications and assurances as the State Superintendent may require.
Section 232.40  Allocation of Funds

Final determinations regarding the amounts to be provided shall be made based upon the total funds appropriated for this initiative and the number of students to be served by all the eligible districts that submit applications.

Section 232.50  Program Specifications

a) Eligibility for services under this Part shall not be limited to students who attend the particular attendance centers whose performance led to the district’s eligibility under Section 232.20 of this Part. Any student in an eligible district may be served, provided that he or she was enrolled in pre-kindergarten, kindergarten, or any of Grades 1 through 6 in the school year immediately preceding the summer when the program is offered and:

1) did not meet State standards in reading, as evidenced by the relevant score attained on the State assessment required pursuant to Section 2-3.64 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/2-3.64]; or

2) was recommended for retention in grade; or

3) was referred to the program by his or her teacher based on the results of a locally determined reading assessment or other factors such as poor grades or a high rate of absenteeism.

b) Funding under this Part shall be used only to provide a remedial summer program consisting of no fewer than 90 hours of instruction to each student served and addressing the components of the literacy framework displayed in Appendix A to this Part. Each district operating the program shall be required to purchase or demonstrate the availability of the materials listed in Appendix B to this Part.

c) The number of sites at which the program is offered within any district shall be limited to the number of sites whose performance led to the district’s eligibility for funding under Section 232.20 of this Part. The program may, however, be conducted at sites other than those whose performance led to the district’s eligibility.
d) Except as otherwise specified in subsection (e) of this Section, no fewer than 12 and no more than 15 students shall be served in each class for Grades 1 through 6, and no fewer than seven and no more than 10 students shall be served in each class for pre-kindergarten and kindergarten. Each district shall report its enrollment count by grade level on the sixth day of attendance in the program and shall consolidate classes as needed to achieve class sizes within these ranges. The services of teachers in excess of the number required for the applicable class sizes shall not be paid for with funding provided under this Part.

e) In order to respond to developments that may occur after the sixth day of attendance, a district may seek approval from the State Superintendent of Education to add no more than two students to any class in excess of the applicable maximum. The State Superintendent shall approve a district’s request if the Superintendent determines that doing so is necessary for reasons of cost-effectiveness or to avoid a disruption in learning opportunities for students, provided that the teacher responsible for the class has consented to the addition of the students.

f) Each teacher, paraprofessional, and administrator employed in the program shall be provided with, and shall be required to participate in, 30 hours of professional development.

1) Three hours of professional development shall occur in the time period after the end of the school year and prior to the start of the program and shall be devoted to setting up the learning environment, administering an individual reading inventory, and orientation to the Summer Bridges Program.

2) Twelve hours of professional development shall occur prior to or during the course of the program and shall be devoted to the learning environment, language development and word knowledge, fluency, comprehension, writing, and classroom-based assessment appropriate to the grade level to be served by the participating teachers.

3) Fifteen hours of professional development shall be devoted to mathematics concepts and games, additional literacy strategies, problem-solving, exchange of strategies, activities, and methods among teachers, and analysis of the results of the individual reading inventory.
g) No program funded under this Part shall begin sooner than five business days after the end of the school year.

h) Each district funded under this Part shall assess students’ growth in reading prior to and following their participation in the program. No fewer than 20 percent of the students from each of Grades 2 through 6 and no fewer than 20 percent of the total group of students from pre-kindergarten, kindergarten, and Grade 1 shall participate in an assessment prescribed by the State Superintendent as appropriate to their respective grade levels. The results of these assessments shall be compiled to form part of each district’s summative report under Section 232.70 of this Part.

1) Each student whose results are included in the report shall have achieved an attendance rate of at least 80 percent.

2) The pre-test shall be separated from the post-test by no fewer than 18 days of attendance.

Section 232.60 Local Match; Use of State Funds

a) Each district that receives funding pursuant to this Part shall be required to contribute a matching share equivalent to 20 percent of the amount awarded by the State Board of Education (ISBE). The district’s share may consist of funds, in-kind contributions, or a combination of these, provided that all amounts are related to delivery of the program (e.g., transportation expenses, janitorial services, expenditures for utilities, salary and benefits for an administrator or coordinator, or food service).

b) Each district shall allocate the State funds provided for the program within the range specified in this subsection (b) unless an exception is granted as discussed in subsection (c) of this Section.

1) It is expected that between 45 and 55 percent of the funds provided by ISBE will be used for salaries and benefits related to the employment of instructional and support personnel for the program.
2) It is expected that approximately 20 percent of the funds provided by ISBE will be needed for supplies and materials directly related to the curriculum delivered and not otherwise readily available within the district. Each district shall use no less than $1,000 of its grant allocation per classroom for this purpose.

3) It is expected that approximately 20 percent of the funds provided to each recipient will be used for professional development of the certified and paraprofessional staff who provide instruction and instructional support in the program. All professional development shall be delivered by providers approved for purposes of certificate renewal (see 23 Ill. Adm. Code 25, Subpart J).

4) Up to ten percent of the funds provided to each recipient may be used to offset expenses for administration or program coordination, provided that no support under this program shall be provided for personnel expenditures relative to any staff member employed on an 11- or 12-month contract with the recipient district.

c) A district may expend more than 55 percent of the funds provided under this Part for personnel-related costs only if approved by the State Superintendent of Education based upon evidence of other resources that will be used to ensure the availability of the materials required under Appendix B of this Part and the provision of the professional development required under Section 232.50(f) of this Part.

d) Limitations on Specific Expenditures

1) Grant funds shall not be used to provide more than 130 hours’ compensation for any teacher in the program.

2) Grant funds shall not be used for costs associated with employing more than one support staff member (clerical or paraprofessional) for each four teachers in the program.

3) A full-time program coordinator shall be supported only for programs enrolling at least 1,000 students.
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
NOTICE OF ADOPTED RULES

4) Grant funds may be used only to support classroom-based instruction and shall not be used for field trips or experiences.

5) No food or food service expenditures shall be supported with funds provided under this Part.

6) No equipment, software, or software licenses shall be purchased with funds provided under this Part.

Section 232.70 Reporting Requirements

a) No later than August 31, each participating district shall submit to the State Superintendent of Education a program report, in a format specified by the State Superintendent, that includes assessment data and other information relative to students’ growth as a result of the program and a summary of teachers’ and parents’ responses to survey questions regarding the program.

b) No later than September 30, each participating district shall submit to the State Superintendent a final expenditure report reflecting its use of the total amount provided and the closeout of the program.
Section 232. APPENDIX A  Curriculum and Instruction Frameworks

Curriculum and instruction in the Summer Bridges Program shall be based upon the balanced literacy framework whose components are displayed in this Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word Knowledge</th>
<th>Sight Vocabulary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phonemic Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Letter and Sound Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phonics Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structural Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Word Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>Reading Speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oral Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phrasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>Oral Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding Text Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening Comprehension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Types of Information to “Find” in Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organization of Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inquiry and Study Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy-rich Environment</td>
<td>Engaged Reading and Writing Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Celebration of Reading and Writing Efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extensive Classroom Collection of Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Materials (wide range of high-interest fiction and non-fiction books that motivate and support reading and writing on a variety of levels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room Designed to Support Instruction (whole-group, small-group, and individual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Assessment to Inform Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual and/or Group Reading Inventories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing Rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading Logs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis of Students’ Work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 232. APPENDIX B  Required Materials for the Program

Each district operating the Summer Bridges Program shall select materials compatible with the curriculum and instruction frameworks displayed in Appendix A to this Part. At least the following types and quantities of resources shall be available for students in each class, as appropriate to the respective grade levels.

- 40 books designed to be read aloud by students
- 12 big books*, including both fiction and informational text (and rhyme for grades through 2)
- 6 small books* for each big book
- take-home books (including one set to be used in instruction)
- 50 assorted books representing a range of reading difficulty
- tapes and tape player with books for listening centers
- mathematics manipulatives and literature

Additional Requirements for Pre-kindergarten, Kindergarten, and Grades 1 and 2

- picture, letter, and word cards
- magnetic letters
- anthology of nursery rhymes
- display boards

*According to publishers’ or vendors’ designations of children’s books as “big” or “small”
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education (Interim)
       Ginger Reynolds, Assistant Superintendent
       Darren Reisberg, General Counsel

Agenda Topic: Action Item: Rules for Adoption – New Part 270 (Advanced Placement)

Materials: Recommended Rules

Staff Contact(s): Dana Kinley, Division Administrator, Curriculum & Instruction

Purpose of Agenda Item
The purpose of this agenda item is to present the proposed new rules for the Board’s adoption.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
This rulemaking is required as a result of legislative action but is also congruent with Goal 1, Enhancing Literacy.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
The Board will be asked to adopt new Part 270.

Background Information
This rulemaking responds to the College and Career Success for All Students Act (P.A. 94-534), whose purpose is to increase Illinois students’ access to a “substantive and rigorous curriculum” that will prepare them for success in college and work. One major focus of the legislation is to ensure training for teachers of Advanced Placement courses as well as “Pre-AP” training for teachers in lower grades. Another area of emphasis is outreach to families and students regarding the importance of enrolling in Advanced Placement courses and other rigorous course offerings.

These proposed rules will establish as eligible entities those school districts that serve any of Grades 6 through 12 and have at least one school with a high concentration of low-income students, i.e., at least 40 percent of the student body. The grant program will not pay for the direct costs of teaching Advanced Placement courses or preparatory coursework for students, but instead will support capacity-building training for teachers so that more such courses can be offered. At the same time, outreach and support for students will be available with grant funds, with an emphasis on ensuring that low-income students’ access to rigorous coursework and Advanced Placement examinations is increased.

This set of rules is similar to other Parts that describe competitive grant programs, in that it identifies the eligible applicants, sets out the application procedure, and provides the criteria by which applications will be judged.
These rules were presented for initial review in September of this year and subsequently published in the Illinois Register to elicit public comment. One communication was received, and the issues raised are discussed in the attached Summary and Analysis of Public Comment.

**Analysis and Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action and Communications**

Policy Implications: Please see above.
Budget Implications: The FY 2007 appropriation for this program amounts to $1.5 million.
Legislative Action: None needed.
Communication: Please see “Next Steps” below.

**Superintendent’s Recommendation**

The Superintendent recommends that the State Board of Education adopt the following motion:

The State Board of Education hereby adopts the proposed rulemaking for:

Advanced Placement (23 Illinois Administrative Code 270).

Further, the Board authorizes the State Superintendent of Education to make such technical or nonsubstantive changes as the State Superintendent may deem necessary in response to suggestions or objections of the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules.

**Next Steps**

Notice of the adopted rules will be submitted to the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules to initiate JCAR’s review. When that process is complete, the adopted rules will be filed with the Secretary of State and disseminated as appropriate.
Summary and Analysis of Public Comment
23 Ill. Adm. Code 270 (Advanced Placement)

Comment
The one correspondent who submitted comments on these proposed rules believed that serious inefficiencies would be created by the requirement (stated in Section 270.30(b)) that each grantee use at least 50 percent of the funding provided to pay for training sponsored by the College Board. The commenter’s point of view was that this rule would unnecessarily limit schools’ ability to serve their students best by precluding, for example, collaboration among small schools that could offer classes for their teachers together. She felt that this would actually be helpful to the College Board as well, because it would decrease the number of instructors the Board would need to locate. Schools would also benefit because more diverse teachers would be attending each workshop and all could learn from one another.

The commenter indicated further that working with the College Board presented certain challenges due to inadequate staff capacity and infrastructure for serving large numbers of schools. Scheduling and logistics had presented problems in her experience. These limitations precluded catering to individual schools’ particular needs and generally caused some individuals to question whether the funding stream presented by this grant was worthwhile. The commenter advocated reducing the portion of grant funds required to be spent directly with the College Board.

Analysis
The proposed minimum of 50 percent was developed in an attempt to strike a balance between flexibility for grantees to pursue other strategies for promoting participation and success in Advanced Placement coursework and an appropriate level of conformance with specific AP expectations. It should be understood that the College Board is the only entity that offers AP tests recognized by institutions of higher education. Thus there is ample reason to emphasize a direct relationship among our grantees and that Board so that we can be certain of alignment between the training of staff and the tests that students can take for credit.

It appears, however, that a 50 percent minimum may be artificially high, which would be counterproductive if it does not enable recipients to derive the greatest possible value for the money spent. This would be an unintended consequence that we should avoid. We therefore agree that the 50 percent minimum should be lowered to 20 percent instead.

Recommendation
The first sentence of Section 270.30(b) should be revised to begin as follows:

b) At least 20 percent of the funding provided for each program under this Part shall be used to defray the cost of training for teachers, counselors, and principals that is sponsored by the College Board (see http://apcentral.................).

The second sentence of this subsection should also be changed correspondingly: “Costs for other professional development activities..................shall be allowable beyond the 20 percent threshold.”
Section 270.10 Purpose and Applicability

This Part establishes the application procedure and criteria for selection by the State Board of Education of the entities that will receive funding under the College and Career Success for All Students Act [105 ILCS 302] (“the Act”).

Section 270.20 Eligible Applicants

Eligible applicants shall be school districts serving any of Grades 6 through 12 operating at least one school in which 40 percent or more of the students are classified as “low-income” (i.e., eligible to receive free or reduced-price meals under the School Breakfast and Lunch Program Act [105 ILCS 125]). Public university laboratory schools approved by the State Board of Education pursuant to Section 18-8.05(K) of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/18-8.05(K)], area vocational centers, and charter schools shall be eligible to apply on the same basis as school districts (see 105 ILCS 5/2-3.109a, 2-3.109b, and 27A-11.5, respectively. For purposes of this Part, the term “district” shall be understood to include all these eligible entities). An applicant
chosen for funding shall not subsequently lose eligibility due solely to a change in the low-income status of its schools.

Section 270.30 Program Specifications

Grant funds provided under this Part shall be used only in connection with Advanced Placement (AP) courses identified as such by the College Board (at http://apcentral.collegeboard.com/apc/public/courses/descriptions/index.htm) or in connection with initiatives in any of Grades 6 through 11 that are designed specifically to prepare students in those grades to participate successfully in AP courses. Grant funds shall be expended only to serve students and staff in schools where at least 40 percent of the students are classified as “low-income”.

a) Allowable activities shall include, but need not be limited to, curriculum development, staff training, and the purchase of materials related to AP courses or, in Grades 6-11, initiatives and coursework designed to prepare students for enrollment and success in AP courses (“preparatory programs”).

b) At least 20 percent of the funding provided for each program under this Part shall be used to defray the cost of training for teachers, counselors, and principals that is sponsored by the College Board (see http://apcentral.collegeboard.com/apc/Pageflows/InstitutesAndWorkshops/InstitutesAndWorkshopsController.jsp). Costs for other professional development activities that correspond to the purposes stated in Section 15 of the Act [105 ILCS 302/15] shall be allowable beyond the 20 percent threshold. Training costs may include stipends for those participating and for substitute teachers.

c) Some portion of the funding provided for each proposed program under this Part shall be devoted to strategies and activities specifically designed to increase the participation of low-income students in AP courses or to promote participation by low-income students in preparatory programs, such as:

1) development and dissemination of promotional materials or other outreach to students and their families;

2) counseling, enrichment, tutoring, or other assistance for students that will prepare them to succeed in these courses and on the culminating examinations; and
3) administering the Pre-Scholastic Aptitude Test (PSAT) (see CollegeBoard.com (2006)) to students.

d) Grant funds shall not be used to pay for the services of teachers to teach Advanced Placement courses or preparatory courses.

e) Grant funds shall not be used to supplant other efforts currently funded with local, State, or federal resources.

Section 270.40 Application Procedure

For purposes of this Part, the terms “proposal” and “application” shall have the same meaning.

a) When State funding is available for new grants under this Part, the State Superintendent of Education shall issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) in order to solicit applications from eligible entities.

b) The RFP shall describe the format that applicants will be required to follow and the information they will be required to submit, including, but not limited to, identification of the schools that will be served, the specific training planned and the schedule for those activities, and the strategies that will be used to increase the rate of participation by low-income students.

c) The RFP shall indicate the amount or expected amount of the appropriation for the program, the expected average size of grant awards, the allowable expenditures, and the basis for awarding grants. The RFP shall identify any restrictions or areas of high priority that have been established for a particular program year. If matching funds or resources will be required of applicants, the RFP shall describe these requirements.

d) The RFP shall include a budget summary and payment schedule, as well as a narrative budget breakdown, i.e., a detailed explanation of each line item of expenditure.

e) The RFP shall identify the information recipients will be required to collect and report regarding the activities conducted with grant funds and the results of those activities, as well as the timelines for reporting.
f) The RFP shall include such certification and assurances as the State Superintendent may require.

g) The RFP shall specify the deadline for submission of proposals, which shall provide potential applicants with at least 45 days to respond.

h) Separate applications shall be required for renewal of funding. Each application for renewal shall include at least:

1) a description of expenditures and activities during the year just concluded, demonstrating that the project has been implemented in conformance with the approved grant agreement and that the recipient continues to exhibit a need for grant funds for this purpose;

2) time-specific goals and objectives for the project in the renewal year; and

3) an updated budget summary and payment schedule for the renewal year, including a narrative budget breakdown.

i) Incomplete proposals shall not be considered.

Section 270.50 Criteria for the Review of Initial Proposals

a) Applications shall be evaluated in accordance with the following criteria:

1) Quality and Scope of the Plan (45 points)

   A) The proposal demonstrates that the training to be funded and the staff members to be involved will permit the district to offer AP courses or preparatory programs that are not currently available, or that greater numbers of students will have access to AP courses or preparatory programs, as applicable.

   B) The proposal includes plans for support for and collaboration among staff members and administrators that will result in the sequential alignment of rigorous course offerings across grade levels, culminating in Advanced Placement studies.
The proposal demonstrates that the activities and materials to be supported with grant funds will enhance students’ preparedness for AP courses and strengthen their ability to participate successfully.

2) Student Recruitment and Support (25 points)
   
   A) The proposal provides evidence that the intended outreach and recruitment strategies respond to the needs of low-income students in the communities to be served.
   
   B) The proposal presents a combination of supportive elements that will strengthen low-income students’ preparation for AP coursework, assist them in successful completion of the courses chosen, and enhance their likelihood of success on the culminating examinations.

3) Need (15 points)
   
   A) The proposal describes the status of the applicant’s instructional programs and demonstrates that students’ access to rigorous academic coursework is limited by the scarcity of appropriately trained instructional staff or other necessary resources and materials.
   
   B) The proposal demonstrates that other sources of funding are limited to such an extent that the applicant is unable to conduct or expand the program as proposed without funding under this Part.

4) Cost-Effectiveness and Sustainability (15 points)
   
   A) The scope of the proposed activities is reasonable in light of the amount of funding to be provided, and the project will be cost-effective considering the number and types of courses to be supported and the number of students to be served.
   
   B) The proposal gives evidence of the district’s commitment to continuing efforts to foster greater participation in AP coursework.
by low-income students and to support them in achieving greater success and achievement in that coursework.

Section 270.60  Allocation of Funds

a) Applications for funding shall be approved and final determinations regarding the amounts to be provided shall be made based upon the total funds appropriated for this initiative, the amounts necessary to fund the top-ranked proposals, and the need to promote students’ participation in rigorous academic coursework on a statewide basis.

b) It is the intention of the State Board of Education to approve grants under this Part for a three-year period. Funding for the second and third years shall be contingent upon the availability of funds for the program and evidence presented in renewal proposals in accordance with Section 270.30(h) of this Part. A district that has received three years’ funding under this Part may subsequently apply as a new applicant.
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Dr. Christopher Koch, State Superintendent of Education (Interim) 
      Ginger Reynolds, Assistant Superintendent, Teaching and Learning

Agenda Topic: Action Item: Institutional Accreditation and Program Approvals 
              Trinity International University

Materials: State Teacher Certification Unit Accreditation and Program Approval

Staff Contact: Linda Jamali and Marti Woelfle

Purpose of Agenda Item
The purpose of this agenda item is to consider the State Teacher Certification Board recommendation for the accreditation of Trinity International University and approval of the institution’s programs.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
The State Teacher Certification Board voted to recommend that Trinity International University be assigned accreditation with conditions with a focused visit addressing the one unmet standard and additional areas for improvement within two years after the semester when the conditions were issued. This recommendation is based on the State Teacher’s Certification Board’s review of the documentation provided in the ISBE team report, institutional rejoinder, and team chair’s response to the rejoinder [Section 25.125 (j) (2) (C)].

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
The approval of the professional preparation institution has a direct linkage to Goal 2 Improving Educator Quality for All Children. Accreditation of Illinois teacher preparation institutions based on recognized and established standards, policies, and procedures ensures that the institution prepares teachers with expertise in the discipline-specific content areas and that these teachers will demonstrate “best practices” and help all students learn.

Background Information
The ISBE on-site accreditation review of Trinity International University was conducted on February 25-March 1, 2006. The team reviewed the institutional report (self-study) of how Trinity International University addresses the NCATE Unit Standards Edition 2002; reviewed extensive exhibits related to the conceptual framework and six unit standards; interviewed administrators, full- and part-time faculty, support personnel, undergraduate and graduate program candidates, alumni, and members of the P-12 community who participate in the preparation of candidates and decision-making processes of the educational unit; observed in P-12 classrooms throughout the Trinity International University service region; and visited campus facilities.

Program reports were submitted to the State Board of Education in advance of the on-site review for seven teacher preparation programs and the programs were determined to meet the Illinois professional education standards. The general administrative/principal certificate program was granted provisional approval by the State Board of Education on
December 15, 2005, and was not reviewed by a panel because the program was in the initial stage of being implemented at the time of the on-site review.

As defined by Section 25.125 (h-j) of the State Board’s administrative rules, the State Teacher Certification Board conducted its accreditation review of institutions on Thursday and Friday, June 1-2, 2006, including the ISBE on-site accreditation review of Trinity International University and its programs. The Certification Board reviewed the ISBE team report, institutional rejoinder, team chair’s response to the institutional rejoinder, documents provided by the institution during the on-site review, and individual program panel reports prepared by the ISBE program review panels.

Analysis and Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action and Communications
The team findings and the State Board of Education concur that Trinity International University met five of the six NCATE Unit Standards Edition 2002 with ten areas for improvement.

Standard One: Met

Standard Two: Met with Areas for Improvement
- The unit is not systematically analyzing and using data to improve candidate performance.
- The unit has not clearly determined the data management processes for the collection, analysis, and evaluation of data.

Standard Three: Met with Areas for Improvement
- Not all programs ensure candidates have intensive and extensive field experiences.
- The unit does not provide training for cooperating teachers and supervisors.

Standard Four: Met with Area for Improvement
- Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.

Standard Five: Met with Area for Improvement
- There is limited evidence of recent scholarly work by the full-time unit faculty.

Standard Six: Not Met
- There are insufficient unit resources dedicated for database management.
- The unit lacks budgetary support to meet the expanded number of program and unit needs.
- The unit does not have sufficient full-time faculty to meet multiple program and unit needs.
- Excessive SOE workloads limit faculty involvement in the implementation of the assessment system, collaborative efforts with school partners, and scholarship.

As defined in Section 25.125 (j) (2) (C) of the Illinois administrative rules, the State Teacher Certification Board recommends that the State Board of Education assign accreditation with conditions and require a focused visit to Trinity International University within two years after the semester when the conditions were assigned. At the time of the focused visit, the institution must present evidence that it meets the unmet standard and the areas for improvement. The STCB recommends a focused visit because the conditions cannot be adequately satisfied within six months through the submission of documentation.
Program panel reports were also reviewed, and the Certification Board recommends continuing approval of the following programs at Trinity International University until the time of the focused accreditation review in spring 2009:

- Elementary Education
- English Language Arts
- Mathematics
- Music
- Physical Education
- Science – Biology
- Social Science – History

The General Administrative/Principal program will be “provisionally approved” until the time of the university’s next scheduled accreditation review [Section 25.145 (d) (1)].

The State Board of Education accreditation decision following the focused review in spring 2009 unit will determine the continuing approval of the unit’s professional education programs.

Pross and Cons of Various Actions
Accreditation of Trinity International University will allow the university to entitle program completers for certification through its approved programs until its next scheduled accreditation review.

Policy Implications: None

Budget Implications: Funding for the focused accreditation review in spring 2009 will be considered during the FY10 State Board budget development.

Legislative Action: None

Communication: This will occur following the decisions by the State Board of Education.

Superintendent’s Recommendation
The Superintendent recommends that the following motion be adopted.

The State Board of Education hereby assigns the status of “accreditation with conditions” with a focused visit addressing the unmet standard and additional areas for improvement within two years after the semester when the conditions were issued. This action is in accordance with Section 25.125 (j) (2) (C) of the State Board’s administrative rules and authorizes the institution to conduct its programs and recommend candidates for certification by entitlement until the time of the institution’s focused review in spring 2009.

Next Steps
Trinity International University will be notified regarding the State Board’s decision. The State Teacher Certification Board will also be notified.
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education (Interim)
Ginger Reynolds, Assistant Superintendent

Agenda Topic: Action Item: Institutional Accreditation and Program Approvals
Blackburn College

Materials: State Teacher Certification Unit Accreditation and Program Approval

Staff Contact: Linda Jamali
Phyliss Jones

Purpose of Agenda Item
The purpose of this agenda item is to consider the State Teacher Certification Board recommendation for the accreditation of Blackburn College and approval of the institution’s programs.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
The State Teacher Certification Board voted to recommend that unit accreditation and approval of the institution’s programs to Blackburn College are in accordance with the State Board’s administrative rules, Section 25.125 (j) (3) (B). The State Board’s unit accreditation decision will authorize the institution to conduct its programs and recommend candidates for certification by entitlement.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
The approval of the professional preparation institution has a direct linkage to Goal 2, Improving Educator Quality for All Children. Accreditation of Illinois teacher preparation institutions based on recognized and established standards, policies, and procedures ensures that the institution prepares teachers with expertise in the discipline-specific content areas and that these teachers will demonstrate best practices and help all students learn.

Background Information
Blackburn College is an established Illinois teacher preparation institution that offers undergraduate programs in elementary education, secondary education, and special certification areas.

On June 17, 2003, after reviewing documentation that Blackburn College presented as required by the “accreditation with conditions” assignment of June 2001, the State Board of Education assigned “accreditation with probation” to Blackburn College’s educational unit and teacher education preparation programs. This was in accordance with the Board’s administrative rules Section 25.130 (a) (2) of June 2003. This decision required that the educational unit at Blackburn College be subject to “an on-site visit on the unmet standard(s) and weaknesses within eighteen months of the accreditation decision.”

An on-site visit to Blackburn College was conducted by an Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) review team on March 4-8, 2006, and the team submitted its report to the State Board.
Analysis and Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action and Communications

As defined by Section 25.125 (j) (3) (A) of the State Board’s administrative rules, an ISBE review team reviewed the institution’s report (self-study) of how Blackburn College addressed the cited areas for improvement that were based on the NCATE Unit Standards Edition 2002 and aligned to the NCATE Unit Standards Edition 1997. As part of the on-site review, the team also reviewed extensive exhibits related to the citations and interviewed administrators, faculty, support personnel, undergraduate program candidates, and members of the P-12 community who participate in the preparation of candidates and decision-making processes of the educational unit. The team forwarded to the State Teacher Certification Board a report indicating that the conditions cited on June 17, 2003, have been satisfied (Section 25.125 (j) (3) (B) and all standards met.

As defined by Section 25.125 (j) (3) (B) of the State Board’s administrative rules, the State Teacher Certification Board conducted its review of the team’s report and institution’s supporting documentation on Thursday and Friday, November 30 and December 1, 2006. The Certification Board determined that Blackburn College met the six NCATE Unit Standards Edition 2002 with only one new area for improvement. The State Teacher Certification Board is recommending “continuing accreditation” to the State Board of Education.

**Standard One:** Met

**Standard Two:** Met with One Area for Improvement

- A fully developed data management system to enable regular use of data for the improvement of program quality and unit operations has not been implemented by the unit.

**Standard Three:** Met

**Standard Four:** Met

**Standard Five:** Met

**Standard Six:** Met

As defined in Section 25.125 (j) (3) (B) of the Illinois administrative rules, the State Teacher Certification Board recommends that the State Board of Education continue the accreditation of Blackburn College because the educational unit met all of the applicable standards, thereby authorizing the institution to conduct its approved programs and recommend candidates for certification by entitlement.

Program panel reports were also reviewed, and the Certification Board recommends continuing approval of the following programs at Blackburn College [Section 25.127 (j) (1) (A)]:

- Elementary Education
- English Language Arts
- Mathematics
- Physical Education
- Science – Biology
- Social Science – History
- Visual Arts
The State Board of Education will take final action on the accreditation status and approval of the programs of Blackburn College.

Policy Implications: None
Budget Implications: None
Legislative Action: None
Communication: This will occur following the State Board of Education decisions.

**Pros and Cons of Various Actions**
Accreditation of Blackburn College will allow the College to entitle program completers for certification through its approved programs.

**State Teacher Certification Board Recommendation**
The State Teacher Certification Board recommends that Blackburn College be assigned “continuing accreditation” status. This action is in accordance with Section 25.125 (j) (3) (B) and (C) of the State Board’s administrative rules and authorizes the institution to conduct its programs and recommend candidates for certification by entitlement until the time of the institution’s next scheduled review. This review will occur in 2013.

**Superintendent’s Recommendation**
The Superintendent recommends that the following motion be adopted.

The State Board of Education hereby assigns the status of “continuing accreditation” to Blackburn College. This action is in accordance with Section 25.125 (j) (3) (B) and (C) of the State Board’s administrative rules and authorizes the institution to conduct its programs and recommend candidates for certification by entitlement until the time of the institution’s next scheduled review. This review will occur in 2013.

**Next Steps**
Blackburn College will be notified regarding the State Board’s decision. The State Teacher Certification Board will also be notified, and the State Board’s Directory of Approved Institutions and Programs will be updated to reflect the approval status.
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed. D., State Superintendent of Education (Interim)
      Ginger Reynolds, Assistant Superintendent

Action Item: Institutional Accreditation and Program Approvals
              • Northwestern University
              • The School of The Art Institute of Chicago

Materials: State Teacher Certification Unit Accreditation and Program Approval

Staff Contact: Linda Jamali
               Phyliss Jones

Purpose of Agenda Item
The purpose of this agenda item is to consider the State Teacher Certification Board recommendation for the accreditation of Northwestern University and the School of the Art Institute of Chicago and approval of the institutions' programs.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
The State Teacher Certification Board voted to recommend that unit accreditation and approval of the institutions' programs to Northwestern University and the School of The Art Institute of Chicago in accordance with the State Board's administrative rules, Section 25.125 (j) (1). The State Board's unit accreditation decisions will authorize the institutions to conduct their programs and recommend candidates for certification by entitlement.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board's Strategic Plan
The approval of the professional preparation institutions has a direct linkage to Goal 2, Improving Educator Quality for All Children. Accreditation of Illinois teacher preparation institutions based on recognized and established standards, policies, and procedures ensures that the institutions prepare teachers and school service personnel with expertise in the discipline-specific content areas and that these teachers and specialists will demonstrate best practices and help all students learn.

Background Information
The professional education preparation units and programs of the following higher education institutions were reviewed by ISBE in spring 2006:

Northwestern University
The School of the Art Institute of Chicago

As defined by Section 25.125 (h-j) of the State Board's administrative rules, the State Teacher Certification Board conducted its accreditation review of the two institutions on November 30 and December 1, 2006.
The Certification Board reviewed the ISBE teams’ reports, institutional responses, documents provided by the institutions during the on-site review, and individual program panel reports prepared by the ISBE program review panels.

**Analysis and Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action and Communications**

**Northwestern University**

An ISBE on-site accreditation review of Northwestern University was conducted on February 25-March 1, 2006. The team reviewed the institutional report (self-study) of how Northwestern University addresses the *NCATE Unit Standards Edition 2002*; reviewed extensive exhibits related to the conceptual framework and six unit standards; interviewed administrators, full- and part-time faculty, support personnel, undergraduate and graduate program candidates, alumni, and members of the P-12 community who participate in the preparation of candidates and decision-making processes of the educational unit; observed in P-12 classrooms throughout the Northwestern University service region; and visited campus facilities.

The team findings indicate that Northwestern University met the six *NCATE Unit Standards Edition 2002* with five areas for improvement cited.

**Standard One: Met with Two Areas for Improvement**

- The School of Music and School of Communications have not aggregated sufficient data to use for program improvement.
- Student learning was not sufficiently documented.

**Standard Two: Met with One Area for Improvement**

- The unit's assessment system does not yet use data to make programmatic changes.

**Standard Three: Met with Two Areas for Improvement**

- The unit does not have a standardized procedure for dealing with problems that candidates or mentor teachers encounter with field experience clinical practice.
- The criteria for clinical faculty needs to be outlined more specifically and made clear to all involved parties.

**Standard Four: Met**

**Standard Five: Met**

**Standard Six: Met**

As defined in Section 25.125 (j) (1) of the Illinois administrative rules, the State Teacher Certification Board recommends that the State Board of Education continue the accreditation of Northwestern University because the educational unit met the applicable standards, thereby authorizing the institution to conduct its approved programs and recommend candidates for certification by entitlement.

Program panel reports were also reviewed, and the Certification Board recommends continuing
approval of the following programs at Northwestern University:

- Elementary Education
- English Language Arts
- Foreign Language - German
- Foreign Language - Spanish
- Learning Behavior Specialist I
- Mathematics
- Music
- Science - Biology
- Science - Chemistry
- Science - Physics
- Social Science - Economics
- Social Science - History
- Social Science - Political Science
- Social Science - Sociology and Anthropology
- Speech-Language Pathologist
- Visual Arts

The School of the Art Institute of Chicago

An ISBE on-site accreditation review of the School of the Art institute of Chicago was conducted on April 1-5, 2006. The team reviewed the institutional report (self-study) of how the School of the Art Institute of Chicago addresses the NCATE Unit Standards Edition 2002; reviewed extensive exhibits related to the conceptual framework and six unit standards; interviewed administrators, full-and part-time faculty, support personnel, undergraduate and graduate program candidates, alumni, and members of the P-12 community who participate in the preparation of candidates and decision-making processes of the educational unit; observed in P-12 classrooms throughout the Northwestern University service region; and visited campus facilities.

The team findings indicate that the School of the Art Institute of Chicago met the six NCATE Unit Standards Edition 2002 with two areas for improvement cited.

Standard One: Met

Standard Two: Met with Two Areas for Improvement

- A specific timeline for systematic data aggregation, review, and use in program revision by the faculty and stakeholders is not evident. It is not evident that the unit has evaluated the relative sensitivity of key assessments in accurately monitoring and predicting candidate performance on the conceptual framework learning outcomes.

Standard Three: Met

Standard Four: Met

Standard Five: Met
Standard Six: Met

As defined in Section 25.125 (j) (1) of the Illinois administrative rules, the State Teacher Certification Board recommends that the State Board of Education continue the accreditation of the School of the
Art Institute of Chicago because the educational unit met the applicable standards, thereby authorizing the institution to conduct its approved programs and recommend candidates for certification by entitlement.

Program panel report for the Visual Arts program was also reviewed, and the Certification Board recommends continuing approval of the Visual Arts program at the School of the Art Institute of Chicago [Section 25.127 (j) (1) (A)].

The State Board of Education will take final action on the accreditation status of Northwestern University and the School of the School of the Art Institute of Chicago.

Policy Implications: None
Budget Implications: None
Legislative Action: None
Communication: This will occur following the State Board of Education decisions.

**Pros and Cons of Various Actions**

Accreditation of Northwestern University and the School of the Art Institute of Chicago will allow the institutions to entitle program completers for certification through their approved programs.

**State Teacher Certification Board Recommendation**
The State Teacher Certification Board recommends that Northwestern University and the School of the Art Institute of Chicago be assigned "continuing accreditation" status. This action is in accordance with Section 25.125 (j) (1) of the State Board's administrative rules and authorizes the institutions to conduct their programs and recommend candidates for certification by entitlement until the time of the institution's next scheduled review. These reviews will occur in 2013.

**Superintendent's Recommendation**
The Superintendent recommends that the following motions be adopted.

The State Board of Education hereby assigns the status of "continuing accreditation" to Northwestern University. This action is in accordance with Section 25.125 (j) (1) of the State Board's administrative rules and authorizes the institution to conduct its programs and recommend candidates for certification by entitlement until the time of the institution's next scheduled review. This review will occur in 2013.

The State Board of Education hereby assigns the status of "continuing accreditation" to The School of the Art Institute of Chicago. This action is in accordance with Section 25.125 (j) (1) of the State Board's administrative rules and authorizes the institution to conduct its programs and recommend candidates for certification by entitlement until the time of the institution's next scheduled review. This review will occur in 2013.

**Next Steps**
Northwestern University and the School of the Art Institute of Chicago will be notified regarding the State Board's decision. The State Teacher Certification Board will also be notified, and the State Board's Directory of Approved Institutions and Programs will be updated to reflect the approval status.
TO: Illinois State Board of Education
FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education (Interim)
       Ginger Reynolds, Assistant Superintendent

Agenda Topic: Action Item: Institutional Accreditation and Program Approvals
               University of Chicago

Materials: State Teacher Certification Unit Accreditation and Program Approval

Staff Contact: Linda Jamali
               Marti A. Woelfle

Purpose of Agenda Item
The purpose of this agenda item is to consider the State Teacher Certification Board recommendation for the accreditation of the University of Chicago and approval of the institution’s programs.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
The State Teacher Certification Board voted to recommend that unit accreditation and approval of the institution’s programs to the University of Chicago is in accordance with the State Board’s administrative rules, Section 25.125 (j) (3) (B). The State Board’s unit accreditation decision will authorize the institution to conduct its programs and recommend candidates for certification by entitlement.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
The approval of the professional preparation institution has a direct linkage to Goal 2, Improving Educator Quality for All Children. Accreditation of Illinois teacher preparation institutions is based on recognized and established standards, policies, and procedures. These criteria ensure that the institution prepares teachers with expertise in the discipline-specific content areas and that these teachers will demonstrate best practices and help all students learn.

Background Information
The University of Chicago is an established Illinois teacher preparation institution that offers graduate programs in elementary education and school social worker certification.

On June 17, 2003, after reviewing the recommendation of the State Teacher Certification Board, the objections to the recommendation presented by the University, and the supporting documentation provided by each entity, the State Board of Education assigned “accreditation with probation” to the University of Chicago’s educational unit and teacher education preparation programs. This decision required that the educational unit at the University of Chicago be subject to “a full on-site visit within two years of the accreditation decision” [Section 25.125 (j) (3)].

An on-site visit to the University of Chicago was conducted by an Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) review team on April 22-26, 2006, and the team submitted its report to the State Board.
As defined by Section 25.125 (j) (3) (A) of the State Board's administrative rules, an ISBE review team reviewed the institution’s report (self-study) of how the University of Chicago addressed the cited areas for improvement that were based on the NCATE Unit Standards Edition 2002. As part of the on-site review, the team also reviewed extensive exhibits related to the citations and interviewed administrators, faculty, support personnel, graduate program candidates, and members of the P-12 community who participate in the preparation of candidates and decision-making processes of the educational unit. The team forwarded to the State Teacher Certification Board a report indicating that the conditions cited on June 17, 2003, have been satisfied Section 25.125 (j) (3) and all standards met.

As defined by Section 25.125 (j) (3) (B) of the State Board’s administrative rules, the State Teacher Certification Board conducted its review of the team’s report and institution’s supporting documentation on Thursday and Friday, November 30 and December 1, 2006. The Certification Board determined that the University of Chicago met the six NCATE Unit Standards Edition 2002 with no areas for improvement. The State Teacher Certification Board is recommending “continuing accreditation” to the State Board of Education.

Standard One: Met

Standard Two: Met

Standard Three: Met

Standard Four: Met

Standard Five: Met

Standard Six: Met

As defined in Section 25.125 (j) (3) (B) of the Illinois administrative rules, the State Teacher Certification Board recommends that the State Board of Education continue the accreditation of The University of Chicago because the educational unit met all of the applicable standards, thereby authorizing the institution to conduct its approved programs and recommend candidates for certification by entitlement.

Program panel reviews were not conducted because the University of Chicago's elementary program was in the initial stages of implementation and, at the time of the on-site review, the University of Chicago elementary education program had just graduated its first nine candidates. The team reviewed the data that were collected, analyzed, and used for program improvement and reported the findings in the team report [Section 25.127 (c)]. The school social worker program is nationally accredited by the Council on Social Worker Education and meets the program approval requirements as defined by Section 25.127 (b). Therefore, the Certification Board recommends continuing approval of the following programs at the University of Chicago [Section 25.127 (j) (1) (A)]:

- Elementary Education
- School Social Worker

The State Board of Education will take final action on the accreditation status and approval of the programs of the University of Chicago.
Policy Implications: None
Budget Implications: None
Legislative Action: None
Communication: This will occur following the State Board of Education decisions.

Pros and Cons of Various Actions
Accreditation of the University of Chicago will allow the University to entitle program completers for certification through its approved programs.

State Teacher Certification Board Recommendation
The State Teacher Certification Board recommends that the University of Chicago be assigned “continuing accreditation” status. This action is in accordance with Section 25.125 (j) (3) (B) and (C) of the State Board’s administrative rules and authorizes the institution to conduct its programs and recommend candidates for certification by entitlement until the time of the institution’s next scheduled review. This review will occur in 2013.

Superintendent’s Recommendation
The Superintendent recommends that the following motion be adopted.

The State Board of Education hereby assigns the status of “continuing accreditation” to the University of Chicago. This action is in accordance with Section 25.125 (j) (3) (B) and (C) of the State Board’s administrative rules and authorizes the institution to conduct its programs and recommend candidates for certification by entitlement until the time of the institution’s next scheduled review. This review will occur in 2013.

Next Steps
The University of Chicago will be notified regarding the State Board’s decision. The State Teacher Certification Board will also be notified, and the State Board’s Directory of Approved Institutions and Programs will be updated to reflect the approval status.
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education (Interim)
       Ginger Reynolds, Assistant Superintendent

Agenda Topic: Approval of New Teacher Preparation Programs

Materials: None

Staff Contact(s): Linda Jamali
                Phyliss Jones
                Marti Woelfle

Purpose of Agenda Item
The purpose of this agenda item is to consider the State Teacher Certification Board recommendations for approval of six professional preparation programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Staff Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dominican University</td>
<td>School Social Worker</td>
<td>Marti Woelfle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Illinois University</td>
<td>Director of Special Education</td>
<td>Marti Woelfle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois at Chicago</td>
<td>Early Childhood Education Alternative Certification</td>
<td>Marti Woelfle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois at Chicago</td>
<td>Learning Behavior Specialist II:</td>
<td>Phyliss Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bilingual Special Education Specialist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Technology Specialist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois at Springfield</td>
<td>Chief School Business Official</td>
<td>Phyliss Jones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
The approval of the professional preparation programs has linkage to Goal 2: Improving Educator Quality for All Children. These standards-based programs will prepared educators with expertise in the discipline-specific content areas and ensure these teachers, school social workers, and administrators demonstrate best practices and help all students learn.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
The State Teacher Certification Board reviewed the six proposals and voted to recommend that Dominican University’s School Social Worker program, Northern Illinois University’s Director of Special Education program, the University of Illinois at Chicago’s Early Childhood Education Alternative Certification, Learning Behavior Specialist II: Bilingual Special Education Specialist, and Learning Behavior Specialist II: Technology Specialist programs, and the University of Illinois at Springfield’s Chief School Business Official program be granted provisional approval in accordance with Section 25.145 (d) of the State Board’s Administrative Rules, and the State Board authorize the institutions to conduct the programs and recommend candidates for certification by entitlement.
Background Information

Dominican University
Dominican University is an established Illinois-approved teacher preparation institution that offers undergraduate programs in early childhood education, elementary education, ten secondary education areas, and four K-12 special certification areas. These same programs are offered at the graduate level, as well as learning behavior specialist I (LBS I), library information specialist, reading specialist, and general administrative-principal programs. The elementary and secondary education programs are also offered as alternative certification programs.

Northern Illinois University
Northern Illinois University is an established Illinois-approved teacher preparation institution that offers undergraduate and graduate level programs in early childhood education; elementary education; sixteen secondary education areas; six K-12 special certification areas; and three areas of special education (ages 3-21), including learning behavior specialist (LBS) I, blind or visually impaired, and deaf or hard of hearing. Graduate level programs are offered for reading specialist, library information specialist, technology specialist, four LBS II specialized special education areas, three school service personnel certification areas, and three administrative areas.

University of Illinois at Chicago
The University of Illinois at Chicago is an established Illinois-approved teacher preparation institution that offers undergraduate programs in elementary education, five secondary education areas, and three special certification areas. These same programs are offered at the graduate level, as well as early childhood education, early childhood special education, learning behavior specialist I (LBS I), reading specialist, school nurse, school social worker, and general administrative-principal programs. The elementary program is also offered as an alternative route to a teacher certification program.

University of Illinois at Springfield
The University of Illinois at Springfield is an established Illinois-approved teacher preparation institution that offers undergraduate programs in elementary education and seven secondary education areas. Graduate programs are offered for school counselor and two administrative (principal and superintendent) certification areas.

Analysis and Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action and Communications

School Social Worker
Dominican University’s School Social Worker program will lead to a Type 73 school service personnel certificate and a Master in Social Work with a Specialization in School Social Work degree.

The proposal is presented in the format requested by the board and provides an overview of the knowledge base and how the outcomes relate to the conceptual framework; a description of the course of study, including the field experiences and clinical practice components; assurances that the applicable Illinois standards will be met; a description of the program assessment system; the program faculty and their expertise in this field; and the resources that will be available for program candidates.
The State Teacher Certification Board (STCB) determined that the program proposal provides evidence that the Standards for the School Social Worker (Section 23.140) will be met; and the proposal addresses the approval of new program requirements as defined in the Illinois Administrative Rules Section 25.127 (b) (1-5).

**Director of Special Education**
Northern Illinois University’s Director of Special Education program is an advanced-level administrative program that will lead to the endorsement on a Type 75 general administrative certificate and an optional Master’s degree.

The proposal is presented in the format requested by the board and provides an overview of the knowledge base and how the outcomes relate to the conceptual framework; a description of the course of study, including the field experiences and clinical practice components; assurances that the applicable Illinois standards will be met; a description of the program assessment system; the program faculty and their expertise in this field; and the resources that will be available for program candidates.

The State Teacher Certification Board (STCB) determined that the program proposal provides evidence that the Director of Special Education Standards (Section 29.140) and the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) Special Education Administrator standards will be met; and the proposal addresses the approval of new program requirements as defined in the Illinois Administrative Rules Section 25.127 (b) (1-5).

**Early Childhood Education Alternative Certification**
The University of Illinois at Chicago’s Early Childhood Education Alternative Certification program has been developed in partnership with the Chicago Public School Community Partnership Program and with support from the Ounce of Prevention Early Learning Project. The program will be offered at the graduate level and lead to a Type 04 early childhood education certificate.

The program is designed to facilitate the certification of practicing early childhood educators who hold a baccalaureate degree and are currently serving young children in community-based preschool settings. It has been specifically designed to address the severe shortage of state-certified (Type 04) bilingual and minority educators who reflect the diverse culture and languages of children and families living in the Chicago-Metro community.

The Early Childhood Education program proposal addresses Section 21-5b of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/21-5b] and Section 25.65 of the Illinois Administrative Rules. It has been presented in the format requested by the board.

The proposal provides an overview of the knowledge base and how the outcomes relate to the conceptual framework; a description of the course of study in Phase I and Phase II, including practice teaching and full-year, full-time teaching internship components that encompass the range of the certificate (birth through grade three); assurances that the applicable Illinois standards will be met; a description of the program assessment system, including Phase III; the program faculty; and the resources that will be available for program candidates.

The State Teacher Certification Board (STCB) determined that the program proposal provides evidence that the Standards for Certification in Early Childhood Education (Section 26.110-26.270) and the Standards for All Illinois Teachers (IAC Part 24) will be met.
The recommendation action with respect to the proposed program is also defined by Section 21-5b of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/21-5b]. The statute states: The State Board of Education, in cooperation with a partnership formed with a university that offers 4-year baccalaureate and masters degree programs and that is a recognized institution as defined in Section 21-21 and one or more not-for-profit organizations in the State which support excellence in teaching, shall within 30 days after submission by the partnership approve a course of study developed by the partnership that persons in the program must successfully complete in order to satisfy one criterion for issuance of an alternative certificate under this Section.

**Learning Behavior Specialist II:**

- **Bilingual Special Education Specialist**
- **Technology Specialist**

The University of Illinois at Chicago's Learning Behavior Specialist II: Bilingual Special Education Specialist program and Learning Behavior Specialist II: Technology Specialist programs are advanced-level graduate programs that will lead to a Type 10 (ages 3-21) special education certificate with the endorsement in the specified LBS II area of concentration and a Master's degree.

The proposal is presented in the format requested by the board and provides an overview of the knowledge base and how the outcomes relate to the conceptual framework; a description of the course of study, including the field experiences and clinical practice components; assurances that the applicable Illinois standards will be met; a description of the program assessment system; the program faculty and their expertise in this field; and the resources that will be available for program candidates.

The State Teacher Certification Board (STCB) determined that the program proposal provides evidence that the Standards for the LBS II: Bilingual Special Education Specialist (Section 28.330) and the Standards for the LBS II: Technology Specialist (Standards 28.320) will be met by the candidates in the area of concentration; and the proposal addresses the approval of new program requirements as defined in the Illinois Administrative Rules Section 25.127 (b) (1-5).

**Chief School Business Official:**

The University of Illinois at Springfield's program is a post-master's, advanced-level program that will lead to the addition of a Chief School Business Official endorsement on a Type 75 general administrative certificate held by a practicing school administrator.

The proposal is presented in the format requested by the board and provides an overview of the knowledge base and how the outcomes relate to the conceptual framework; a description of the course of study, including the field experiences and clinical practice components; assurances that the applicable Illinois standards will be met; a description of the program assessment system; the program faculty and their expertise in this field; and the resources that will be available for program candidates.

The State Teacher Certification Board (STCB) determined that the program proposal provides evidence that the Illinois Professional School Leader Standards (Section 29.100) and the Chief School Business Official Standards (Section 29.110) will be met; and the proposal address the approval of new program requirements as defined in the Illinois Administrative Rules Section 25.127 (b) (1-5).
Policy Implications: None
Budget Implications: None
Legislative Action: None
Communication: This will occur following the State Board of Education decisions.

Pro and Cons of Various Actions
Approval of the programs will authorize Dominican University to entitle graduates for a Type 73 school service personnel certificate with a School Social Worker endorsement; authorize Northern Illinois University to entitle graduates for a Type 75 general administrative certificate with a Director of Special Education endorsement, authorize the University of Illinois at Chicago to entitle graduates of the Early Childhood Education program for a Type 04 certificate, a Learning Behavior Specialist II: Bilingual Special Education Specialist endorsement on a Type 10 special education certificate, and a Learning Behavior Specialist II: Technology Specialist endorsement on a Type 10 special education certificate, and authorize the University of Illinois at Springfield to entitle graduates for the Chief School Business Office endorsement on a Type 75 general administrative certificate.

Superintendent’s Recommendation
I recommend that the following motions be adopted:

The State Board of Education provisionally approves the School Social Worker program for Dominican University, thereby authorizing the university to conduct the program and to recommend candidates for certification by entitlement until the time of the institution’s next accreditation review.

The State Board of Education provisionally approves the Director of Special Education program for Northern Illinois University, thereby authorizing the university to conduct the program and to recommend candidates for certification by entitlement until the time of the institution’s next accreditation review.

The State Board of Education provisionally approves the Early Childhood Education Alternative Certification program for the University of Illinois at Chicago, thereby authorizing the university to conduct the program and to recommend candidates for certification by entitlement until the time of the institution’s next accreditation review.

The State Board of Education provisionally approves the Learning Behavior Specialist II: Bilingual Special Education Specialist program for the University of Illinois at Chicago, thereby authorizing the university to conduct the program and to recommend candidates for certification by entitlement until the time of the institution’s next accreditation review.

The State Board of Education provisionally approves the Learning Behavior Specialist II: Technology Specialist program for the University of Illinois at Chicago, thereby authorizing the university to conduct the program and to recommend candidates for certification by entitlement until the time of the institution’s next accreditation review.

Further, the State Board of Education provisionally approves the Chief School Business Official program for the University of Illinois at Springfield, thereby authorizing the university to conduct the program and to recommend candidates for certification by entitlement until the time of institution’s next accreditation review.
Next Steps
Dominican University, Northern Illinois University, the University of Illinois at Chicago, and the University of Illinois at Springfield will be notified regarding the State Board’s decision. The State Teacher Certification Board will also be notified and the State Board’s Directory of Approved Institutions and Programs will be updated to identify the new programs.
TO: Illinois State Board of Education  
FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education (Interim)  
       Becky Watts, Chief of Staff  

Materials: Draft 2006 State Board of Education Annual Report  
Staff Contact(s): Becky Watts, Chief of Staff  

Purpose of Agenda Item  
The Board will review and approve the Draft 2006 State Board of Education Annual Report.  

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan  
The data included in the Draft 2006 Annual Report support Goal 3 of the Strategic Plan,  
Expanding Data-Informed School Management and Support Practices.”  

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item  

Background Information  
The Draft 2006 Annual Report includes reports on the following topics: Demographic, Financial  
and Statistical Data; State, Federal and Local Resources; Schools and Districts; Students;  
Student Performance; Educators; Special Education and Categorical Grants.  

Analysis and Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action and Communications  
Policy Implications: None  
Budget Implications: None  
Legislative Action: None  
Communication: Report to be filed with Governor Blagojevich and Illinois General Assembly on  
or before January 14, 2007.  

Superintendent’s Recommendation  
I recommend that the following motion be adopted:  

The Illinois State Board of Education hereby approves the Draft 2006 Annual Report  
pending the inclusion of the Condition of Education narrative based on 2006 assessment  
results; and Local Resources for 2005-2006.  

Next Steps  
Once the final information is included the approved 2006 Annual Report will be submitted to the  
Governor and the General Assembly on or before January 14, 2007.
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Dr. Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education (Interim)
Darren Reisberg, General Counsel

Agenda Topic: Rules for Adoption - Part 226 (Special Education)

Materials: Materials will be forthcoming

Staff Contact(s): Elizabeth Hanselman, Division Administrator for Special Education Services
Dr. John Herner, Interim Assistant Superintendent for Special Education Services

Materials are not finalized at time of print.
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education (Interim)
Nicole Wills, Governmental Relations Staff
Josh Jacobs, Governmental Relations Staff

Agenda Topic: Proposed Spring 2007 Legislation

Materials: Summary of Proposed 2007 ISBE Legislative Proposals
(Full text of proposed changes appears in the Governmental Relations packet)

Staff Contacts: Nicole Wills, Liaison, Governmental Relations Division
Josh Jacobs, Liaison, Governmental Relations Division

Purpose (s) of Agenda Item
Following discussion in the Governmental Relations Committee meeting, the committee will recommend that the Board direct staff to move forward on specific legislative proposals.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
The goal for the December meeting is to get further feedback from Board members before we prepare official legislation for the spring session.

Background Information
Over the last three months, division staff have prepared potential legislative proposals for the Spring 2007 legislation session. Staff have submitted a number of proposals that are being reviewed by the Governmental Relations staff, Executive Staff and by the Board.

Additional Note
There are no materials provided for proposal numbers 14 (Obsolete & Duplicative Round 2) and 24 (Textbook Publication Technology). Potential statutory repeals for proposal 14 are still being pulled together by Governmental Relations, Legal and audit staff. Proposal 24 has come about very late in the process because of communication from the U.S. Department of Education, so the actual written proposal will be forthcoming.

Superintendent's Recommendation
The following motion will be amended following discussion during the Governmental Relations Committee meeting:

I move that the Governmental Relations Committee recommend the following legislative proposals for endorsement by the State Board of Education.

• (as determined by committee)

Further, the committee recommends that staff pursue other legislative proposals if vehicles become available for the following issues:

• (as determined by committee)

Next Steps
Any proposals approved by the Board will be drafted for introduction during the spring session.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal #</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>SBE Federal Indirect Cost Recovery Fund</td>
<td>This proposal would create the SBE Federal Indirect Cost Recovery Fund. Currently, SBE has three Federal Funds where all federal dollars are placed upon receipt. The creation of the new fund would allow the agency to more clearly monitor federal indirect costs because it will allow for the separation of federal grant dollars and federal administrative funds. Not only will monitoring be easier, the creation of this fund will also alleviate concerns about having cash on hand for current federal funds. Federal rules do not allow states to maintain federal dollars on hand. If that happens, states are required to pay interest on such funds. Under the current scenario, the majority of indirect costs sit in the three federal funds. A separate fund would alleviate this issue because federal indirect costs are not considered &quot;federal&quot; dollars once they are drawn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>General State Aid/AllKids Calculations</td>
<td>This proposal is a technical change that changes references to Kid Care in Section 18.805 for Supplemental General State Aid Calculations regarding the poverty count, to references All Kids, which as now been changed. This is only a technical change - not a substantive one to the formula calculation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Technology Immersion Pilot Project sunset extension</td>
<td>Legislation establishing the Technology Immersion Pilot Project was passed during the 93rd General Assembly and signed into law August 10, 2004. The project was intended to be a 3-year pilot beginning in FY 04 and ending in FY 07. However, funding for the project was not received until FY 07. This proposal would change the repeal date of this project to August 31, 2009, thereby fulfilling the original intent of the legislation, which is to be a 3-year pilot project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>No Attendance Penalty - Interrupted Day</td>
<td>This proposal would allow school district to claim a full day of attendance in instances where the district must dismiss one or more school buildings due to a condition which is beyond its control. Section 18-12 provides that a school district is not penalized for interrupted school days for circumstances such as unforeseen weather conditions or a hazardous threat to students as long as one hour of attendance is provided. However, this provision states that the entire district must be dismissed. There are instances, however, when a boiler might break at one school in the district. There is no need for the entire school district to be released, however. This change would allow the one school to release its students without being assessed an attendance penalty as long as one hour of instruction has been provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Parent Teacher Conferences</td>
<td>This proposal will allow parent/teacher conference formats to happen by a local board of education decision provided the normal school day length is adhered, so that ultimately the necessity of school waivers would be unnecessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Special Education Personnel - 180 Day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This change will alter the Special Education Personnel Reimbursement calculation for a full school year to 180 days instead of the current 185 days. Districts are required to set a school calendar at 185 (which allows for 5 emergency days), but the minimum school term is 180 days. Currently, districts are being penalized reimbursement because the formula is based on the 185 days.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>General State Aid - 22 Payments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This proposal would change the General State Aid Payment schedule from 24 payments (received from August to July) to 22 payments (August to June). This only changes the payment schedule to ensure all funds are received in the same fiscal year - school districts are not &quot;losing&quot; any payments. A majority of school districts are on a cash basis. As a result, they count on receiving an advance of their final two July GSA payments in June in order to close out their current fiscal year books (ending June 30th). Without the advance, school districts that are on a cash basis could find themselves in deficit spending for that fiscal year which may affect their financial rating. In the past, the Governor has issued a directive to the Comptroller and Treasurer to transfer GRF to the Common Schools Fund to accelerate the July payments into June. ISBE, legislators and the Governor's office receive a large volume of calls from school districts each year about anxiety over the possibility of not receiving all 24 payments before the end of the fiscal year and this would eliminate that concern.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>School Support</td>
<td>Financial Oversight Panels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Currently, the School Code has 3 different sections that govern school finance authorities and financial oversight panels. Each of the three different sections offers various assistance to the school district or a various amount of control to the FOP or SFA. This proposal would create a new FOP that all affected districts would fall under in the future. The new FOP would be a five member board and would have duties and powers like those that existed for previous provisions FOPs and SFAs. School districts under current FOPs and SFAs would continue to operate as they have been while in existence, but future any future FOPs would be under the new statute and old SFAs and FOPs would be repealed when there were no longer any under their existence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>School Support</td>
<td>H/L/S P-TELL Exemptions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This proposal would exempt violations of minimum health/life/safety standards from the Property Tax Extension Limitation Law (PTELL). Optional improvements would continue to be subject to PTELL limitations. If this proposal were to pass, districts would still have to have the safety violations approved by ISBE. In order to increase the accountability for these measures, districts would be required to do a Capital Development Plan and the Health/Life/Safety survey would be done on a five year cycle, not a ten year cycle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This legislative proposal cleans-up and makes some corrections to the newly created Article 11E, which has become the new Article and new options for school district reorganizations. Many of these changes correct items that may have inadvertently left out of SB 2795 last spring, or correct issues discovered by staff as guidance documentation has been prepared. These changes include:

* Clarifying that the voters of the new district requesting the issuance of bonds will be the only voters to vote on the bond issuance - not necessarily the original distinct.

* Clarifies that when publishing notices for hearings, the time and location must also be included, not just the date.

* Requires the newly formed districts to provide transportation if any portion of the district had transportation provided prior to the new reorganization.

* Changes the language so that the ROE is not responsible for presenting information on the reorganization proposal at the public hearing. This will be the responsibility of the Committee of Ten, since the ROE will be making a decision based on the merits of the proposal.

* Allows a High School-Unit Conversion to be eligible for the Deficit Fund Balance incentive. Original intent was to allow this and was inadvertently left out of the final legislation.

* Allows the Unit District Formation and High School-Unit Conversion to be eligible for the $4000 per Certified Staff incentive. This was also left out inadvertently.

* Changes the section detailing the computation of Available Local Resources within the General State Aid claim for new partial elementary unit districts. As written, the calculation for Available Local Resources would hurt these new hybrid districts. For the first four years, the incentives would cover the loss, but in the fourth year, these districts be hurt in the amount of General State Aid received and this was not the intent of the legislation.

* Specifically adds optional elementary unit districts and combined high school-unit districts to "unit" districts for calculation of Pupil Transportation Reimbursement and details that the high school EAV will be used in the calculation in these districts.
<p>| 11 | School Support | Article 11E re-org Incentives Fix | Currently, deactivations (K-8 or 9-12) are not legible for reorganization incentives. Under this proposal, they would be legible for the salary differential and the certified staff incentive. The salary difference would be based on the number of teachers being transferred from the deactivating district to the receiving district. Since deactivations are normally for 2 years and then renewed for either one or two years at a time, the language would allow the salary incentives will be paid for the lesser of four years or the deactivation time plus renewals. Districts will also be eligible to receive the $4000 per Certified Staff incentive based on the number of full-time, certified staff members transferred to the receiving district as a result of the deactivation. The new district will be eligible for this incentive for three years or the length of the deactivation agreement, including any renewals of the original deactivation, whichever is less. |
| 12 | Curriculum | Reading Improvement Block Grant | This proposal would make changes to the Reading Improvement Block Grant: * Eligible entities would receive one payment annually, instead of two. * The proposal would eliminate performance accountability specific to the grant, and will instead assist districts in reaching the NCLB goal of meeting AYP. * Currently districts are allowed to use up to 25% of the funds to provide classroom reading materials for students in grades K through 6. This proposal would also allow that 25% to also be used for assessment tools and professional development materials. * Currently ISBE can distribute no more than 2% of RIBG funds to provide teacher training and re-training in teaching reading. This change would also allow ISBE to provide additional funds to districts with a substantial enrollment of at-risk students. * The final change would require prior ISBE approval for the types of professional development initiatives to be funded through the grant in lieu of attempting to track the effects of specific teachers' professional development on their students learning. |
| 13 | Data Analysis | Educator Supply &amp; Demand Report Changes | Changes the deadline to submit Teacher Supply and Demand Report to February 1 instead of January 1. In addition, this change would have the report be submitted every two years instead of annually. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Legal/ Gov Relations</th>
<th>Obsolete &amp; Duplicative - Round 2</th>
<th>This proposal is a continuation of the attempt to eliminate obsolete and duplicative language from the School Code. Many of the proposed statutory repeals have been audit findings in the past.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Legal/ Gov Relations</td>
<td>School Holiday Waivers</td>
<td>This legislative change would allow decisions concerning school holidays to be made at the local level, and not require a waiver application to ISBE, which is merely a rubber stamp as long as all procedures leading up to the waiver were followed properly. This proposal would continue to require the district hold a hearing for this matter, but would allow the local school boards action to be the final decision after the hearing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Certification</td>
<td>NBPTS - required mentoring</td>
<td>Requires Master certificate holders to provide 60 hours of mentoring in an Academic Early Warning or Academic Early Watch school to receive the $3000 stipend; allows NBCTs to provide mentoring during the school day and strikes language referring to NBCTs providing professional development. Such professional development is already covered under the options available for certificate renewal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Certification</td>
<td>Eliminate CEU</td>
<td>This proposal would eliminate CEUs as a measurement for professional development. Currently, two different measurements exist in the School Code: Continuing Education Units and Continuing Professional Development Units (CPDUs). Initially CEUs and CPDUs were different measuring units, but now they are equivalent. Having two different names is confusing to both teachers and professional development providers. Additionally, confusion exists because the Department of Professional Regulations approves providers for other professionals employed in the education field, but not certified through ISBE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Certification</td>
<td>Fee increases for certificates/endorsement</td>
<td>This proposal would increase the fees for both certificate application or endorsement from $30.00 to $50.00. Individuals applying for a master’s certificate would be required to pay a $50.00 application fee. Statute currently states that there is not an application fee for a Master Certificate. Staff believes charging a fee for this certificate is appropriate since the state is subsidizing individuals for attaining the certificate and giving master certificate holders a minimum of $3000 a year in stipend. This legislation would also add a fee for approvals, such as paraprofessionals and Educational Interpreters. Currently there is no application fee, but this change would set the fee at $10.00-$20.00. Finally, these amendments would add language concerning returned checks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Certification</td>
<td>Eliminate out-of-state testing waivers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This proposal would eliminate the statute allowing for out-of-state testing waivers. Additionally, the proposal would make a corresponding change to allow provisional certificates to be valid for two years, including testing deficiencies. Currently, provisional certificates are valid for 9 months. The proposal would allow for two years, without the option for a waiver. It is difficult for ISBE staff to maintain accurate data regarding other states' specific testing requirements. Test waivers granted as a result of this misinformation compromises the State's ability to ensure these teachers are familiar with Illinois Learning Standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20</th>
<th>Certification</th>
<th>Eliminate the Alternative Math-Science Certificates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This proposal would eliminate the Section 21-5a, which establishes the Alternative Math-Science Certification. This certificate is proposed for repeal because ISBE has never approved any such programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21</th>
<th>Certification</th>
<th>Combine Resident Teacher Cert. and Illinois Teacher Corps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The content of 105 ILCS 5/21-11.4 is frequently missed because of its header: Illinois Teacher Corps. This labeling and some of the contents have caused considerable confusion for higher education institutions and school districts interested in developing &quot;resident teacher certification&quot; programs that meet the requirements defined in 105 ILCS 2/21-11.3. This change would eliminate the confusion of having two statues with two different headers and clearly define the expectations required of resident teacher certification preparation programs and the issuance of a resident teacher certificate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Certification</td>
<td>Combine and Revise Alternative Certification statutes&lt;br&gt;Both statutes describe the same program completion requirements; however, there are some differences in the statutes that can cause difficulties for program completers, confusion for program developers and applicants looking for a program. Additionally, some items are no longer relevant.&lt;br&gt;Individuals completing a program under 105 ILCS 5/21-5b are issued an “alternative teaching certificate” while individuals completing a program under 105 ILCS 5/21-5c are issued an “initial teaching certificate.”&lt;br&gt;Even though the alternative certification and alternative route to teacher certification program requirements are identical, many administrators view the holder of an “alternative teaching certificate” as not being as competent as one holding the “initial teaching certificate”, thereby limiting the employment opportunities for individuals completing a program under Section 5/21-5b. This difference has also caused confusion at the Regional Offices of Education and State Board of Education when a program completer of a “105 ILCS 5/21-5c Alternative Route to Teacher Certification” program checks the wrong box on the certification application.&lt;br&gt;The identified differences impact those who are preparing these programs for approval and the cooperating school districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>School Breakfast Program&lt;br&gt;This proposal makes further changes to the School Breakfast Incentives Program. Specifically it provides that if there are enough state funds to provide universal funding, no one district would receive more than 5% of the total appropriation. This is being done because if one large district applies for the universal program, it could wipe out all the funds available. This proposal also eliminates the requirement that first priority be given to schools in which 40% or more of student s are eligible for free and reduced lunch. Now that the program has existed for a few years, schools with this level of students receiving free and reduced price lunches are already participating, but the provision in statute requires ISBE to hold off awarding any more applications until November of every year (after the waiver submission deadline date). Finally, these changes consolidate the report that is submitted to the General Assembly and better outline more pertinent information that should be submitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Textbook publication technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Certification</td>
<td>Fee for Duplicate Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Certification</td>
<td>Retired HQ Teachers Returning to Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>School Support</td>
<td>General Obligation Debt Limitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>School Support</td>
<td>School Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This proposal amends the School Construction Law to allow entities greater flexibility to be eligible for school construction funds. These changes do not change the priority list or application cycle for applications ISBE has already received. This proposal has five main points:

1. It expands the definition of "aging school building" to include not just the chronological age, but also the functional age of the building or part of a building. This definition would be determined by multiplying the chronological age by the physical and operational condition.

2. Allows special education co-ops and vocational co-ops to be eligible for funds and provides a mechanism for obtaining a grant index for both, which would be 75% (the maximum the state would contribute).

3. Allows school districts with a poverty concentration of 90% or greater to have a grant index of .95 (meaning 95% of the cost would be covered by the state and the district would have to cover 5% of the cost).

4. Removes references to obsolete debt service grants.

5. Allows a committee of Ten to apply for construction funds on behalf of a proposed reorganized district.
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Christopher Ward, Chairman
       Board Operations Committee

Agenda Topic: Review and Approval of Draft Criteria for State Superintendent

Materials: Attached Draft Criteria

Purpose of Agenda Item
The Board will review the draft criteria that Hazard, Young, Attea and Associates presented to the State Board at the November Board meeting.
**Characteristics Desired* - State Superintendent of Education**

The Illinois State Board of Education seeks an experienced educational leader who has been a teacher and administrator at the elementary, secondary and/or college level(s). The sought after individual will place the interests of students as a priority at all times and have demonstrated the ability to:

- Address the educational and political responsibilities of the position, while placing the educational needs of students ahead of political expediency.
- Communicate effectively with all stakeholders, both internal and external to the Agency.
- Lead and manage a complex organization through a strong leadership team that builds capacity within the organization.
- Improve student performance through a comprehensive system of standards and assessment and the implementation of proven methods that address the achievement gap, and by encouraging local districts to access resources available at the local, regional, state and federal levels.
- Build consensus and rally support for sustainable change.
- Be responsive to the diverse needs of all students, local districts, Regional Offices of Education, and other constituents.
- Understand the requirements of federal and state laws and regulations, as well as their impact on student learning, and oppose laws and regulations that deter the ability to maximize student learning.
- Build positive relationships with constituents who are internal and external to the organization.
- Work successfully with the Governor, State Legislature, Congress and the U.S. Department of Education.
- Develop processes and procedures necessary to provide consistency in decision-making and to ensure effective and efficient operations.
- Facilitate the Governor and State Board in defining and articulating a vision for the State, and provide the leadership to implement the vision through effective short and long term strategic planning.

The State Board seeks an individual who has a commitment to equitable opportunities for all students, a thorough understanding of school finance and the resultant inequities of current funding mechanisms, and a commitment to take leadership in securing additional resources and the development of a new formula that will ensure that additional funding will contribute to greater equity across the state. The Board also seeks a leader who is collaborative yet decisive, who demonstrates integrity, objectivity, fairness and vision and who establishes high expectations for self and others.

An earned doctorate from an accredited institution is preferred.

*Draft: Subject to approval by Illinois State Board of Education
Hazard, Young, Attea & Associates, Ltd. 11/16/06
To apply, please go to: [www.hyasuperearches.com](http://www.hyasuperearches.com)
TO: State Board of Education

FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education (Interim) 
Linda Riley Mitchell, Chief Financial Officer

Agenda Topic: Presentation from Commission on Government Forecasting and Accountability

Materials: Economic and Revenue Update – FY2007

Staff Contact(s): Ronny Wickenhauser, Division Administrator, Budget and Financial Management

Purpose of Agenda Item
To provide a revenue outlook for the state.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
N/A

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
N/A

Background Information
The State Board of Education asks for and receives a revenue outlook to consider when drafting a budget request. The revenue outlook is prepared by the Commission on Government Forecasting and Accountability, a bipartisan joint legislative commission. The Commission provides the General Assembly with information relevant to the Illinois economy, and projects revenue from taxes and other sources. It prepares information on legislation which would appropriate bond funds or increase bond authorization as well as preparing a periodic assessment of capital facility plans. It assists in examining economic trends for long-range planning and budgeting. For the last several years, the Commission has made a presentation to the Illinois State Board of Education prior to the Board preparing its annual budget recommendation.

Analysis and Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action and Communications
N/A

Pros and Cons of Various Actions
N/A

Superintendent’s Recommendation
N/A

Next Steps
The Board will consider this revenue outlook when determining an FY08 budget request.
TO: Illinois State Board of Education
FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed. D, State Superintendent (Interim)

Agenda Topic: Information Item: SBE Fiscal & Administrative Monthly Reports

Materials: Appropriations and Spending by Program
Financial Status Report (contract & grant detail)
$1M Contracts
Monthly Headcount Graph, Staff Detail, Personnel Transactions

Staff Contact(s): Linda Mitchell and Don Evans

Purpose of Agenda Item
To provide the Board standard reports with key information on fiscal and administrative activities of the state Agency.

Background Information
In June 2002, the State Board adopted bylaws outlining a new committee structure under which fiscal, audit and operations issues will be handled by the Fiscal and Audit Committee. The Superintendent requested that the Agency organize and standardize the financial and headcount data provided to the Board for their future policy work and decision making.

Currently the following Reports are provided or are being developed.

1. Budget/Annual Report (annually in January)
2. Condition of Public Education (December)
3. Comptroller SEA Report (annually in February)
4. Appropriation and Expenditure (monthly)
5. Financial Status Report – Contract/Grant Detail (monthly)
6. Headcount Reports (monthly)
   Personnel Transactions, Staff Detail by Division, & Monthly Headcount Graph

Analysis and Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action and Communications
The Monthly or Quarterly Fiscal and Headcount Reports were first provided to the Board in August 2002. These provide information regarding staffing and funding as well as details of contracts over $50 thousand and grants the Agency is processing.

The Board specifically approves all proposed contracts over $1M prior to the issuance of an RFP. This month there are no such proposed contracts.

Superintendent's Recommendation
None needed.

Next Steps
Continue to provide these reports pursuant to the schedule above.
## Illinois State Board of Education
### FY 2007 Appropriation & Spending by Program 07/01/2006 thru 11/30/2007
(Dollars in Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Appropriation</th>
<th>YTD Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Grants</td>
<td>$5,775,514.6</td>
<td>$5,775,514.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General State Aid</td>
<td>$4,146,118.2</td>
<td>$4,146,118.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General State Aid/Hold Harmless</td>
<td>$20,211.5</td>
<td>$20,211.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Assistance</td>
<td>$11,800.0</td>
<td>$11,800.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Safety &amp; Education Block Grant (ADA)</td>
<td>$74,841.0</td>
<td>$74,841.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Charter Schools</td>
<td>$3,421.5</td>
<td>$3,421.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Consolidation Cost</td>
<td>$7,850.0</td>
<td>$7,850.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Breakfast Incentive Program</td>
<td>$723.5</td>
<td>$723.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook Loan Program</td>
<td>$29,126.5</td>
<td>$29,126.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandated Categoricals</td>
<td>$1,481,422.4</td>
<td>$1,481,422.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Free Lunch/Breakfast</td>
<td>$21,000.0</td>
<td>$21,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orphanage Tuition 18-3 (Reg Ed)</td>
<td>$13,130.0</td>
<td>$13,130.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp-Ed - Extraordinary Services</td>
<td>$268,892.6</td>
<td>$268,892.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp-Ed - Orphanage Tuition 14-7.03</td>
<td>$79,400.0</td>
<td>$79,400.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp-Ed - Personnel Reimbursement</td>
<td>$368,500.0</td>
<td>$368,500.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp-Ed - Private Tuition</td>
<td>$109,080.0</td>
<td>$109,080.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp-Ed - Summer School</td>
<td>$8,694.0</td>
<td>$8,694.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp-Ed - Transportation</td>
<td>$326,607.8</td>
<td>$326,607.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation - Regular/Vocational</td>
<td>$286,118.0</td>
<td>$286,118.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards - Assessment &amp; Accountability</td>
<td>$20,224.7</td>
<td>$3,042.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments</td>
<td>$12,382.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Assessments</td>
<td>$4,500.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System of Support</td>
<td>$3,342.7</td>
<td>$3,042.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring Quality Ed Personnel</td>
<td>$15,990.0</td>
<td>$15,005.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grow Your Own Teachers</td>
<td>$3,000.0</td>
<td>$3,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Mentoring Pilot Project</td>
<td>$800.0</td>
<td>$15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach for America</td>
<td>$450.0</td>
<td>$450.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher of the Year</td>
<td>$135.0</td>
<td>$135.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education &amp; National Board Cert.</td>
<td>$9,605.0</td>
<td>$9,605.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Mentoring Pilot Project</td>
<td>$2,000.0</td>
<td>$1,800.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiatives</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Appropriation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Improvement Block Grant</td>
<td>$76,139.8</td>
<td>$76,139.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>$318,254.5</td>
<td>$318,254.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Difficulty</td>
<td>$125,403.7</td>
<td>$125,403.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Learning/Regional Safe Schools</td>
<td>$18,535.5</td>
<td>$18,535.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>$66,552.0</td>
<td>$66,552.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge/Classroom/Extended Days Program</td>
<td>$22,238.1</td>
<td>$22,238.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truant Alternative Optional Education</td>
<td>$18,078.1</td>
<td>$18,078.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Technologies (Tech for Success)</td>
<td>$6,169.7</td>
<td>$6,169.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology for Success</td>
<td>$6,169.7</td>
<td>$6,169.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Infrastructure</td>
<td>$1,000.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Preparation</td>
<td>$45,573.2</td>
<td>$45,573.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Education</td>
<td>$2,881.2</td>
<td>$2,881.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career and Technical Education</td>
<td>$38,562.1</td>
<td>$38,562.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs for Illinois Graduates</td>
<td>$4,000.0</td>
<td>$4,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Governmental Internship Program</td>
<td>$129.9</td>
<td>$129.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Services</td>
<td>$15,420.0</td>
<td>$15,420.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISC - South Cook</td>
<td>$300.0</td>
<td>$300.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Superintendent Initiatives</td>
<td>$500.0</td>
<td>$500.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROE - Salaries</td>
<td>$8,150.0</td>
<td>$8,150.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROE - School Service</td>
<td>$6,470.0</td>
<td>$6,470.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan</td>
<td>$500.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Security and Bullying Prevention</td>
<td>$6,000.0</td>
<td>$6,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying Prevention</td>
<td>$1,000.0</td>
<td>$1,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security for Schools</td>
<td>$5,000.0</td>
<td>$5,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$22,774.6</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Initiatives</td>
<td>$73,816.9</td>
<td>$73,291.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Placement Classes</td>
<td>$1,500.0</td>
<td>$1,500.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace Education Initiative - Chicago</td>
<td>$920.0</td>
<td>$920.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiatives</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After School Matters Mentoring/Support</td>
<td>$24,128.4</td>
<td>$24,128.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Foreign Language</td>
<td>$4,000.0</td>
<td>$4,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism Project</td>
<td>$100.0</td>
<td>$100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind &amp; Dyslexic</td>
<td>$518.8</td>
<td>$518.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building with Books</td>
<td>$500.0</td>
<td>$500.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Mental Health Partnership</td>
<td>$3,000.0</td>
<td>$3,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Size Reduction Pilot Project</td>
<td>$10,000.0</td>
<td>$10,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Organization Programs</td>
<td>$3,260.0</td>
<td>$3,260.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Residential Services Authority</td>
<td>$525.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Kids/Healthy Minds/Expanded Vision</td>
<td>$3,000.0</td>
<td>$3,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Economic Education</td>
<td>$250.0</td>
<td>$250.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Center for the Visually Impaired</td>
<td>$2,121.0</td>
<td>$2,121.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro East Consortium for Child Advocacy</td>
<td>$217.1</td>
<td>$217.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Transition Program</td>
<td>$578.8</td>
<td>$578.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Participation Pilot Project</td>
<td>$100.0</td>
<td>$100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip J. Rock Center &amp; School</td>
<td>$3,220.5</td>
<td>$3,220.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Transportation</td>
<td>$1,200.0</td>
<td>$1,200.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Equivalent Grants</td>
<td>$222.6</td>
<td>$222.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Reimbursement to Parents</td>
<td>$14,454.7</td>
<td>$14,454.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook Loan Reappropriation</td>
<td>$28,215.6</td>
<td>$28,033.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL GENERAL FUNDS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,530,997.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,487,848.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NON STATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Grants</th>
<th>Admin</th>
<th>YTD Expenditures</th>
<th>Admin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Infrastructure Fund</td>
<td>$5,105.0</td>
<td>$5,000.0</td>
<td>$105.0</td>
<td>$43.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Infrastructure (Debt Admin)</td>
<td>$105.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$105.0</td>
<td>$43.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Technology Revolving Loan</td>
<td>$5,000.0</td>
<td>$5,000.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Education</td>
<td>$18,000.0</td>
<td>$17,929.6</td>
<td>$70.4</td>
<td>$4,534.4</td>
<td>$28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Funds</td>
<td>$21,411.8</td>
<td>$17,471.8</td>
<td>$3,940.1</td>
<td>$2,066.1</td>
<td>$959.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter Schools Revolving Loan Fund</td>
<td>$20.0</td>
<td>$20.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Financial Assistance Fund</td>
<td>$1,000.0</td>
<td>$1,000.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISBE Special Purpose Trust Fund</td>
<td>$10,500.0</td>
<td>$10,500.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$148.3</td>
<td>$148.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISBE Spec. Purpose/Technology Immersion</td>
<td>$5,000.0</td>
<td>$4,050.3</td>
<td>$949.8</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISBE Teacher Certificate Institute Fund</td>
<td>$1,008.9</td>
<td>$500.0</td>
<td>$508.9</td>
<td>$97.8</td>
<td>$97.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Certification Fee Revolving Fund</td>
<td>$2,482.9</td>
<td>$1.5</td>
<td>$2,481.4</td>
<td>$862.3</td>
<td>$861.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiatives</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>YTD Expenditures</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temporary Relocation Revolving Fund</strong></td>
<td>$1,400.0</td>
<td>$1,400.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$957.8</td>
<td>$957.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDERAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Funds</strong></td>
<td>$2,173,537.2</td>
<td>$2,108,810.0</td>
<td>$64,727.2</td>
<td>$445,912.0</td>
<td>$430,625.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Placement Fee Payment</td>
<td>$2,611.2</td>
<td>$2,000.0</td>
<td>$611.2</td>
<td>$196.7</td>
<td>$101.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career &amp; Technical Education</td>
<td>$51,206.5</td>
<td>$50,000.0</td>
<td>$1,206.5</td>
<td>$17,632.7</td>
<td>$17,187.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career &amp; Technical Education - Technical Prep</td>
<td>$5,192.9</td>
<td>$5,000.0</td>
<td>$192.9</td>
<td>$1,209.4</td>
<td>$1,153.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter Schools</td>
<td>$2,518.5</td>
<td>$2,500.0</td>
<td>$18.5</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Nutrition</td>
<td>$481,835.8</td>
<td>$475,000.0</td>
<td>$6,835.8</td>
<td>$109,333.8</td>
<td>$106,763.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Purchase Care Review Board</td>
<td>$244.4</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$244.4</td>
<td>$70.0</td>
<td>$70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals with Disabilities Educ. Act, Pt. B</td>
<td>$562,147.6</td>
<td>$550,000.0</td>
<td>$12,147.6</td>
<td>$167,005.5</td>
<td>$162,999.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA - Deaf Blind, Part C</td>
<td>$380.0</td>
<td>$380.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$100.9</td>
<td>$100.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA - Improvement Plan</td>
<td>$2,778.6</td>
<td>$2,500.0</td>
<td>$278.6</td>
<td>$607.4</td>
<td>$586.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA - Model Outreach</td>
<td>$400.0</td>
<td>$400.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$39.0</td>
<td>$39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA - Pre-School</td>
<td>$26,010.4</td>
<td>$25,000.0</td>
<td>$1,010.4</td>
<td>$6,890.1</td>
<td>$6,615.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn and Serve America</td>
<td>$2,563.6</td>
<td>$2,500.0</td>
<td>$63.6</td>
<td>$6.6</td>
<td>$5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math &amp; Science Partnerships</td>
<td>$9,257.0</td>
<td>$9,000.0</td>
<td>$257.0</td>
<td>$372.4</td>
<td>$255.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Center for Education Statistics</td>
<td>$173.1</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$173.1</td>
<td>$58.2</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee</td>
<td>$2,115.5</td>
<td>$2,000.0</td>
<td>$115.5</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Health Programs</td>
<td>$301.7</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$301.7</td>
<td>$47.9</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I - Basic Programs</td>
<td>$587,741.8</td>
<td>$583,500.0</td>
<td>$4,241.8</td>
<td>$70,468.7</td>
<td>$69,162.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I - Comprehensive School Reform</td>
<td>$10,320.7</td>
<td>$10,000.0</td>
<td>$320.7</td>
<td>$693.3</td>
<td>$611.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I - Education of Migratory Children</td>
<td>$4,656.2</td>
<td>$4,600.0</td>
<td>$56.2</td>
<td>$365.3</td>
<td>$350.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I - Even Start Family Literacy Programs</td>
<td>$10,329.1</td>
<td>$10,000.0</td>
<td>$329.1</td>
<td>$1,065.3</td>
<td>$964.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I - Neglected and Delinquent</td>
<td>$3,027.5</td>
<td>$3,000.0</td>
<td>$27.5</td>
<td>$294.5</td>
<td>$284.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I - Reading First</td>
<td>$52,504.0</td>
<td>$50,000.0</td>
<td>$2,504.0</td>
<td>$9,142.9</td>
<td>$8,711.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I - School Improvement</td>
<td>$31,646.5</td>
<td>$30,900.0</td>
<td>$746.5</td>
<td>$5,530.8</td>
<td>$5,326.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title II - Enhance Ed through Technology</td>
<td>$31,251.7</td>
<td>$30,000.0</td>
<td>$1,251.7</td>
<td>$3,960.2</td>
<td>$3,783.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title II - Quality Teachers</td>
<td>$136,843.0</td>
<td>$134,830.0</td>
<td>$2,013.0</td>
<td>$18,974.1</td>
<td>$18,641.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title III - English Language Acquisition</td>
<td>$41,397.2</td>
<td>$40,000.0</td>
<td>$1,397.2</td>
<td>$5,784.1</td>
<td>$5,617.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title IV - 21st Century Schools</td>
<td>$45,754.0</td>
<td>$45,000.0</td>
<td>$754.0</td>
<td>$14,904.1</td>
<td>$14,656.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title IV - Safe &amp; Drug Free Schools</td>
<td>$20,412.4</td>
<td>$20,000.0</td>
<td>$412.4</td>
<td>$2,188.0</td>
<td>$2,077.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title V - Innovative Programs</td>
<td>$10,556.0</td>
<td>$10,000.0</td>
<td>$556.0</td>
<td>$1,543.5</td>
<td>$1,464.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title VI - Rural &amp; Low Income Programs</td>
<td>$1,558.7</td>
<td>$1,500.0</td>
<td>$58.7</td>
<td>$18.3</td>
<td>$18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title VI - State Assessment</td>
<td>$19,297.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$19,297.0</td>
<td>$2,557.6</td>
<td>$2,557.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title X - McKinney Homeless Assistance</td>
<td>$3,396.5</td>
<td>$3,250.0</td>
<td>$146.5</td>
<td>$993.4</td>
<td>$990.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition to Teaching</td>
<td>$1,212.7</td>
<td>$1,000.0</td>
<td>$212.7</td>
<td>$20.2</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiatives</td>
<td>Appropriation</td>
<td></td>
<td>YTD Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troops to Teachers</td>
<td>$9.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$9.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Congressional Initiatives</td>
<td>$5,000.0</td>
<td>$4,950.0</td>
<td>$50.0</td>
<td>$2,157.4</td>
<td>$2,157.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Indirect Appropriation</td>
<td>$6,886.4</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$6,886.4</td>
<td>$1,679.4</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL - ALL FUNDS:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,749,051.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,637,060.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>$111,991.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,780,798.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,754,386.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
## FINANCIAL STATUS REPORT - 07/01/06 THROUGH 11/30/06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Approp Amount</th>
<th>Expended Year to Date</th>
<th>% Spent Year to Date</th>
<th>November Expenditures</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Services and Related</strong></td>
<td>41,747.4</td>
<td>16,064.0</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>3,201.8</td>
<td>Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contractual Services</strong></td>
<td>64,532.9</td>
<td>8,527.2</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>2,342.7</td>
<td>Agency Contracts (see below); Non-Employee Travel; Conferences; Registration Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel</strong></td>
<td>2,064.0</td>
<td>476.8</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>117.8</td>
<td>Staff Travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commodities</strong></td>
<td>450.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>Supplies; Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Printing</strong></td>
<td>503.4</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Agency Printing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment</strong></td>
<td>546.1</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Computers; Printers; Furniture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telecommunications</strong></td>
<td>945.4</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>Telecommunications Expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auto Operations</strong></td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>Operation of Agency Autos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prompt Payment Act</strong></td>
<td>181.8</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Prompt Payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refunds</strong></td>
<td>148.3</td>
<td>148.3</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Refunds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temp. Relocation Revolving Fund</strong></td>
<td>1,000.0</td>
<td>1,000.0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Interfund Cash Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grants</strong></td>
<td>8,636,912.0</td>
<td>2,714,072.7</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>719,761.4</td>
<td>See Detail Below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Agency Contracts Breakdown:

### State Superintendent

**Gail Lieberman**

- **Federal**
  - Amount: 54.0
  - Expended Year to Date: 4.5
  - % Spent Year to Date: 8.3%
  - November Expenditures: 0.0
  - Description: Coordinate NCLB and other initiatives

**John Perkins**

- **GRF**
  - Amount: 53.0
  - Expended Year to Date: 21.6
  - % Spent Year to Date: 40.8%
  - November Expenditures: 5.6
  - Description: School District Liaison

### Board Services

**Hazard, Young, Attea & Assoc. Inc.**

- **GRF**
  - Amount: 44.0
  - Expended Year to Date: 14.7
  - % Spent Year to Date: 33.4%
  - November Expenditures: 0.0
  - Description: Superintendent Search

### Administrative Services

**Xerox Corp**

- **GRF**
  - Amount: 90.1
  - Expended Year to Date: 18.6
  - % Spent Year to Date: 20.6%
  - November Expenditures: 7.1
  - Description: Copier Maintenance Repairs

- **Federal**
  - Amount: 92.5
  - Expended Year to Date: 37.8
  - % Spent Year to Date: 40.9%
  - November Expenditures: 0.0

**Alzina**

- **GRF**
  - Amount: 1,527.8
  - Expended Year to Date: 480.5
  - % Spent Year to Date: 31.5%
  - November Expenditures: 480.5
  - Description: Building lease in Springfield

- **Other State**
  - Amount: 70.0
  - Expended Year to Date: 0.0
  - % Spent Year to Date: 0.0%
  - November Expenditures: 0.0

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Funded Amount</th>
<th>Expended Date</th>
<th>% Spent Date</th>
<th>November Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>886.1</td>
<td>761.5</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
<td>761.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Counsel/Legal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Impartial Hearing Officers</td>
<td>176.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franczek, Sullivan PC</td>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland &amp; Knight LLC</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General's Office appointed Res Vazquez to continue as Legal Counsel for the ongoing implementation and monitoring of the Corey H. consent decree Negotiation settlement with Harcourt Assessment, Inc. and oversight of operations at Calumet School District.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Systems</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRF</td>
<td>1,065.0</td>
<td>329.0</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>1,429.5</td>
<td>877.0</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>239.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilistar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashbaugh &amp; Associates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other State</td>
<td>138.9</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>268.7</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTW Solutions LLC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRF</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Analysis &amp; Progress Reporting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Illinois University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRF</td>
<td>151.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>400.0</td>
<td>110.9</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum &amp; Instruction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL Caucus for Adolescent Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Illinois University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>269.7</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRF</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless Generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>232.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Oyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Society for Tech Ed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>350.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Rakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT of America, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>344.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Language Learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Migrant Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support and technical assistance to the Migrant Education Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Funded Amount</th>
<th>Expended Year to Date</th>
<th>% Spent Year to Date</th>
<th>November Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>531.9</td>
<td>181.0</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>125.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Special Education Compliance**

- **19 Hearing Officers**
  - Federal: 513.0, 132.6, 25.8%, 30.7
  - Description: Impartial Hearing Officers in the local-level due process hearing/Section 14-8.02 of the School Code

- **10 Mediation Agreements**
  - Federal: 75.0, 29.3, 39.1%, 4.3
  - Description: IDEA mandates ISBE to offer mediation services

- **Marucco, Stodداد, Ferenbach & Walsh, Inc.**
  - Federal: 70.0, 35.1, 50.1%, 0.0
  - Description: ISBE's Illinois Continuous Improvement Plan per Grant Specs

- **Hupp Information Technology**
  - Federal: 338.2, 82.3, 24.3%, 0.0
  - Description: Customize the Special Ed Data Systems and add critical indicators for the mediation process

- **Joyce Eckrem**
  - Federal: 168.2, 49.2, 29.3%, 12.1
  - Description: Hearing Officer Evaluation and Training

- **ROE # 20**
  - Federal: 667.0, 290.6, 43.6%, 53.9
  - Description: Harrisburg Project - Manage software by special education districts and co-ops

**Federal Grants & Programs**

- **Northern Illinois University**
  - Federal: 135.1, 54.8, 40.6%, 36.7
  - Description: Comprehensive external evaluation of the 21st Century Program

**Student Assessment**

- **Metri Tech, Inc.**
  - GRF: 113.0, 37.7, 33.4%, 9.4
  - Description: Develop, administer, retrieve, analyze, and score the Consumer Ed Proficiency Test Component 12 - MY017412

- **Measurement Incorporated**
  - Federal: 2,095.6, 209.6, 10.0%, 0.0
  - Description: Scoring of bilingual students' writing essays Component 9 - MY99749

- **Harcourt Assessment, Inc.**
  - GRF: 4,947.1, 0.0, 0.0%, 0.0
  - Description: Enhanced Statewide Student Assessment System Component 8 - MY99748

- **Measured Progress, Inc.**
  - Federal: 2,272.7, 757.6, 33.3%, 189.4
  - Description: Assessment data collection/reporting, training, and conducting on-going evaluations and make recommendations for modification - continuation of multi-year MY00612 Development of the IMAGE test Component 10 - MY997410

- **Metri Tech, Inc.**
  - Federal: 322.8, 80.7, 25.0%, 26.9
  - Description: Technical and statistical services such as equating, item analysis and technical reports Component 8 - MY99748 New requirements for the ACCESS Test (Bilingual Assessment)

- **Wisconsin, Illinois, Delaware, Arkansas**
  - GRF: 4,442.3, 0.0, 0.0%, 0.0
  - Description: IMAGE Test

- **Questar Educational Systems**
  - Federal: 1,718.2, 116.1, 6.8%, 0.0
  - Description: ACT Test - College Entrance Exam

- **NCS Pearson, Inc.**
  - Federal: 1,183.7, 394.6, 33.3%, 197.3
  - Description: IAA Test

- **American College Testing**
  - GRF: 3,000.0, 0.0, 0.0%, 0.0
  - Description: ACT Test - College Entrance Exam

- **Norman Webb**
  - Federal: 60.0, 29.9, 49.8%, 0.0
  - Description: Conduct ISAT alignment study
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Funded Amount</th>
<th>Expended Amount</th>
<th>% Spent Year to Date</th>
<th>November Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Certification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Area Development Corp</td>
<td>350.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iroquois-Kankakee County ROE</td>
<td>500.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Funded Amount</td>
<td>Expended Amount</td>
<td>% Spent Year to Date</td>
<td>November Expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nutrition Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelis Corporation</td>
<td>139.7</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Illinois University</td>
<td>195.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Resolve, Inc.</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Assurance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Innovations</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grants Breakdown:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General State Aid</td>
<td>4,166,329.7</td>
<td>1,554,328.1</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>512,120.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I - Low Income</td>
<td>642,000.0</td>
<td>76,700.1</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>31,512.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA</td>
<td>550,000.0</td>
<td>126,027.8</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>30,455.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Nutrition</td>
<td>475,000.0</td>
<td>106,763.9</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>30,723.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spec Ed Personnel</td>
<td>368,500.0</td>
<td>108,863.9</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>32,893.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Spec Ed</td>
<td>326,607.8</td>
<td>56,584.8</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Block</td>
<td>318,254.5</td>
<td>96,209.0</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>24,402.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Reg/Voc</td>
<td>286,118.0</td>
<td>79,898.5</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spec Ed Extraordinary</td>
<td>268,892.6</td>
<td>47,594.0</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title II - Quality Teachers</td>
<td>134,830.0</td>
<td>18,641.8</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>6,320.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spec Ed Private Facility Tuition</td>
<td>109,080.0</td>
<td>66,864.9</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spec Ed Orphanage</td>
<td>79,400.0</td>
<td>31,965.3</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Imp. Block Grant</td>
<td>76,139.8</td>
<td>45,399.3</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>600.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Sch. Safety and Ed. Bl.</td>
<td>74,841.0</td>
<td>37,420.5</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I - Reading First</td>
<td>50,000.0</td>
<td>8,711.1</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>2,080.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc Ed - Federal</td>
<td>50,000.0</td>
<td>17,187.4</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>2,672.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title IV - 21st Century</td>
<td>45,000.0</td>
<td>14,656.5</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>3,882.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title III - English Language Acq</td>
<td>40,000.0</td>
<td>5,817.0</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>4,551.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education - State</td>
<td>38,562.1</td>
<td>17,900.1</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>3,808.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education - Chicago</td>
<td>36,896.6</td>
<td>36,896.6</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Literacy</td>
<td>30,000.0</td>
<td>3,783.3</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>269.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education - Downstate</td>
<td>29,655.4</td>
<td>3,268.7</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>2,954.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook Program</td>
<td>29,126.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook Loan - Reappropriation</td>
<td>28,033.8</td>
<td>20,955.0</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>1,558.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool - Spec Ed</td>
<td>25,000.0</td>
<td>5,304.7</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>1,114.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After School Matters Mentoring</td>
<td>24,128.4</td>
<td>5,539.6</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>2,489.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12/4/2006
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Expended Amount</th>
<th>Expended Year to Date</th>
<th>% Spent Year to Date</th>
<th>November Expenditures</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer Bridges</td>
<td>22,238.1</td>
<td>19,973.1</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Grants to districts (based on ISAT reading scores)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Free Lunch and Breakfast</td>
<td>21,000.0</td>
<td>13,019.2</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>996.1</td>
<td>Mandated Categorical - Reimbursement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title IV - Safe and Drug Free</td>
<td>20,000.0</td>
<td>2,077.4</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>728.1</td>
<td>Formula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Ed/Reg Safe Schools</td>
<td>18,535.5</td>
<td>6,593.3</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>1,605.7</td>
<td>Formula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truant/Dropout/Optional Education</td>
<td>18,078.1</td>
<td>9,379.1</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Competitive - at-risk students/dropout prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Education</td>
<td>17,929.6</td>
<td>4,505.8</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Reimbursement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Guardian Transportation</td>
<td>14,454.7</td>
<td>14,440.8</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Formula based on appropriation level divided by eligible students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orphanage Tuition</td>
<td>13,130.0</td>
<td>2,504.4</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>Reimbursement to school districts for children residing in orphanages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Assistance</td>
<td>11,800.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Formula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Purpose Trust Fund</td>
<td>10,351.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Size Reduction Pilot</td>
<td>10,000.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Grants for K-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title V - Innovative Programs</td>
<td>10,000.0</td>
<td>1,464.8</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>340.9</td>
<td>Formula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>9,605.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Reimbursement for Nat'l Bd Certification costs; grant for Teacher of the Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title II Math/Science Partnerships</td>
<td>9,000.0</td>
<td>255.2</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>Formula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spec Ed Summer School</td>
<td>8,694.0</td>
<td>4,729.5</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Formula - Special ed students enrolled in summer sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROE Salaries</td>
<td>8,150.0</td>
<td>3,296.8</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>661.5</td>
<td>Salaries for ROE’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reorganization Incentive</td>
<td>7,850.0</td>
<td>7,286.7</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Grants to districts to encourage reorganization through consolidation/annexation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROE School Services</td>
<td>6,470.0</td>
<td>4,274.3</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>501.0</td>
<td>Formula - ROE Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology for Success</td>
<td>6,169.7</td>
<td>3,592.6</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>1,636.9</td>
<td>Northwestern Univ. (Collaboratory Project); IL Math and Science Academy (IVHS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security For Schools Grants</td>
<td>5,000.0</td>
<td>3,299.7</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>513.0</td>
<td>Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc Ed - Federal Tech Prep</td>
<td>5,000.0</td>
<td>1,153.9</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Grants - assists students in achieving learning/occupational skills standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Tech. Rev. Loan</td>
<td>5,000.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Loans to schools to implement technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Immersion</td>
<td>4,050.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs for IL Graduates</td>
<td>4,000.0</td>
<td>2,000.0</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>Grants to formula reimbursement, work-based learning, jobs for IL graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Education</td>
<td>4,000.0</td>
<td>233.7</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Charter Schools</td>
<td>3,421.5</td>
<td>1,710.8</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>147.9</td>
<td>Grants - Start-up funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Org Not for profit</td>
<td>3,260.0</td>
<td>194.4</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinney Homeless Ed</td>
<td>3,250.0</td>
<td>990.5</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>215.7</td>
<td>Competitive grants to school districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Rock Center</td>
<td>3,220.5</td>
<td>1,160.0</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>290.0</td>
<td>Targeted Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards Assessment &amp; Acct</td>
<td>3,042.7</td>
<td>1,070.5</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>380.6</td>
<td>Grants for K-6 Arts, Learn Improve, Learning Standards, Student/Teacher Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Mental Health Partner</td>
<td>3,000.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Kids/Minds/Exp Vision</td>
<td>3,000.0</td>
<td>818.2</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grow Your Own Teachers</td>
<td>3,000.0</td>
<td>125.0</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture Education</td>
<td>2,881.2</td>
<td>1,705.1</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>154.9</td>
<td>Grants to school districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spec. Congressional Initiatives</td>
<td>2,847.5</td>
<td>181.9</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn &amp; Serve America</td>
<td>2,500.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Competitive grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter Schools - Federal</td>
<td>2,500.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA Part D</td>
<td>2,500.0</td>
<td>467.8</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>154.3</td>
<td>Reimbursement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat's for the Visually Impaired</td>
<td>2,121.0</td>
<td>1,161.6</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>111.6</td>
<td>Targeted Init. - with The Chicago Lighthouse for People who are Blind or Visually Impaired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurricane Ed Recovery Act</td>
<td>2,102.5</td>
<td>1,975.5</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Grants to aid school districts with Katrina &amp; Rita hurricane victims attending school in IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Children</td>
<td>2,000.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Placement Fee</td>
<td>2,000.0</td>
<td>101.3</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Fee reimbursement for Adv Placement Exam and Int'l Baccalaureate exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Mentoring Pilot</td>
<td>1,800.0</td>
<td>809.9</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>321.3</td>
<td>Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Place Classes/State</td>
<td>1,500.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title VI-Flex. &amp; Acct Rural Education</td>
<td>1,500.0</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>Grants to school districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Relocation</td>
<td>1,400.0</td>
<td>957.8</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>Formula grants for school emergency relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Transportation</td>
<td>1,200.0</td>
<td>518.7</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>518.8</td>
<td>Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying Prevention</td>
<td>1,000.0</td>
<td>415.3</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>415.3</td>
<td>Grants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12/4/2006
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Funded Amount</th>
<th>Expended Year to Date</th>
<th>% Spent Year to Date</th>
<th>November Expenditures</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Financial Assistance</td>
<td>1,000.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition to Teaching</td>
<td>1,000.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach America/Building w/Books</td>
<td>950.0</td>
<td>390.4</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>291.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace Ed Initiative</td>
<td>920.0</td>
<td>757.0</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
<td>134.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Breakfast Incentive</td>
<td>723.5</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Transition</td>
<td>578.8</td>
<td>159.0</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording - Blind and Dyslexic</td>
<td>518.8</td>
<td>338.0</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>140.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Supt. Initiatives</td>
<td>500.0</td>
<td>255.0</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach Institutes/workshops</td>
<td>500.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA Model Outreach</td>
<td>400.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf/Blind</td>
<td>380.0</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Cook ISC - Supplemental</td>
<td>300.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL Economic Education</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Equivalent Grants</td>
<td>222.6</td>
<td>222.6</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro East Consortium</td>
<td>217.1</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL Teach Excellence-Teach of year</td>
<td>135.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL Gov't Internship</td>
<td>129.9</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Participation Pilot</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism Training &amp; Tech Assist.</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter Schools-Rev Loan Fund</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Mentoring Prgm Grants</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Cert Tech Fund</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description:
- Emergency Financial Assistance: Formula and loans to school districts
- Transition to Teaching: Grant to Illinois Resource Center
- Teach America/Building w/Books: Grant for Teach for America and Building with Books, Inc.
- Aerospace Ed Initiative: Grants
- Illinois Breakfast Incentive: Reimbursement and grant to public and private schools and child-care institutions
- Minority Transition: Grants - serves disadvantage students from selected Chicago HS and elem. schools
- Recording - Blind and Dyslexic: Grant to increase achievement of students with visual impairments
- Regional Supt. Initiatives: Targeted Initiatives - to St. Clair and Madison ROE's
- Teach Institutes/workshops: Other
- IDEA Model Outreach: Competitive
- Deaf/Blind: Grant to Philip J. Rock Center
- South Cook ISC - Supplemental: Grant to South Cook ISC
- IL Economic Education: Grant to IL Council on Economic Education
- Tax Equivalent Grants: Grant to Chaney-Monge School District
- Metro East Consortium: Grant to provide staff development to increase student achievement in MECCA
- IL Teach Excellence-Teach of year: Grants for Teacher of the Year
- IL Gov't Internship: Targeted Initiative - Springfield School District 186
- Parental Participation Pilot: Grants
- Autism Training & Tech Assist.: Grants to the IL Autism Training and Technical Assistance Program
- Charter Schools-Rev Loan Fund: Other/Repayment of loans
- Principal Mentoring Prgm Grants: Grants
- Teacher Cert Tech Fund: Other
# Agency Staff Detail as of November 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Mgmt.</th>
<th>Prof. Support</th>
<th>GRF</th>
<th>Non-GRF</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUPERINTENDENT'S OFFICE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Counsel &amp; Legal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Audit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROE Services - Chicago</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUMAN RESOURCES &amp; PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources &amp; Prof Development</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC INFORMATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental Relations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPECIAL EDUCATION SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Admin.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Services - Spfld.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Services - Chgo.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEACHING AND LEARNING SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Learning Admin.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis &amp; Progress Reporting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Development &amp; Preparation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Grants and Programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Assessment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mgmt.</td>
<td>Prof. Support</td>
<td>GRF</td>
<td>Non-GRF</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINANCIAL SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal/School Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget &amp; Financial Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Systems</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding and Disbursements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition Programs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Business &amp; Support Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Assurance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL, ALL CENTERS</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes one Leave of Absence
*March headcount revised in April.
Personnel Transactions

Transaction Data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY01</th>
<th>FY02</th>
<th>FY03</th>
<th>FY04</th>
<th>FY05</th>
<th>FY06</th>
<th>FY07*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Begin Year</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire Externally</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recall</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retire</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>-37</td>
<td>-128</td>
<td>-34</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resign</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layoff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Year</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Through end of November