AGENDA

1. Public Participation

2. Minutes of the January Education Policy Planning Committee Meeting  (pp. 2-3)

3. Evaluation of Supplemental Education Service Providers  (pp. 4-12)
   (Jon Furr, Dr. Steven Ross and Dr. Allison Potter, Center for Research in Education Policy, University of Memphis)

4. Private Facilities and PSAE Testing (Ginger R., Becky M., Chris Koch, Gail Lieberman)  (p. 13 )

5. Preliminary Discussion regarding NCLB Workbook Changes (Gail Lieberman)  (pp. 14-15)

6. Additional Items

* Items listed with an asterisk (*) will be discussed in committee and action may be taken in the plenary session.
The Education Policy Planning Committee convened at 3:20 p.m.

1. **MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 2005 EPPC MEETING:** The Committee approved the minutes for the December 2005 EPPC Meeting.

2. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:** Janet Milkovich of Recording for the Blind and Dyslexic gave a presentation on the organization’s digital materials and how they can train teachers in the effective use of recorded textbooks in the classroom and the organization’s request for funding in Fiscal Year 2007.

   The Committee also heard discussion and comments/concerns throughout the meeting from Jeff Mays of the Illinois Business Roundtable regarding the ISAT Cut Scores. Mr. Mays’ concern is if we are moving away from standards and inserting the national norm test to determine if we are out of line or not and if we are going ahead with this, are we bringing the 67% “meets” down? The result in the change is that more students and more schools will “meet”? (Jennifer Ross of IBRT accompanied Mr. Mays, but she did not speak).

   Dr. Bob Nielsen of the Large Unit District Association (LUDA) (along with Robin Miller) was in attendance to share his comments on the ISAT Cut Scores. Dr. Nielsen believes the new ISAT is a significant step forward for the state of Illinois and agrees that students need to meet the standards. He further stated that the 8th grade students suffer loss of accountability and believes we will actually be able to show growth over time for each child. He then added that the changes being proposed will bring a sense of reliability and that LUDA endorses the current proposal and encourages the ISBE to adopt it.

3. **ISAT CUT SCORES (Becky McCabe and Sam Krug (ISBE Staff Members Renee Lange and Megan Forness were also on hand for questions)):** Becky McCabe introduced Sam Krug of Metritech who gave a brief overview through a PowerPoint presentation of a recommendation that has gone through an extensive process for ISAT Cut Scores. Becky stated that they are requesting the proposed cut scores for the ISAT to be approved at the February board meeting.

   Sam commented on how the cut scores are the point at which students are considered “meeting” the Illinois standards or not. He stated that in 2006, ISAT will be reported in reading and math in all grades 3 through 8, which this means this will add three more grades to the testing. Dr. Krug further added that the process requires a group of math and reading teachers and administrators to examine the test questions and establish a reasonable place for the “meets” cut score. This was done in 1999 when the ISAT became the state test for grades 3, 5 and 8. Dr. Krug also stated that during the current process, there was information that linked the cut scores to the national percentage, which every “meet” cut score in reading and math was near the 38% except for the 8th grade math, which was at 67%. 8th grade is at a very high standard. In addition, we had to establish cuts for 4th and 6th. Nothing has changed in the reading, those numbers correspond to the same level as in 1999. However, the standards increase each year.
Dr. Krug also added that the State Testing Review Committee met on January 4th to review the process as presented by Dr. Krug. The State Testing Review Committee recommended the adjustment to 8th grade to reflect the 38% and then to accept the cut scores as presented and be reviewed when preliminary data comes back from the ISAT 2006 test.

Student Assessment staff are going to provide more information on this, per Board Member Andrea Brown’s request.

Board Member Joyce Karon asked if the SIS has helped in preparing this test. Becky McCabe responded by saying we have close to 700 districts with ID numbers and that the districts are working really hard to be ready.

4. **ADDITIONAL ITEMS:** There were no additional items.

**ADJOURN:** The Educational Policy Planning Committee meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.
TO: Members of the Board Education Policy and Planning Committee

FROM: Jonathan Furr, General Counsel

Agenda Topic: Evaluation of Supplemental Educational Service Providers

Materials: Excerpts from Proposal for Evaluation of Supplemental Educational Service Providers

Staff Contact(s): Jonathan Furr
Gary Greene
Robert Wolfe

Purpose of Agenda Item
To present information to the Committee on our proposed evaluation process for Supplemental Educational Service Providers.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
An initiative under GOAL 3 Expanding Data-Informed School Management & Support Practices, includes monitoring the effectiveness of supplemental educational service providers.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
For informational purposes. Aspects of the evaluation will be incorporated into amendments to the Part 675 rules brought to the Board in March or April.

Background Information
With the adoption of the Part 675 rules and the other actions taken by the Board in the spring and summer of 2005, the State Board of Education has taken a leading national role in its monitoring and oversight of supplemental educational service providers. One of our responsibilities as an agency is to develop a process and standards to evaluate the effectiveness of supplemental educational services providers. Through a competitive bid process, the State Board of Education has selected a partnership of Education Innovations/Center for Research in Educational Policy (EI/CREP) and Learning Point Associates (LPA) to develop the process and standards for this evaluation.
SBE – Evaluation of Supplemental Educational Service Providers

[EXCERPTS FROM FULL PROPOSAL]

Revised: February, 2006

Education Innovations, LLC
3161 Campus Postal Station
Memphis, TN 38152
866-670-6147 ● 901-201-1160
www.memphis.edu/crep

LEARNING POINT Associates™
1120 East Diehl Road, Suite 200
Naperville, IL 60563-1486
800-356-2735 ● 630-649-6500
www.learningpt.org
Contractors Qualifications
Education Innovations/Center for Research in Educational Policy (EI/CREP) and Learning Point Associates (LPA)

Education Innovations, LLC (EI) is an elite educational research organization located in Memphis, TN. The Center for Research in Educational Policy (CREP) is a University (Memphis) based research center and state (Tennessee) Center of Excellence. Together the EI/CREP partnership’s mission is to implement a research agenda associated with educational policies and practices in preK-12 schools, and to disseminate research findings so that they inform decisions made by educational practitioners and policymakers. EI/CREP staff, including Dr. Steven Ross, have gained national recognition for their contribution to discussions of issues such as reform of teacher education, educational equity, educational technology, school reform and restructuring, urban and multicultural education, interventions for at-risk students, and using formative evaluation methods for school improvement decision-making. In particular, EI/CREP is one of the most active and expert organizations nationally in guiding national policies and state practices for conducting SES evaluations.

Learning Point Associates became a nationally and internationally focused education nonprofit organization in 2003. Founded in 1984 as the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL), one of 10 regional educational laboratories funded by the U.S. Department of Education, the organization was chartered to perform and deliver research, technical assistance, and policy activities in a seven-state Midwest region. NCREL continues today as a wholly owned subsidiary of Learning Point Associates. Headquartered in Naperville, Illinois, Learning Point Associates also operates offices in Washington, D.C., and downtown Chicago.

Learning Point Associates has effectively staffed and managed a variety of awards since 1984, ranging from small consulting contracts to multimillion-dollar federal grants and contracts. Among the awards made by the U. S. Department of Education are four consecutive contracts to operate the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, a contract for Analytic Support for Evaluation and Program Monitoring—21st Century Community Learning Centers Program, and a contract to operate a national Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement.

EI/CREP and Learning Point Associates staff dedicated to the project includes dedicated professionals with a broad range of content expertise, accomplished project managers, skilled evaluators, and experienced seasoned technical-assistance providers. Research and evaluation staff members have expertise in quantitative and qualitative inquiry methodologies spanning experimental, quasi-experimental, and case-study designs. Our data collection experience includes mining large student achievement databases and related systems, direct observations, surveys, interviews, focus groups, portfolio assessment, and records abstractions, including a variety of student performance indicators.

Work Plan
Supplemental Educational Services (SES) are a component of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as reauthorized by the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), that
will provide extra academic assistance for eligible children. State Educational Agencies (SEAs) are required to:

- Ensure delivery of high-quality SES. Specifically, SEAs must identify whether SES providers improve academic achievement in reading/language arts or mathematics.

- Develop and implement standards for monitoring the quality, performance, and effectiveness of the services.

- Publicly report the monitoring standards and ensure consistency with the standards developed for identifying potential providers.

- Collect and report information about parent satisfaction with services.

- Use a consistent policy for withdrawing providers from the list. A mandatory criterion for removal is failure for two consecutive years to contribute to increased student proficiency. Another is failure to provide services consistent with applicable health, safety, and civil rights requirements.

This proposal describes a comprehensive plan for evaluating the effectiveness of Illinois state providers. Integral to this purpose is the development of an assessment rubric for ISBE to employ in evaluating individual providers and making decisions about continuing approval or removal from the approved list. Embedded in the plan are descriptions of optional components that ISBE might consider over time to increase capacity and effectiveness in monitoring provider services, assessing school and district participation, and determining “consumer satisfaction” (see Ross, 2005). The proposed evaluation model will provide valid and highly usable data to make the following types of judgments about individual providers:

1. Does the provider contribute to increased student proficiency relative to State academic and achievement standards?
2. Does the provider communicate effectively with parents of students served by SES regarding the progress of their children in achieving academic goals?
3. Do parents report being satisfied with the services provided by the provider?
4. Does the provider effectively offer services relative to attendance rates, cost effectiveness, and percentage of funds spent on program activities?

Optional questions for consideration by ISBE in future years of the evaluation:

5. Does the provider work with principals and teachers as needed to develop instructional plans geared to the needs of the students?
6. What are the reactions of school district liaisons, principals, and teachers to SES interventions?

**Tracking Student Performance on State Assessments**

Education Innovations/The Center for Research in Educational Policy (EI/CREP), in partnership with Learning Point Associates (LPA), will provide technical assistance with
implementation of a student characteristics tracking system in accord with the needs of the proposed evaluation design, utilizing all demographic categories stipulated in the Adequate Yearly Progress requirements of NCLB. Based on our experiences with analyzing SES provider effects on student achievement in Tennessee (Potter, Ross, & Nunnery, in preparation) and Louisiana (Ross, Potter, & Nunnery, in preparation), the most scientifically rigorous and useful design for estimating expected performance is the “matched-subject” design, whereby each student who received SES services is paired individually to another student attending the same school who is similar with respect to prior achievement and demographic characteristics. Relative to a multiple regression design, the matched-subject approach has proven to be in these prior evaluations: (a) more adaptable to situations where SES student sample size is small for a given provider, and (b) easier to translate into effect sizes understandable to policy makers and practitioners. It is proposed that a similar approach be employed as part of this evaluation effort. Protocols specifying what factors will be utilized in constructing the matched control groups will be developed and include specifications regarding the minimum number of control group members that need to included in the analysis to ensure defensible results.¹ The approach for constructing a control group by provider on a district-by-district basis to determine whether the provider has contributed to increased student proficiency will be described below.

Analytic Approach to Estimating SES Provider Effect on Student Proficiency

To estimate an SES provider effect, one must compare the actual performance of the students served to their expected performance if they had not received SES services. Based on our experiences with SES data from Tennessee and Louisiana, the best design for estimating expected performance is the matched subjects design, whereby a comparison group sample is constructed by matching each student who received SES services to another student attending the same school who is similar with respect to prior achievement (if available) and demographic characteristics. Effect size estimates are then computed by (1) conducting an analysis of covariance to estimate adjusted mean posttest achievement for the comparison group and for each provider, (2) subtracting the comparison group adjusted mean from each provider adjusted mean, and (3) dividing the difference by the pooled within-groups standard deviation of the outcome measure:

\[ g_k = \frac{X_k - X_c}{s_p} \]

where \( g_k \) = the effect size estimate for provider \( k \), \( X_k \) is the covariate-adjusted mean outcome score for provider \( k \), \( X_c \) is the covariate-adjusted mean outcome score for the comparison sample, and \( s_p \) is the pooled within-schools standard deviation for the outcome measure. These effect size estimates are computed within districts across all schools whose students are assigned to SES providers for each grade level and outcome measures (typically Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics).

¹ This determination is partially statistical in nature, based on considerations involving power to detect differences and the standard error of measurement but is also subjective based on preferences by State leaders and policy makers regarding, for example, the ability to defer decisions where sample sizes are small (e.g., less than 10 students per grade).
Thus, any given provider might have multiple estimated $g$’s depending on the number of grade levels at which the children they served were enrolled, the number of subjects in which they offered tutoring, and the number of districts in which they were operating. Aggregate weighted effect size estimates can then be computed from the individual $g$’s to estimate overall impact by subject area across grade levels and districts for each provider. The weighted effect size estimates are computed by summing the product of each $g$ and its weight, $w_i \cong \frac{n_i'}{\sum n_i'}$, where $w_i$ is the weight applied to effect size $i$, $n_i = n_i^P n_i^C / (n_i^P + n_i^C)$, and $\sum n_i'$ is the sum of the $n_i'$ for all effect size estimates of provider $k$. The weighted effect size estimates express the average standardized difference in performance between students served by each provider and similar students enrolled in the same schools. The weighted effect size estimates can be tested for statistical significance, and the individual effect size estimates can be modeled to determine whether provider effects are consistent across sites, grade levels, and subject areas.

Although no ex post facto design can rule out all threats to causal inference, the proposed approach is relatively strong given the realities of SES implementation. First of all, it is extremely important to develop matched comparison samples from the same schools attended by SES students. By definition, these schools have consistently under-performed. Hence, it is not sufficient to utilize comparison students from demographically similar schools, because SES provider effects will be confounded with school effects. Secondly, if possible, comparison samples should be constructed on the basis of one-to-one matches within the same school. Preliminary analyses of SES data in Tennessee and Louisiana indicated that using the entire sample from a school when a portion of that school’s students received SES services could distort estimates of SES provider effects. This distortion arises when SES recipients are systematically different from non-SES recipients; for example, when SES recipients are more educationally at-risk, have lower prior achievement scores, etc.

The proposed approach also has some advantages from a statistical point of view. Generally, outcomes must be analyzed separately for each grade level because the test instruments used are not vertically equated. Except for a few large providers, most SES providers only serve a few students at any given grade level, and it is typical for a different set of providers to be associated with each school. It is therefore nearly impossible to get a reliable estimate of individual provider effects, or to test these effects for statistical significance within the context of analyses conducted grade level by grade level. However, by pooling effect size estimates and sample sizes across grade levels and districts, one may obtain a more reliable estimate of the overall effectiveness of a given provider that can be reasonably tested for statistical significance. In addition, confidence bands and associated standard error estimates will be provided to allow for further interpretation of the net effects using meta-analytic methodologies proposed by Hedges and Olkin (1981). The distribution of effect size estimates within and between schools will be generated to estimate a more accurate representation of the aggregate effect of SES in the state of Illinois. These effectiveness assessments will become increasingly reliable over time as the cumulative samples served by each provider grow in size.

Finally, the precise analytical approach will depend upon the historical data available to the contractor. If the state can provide data on achievement test scores in previous years, it will be
possible to match students based on previous achievement levels and to compare their rate of change. If the data are available only for the 2005-2006 school year and beyond, such a comparison will not be possible until subsequent years of the program.

**Parent Survey**

EI/CREP and Learning Point Associates will develop and validate a parent survey that measures the percentage of parents who (a) agree with each provider’s assessment of the SES student’s achievement of the academic goals set out in that student’s Individual Tutorial Plan, and (b) express satisfaction with the services provided to their child. This instrument will be adapted for use within the STARS system with automated scoring and reporting options. To the extent possible, data will be easily manipulated for the purposes of aggregating and disaggregating by NCLB demographic categories within and between providers. To ensure the integrity of survey data, the contractor proposes to supervise the administration and collection of parent surveys in concert with school district officials. These data will be included in the package of indicators to inform the public about the effectiveness of the SES providers. Moreover, it may be included in the regulatory standard for determining retention of the provider on the state approved list, as described under the following component.

To the extent that ISBE deems additional information useful, the contractor is prepared to expand the topics covered in the parent survey in several ways. For example, in prior SES evaluations (Potter et al., in preparation; Ross et al., in preparation) it has proven informative to question parents on such matters as the number of contacts received from the provider, perceived impacts on the child’s achievement, the child’s enjoyment of the tutoring, and personal reactions expressed in open-ended comments. We will further examine with ISBE staff the potential advantages for measurement validity, relative to the greater logistical demands, of having the evaluators (as opposed to the providers themselves) administer the Parent Survey. Given that the evaluation can have strong financial and marketing implications for providers, eliminating opportunity for any unscrupulous providers to manipulate data either directly or indirectly (e.g., selecting more involved and satisfied parents) would seem desirable, if feasible.

**Attendance Rates**

The attendance rate of enrolled students is an important indicator of the effectiveness of SES providers because students who do not consistently attend the program are unlikely to benefit from it. Attendance information collected in STARS will be analyzed, to the extent possible, to assess the intensity in which students participated in SES services, the duration of participation across the span of the school year, and the breadth of SES-supported activities attended by students. This information will be especially relevant to determining the dosage of SES services received by an individual student.
# Appendix A. Sample Decision Tree

Supplemental Educational Services Decision Tree (for making decisions about provider retention/removal)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement gains meet standards.</td>
<td>Provider is in good standing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement results are positive but do not reach standards.</td>
<td>Maintain good standing, with reservations, for one year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement results are below standards. Survey results are positive and show satisfaction.</td>
<td>Probationary status 1. Required improvement plan and achievement gains expected in one year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement gains are negative and survey results show marginal satisfaction.</td>
<td>Probationary status 2. Required achievement gains and improvement plan necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative achievement effects. Negative survey satisfaction ratings.</td>
<td>Removal from state approved provider list.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B: Sample Rubric of Overall Evaluation of Provider Effectiveness

### Table C-1. Rubric of Overall Evaluation of Provider Effectiveness – Provider X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Insufficient Information</th>
<th>Below Standards</th>
<th>Marginal Quality</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Above Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Student Achievement</td>
<td>There is insufficient information available to determine student achievement outcomes.</td>
<td>Students have not shown gains related to tutoring received from service providers. The average overall Effect Size is close to zero.</td>
<td>About half of the students have made some gain related to tutoring received from service providers. The average overall Effect Size is positive but &lt; +0.10.</td>
<td>There has been some gain for the majority (over 60%) of students related to tutoring received from service providers. The average overall Effect Size exceeds +0.17.</td>
<td>Most students (over 75%) have shown gains related to tutoring received from service providers. The average overall Effect Size exceeds +0.25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Communication</td>
<td>There is insufficient information available to determine communication outcomes.</td>
<td>Provider has not communicated with the principals, teachers, and parents of students served.</td>
<td>There has been limited communication throughout the year between the provider and at least two of the following: principals, teachers, and parents.</td>
<td>There has been some regular communication throughout the year between the provider and the principals, teachers, and parents of students served.</td>
<td>There is an ongoing and sustained system of communication between the provider and the school-level educators as well as parents of students served.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Instructional Plans</td>
<td>There is insufficient information available to determine instructional plans of the provider.</td>
<td>Provider does not plan instruction explicitly geared to student needs or to reinforce their regular academic program.</td>
<td>Provider is in the planning stages of gearing instruction to student needs, and reinforcing the regular academic program.</td>
<td>Provider has made some attempt with the majority of students to plan instruction explicitly geared to student needs and to reinforce the regular academic program.</td>
<td>Provider instructional plans are explicitly geared to the needs of most or all students and reinforce the regular academic program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Local and State Standards</td>
<td>There is insufficient information available to determine alignment with local and state standards.</td>
<td>None of the instructional plans used by the provider are aligned with local and state academic standards for students.</td>
<td>Provider is in the process of aligning instructional plans with local and state academic standards for students.</td>
<td>Some of the instructional plans used by the provider are presently aligned with local and state academic standards for students.</td>
<td>Most or all of the instructional plans are presently aligned with local and state academic standards for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Special Ed/ELL Students</td>
<td>There is insufficient information available to determine special ed/ELL student outcomes.</td>
<td>Provider does not offer accommodations for addressing the needs of special ed or ELL students.</td>
<td>Provider has made limited accommodations for addressing the needs of special ed and ELL students.</td>
<td>Provider has made some accommodations for addressing the needs of special ed and ELL students.</td>
<td>Provider offers appropriate services, if needed, to special education and ELL students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Provider Overall</td>
<td>There is insufficient information available to determine provider overall outcomes.</td>
<td>There is overall dissatisfaction with the provider at the district and school levels.</td>
<td>There is more dissatisfaction than satisfaction with the provider at the district and school levels.</td>
<td>There are mixed but mostly positive reactions about the provider at the school and district levels.</td>
<td>There is overall satisfaction with the provider at the district and school levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Education Policy and Planning Committee

FROM: Dr. Ginger Reynolds, Assistant Superintendent for Teaching & Learning
       Dr. Chris Koch, Assistant Superintendent for Special Education

Agenda Topic: Possible Exemptions from State Testing

Materials: None

Staff Contact(s): Becky McCabe, Gail Lieberman, Gayle Johnson

Purpose of Agenda Item
The purpose of this agenda item is to provide information about the need to exempt students from state testing when they are unable to test at their serving schools (because that school is not authorized to administer a state assessment) and, for safety reasons, cannot be transported back to their home schools to test.

The following has not yet been presented to the U.S. Department of Education for approval. It is being proposed to this Committee for consideration and discussion to determine if it should be moved forward as a request to the Department.

When public school students are being educated at private facilities that are not authorized to administer secure state assessments, the only way these students can participate in these assessments is to return their home schools to test. IEP teams are responsible for deciding how students can be transported safely back to their home schools so they can participate in state testing, and interventions that need to be in place to keep students safe must be documented in their IEPs.

If, on the day of testing, a student cannot be transported safely due to health, behavior, or distance—even with all the planned interventions in place—the student could be excluded from state testing. In consultation with the student's case manager, home and serving school administrators will be responsible for making the decision that the student cannot be safely transported on that day. The home district will be responsible for documenting and for keeping on file the reasons for that decision (for audit purposes) and for verifying the student's exemption with the State Board.

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

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
It is expected that the Committee will provide feedback, information, and direction on whether this exemption is reasonable and warranted and any next steps in the process for moving it forward to be implemented as policy.
TO: Education Policy and Planning Committee

FROM: Gail Lieberman, Special Assistant for NCLB

Agenda Topic: Preliminary Discussion Regarding Changes in the Illinois Accountability Workbook (NCLB)

Purpose of Agenda Item
The purpose of the agenda item is to have a preliminary discussion with the committee members regarding the status of the Illinois Accountability Workbook, and comment on the upcoming process.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
This agenda item links to the description of Learning Standards and Assessment: At the core of every function and activity of the Illinois State Board of Education is the achievement of student learning outcomes measured against the Illinois Learning Standards. The goals, objectives and initiatives contained in this Strategic Plan—in conjunction with our system of assessment frameworks and performance indicators—are intended to assist in ultimately reaching these learning outcomes for every student in Illinois.

It also aligns with two goal summaries:
- Foster the 21st Century literacy skills of reading fluency, numeracy, scientific literacy and global awareness by providing support for effective instruction and broad approaches to impact all students.
- Support the utilization of data to assist school districts in providing more effective operational practices, opportunities to pool shared services and flexibility in balancing their budgets to increase educational outcomes.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
Board members will be informed of the upcoming process for reviewing potential changes. Like 2005, the Board will have the responsibility to approve the final workbook once USDE has approved changes.

Background Information
The original Accountability Workbook was submitted to USDE in 2003. Changes have been made in 2004 and 2005. Such changes both clarifications as well as revisions. The current workbook is on line on the agency’s web site at http://www.isbe.net/nclb/pdfs/accountability_workbook.pdf. States have the opportunity to make modifications again in 2006. These are due in 2006 on or before April 1, 2006.
In 2005 the Board was apprised at several meetings regarding staff work with USDE on the workbook. Final approval was received from USDE the week of September 12th. Board final action occurred thereafter.

In 2005, the approved revisions were in four areas:

- Subgroup size/use of Confidence Intervals
- District Grade Span Review regarding Improvement Status
- Special Education “Proxy”
- New Definition of Full Academic Year

Clarification was approved in terms of testing students new to the US, during their first year of schooling, and reporting to the home school for students with disabilities.

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

_**Policy Implications.**_ Like 2005, we need to make sure that any changes result in a fairer and more reasonable approach to assessing all students and holding all schools and districts accountable.

_**Legislative Actions.**_ Public Act 94-666 of 2005 is relevant. You may remember that this law was enacted in August 2005, asking that USDE formally approve or disapprove certain actions regarding the workbook. USDE was asked for action shortly after the bill was enacted into law. To date, no approval or disapproval has been received in writing.

**Next Steps**

A meeting will be convened in late February to discuss potential changes and seek ideas for 2006 clarifications or revisions. From there, language will be crafted. Staff will review with you in March what the areas are for consideration. The document as revised will be submitted to USDE by April 1, 2006. As time permits, we will meet with USDE personnel in Washington DC in April to review. Once final language has been approved, staff will return to the Board for final discussion and action.