AGENDA

1. Public Participation

2. Minutes of the May Ad Hoc Rules Committee Meeting (pp. 2-4)

*3 Rules for Initial Review
   a. Part 1 (Public Schools Evaluation, Recognition and Supervision) *(Plenary pp. 13-21)*  
      (Robin Lisboa)
   b. New Part 65 (Teacher Induction and Mentoring) *(Linda Jamali) (pp. 22-31)*
   c. Part 235 (Early Childhood Block Grant) *(Kay Henderson) (pp. 32-46)*
   d. New Part 365 (Technology Immersion Pilot Project) *(Dana Kinley) (pp. 47-55)*

*4 Rules for Adoption
   a. New Part 65 Emergency Rulemaking (Teacher Induction & Mentoring) *(Plenary pp. 22-31)*  
      (Linda Jamali)
   b. Part 235 Emergency Rulemaking (Early Childhood Block Grant) *(Plenary pp. 32-46)*  
      (Kay Henderson)
   c. Part 305 (School Food Service) *(Chris Schmitt) (Plenary pp. 390-399)*
   d. New Part 365 Emergency Rulemaking (Technology Immersion Pilot Project) *(Plenary pp. 47-55)*  
      (Dana Kinley)
   e. Part 675 (Providers of Supplemental Educational Services) *(Plenary pp. 56-113)*  
      (Robert Wolfe)
      (Debbie Vespa)

5. Information Item: Comprehensive Rules Review & Less Red Tape *(Jon Furr) (pp. 5-27)*

6. Additional Items

7. Adjourn

* Items listed with an asterisk (*) will be discussed in committee and action may be taken in the plenary session.
1. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:
Chairman Ruiz asked if there was anyone wishing to address the Committee. No one came forward.

2. MINUTES OF THE APRIL AD HOC RULES COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
Jon Furr informed the committee that the date of the meeting should be shown as April 19 rather than March 15. The April Ad Hoc Rules Committee meeting minutes were unanimously approved as amended.

3. DISCUSSION OF RULES FOR INITIAL REVIEW

PART 1
(Public Schools Evaluation, Recognition and Supervision)

General Counsel Jon Furr informed the Committee that there were several changes being proposed to Part 1 of the rules and asked Donna Luallen, Division Administrator for Accountability, and Sally Vogl to come to the table.

Ms. Vogl explained the two items originating with the Certification Division. She indicated that a new section was being proposed to require that districts record information about the qualifications of teachers electronically on ISBE’s new Educator Certification System (ECS), which has been set up to gather those data. She noted that this requirement will be similar to the requirement for use of the Student Information System that was added last year in the amendments changing the accountability system.

Ms. Vogl also explained the technical change in the provision related to physical education, noting that, under newly enacted legislation, p.e. is not required daily in cases of block scheduling.

Mr. Furr then commented on P.A. 93-803, which allows districts to deny enrollment to high school students for failing to meet academic or attendance standards. He explained that ISBE is
required to determine what due process is necessary in these cases and that the process presented is much like the one used for expulsions.

Board Member Brenda Holmes asked Mr. Furr about the criteria in the law as to the exclusion of students, and Mr. Furr provided an example of the sequence of events as required by the statute. A student would be given notice and would have one semester to bring the grades or attendance up. If he or she failed to do so, enrollment would be denied for the next semester. What the rules put in place is an opportunity for the parents to request a hearing to challenge the initial determination.

Ms. Holmes asked Mr. Furr what the next steps would be if the student is under age 17. Mr. Furr responded that the student would not have the ability to attend school for that one semester and noted that this would be considered an exception to the compulsory attendance requirement.

Several members asked about obligations of districts to place students in alternative programs and about students’ potential eligibility for programs such as the Truants’ Alternative and Optional Education Program. Ms. Luallen said that a student could be given alternatives and that nothing in the statute that would prohibit that at all. She further noted the involvement of the regional offices of education and indicated that districts generally would contact the regional office in these situations. Dr. Brown concurred.

Superintendent Dunn noted that this matter should be put on the ROEs’ agenda to make sure they understand the background, too. Chairman Ruiz said he was concerned that the ROEs would not be aware of the procedures.

Dr. Hall expressed concern about the students who have been dropped at age 16 and how this affects them because they have not been able to get into special education when needed. She asked if there is a procedure in the statute that allows for this exclusion, and Mr. Furr explained that the rules would be putting in place the due process requirements under which the parent could appeal. He also brought to the Board members’ attention the statutory requirement for remediation services.

The discussion turned back to the new rule for electronic reporting of teachers’ qualifications, and Dr. Brown asked Ms. Vogl who is responsible for the accuracy of the information. Ms. Vogl answered that both districts and the Illinois State Board of Education are responsible.

Linda Jamali, Division Administrator for Certification, had joined the discussion, and she commented that teachers were being strongly encouraged to complete the worksheet for any content area they think they may be assigned to so all fields in which they are highly qualified will be recorded.

Dr. Brown noted that having the information on record would also help teachers in RIF situations. She asked whether most teachers are also using the CERTS system, and Ms. Jamali explained that use of that system is not required whereas this will be required. Mr. Furr clarified that the obligation imposed by this new rule will apply to districts and not to teachers.

Dr. Brown asked if this information would come in to ISBE through the assurance sheet at the beginning of the year that is signed by the superintendent. Ms. Luallen explained that there are two requirements that need to be kept separate. Through the recognition process, which is now on IWAS, each school district is required to list its paraprofessionals, because those individuals are also required to be qualified. That is distinct from the on-site reviews conducted by regional superintendents to ensure that teachers hold the required qualifications.
Part 565  
(Class Size Reduction Grants)

Dana Kinley, Division Administrator for Curriculum and Instruction, generally described the rules for Part 565, class size reduction grants.

Mr. Furr acknowledged Mr. Dave Piccioli, School Finance Director of the Illinois Federation of Teachers (IFT), who played a major part in the enactment of the legislation and funding related to these rules.

Ms. Holmes asked for clarification regarding which part of the program was being funded, and Ms. Kinley stated that the appropriation was for the pilot program described in Subpart B but not for the other portion of the program described in Subpart A. Ms. Vogl commented that the class size reduction provisions other than the pilot program had been enacted several years previously but had never been funded, so that no rules had been brought to the Board until now. Mr. Furr noted that the rules would cover both statutory programs.

Ms. Holmes wished to verify that the $10 million would for the class size reduction pilot and Ms. Kinley and Ms. Vogl agreed.

Mr. Furr commented on the allocation of funds. Approximately one-third of the funding would be allocated to Chicago, one-third to suburban Cook and the collar counties, and the final one-third to the remainder of the state.

Dr. Fields asked what the criteria would be for choosing among the downstate schools, and Mr. Furr explained that selection would be based upon ranking according to the points set out in Section 565.150. The short turn-around time for issuance of the RFP was noted.

Ms. Holmes asked how many school districts could receive the money and how far the funds might go. Dr. Brown stated her concern for schools in warning or watch status or corrective action. She asked if the schools that have moved into that category would be eligible and Mr. Furr said they were included.

Mr. Furr informed the Board that an emergency amendment to Part 235 (Early Childhood Block Grant) would be presented to them in June in order to respond to the Preschool for All legislation. He also noted the timelines for processing the related RFP for this program, and similar timelines were discussed in connection with the class size reduction grants. It was determined that the proposed rules for that program should be changed to provide for a 30-day response timeframe rather than the standard 45 days.

Ms. Holmes made a motion to change the response timeframe for the class size reduction pilot program RFP to 30 days rather than the standard 45-day response time.

Dr. Fields seconded the motion and it was adopted.

4. Informational Update: Less Red Tape
Mr. Furr commented that Less Red Tape would be a quarterly update.

Dr. Brown asked about the special education hearings that were cancelled and asked if they would be coming up in August or September. It was explained that those hearings would be rescheduled for dates throughout the summer.

5. Adjournment
Joyce Karon made the motion to adjourn. David Fields seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 11:15.
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Upon the Governor’s appointment of the new Illinois State Board of Education, the agency immediately began a comprehensive review and overhaul of the State Board’s rules to identify how they can be made less cumbersome for districts and teachers. This process has included a thorough review of how the State Board of Education interacts with its constituents – through administrative rules, forms and procedures, and statutory provisions.

Each of the State Board of Education’s divisions has worked with legal staff and the agency’s rules coordinator to determine whether there are rules that can be eliminated, updated or modified to reduce burdens on the agency’s constituents. The comprehensive rules review has also performed the critical function of updating the State Board’s administrative rules to reflect agency operations.

As part of that overhaul, the State Board of Education launched a “Less Red Tape Campaign”, accessible at lessredtape@isbe.net. Ideas generated through the lessredtape email address and the comprehensive rules review were consolidated into an agency legislative initiative. The agency worked closely with constituent organizations to draft, modify and advance the resulting legislation, SB 2829. SB 2829 unanimously passed both chambers of the Illinois General Assembly and was sent to the Governor on April 28, 2006.

This report is organized as follows:

- **Section 1** describes the progress of the comprehensive review of the State Board of Education’s rules, and highlights the changes that have resulted from this review.
- **Section 2** includes a summary of changes to agency processes and procedures that have resulted from lessredtape@isbe.net.
- **Section 3** includes a description of the various components of SB 2829.

I greatly appreciate the ongoing support of the State Board of Education for the agency’s efforts to reduce and eliminate unnecessary administrative burdens on the educational community.
SECTION 1 – UPDATE ON COMPREHENSIVE RULES REVIEW

This update on the agency’s comprehensive rules review is organized by Part. The agency’s administrative rules are organized into more than 50 separate Parts. If a Part is not listed below, then the agency has reviewed this Part and determined it does not require revision as part of the comprehensive rules review process, or revisions have been made but separate from the comprehensive rules review process. New Parts that have resulted from recent legislation are also not discussed in this report.

PART 1 – PUBLIC SCHOOLS EVALUATION, RECOGNITION AND SUPERVISION

Part 1 is the primary Part that details what mandates school districts have to follow. This Part has been comprehensively overhauled to include the requirements from the state’s single accountability framework mandated by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, delete unnecessary and cumbersome sections, and combine similar requirements in the same location.

A. Rule Revisions

- **Undocumented Immigrant Access to Preschool:** ISBE’s rules are now explicit that free public education is guaranteed regardless of immigration status under the U.S. Supreme Court’s 1982 decision in *Plyler v. Doe*. In particular, this right is extended to preschool programs. (Rulemaking is complete; effective July 13, 2005.)

- **Deletion of Outdated, Unnecessary and Duplicative Regulatory Language:** With the streamlining of Part 1 and the elimination of the other unnecessary Parts, a significant amount of outdated, unnecessary and duplicative regulatory language was eliminated from the ISBE rulebook. Amendments expand existing Section 1.510 to encompass all the needed material from Part 275 (Pupil Transportation), and a new Section 1.515 has been added to set forth the training requirements for individuals who train school bus drivers. Insertion of this material allows ISBE to repeal Part 275 in its entirety and include all district transportation-related requirements in one location. Another set of amendments was generally confined to Subparts B, C, D, and E of Part 1, which were modified to remove unnecessary references to requirements that are set out in statute or in other parts of ISBE’s rules. Much of the text of four existing Parts 50, 251, 253, and 625 is not needed in rules, because it either repeats statutory language or is couched as recommendations rather than requirements. Placing the necessary provisions that remained into Part 1 enabled the State Board to repeal Parts 50, 251, 253, and 625. (Completed; effective October 3, 2005.)

- **Evaluation of Tenured Teachers:** With the consolidation of Part 50 into Part 1, several important changes were made to the evaluation process of tenured teachers. A definition was developed for the term “substantive change” used in Section 24A-4 of the School Code (a substantive change necessitates submission of the evaluation plan to ISBE and the exclusive bargaining representatives). Part 50 had previously indicated, and ISBE had taken the position, that a substantive
change included a change in the identity of any administrator authorized to conduct evaluations. We no longer believe the change in identity of an administrator should require a filing with ISBE, and we eliminated this unnecessary regulatory burden. (Completed; effective June 30, 2005.)

- **State Accountability Framework:** Like it or not, most schools and almost all school districts are subject to the No Child Left Behind Act’s accountability provisions. This Part sets out the rules for our state’s accountability framework. We did not want our state rules to be pulling districts in a direction different than NCLB, or imposing requirements through the state accountability rules not derived from NCLB. The modifications to Part 1 brought consistency between the NCLB accountability workbook requirements and the state’s accountability framework. These rules cover a variety of topics, including:
  1. the requirement for adequate yearly progress and the indicators that will be considered;
  2. the targets for each aspect of performance;
  3. the subgroups of students, their participation in state-level assessments, and the treatment of their scores;
  4. academic early warning and academic watch status and the requirements for school and district improvement plans and restructuring plans;
  5. rewards and recognition; and
  6. the appeals process related to schools’ and districts’ status.

These modifications also reflect the revisions to the State’s NCLB accountability workbook obtained in recent months through negotiations with the U.S. Department of Education. In particular, ISBE was able to obtain additional flexibility in the areas of:
  1. Increasing the subgroup size from 40 to 45, with a 95% confidence interval;
  2. Recognizing a district as not having made AYP only when one or more of its underlying grade spans have not made AYP;
  3. Changing the definition of a full academic year to May 1; and
  4. Providing flexibility for performance scores for subgroups of students with disabilities.

(Completed; effective November 23, 2005.)

**Less Red Tape Case Study: School and District Improvement Plans**

The revisions to Part 1 eliminate unnecessary state-imposed requirements for improvement plans, allowing districts to create a plan targeted toward the development of better educational strategies. These rule changes are reflected in a new template for school and district improvement plans ISBE launched in the fall of 2005.

Previously, schools and districts were required to complete lengthy improvement plans that regularly exceeded 100 pages in length per school. Numerous lessredtare e-mails were received about the agency’s cumbersome improvement plan template and rubric. In districts where multiple schools were required to submit plans, school officials often submitted hundreds of pages of forms. Large unit districts with 10 or more schools in
improvement status literally submitted thousands of pages of school plans. Many of the “required items” in the plan were already collected by the state in other documents or not mandated by either state or federal law. The planning process was so paper-intensive that schools and districts received little in the way of timely or meaningful feedback from the state. Accordingly, time that State Board staff could spend providing upfront assistance to schools was spent monitoring paperwork compliance. More importantly, teachers and parents were not able to clearly identify the strategies to improve school and district performance amongst the reams of data.

School and district improvement plans are required by federal and state law; they are valuable to districts as a tool for increasing student achievement, but the process dictated by ISBE need not be as cumbersome as it was before. The rule changes and new improvement planning template generally limits the information schools and districts are required to provide to those items specified by law, and focuses on outlining actions that will be taken to improve student achievement. While use of the template will be voluntary, districts that choose to use it should find that it focuses the district efforts on strategies, not paper shuffling.

The planning templates for school and district improvement plans and school restructuring plans called Illinois e-Plans are available at the Interactive Illinois Report Card (IIRC) site http://iirc.niu.edu/. The e-Plans automatically populate multiple years of state assessment data and school information that ISBE collects. It also automatically customizes each template for schools and districts to focus on the areas of deficiency that caused it to be identified as not making Adequate Yearly Progress. It encourages districts to concentrate on activities that will increase student achievement by focusing on actions that directly engage students, professional development, and parental involvement. The template is user-friendly; moving through and completing the screens in the template is easy. For this reason, ISBE finds that schools and districts making adequate yearly progress are also using the e-Plans, in addition to those schools and districts affected by NCLB sanctions.

ISBE staff provides technical assistance to schools and districts while reviewing e-Plans even in draft form. Regional office service providers as well as Northern Illinois University, the host for e-Plans, have also been providing technical assistance for e-Plans. Paper and electronic resources are available at the ISBE home page and at IIRC. IIRC staff has been responsive to schools working with the templates and the templates have been enhanced since their fall debut. Districts may fulfill several planning requirements by submitting required information and completing only one template. For example, a district can comply with planning requirements under State law, Title I of NCLB (districts not making AYP), Title II of NCLB (districts seeking Ed Tech grants and e-Rate), and Title III of NCLB (districts not making annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs)). Previously, districts were required to submit a separate plan for each. The template under the Illinois e-Plans is not only more efficient, but is also allows districts to develop comprehensive plans that are more cohesive and more likely to improve student achievement. Furthermore, users may now save their work in pdf or Word formats which enables greater flexibility for customized plans.
Early feedback from users is very positive; users welcome the data that are included from IIRC and are appreciative that the e-Plans prompt what the law requires. The e-Plans are serving as an executive summary that focuses on the strategies and activities. What has been lost in bulk has not detracted from the quality of the content. Illinois e-Plans does not do the tough work of planning for Illinois schools and districts, but it certainly makes it easier for educators to do so and for them to share their plans with school boards, parents and community members, and ISBE.

ISBE will launch a significant upgrade to the district plan later this summer. The new district improvement plan template will integrate district improvement plan with technology plan requirements. Thus, districts can easily coordinate plans and resources, better focusing on student achievement needs. Districts wishing only to submit technology plans may select an e-Plan for this purpose unencumbered by other requirements.

PART 25 - CERTIFICATION

Part 25 lays out the certification requirements for new teachers, the professional development requirements for existing teachers, and the process for approving teacher preparation programs. These rules have been substantially revised to remove bureaucracy from the program approval process, eliminate unnecessary barriers to entry into educational fields, and remove red tape related to professional development requirements. With the clearance of the certification backlog and these rule revisions, ISBE is better able to address the certification-related needs of its constituents.

1. **General Streamlining**

   Numerous provisions that are outdated and/or have been replaced by new requirements have been deleted. Others are being updated so that they no longer refer to time periods that have passed. A number of provisions setting out essentially the same requirements have been consolidated for ease of reference. As a result, Part 25 will be much easier to navigate by our constituents. (Completed; effective October 3, 2005.)

2. **Program Approval**

   - **Co-chairing Requirement** (Section 25.125(d)): Deletes the requirement for ISBE team members and an ISBE co-chair on visits involving NCATE accreditation. At the same time, the role of the ISBE consultant was clarified, i.e., this individual does participate in the visit. (Completed; effective June 30, 2005.)
   - **Responses to STCB** (Section 25.160(a)): The procedure outlined in this section has proven to contain one unnecessary step. When the State Teacher Certification Board’s recommendation is for approval or accreditation that is not provisional or conditional, there is no need for the affected institution to submit a response and consequently no need for a 30-day waiting period before the recommendation is
forwarded to the State Board of Education. This was eliminated by revising subsection (a). (Completed; effective June 30, 2005.)

- **School Psychologists**: The requirement that each candidate for a school psychologist’s credential have completed a program accredited by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) was eliminated. Not all states require that their programs be accredited by this national body, and it became clear that it was counterproductive to eliminate all individuals from certain states from the available pool for Illinois certification. In addition, NASP accreditation is a fairly recent development, so the rule also eliminated many experienced school psychologists from eligibility in Illinois. An additional unintended consequence of the rule was to preclude the establishment of additional preparation programs in Illinois because of a “chicken-and-egg” dynamic: NASP requires data on graduates (i.e., a record of a program’s success) as a condition for accreditation, but a new program would not be able to produce graduates because Illinois candidates would have no incentive to complete a program that was not already accredited. (Completed; effective June 30, 2005.)

- **Duplication of Effort with NCATE**: State Superintendent Dunn established a task force to determine whether better continuity could occur between NCATE review process for accreditation and the State process. A comprehensive set of revisions was developed for this purpose and presented for initial review at the December 2005 Board meeting. (Completed; effective April 21, 2006.)

3. **Obtaining Endorsements or Certification**

- **Endorsing Teaching Certifications**: Section 25.100(a) was amended due to a change made by P.A. 93-679. Holders of master teaching certificates are now permitted to teach honors and Advanced Placement courses in the sciences or social sciences regardless of whether they hold the specific designations, as otherwise required. (Completed; January 4, 2005.)

- **Accessibility of special K-12 Certificates and Supervisory Endorsements**: Section 25.37 was amended to address the method by which certificates may be issued, making the special K-12 certificate available to certain teachers as a subsequent certificate via a streamlined procedure, helping to ease the problem of a shortage of teachers who are able to supervise other staff. Specifically, ISBE can reasonably facilitate secondary teachers’ access to supervisory endorsements by first enabling them to attain K-12 certification through this means. If they meet the additional requirements for supervision that are imposed by Section 21-4 of the School Code, then they would then be able to supervise other certified staff members. (Completed; effective July 28, 2005.)

- **Requirements for Teachers in the Middle Grades**: Section 25.100(k) was amended to eliminate a discrepancy in requirements that resulted from the comprehensive changes that took effect June 1, 2004, and makes uniform requirements across all grade levels for reading teachers and library information specialists. (Completed; effective July 28, 2005.)

- **Requirements for School Nurses Certification (Section 25.245)**: Rather than requiring these applicants to seek certification through Illinois approved
programs, the amendment allows for a simpler method relying upon the existing degree and licensure requirements, the completion of an out-of-state program or certificate, and the Illinois standards-based examination. Language was also added to the rule for certification of out-of-state applicants (Section 25.425), particularly to state requirements for those from states that do not require completion of approved programs for certification and those that do not certify persons for fields in which certification is required in Illinois. (Completed; effective July 28, 2005.)

- **Educational Interpreters** (Section 25.550): This new Section conveys the requirements developed under P.A. 90-200. Approval for sign language interpreters and cued speech interpreters will be available at the initial, standard, and master levels. Emergency approval will also be available. Each eligible applicant will be approved to reflect the level of educational attainment and interpreting skill that he or she has demonstrated. (Completed; effective July 28, 2005.)

- **Speech-language Pathologists**: The changes set forth revisions to Section 25.252 and add Section 25.255, both dealing with the certification of non-teaching speech-language pathologists in response to P.A. 93-1060. (Completed; effective October 3, 2005.)

- **Temporary Substitute Teaching Permit**: At a special meeting called in mid-September for this purpose, the Board put in place an emergency rule designed to provide the potential for employment to individuals displaced by Hurricane Katrina. An individual from one of the affected areas who provides one form of personal identification and a notarized written affirmation of having received a bachelor’s degree would be issued a temporary substitute teaching permit valid for the 2005-06 school year. (Possession of a bachelor’s degree is generally the required qualification for substitute teaching in Illinois.) While not a guarantee of employment, this permit at least created the potential for employment. A regular rule was promulgated to replace this emergency rule and took effect on January 26, 2006.

- **Director of Special Education**: At the September 2005 meeting, the Board agreed to propose a revision to the new requirements for directors and assistant directors of special education, in order to restore the availability of transcript review against a specific list of required coursework for this credential. This action responded to the needs of a large number of candidates then “in the pipeline” and to the shortage of standards-based preparation programs for this credential. (Completed; effective January 26, 2006.)

4. **Professional Development/Certificate Renewal**

- **Modifications Resulting from P.A. 93-679**: One set of amendments arose almost entirely from enactment of P.A. 93-679, which made significant changes in the requirements for renewal of teaching and administrative certificates, teachers’ movement from the initial to the standard certificate, and certification testing for out-of-state applicants. (Completed; effective January 4, 2005.)
• **Applications for Standard Certificates:** Section 25.11(f) was revised with respect to the definition of “four years of teaching experience” so that an individual who is approaching the end of the fourth year and who is expected to complete that year in his or her current position can apply for the standard certificate. As a result, standard certificate applications can be processed earlier than before, and a backlog of applications can be avoided. (Completed effective July 28, 2005.)

• **Requirements for Approved Providers of Continuing Professional Development Activities:** In Section 25.855, the State Board deleted the requirement that approved providers notify the State Board of Education in advance of the first offering of any new activity in the fields for which the providers are approved. This requirement proved cumbersome in that it resulted in a large volume of paperwork without any substantive value in terms of monitoring or quality of professional development activities. (Completed; effective July 28, 2005.)

• **Lapsed Certificates:** Section 25.450 unnecessarily restricted the timeframe within which individuals serving on reinstated certificates must complete the statutorily required five semester hours of college credit. As previously written, five semester hours of coursework had to be completed during a teacher’s one-year period of reinstatement. As a result, teachers seeking to reenter the field would receive no credit for any coursework they had completed prior to completing ISBE’s reinstatement paperwork. Under the amended rules, teachers with lapsed certificates can meet the statutory requirement for five semester hours of college credit through coursework completed either during the year of reinstatement or during the five years immediately preceding reinstatement. (Completed; effective July 28, 2005.)

**PART 51 AND PART 52 - DISMISSAL OF TENURED TEACHERS; DISMISSAL OF TENURED TEACHERS AND CIVIL SERVICES EMPLOYEES UNDER ARTICLE 34**

The State Board has consolidated these two parts. Where required by the School Code, distinctions have been made within the rules to accommodate differences between the processes for the City of Chicago and for districts outside of the City of Chicago. This new version does not include requirements that are sufficiently specified by statute, so that districts, teachers and other constituents will no longer need to review both the statute and rules to determine where differences occur.

Due to “conflict of interest concerns,” the old rules provided that hearing officers involved in teacher dismissal hearings not be residents of the district in question. However, while the law is silent on Chicago, State Board rules applied the law to Chicago Public Schools (CPS). As a consequence, a hearing officer who lives one block south of Howard in Rogers Park could not hear a case in Bridgeport, whereas an officer who lives one block north could. The State Board eliminated the rule prohibiting a hearing officer used in a CPS teacher dismissal hearing from being a resident of Chicago. Elimination of that particular criterion will make it easier for CPS to obtain hearing officers when it conducts teacher dismissal hearings. Unfortunately, because of the
specific parameters of the law, we were not able to extend this rule revision to any other districts in Illinois. (Completed; effective June 30, 2005.)

**PART 110 – PROGRAM ACCOUNTING MANUAL**

Revisions to the Program Accounting Manual will eliminate outdated numbering and any unnecessary level of detail. The goal is to ensure that the chart of accounts will cover current requirements while at the same time being flexible enough to respond to future changes. In addition, the existing requirements for audits of the regional offices of education will be eliminated in response to P.A. 92-544, which transferred that responsibility to the Auditor General. Now that the Auditor General has promulgated rules to cover this function, ISBE’s obsolete provisions can be repealed. (Proposed rules expected in fall of 2006.)

**PART 120 – PUPIL TRANSPORTATION REIMBURSEMENT**

In addition to streamlining and general technical updating, the amendments adopted by the State Board include elimination of the requirement in Section 120.110 for the “Resident Pupils Transported Work Sheet”. The depreciation threshold of $1,000 stated in Section 120.115(d)(1)(A) also was changed to $2,500 to be consistent with a related provision in existing language found in Section 120.60(e). (Completed; effective July 28, 2005.)

**PART 130 – DETERMINING SPECIAL EDUCATION PER CAPITA TUITION CHARGE**

At its April 2006 meeting, the Board reviewed a set of revisions to this Part chiefly designed to simplify and clarify the language that also included various technical updates in statutory citations and rule-related style. One noteworthy policy change was also presented. In Section 130.10, a “program” will now be defined in a way that focuses on subsets of services that are designated by local agencies as meeting the common needs of an identified group of students. For purposes of state reimbursement but not for purposes of inter-district billing, this will mean that local agencies will generally be precluded from combining all their costs related to special education and terming that entire combination one “program”. The result of this change is that reimbursement for students who are not extraordinarily expensive to serve will no longer be potentially inflated by the cost of students who are very expensive to serve.

This revision more accurately reflects the costs of educating a child with special needs. Other changes that were included in this packet provide greater flexibility in allocating costs for social work, psychological services, and speech pathology and audiology services by dividing those costs only by the number of special education pupils rather than by the number in the entire student population. Similarly, changes in subsections (g) and (h) will permit division of the cost for all special education administrative services by the number of special education pupils rather than by the total number. (The public comment period ended June 19, 2006.)
PART 145 - TEMPORARY RELOCATION EXPENSES

These rules were amended to simplify the process for repaying loan funds to the State Board. Instead of requiring that districts submit to ISBE the proceeds of tax payments related to these expenses within 30 days after the proceeds are received (potentially requiring 12 payments per year), each affected district can make one payment annually, consisting of all proceeds received to that point. (Completed; effective June 30, 2005.)

PART 155 - ELECTRONIC TRANSFER OF FUNDS

In addition to general technical updating, the revisions include elimination of the option for certain participants to designate multiple bank accounts for the receipt of electronically transmitted funds. (Completed; effective June 30, 2005.)

PART 180 - HEALTH/LIFE SAFETY CODE FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

These rules have been updated to incorporate by reference the current edition of the International Building Code instead of the 1996 BOCA Code. The rules specify that fire prevention and safety financing can be used to pay for automated external defibrillators. The rules were also streamlined to eliminate unnecessary requirements or those that are adequately covered by statute or applicable standards, such as:

- Eliminates requirement for the district facility inventory.
- Allows a district to delegate authority to seek variances to an individual (i.e., district administrator or architect).
- Allows multiple variances to be submitted on the same application.
- Eliminates ISBE-specified scaling and format requirements for specifications.
- Deletes a separate certification requirement for sprinkler systems.
- Deletes sketch map requirements for the safety survey report and requests for authorizations for use of fire prevention and safety funds.

(Completed; effective October 3, 2005.)

PARTS 201 AND 202 - SUPPLEMENTAL GENERAL STATE AID PLANNING REQUIREMENTS

These rules have been revised to link the SGSA planning process for downstate districts to the district improvement planning process, thereby eliminating a duplicative planning requirement. The SGSA planning process for Chicago Public Schools is prescribed by statute. However, the rules have been substantially revised to bring this process in line with current practice.

(Both these Parts were repealed and replaced by a new Part 203, effective February 28, 2006.)

PART 226 - SPECIAL EDUCATION

These rules have been substantially reworked to address IDEA reauthorization and eliminate any unnecessary state-imposed burdens. (The set of amendments originally proposed after the January 2006 Board meeting was withdrawn and revised with respect
to the class size requirement. The new version was published in the Illinois Register after the February meeting; the public comment period will end September 15, 2006.)

PART 228 – TRANSITIONAL BILINGUAL EDUCATION

The rules for Transitional Bilingual Education are being comprehensively updated and reorganized to eliminate redundancy. Amendments are also being made to require the use of ACCESS as the annual examination of English language proficiency, with the ACCESS “screener” used as the instrument for determining students’ eligibility for and placement into bilingual education upon entry into a district. Recent statutory changes regarding dates for the submission of reports will also be reflected.

(Initial board review occurred in April 2006; the public comment period will end June 19, 2006.)

PART 235 – PRESCHOOL EDUCATIONAL AND COORDINATED MODEL PRESCHOOL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Part 235 was comprehensively revised to address 2005 statutory changes and the current administration of the program.

(Completed; effective February 28, 2006.)

PART 252 - DRIVER EDUCATION

Part 252 has been streamlined to eliminate unnecessary requirements and definitions, matters adequately covered by statute, and some duplicate statements. In addition, Section 252.20 was reorganized to clarify certain points having to do with the obligation of school districts to offer driver education to all eligible students, and Section 252.40 was revised to account for the time actually needed for a driver’s license to be restored to good standing.

As part of the rules review, the agency also reviewed the need for a form we required from districts detailing driver’s ed expenses in order to obtain reimbursement. The law limits reimbursement to the per-pupil amount determined by appropriation or the amount of actual expenditures for the driver ed program. Last year, there were only three districts whose accountants indicated driver ed program expenses did not exceed the per-pupil allocation amount set by appropriation. As a result, the agency sought a statutory change to eliminate this unnecessary reporting requirement. With the enactment of Public Act 94-0440, districts no longer have to submit a detailed breakdown of program costs when virtually all districts are reimbursed based upon the appropriation level.

(Completed; effective October 3, 2005.)

PART 254 – VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

New rules to be titled “Career and Technical Education”: Rules and Waivers, Legal and Career Development and Preparation staff are in the process of updating Part 254. The
Vocational Education rules are outdated and can be substantially streamlined to reflect current program requirements and administration.
(Initial board review anticipated in September 2006.)

**PART 260 - READING IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

The amendments streamline the operation of the program and eliminate language that is not needed. New language in Section 260.55(i) provides for a preliminary, less formal avenue of review when districts may be facing ineligibility. Another change provides additional districts with another method of establishing continuing eligibility for funding. Since districts would be able to rely on the ISAT reading scores of the students served in this program as their method for demonstrating performance progress if they so chose, staff believed it was reasonable for ISBE to rely on the ISAT in instances where the results on a locally chosen method (other than the ISAT) would make a district ineligible for continued funding. The recent expansion of the State reading assessment into additional grades will make information on more students’ performance available, and staff in the Curriculum and Instruction Division have indicated that the Student Information System will permit tracking of students’ scores for this purpose. A provision has been inserted into the rules so that this alternate method of establishing continued eligibility for funding can be used. Finally, we have replaced the word “form” with “format” to denote the movement of this grant process to the e-grants system (thereby saving districts from dealing with a significant amount of paperwork for applications and reporting).
(Emergency amendment to change the reporting deadline effective June 20, 2005. Regular rulemaking completed; effective November 29, 2005.)

**PART 350 - SECULAR TEXTBOOK LOAN**

The State Board’s rules previously indicated that parents must sign for permission in order for their children to receive free textbooks (provided through the State Board’s loan program) used in classroom instruction. The statute allows either a student or parent to request permission, and does not dictate the form of request. Accordingly, the State Board revised its rules to eliminate reference to a specific form, and allow districts to develop their own procedures for collecting textbook requests.

In addition, we heard from numerous superintendents that because of a proposal to move the deadline for textbook loan request applications to December 15, 2004, many districts were unable to order new editions of textbooks for their students. The State Board decided that a more reasonable deadline for districts to submit their textbook loan applications is March 15, 2005. Pushing back the deadline is better for districts, because it allows them to work throughout the first semester to prepare a textbook recommendation for their school boards. With a December deadline, districts would be forced to purchase outdated textbook editions, or use textbook loan dollars on supplemental materials until they could get board adoption of their requests. They would then have to use their own money on new editions of textbooks. The revised deadline also
meets the State Board’s needs, as it gives the agency sufficient time to get the textbooks out to the districts before the end of the school year.  
(Completed; effective June 30, 2005.)

**PART 375 - STUDENT RECORDS**

Amendments were made due to the changes in Section 2-3.13a of the School Code that were made by P.A. 93-859, effective January 1, 2005. The amended rules help to implement the following changes:

- requires the State Board of Education to establish by rule a system for tracking transfer students;
- requires a school or district to count a student who has withdrawn from that school or district as a dropout for purposes of its annual dropout calculation if the school or district does not receive documentation that the student has enrolled in another school within 150 days after the student withdraws; and
- allows a request for student records (academic transcripts or medical records) to be used as documentation of student enrollment.

(Completed; effective March 29, 2005.)

**PART 401 – NONPUBLIC SPECIAL EDUCATION FACILITIES**

A comprehensive set of amendments was developed to streamline these rules as much as possible and update them where needed. (Completed; effective April 25, 2006.)

**PART 475 AND PART 480 - CONTESTED CASES AND OTHER FORMAL HEARINGS; HEARINGS BEFORE THE STATE TEACHER CERTIFICATION BOARD**

The State Board combined these two Parts and repealed Part 480. With this consolidation, ISBE no longer requires staff and outside attorneys to follow separate rules for similar hearing processes. Part 475 will now require evidentiary hearings that are under the jurisdiction of the State Teacher Certification Board (STCB) to be conducted by a hearing officer in accordance with the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act, unless the STCB specifically elects not to appoint a hearing officer. A hearing can be held in the presence of the entire certification board or independent of it. The STCB will make the final decision. Other changes affect timeframes for notices and responses in order to give the parties more time to prepare their material. The language of the rules is generally being brought into conformance with current rulemaking style.  
(Completed; effective June 30, 2005.)

**PART 525 - REGIONAL OFFICES OF EDUCATION AND INTERMEDIATE SERVICES**

Legal and program staff are in the process of reviewing Part 525 to identify any necessary revisions.

**PART 1100 - PROCUREMENT BY THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**
Part 1100 has been repealed, and a new Part 1105 has replaced it. ISBE’s previous procurement rules mirrored the Standard Procurement Rules promulgated by the Department of Central Management Services. The State Board has repealed this duplicative regulatory language, and will now rely almost entirely on the rules of the Department of Central Management Services. ISBE did, however, retain its independent procurement authority.
(Completed; effective October 19, 2005.)

PART 5001 - ACCESS TO INFORMATION OF THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION UNDER THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT

These rules were amended to eliminate unnecessary language otherwise found in statute.
(Completed; effective June 2, 2005.)

REPEAL OF INACTIVE AND UNNECESSARY RULES

A. Inactive Rules

The State Board repealed nine Parts and two subparts of the agency’s rules related to programs that had not been funded for some time or were otherwise not current. It was determined that keeping these on the books was a disservice to districts, in that it made it more difficult to determine what programs we have in place to serve our constituents.

The repeal of these inactive rules was adopted by the State Board in August, and is complete, effective October 31, 2005. At the same time, a new Part 500 (Replacement of Required Rules) was placed into effect to acknowledge the remaining statutory provisions related to these rules.

1. Staff Development Plans and Programs (23 Illinois Administrative Code 30)
2. Insurance for Certificated Employees (23 Illinois Administrative Code 56)
3. Professional Development Block Grant (23 Illinois Administrative Code 160)
4. Scientific Literacy (23 Illinois Administrative Code 220)
5. Alcohol and Drug Education Initiative (23 Illinois Administrative Code 225)
6. Summer School for Remedial Education (23 Illinois Administrative Code 230)
7. Alternative Learning Opportunities Program (23 Illinois Administrative Code 240, Subpart B)
8. Urban Education Partnership Program (23 Illinois Administrative Code 245)
9. Comprehensive Arts Program (23 Illinois Administrative Code 250)
10. Mathematics and Science Loan Program (23 Illinois Administrative Code 360)
11. School Technology Program (23 Illinois Administrative Code 575, Subpart A)

B. Unnecessary Rules

As part of the streamlining process, the agency identified a number of Parts that could be consolidated with other Parts to avoid duplication and to allow our constituents to find information about similar topics in one location. The following Parts were eliminated for these reasons:
2. Disadvantaged Students Funds Plan – Districts Between 1,000 and 50,000 ADA (23 Illinois Administrative Code 201): Necessary information consolidated into new Part 203.
SECTION 2 – CHANGES TO AGENCY PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES

The lessredtape@isbe.net email address has generated numerous suggestions for commonsense changes to the agency’s policies and procedures. These changes are described below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lessredtape Suggestion</th>
<th>Agency Response</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include item analysis for students taking the Prairie State Achievement Examination (PSAE), which includes the ACT.</td>
<td>Agency staff are working with ACT to produce more detailed data reports for schools and students. While a item analysis will not be provided, staff will continue to work with ACT to make this possible in the future.</td>
<td>Progressing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide testing accommodations for students who are home-bound.</td>
<td>Assessment procedures were changed beginning with the 2005 test administration to allow school districts to exclude students who are receiving home-bound instruction on a case-by-case basis.</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarify the meaning of “Percent Tested” when reporting ACT participation results.</td>
<td>Beginning with the 2006 school report card, school districts will no longer be required to report the participation rate as all students in grade 11 are required to take the PSAE in accordance with Section 2-3.64 of the School Code (105 ILCS 5/2-3.64) as a condition of receiving a regular high school diploma.</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| <strong>Data Systems</strong>       |                 |        |
| Have the State Board pull data needed for various purposes from a centralized system rather than having districts submit the data multiple times and allow districts access to same for reporting purposes. | The Student Information System is in place. A contractor has conducted a feasibility study and functional analysis to determine what is needed in order for the State Board of Education to put in place an integrated data system. The contractor completed the study in March, and its findings and recommendations were shared with upper management on May 8, 2006. Numerous policy and financial issues must be resolved before moving forward on the data warehouse initiative. | Progressing. |
| Improve IWAS to:       |                 |        |
| 1. List due dates.     |                 |        |
| 1. A due date link was added to the IWAS System Listing page allowing users to view deadlines for each application. Due dates for reports, public comment on rulemaking, applications and proposals, waiver requests etc., are included in the Superintendent’s Weekly Message. | February 2006 (IWAS). |
| A new column is planned to be added to the Due Dates web page displaying individual current statuses for each application for which a district has | December 12, 2005 (Supt.’s Messages). |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lessredtape Suggestion</th>
<th>Agency Response</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signed up. Issues to be resolved for phase II of this improvement include:  - Addressing web applications with multiple due dates;  - Addressing web applications with overlapping due dates, such as submissions from a previous year; and  - Completing work to change not only IWAS but other systems used to store the requisite data.</td>
<td>Progressing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Send reminders, but only to those that are not complete.</td>
<td>2. Automatic reminders are now in place for 17 different reporting and funding plans, including for all all four of the systems mentioned in the lessredtape submission.</td>
<td>Ongoing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Include the Public School Update (form 60-63).</td>
<td>3. This form is used by school districts to update information about the district and its schools (e.g., names of district and schools, addresses, telephone numbers, superintendent, principals). Given the enormity of the task, it has been delayed at this time.</td>
<td>On hold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merge the Online Teacher Information System (OTIS) and the Certification Renewal Tracking System (CeRTS) into a single system, Educator Certification System.</td>
<td>It is anticipated that later this year the Educator Certification System (ECS) will be placed online to replace OTIS and CeRTS. Educators will be able to use the system to both submit professional development activities for certificate renewal purposes and to access their certification files in order to update addresses, apply for subsequent certificates or endorsements, pay fees, etc.</td>
<td>Progressing; expected to be implemented September 1, 2006, which is the starting date for the next certificate renewal cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the Electronic Grants Management System (e-GMS) to: 1. Add Learning Technology</td>
<td>Lack of resources has prevented the agency from moving forward on this request.</td>
<td>No action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lessredtape</strong></td>
<td><strong>Agency Response</strong></td>
<td><strong>Status</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Center budgets.</strong></td>
<td>Staff have worked with the contractor to determine whether this can be done. Given that the application itself changes from year to year, the system as designed cannot accommodate this change.</td>
<td>No action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Copy data from one year to the next in NCLB application.</strong></td>
<td>The continuation grant for the Early Childhood Block Grant and the Rural and Low Income grant under the federal Rural Education Assistance Program (REAP) were added for the FY 2006 funding cycle. Added for FY 2006 funding cycle.</td>
<td>Complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Add other program applications.</strong></td>
<td>Added for FY 2006 funding cycle.</td>
<td>Complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Add Reading Improvement Block Grant program.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**District Planning Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Suggestion</strong></th>
<th><strong>Agency Response</strong></th>
<th><strong>Status</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simplify the School Improvement Planning process and use that document for several planning initiatives.</td>
<td>The Illinois e-Plans is an electronic system that contains templates for both the school and district improvement plans; these plans automatically populate the template with school and district data already stored in ISBE systems, such as assessment results and demographic data. See the Less Red Tape Case Study under Section I for further details on e-Plans.</td>
<td>Completed November 9, 2005.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Forms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Suggestion</strong></th>
<th><strong>Agency Response</strong></th>
<th><strong>Status</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assist school districts by participating in the Illinois Department of Labor’s online form project.</td>
<td>Staff in the Career Development and Preparation Division are working with the Department of Labor to determine whether its system will be a good fit for school districts and others.</td>
<td>Progressing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alert Regional Superintendents of Schools when certification-related forms have been updated without having to access each form individually.</td>
<td>The Certification website listing all forms has been changed to include in parenthetical the date that the form was last changed so that Regional Superintendents can compare the dates on paper copies of the forms with the website; see <a href="http://www.isbe.net/certification/html/forms.htm">http://www.isbe.net/certification/html/forms.htm</a>.</td>
<td>Completed May 22, 2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicate on the</td>
<td>A disclaimer was added by the forms stating: “The</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestion</td>
<td>Agency Response</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>website that the assurances statement for certification cannot be submitted electronically.</td>
<td>following are downloadable paper forms. To submit Assurance Statements online, use CeRTS.”</td>
<td>August 2005.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not use color graphs in the school report card, as they do not copy well.</td>
<td>The agency is using the most current Crystal Report software available, which should resolve problems with unclear images.</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reporting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not request information about suspensions and expulsions on both the NCLB end-of-the-year report and the performance report.</td>
<td>For the FY 2006 reporting cycle, only the end-of-the-year report will collect data regarding suspensions and expulsions.</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 3 – DESCRIPTION OF SB 2829

SB 2829 arose out of suggestions obtained through the lessredtape@isbe.net email address and ideas generated the administrative rules review process. The bill reflects more than four months of discussions and negotiations with the management alliance, regional superintendents, teachers’ unions and other interested constituents.

The specific components of SB 2829 are described below.

- **School/District Improvement Plans:** School districts across Illinois are struggling to comply with the federal mandates set out in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). SB 2829 eliminates several state-imposed planning burdens and allows ISBE to better support districts’ efforts to implement NCLB. It also eliminates duplicative requirements associated with the school and district improvement planning processes. Specifically, SB 2829:
  
  o Removes the requirement for a district restructuring plan. This is not derived from NCLB, and therefore adds an unnecessary planning process for local districts that does not align with the NCLB framework. (Revisions to Section 2-3.25d(b) of the School Code.)

  o Eliminates school and district improvement panels. The process for appointing these panels by the State Superintendent has created unnecessary bureaucracy and paperwork for both school districts and ISBE. SB 2829 requires districts to collaborate with parents, staff, and outside experts during the development of plans (consistent with NCLB requirements). With more flexibility at the local level, districts can get outside input with less bureaucracy and more focus on improving the quality of education in schools and districts. (Repeal of Section 2-3.25e of the School Code.)

  o Removes the requirement that the State Superintendent approve school and district improvement plans. The State Board’s current scoring and approval of the plans doesn’t provide meaningful feedback to districts and comes too late in the improvement plan process to assist the district with the development of improvement strategies. Also, the State Board believes school districts are in the best position to decide what improvement strategies are best for them. This revision will provide State Board staff with additional time to provide more technical assistance in the development of improvement plans (the main obligation of a state with respect to improvement plans under NCLB). The State Board will continue to monitor plans to ensure they contain all the necessary legal requirements. (Revisions to Section 2-3.25d(a) and (b) of the School Code.)

  o Eliminates other redundant and unnecessary planning requirements. With NCLB’s focus on improvement plans to address adequate yearly progress, many of the other planning requirements in the School Code have become redundant and unnecessary exercises that don’t contribute to the development of effective
improvement strategies. (Revisions to the following Sections of the School Code: Section 2-3.59, Section 2-3.63, Section 2-3.64, and Section 27-1.)

- **Reporting, Fiscal and Administrative Requirements.** The state should not mandate reporting from school districts and teachers unless the benefits of receiving the information outweigh the burdens on districts to provide it. Some statutory reporting requirements fail this test. A number of other statutory requirements can be revised to reduce the administrative and financial burdens on school districts associated with administering building code requirements, obtaining waivers and modifications of School Code mandates, publishing financial information in newspapers, and obtaining criminal background checks, including:

  o Administration of the Health/Life/Safety Code. SB 2829 eliminates the requirements for obtaining “extensions of time” under Section 2-3.12 for completing projects identified in a district’s 10-year health/life/safety survey. “Extensions of time” are burdensome and unnecessary paperwork for school districts and regional superintendents. Regional superintendents have other tools that don’t involve a mere shuffling of paper, including the right to order repairs under Section 3-14.21(b) of the School Code, to make sure necessary repairs are accomplished. (Revisions to Section 2-3.12 of the School Code (all other revisions to this Section simply delete obsolete language or provide numbering and lettering for reference).)

  o Waivers and Modifications of the School Code. SB 2829 eliminates the requirement that a public hearing for waivers and modifications occur on a date other than the regularly scheduled board meeting. Instead, districts must only allow a time for public testimony separate from the regular period for public comment. Waivers of physical education must still have a hearing on a separate day. (Revisions to Section 2-3.25g of the School Code.)

  o Publication of Statement of Affairs. School districts pay thousands of dollars to publish a statement of affairs in a local newspaper as required by Section 10-17 of the School Code. SB 2829 reduces the length of the required notice to save districts money. The publication requirements in SB 2829 are adapted from the requirements for municipalities found in the Municipal Code. (Revisions to Section 10-17 of the School Code.)

  o Criminal Background Checks. SB 2829 allows part-time employees and substitutes to use a background check at any regional superintendent’s office for employment at any Illinois school district, regardless of whether the school district is within the regional superintendent’s educational service region. Currently, part-time employees and substitutes have to obtain multiple duplicative background checks if they work in several regions. (Revisions to the following Sections of the School Code: Section 10-21.9 and Section 34-18.5.)
o District Transportation Claim Date. These new dates will give districts additional
time and mirror the current transmission dates for other similar programs. The
approval by the Regional Superintendent has proven to be an unnecessary
bureaucratic step. With the advent of filing claims electronically, ISBE’s claim
system automatically provides for many edits that appeared in paper claims of the
past. (Revisions to Section 29-5 of the School Code.)

o Latch Key Reporting. Obtaining information for the latch key report is a burden
for local districts and teachers, and ISBE is not aware of any significant use of
this information. SB 2829 eliminates this requirement from the School Code.
(Repeal of Section 2-3.11b of the School Code.)

With the Governor’s signature, the “Less Red Tape” bill takes effect on July 1, 2006.