Ad Hoc Rules Committee of the Whole
Wednesday, November 16, 2005
1:30 p.m.
(This meeting will begin at the conclusion of the previous session.)

Executive Board Room
222 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Suite 400
Chicago, Illinois

Public Conference Call Access Number: 1-866-297-6391 (listen only)
Confirmation # 1 3 1 8 3 3 1

AGENDA

1. Public Participation

2. Minutes of the October Ad Hoc Rules Committee of the Whole Meeting (p. 2)

* 3. Discussion of Rules for Initial Review
   a) Part 401 (Nonpublic Special Education Facilities) (pp. 10-35 Plenary Packet)

4. “Common Rules” for PA 94-0600 School Safety Drills (pp. 3-13)

5. Informational Update: Less Red Tape (pp. 14-21)

6. Additional issues

7. Adjourn

* Items listed with an asterisk (*) will be discussed in committee and action may be taken in the plenary session.
Committee Members Present  |  Board Members Absent  |  Others
--- | --- | ---
Jesse Ruiz  |  Andrea Brown  |  Randy Dunn
Dean Clark  |  Brenda Holmes  |  Jon Furr
Ed Geppert  |   |  Cynthia Zumwalt
dave Fields  |  |  
vinni Hall  |  |  
Joyce Karon  |  |  
Chris Ward  |  |  

1. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:** Jonathan Furr asked if there was anyone that wished to speak to the committee for public participation. No one came forward.

2. **MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER AD HOC RULES COMMITTEE MEETING.**

The September minutes were unanimously approved.

2. **DISCUSSION OF RULES FOR INITIAL REVIEW:**

**Part 235 (Preschool Educational and Coordinated Model Preschool Education Programs)**
Jonathan Furr discussed the proposed revisions to Part 235. Article 1C of the School Code establishes the Early Childhood Block Grant, to be comprised of three existing programs: preschool education, prevention initiative and parental training programs. Funds for these programs are to be awarded on a competitive basis to eligible entities, and the basis for application and award are to be included in administrative rules.

Existing Part 235, however, only sets forth requirements for one of the programs (preschool program for at-risk children ages 3 to 5 years old). Therefore, a new Part 235 is being proposed to address the block grant program, and the existing part is proposed for repeal.

Jonathan Furr discussed several comments received during the preliminary external review period for the rules. A commenter asked that the limit of 5 percent for administrative expenses be increased. As the agency wants to ensure that limited funds are directed towards program expenses, staff did not recommend establishing a higher limit. However, a provision is made for unique and unusual circumstances when a particular proposal may need to budget more than five percent in administrative expenses to serve a specific need for the program.

The rules clarify that fees cannot be charged for participation in early childhood block grant programs. Several commenters recommended adding additional program requirements. Staff accepted two of these recommendations to include a requirement for a snack (for half-day programs) and a meal (for full-day programs), and requirements related to transition services. Staff did not deem it appropriate to impose certain classroom configurations or activities, or recommend particular instructional models.

4. **INFORMATIONAL UPDATE: LESS RED TAPE**
Jonathan Furr informed the Board that the agency continues to respond to comments received through the lessredtape e-mail address.

5. **ADDITIONAL ISSUES**
No additional issues were discussed.

6. **ADJOURN**
The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Dr. Randy J. Dunn, State Superintendent of Education
       Linda Mitchell-Riley, CFO

Agenda Topic: “Common Rules” for PA 94-0600 School Safety Drills

Materials: Draft Rules

Staff Contact(s): Debby Vespa
                 Susan Weitekamp

Purpose of Agenda Item
Inform the Ad Hoc Rules Committee of ISBE’s requirement to adopt “common rules” regarding school safety drills.

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

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
Informational only

Background Information
HB 2693 was signed and became PA 94-0600 that requires the State Board of Education and the Office of the State Fire Marshal (OSFM) to adopt “common” rules with regard to required school safety drills and school district requirements to annual review their school safety plan. ISBE and OSFM have been meeting for several months with the Illinois Terrorist Task Force (ITTF) to draft said rules and regulations. The target date for completion is March 2006 so district boards can establish their designee(s) to review their school safety plan over the summer.

Analysis and Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action and Communications
This law requires ISBE and OSFM to adopt common rules that will require school districts to report to their regional superintendent that they have complied with the law and have hosted the minimum number of school safety drills as well as informed the necessary first responders and reviewed their school safety plans. The regional office of education is to forward documentation to ISBE stating such has occurred for their respective districts. The private schools are to report to the Office of the State Fire Marshal.

Policy Implications: Requires rules of ISBE and the OSFM and school districts to follow said rules.
Budget Implications: ISBE will incur communication and training cost required to inform school district personnel. School districts will be required to review their safety plans and perform required drills.

Legislative Action: The rules will have to be submitted to JCAR

Communication: Once the rules have been finalized, communication will be required to school districts informing them of their new requirements.

**Pros and Cons of Various Actions**

This is mandated by law

**Superintendent’s Recommendation**

No recommendation needed at this time.

I recommend that the following motion be adopted:

No motion required at this time

**Next Steps**

ISBE and OSFM anticipate one more meeting with the ITTF to finalize the rules. They will then be presented to the Board for formal adoption to forward to JCAR.
PART 1500
SCHOOL EMERGENCY AND CRISIS RESPONSE PLANS

Section 1500.10 Purpose
This Part establishes the requirements for the annual review and updating of the protocols and procedures in each school’s emergency and crisis response plan that is required by Section 25 of the School Safety Drill Act [___ ILCS 85], including the review of each school’s compliance with the school safety drill requirements established in Section 15 of the Act [___ ILCS 85-15].

Section 1500.20 Annual Review of Emergency and Crisis Response Plans
Each annual review shall be conducted by the participants identified in Section 25 of the Act [___ ILCS 85-25] and shall encompass the components of the plan enumerated in this Section. The report submitted pursuant to Section 25 of the Act shall indicate whether each component listed in this Section is present and up to date and shall describe the revisions, if any, that are needed in each. If any component is deemed inapplicable by the review participants, the report shall include the rationale for this determination.

a) Overview of Planned Responses
1) The description of the responses planned (i.e., what should happen, when, and at whose direction) to address various emergencies or crises, including:

A) school evacuation responses planned for situations in which conditions outside of a school building are safer than inside, such as fire, discovery of suspicious items, or incidents involving hazardous materials;

B) bus evacuation responses planned for situations when conditions outside of a school bus are safer than inside, such as fire, discovery of suspicious items, or incidents involving hazardous materials;

C) severe weather and shelter-in-place responses planned for situations when conditions inside a school building are safer than outside, such as severe weather, the release of hazardous materials, or the threat of mass destruction; and

D) law enforcement responses planned for situations when conditions inside a school building are safer than outside and the involvement of law enforcement personnel is called for, such as shooting incidents, bomb threats, or the presence of suspicious persons.

2) The definition and assignment of roles and responsibilities, with specific reference to the chain of command, designated back-up for each role, and other critical functions including:

A) responsibilities of individuals who discover an emergency or crisis;

B) response leadership;

C) monitors who will ensure the proper execution of the planned response;

D) responsibility for communicating with first responders, building occupants, families, representatives of the media, and other members of the community;
E) responsibility for maintaining any emergency-related records.

3) The inventory of resources that are available when responding to emergencies, including:
   A) emergency contact lists;
   B) methods for accounting for the whereabouts and status of all children and the process established for releasing students into the care of their parents and others;
   C) response guidance material and the method of providing it to students and staff, including support personnel such as bus drivers, secretaries, and custodians;
   D) emergency supplies and equipment (such as first aid kits, food, water, emergency lighting, fuel, battery-operated radio, and walkie-talkies), maintained for students and staff to use during an emergency or crisis; and
   E) information that exists about the school, such as hazard analyses, area maps, site plans, safety reference plans (see 23 Ill. Adm. Code 180.120), community agreements, etc.

b) Training and preparedness: The description of actions taken to ensure that all administrators, staff, and students understand the warning signals and know what to do in an emergency, including but not limited to the objectives and results of the types of school safety drills conducted in conformance with Sections 15 and 20 of the Act, including:

1) school evacuation drills;
2) bus evacuation drills;
3) severe weather shelter-in-place drills; and
4) law enforcement drills, if any.

Draft
Section 1500.30 Number of Drills, Duties of the Administration, Drill Objectives.

a) Number of Drills. There shall be the number and type of School Safety Drills as specified in Section 15 and 20 of the Act.

b) Duties of the Administration. The Administration of every school shall conduct the required number of School Safety Drills as specified in the Act and shall adopt a School Safety Emergency Plan to guide the actions taken by students and staff during a drill and an actual emergency. Among the Duties of the Administrator are the following:

1) Assign a designee to conduct School Safety drills in the absence of the Administrator. The person so designated shall follow the procedure outlined by the School Emergency Crisis and Response Plan for the particular situation being exercised.

2) Instruct all school personnel regarding School Safety Drill procedures at the beginning of each school year and at the beginning of summer classes. Each staff member shall be furnished a copy of these rules The School Emergency Crisis and Response Plan and such other documentation as shall be considered necessary.

3) Assign personnel to inspect all exit facilities daily while school is in session to ascertain all are in proper condition. All exit doors in the school building are unlocked for the purpose of egress during occupancy of the school and that they are equipped with panic bars. Additionally, personnel should ensure that all exit doors, escapes and stairs in the school are always kept free and clear from all obstructions, snow and ice, and are otherwise free from hazard.

c) The Administration of each school shall ensure that School Safety Drills are conducted in accordance with the following regulations:

d) EVACUATION DRILLS SHALL BE DESIGNED TO PRACTICE THE SCHOOL’S ABILITY TO:

1) Put the appropriate section or sections of the School Emergency Crisis and Response Plan into effect in circumstances which require evacuation of the entire building or only a portion of the building.

Draft
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2) Instruct teachers, students and school employees that anyone who discovers fire or smells smoke or gas shall sound the local fire alarm without seeking permission from school authorities.

3) Instruct personnel in the use of the telephone, the location of night telephone or night switchboard hookup, and post in a conspicuous place on or near all telephones, the appropriate sequence required to dial 911 (i.e. 9-911).

4) Appoint monitors to assist in the proper execution of all evacuation drills and provide for permanent alternates for each assignment to adult personnel in case of absences.

5) Ensure that all students, staff and others in the building evacuate immediately upon hearing an evacuation alarm or upon being instructed to do so bypassing the affected area. Ensure that as each staff, teacher or administrative employee is evacuating, they should be instructed to check their area along the path of evacuation to determine that everyone has been notified of the evacuation order and is complying.

6) Assign Administration or Senior Staff employees to meet the first responders, inform the first responders of the nature of the incident, directly inform the first responders of the evacuation progress, and direct first responders to the location of the emergency.

7) Conduct drills in the manner which would expect to be followed in the event of an actual emergency including situations with an exit or stairway blocked off and an alternate exit or stairway used following the School Safety Emergency Plan.

8) Provide help by a pre-arranged plan for impaired students or staff in evacuating the building. Instruct students when the evacuation signal is sounded to form a line quickly, quietly and in an orderly manner. No one should be permitted to stop to obtain outer clothing when the alarm sounds. Permit no one to re-enter the building until fire or police declare the building safe.

9) Instruct each class to proceed to an assembly sites outside the building and far enough away so there will be no interference with first responder operations. Ensure alternate assembly sites are designated in case the primary location presents a hazard. Instruct each teacher to make an accurate check of all pupils under his or her responsibility to insure their safety and to report the status of their class or group to the administrative staff or senior staff assisting the emergency first responders.

Draft
e) SEVERE WEATHER AND SHELTER-IN-PLACE DRILLS SHALL BE DESIGNED TO PRACTICE THE SCHOOL’S ABILITY TO

1) Put the appropriate section or sections of the School Emergency Crisis and Response Plan into effect regarding Severe Weather or sheltering of students, staff and the public during an emergency. Designate safe areas or shelters in areas that maximize safety.

2) Secure reliable source of real time weather information whether from local, state or national emergency management agencies.

3) Establish a communications system to notify parents that if the school has not started when severe weather threatens, it will not start until the severe weather has passed.

4) Shelter and supervise children, inside the building in an area as free from flying glass or debris as possible. The sheltered location shall have two means of escape in the event one exit becomes blocked by storm debris.

5) Establish a reliable mandatory accountability system for students and staff.

6) Establish a communications system to notify parents of the student/family reunification site established for students following the passing of the severe weather or other emergency.

7) Establish a student/family reunification site with an adult reporting area for parents to gather for information on the status of the students and to pick up their children. This location shall include provision for information updates, student security, processing,(and) parental identification, and parent/student reunification

8) Establish a media reception site away from the command post and students, where the press can be provided regular information briefings and provided visual observation of the school building in an orderly manner that will not interfere with emergency operations.

f) LOCKDOWN DRILLS SHALL BE DESIGNED TO PRACTICE THE SCHOOL’S ABILITY TO:

Draft
1) Put the appropriate section or sections of the School Emergency Crisis and Response Plan to secure students inside the school building into operation.

2) Establish communications with local law enforcement officials and coordinate recommended actions with the first responders.

3) Determine if the threat is from outside the building or inside the building, without entering the area of conflict.

4) Determine whether or not the students should be evacuated from sections of the building, from the entire building or held in place where they are.

5) Establish a communications system for instructions to specific locations within the building regarding the existence of a threat to the students.

6) Quickly remove students from public areas of the building to secure locations. As an example, from the corridor or washroom to a classroom with doors that can be locked, whether it is the student’s assigned classroom or another classroom.

7) Establish a reliable mandatory accountability system for students and staff.

8) Quickly secure sections of the building, outside the area of conflict, to contain a threat from inside the building.

9) Quickly secure the entire building to prevent entry by threats from outside the building.

10) Establish a student/family reunification site with an adult reporting area for parents to gather for information on the status of the students and to pick up their children. This location shall include provision for information updates, student security, processing, parental identification, and parent/student reunification

11) Establish a media reception site away from the command post and students, where the press can be provided regular information briefings and provided visual observation of the school building in an orderly manner that will not interfere with emergency operations or expose media representatives to danger.

Draft

g) REVERSE EVACUATION DRILLS SHALL BE DESIGNED TO PRACTICE THE SCHOOL’S ABILITY TO:
1) Put the appropriate section or sections of the School Emergency Crisis and Response Plan to rapidly move students from outside the school building to inside the building into operation.

2) Establish a prearranged signal to alert staff and students to return to the building.

3) Quickly remove students from the outside school grounds to secure locations within a school building.

4) Establish communications with local law enforcement and coordinate recommended actions with the first responders.

5) Determine whether or not students should be evacuated from sections of the building facing the threat area.

6) Establish a reliable mandatory accountability system for students and staff.

7) Ensure the exterior building windows and entry doors are closed and only students and staff are allowed inside.

8) Determine if lockdown or shelter-in-place procedures should be implemented.

9) Determine if air circulation and ventilation systems should be shut down.

10) Ensure all persons remain in safe areas until notified by the school administrator or emergency responders.

11) Establish a student/family reunification site with an adult reporting area for parents to gather for information on the status of the students and to pick up their children. This location shall include provision for information updates, student security, processing, parental identification, and parent/student reunification.

12) Establish a media reception site away from the command post and students, where the press can be provided regular information briefings and provided visual observation of

Draft
the school building in an orderly manner that will not interfere with emergency operations or expose media representatives to danger.

h) BUS EVACUATION DRILLS SHALL BE DESIGNED TO PRACTICE THE SCHOOL’S ABILITY TO:

1) Conduct a bus evacuation in accordance with the Schools Emergency Operation Plan.

2) Follow the procedures outlined in the ISBE Bus Evacuation Training Outline.

3) Establish a reliable accountability system for students and staff.

4) Ensure emergency parental notification procedures are implemented informing them of the situation, the status of the students, identify location(s) where injured students have been taken, and location where non-injured students may be reunited with their parents.

5) Implement media notification in accordance with established procedures.
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Dr. Randy J. Dunn, State Superintendent of Education  
      Jonathan Furr, General Counsel

Agenda Topic: Lessredtape Update

Materials: Summary of New Submissions  
           List of Responses

Staff Contact: Shelley Helton

Purpose(s) of Agenda Item

The purpose of this agenda item is to update Board members about the status of lessredtape submissions and to provide a summary of lessredtape activity.

Expected Outcome of Agenda Item

This item is informational only.

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

The purpose of the lessredtape initiative is to free school districts from a number of unnecessary administrative burdens. As such, district officials and school staff will be able to focus more time and resources on achieving the objectives set forth in the Strategic Plan.

Background Information

In October 2004, the agency created an email account system so that its constituents could submit ideas for streamlining agency rules and processes. As of Monday, October 31, 2005, the agency had received a total of 307 submissions (not including spam emails) concerning 73 different subjects from superintendents, school staff, regional offices of education, higher education staff, and individuals.

Included with this executive summary are databases of the eight new requests received since the October Board report, and of the submissions and responses provided for those issues that have been resolved.

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

Of the eight submissions received since the October 2005 report, six have been resolved and two were “spam” (i.e., no response needed and not included in the total of requests received). Since the October report, a total of nine submissions have been resolved. Five submissions, all dealing with technology application requirements, still need a response.
A summary of the status of lessredtape inquiries by submission and issues is provided below for each calendar year. Since a single submission may address several issues, the number of submissions received will be fewer than the number of issues addressed in those submissions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>2004 (156 Total Submissions)</th>
<th>2005 (151 submissions to date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Submissions</td>
<td>Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved (all issues resolved)</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Response</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agency staff continue to track those requests for which follow-up is needed. In the coming months, staff will provide summaries of the specific actions taken in response to the suggestions received through the lessredtape email account.

**Superintendent's Recommendation**

No recommendation is being made at this time.
All public schools in the state are required to offer art and music as part of their curricula, pursuant to rules governing Public Schools Evaluation, Recognition and Supervision (23 Illinois Administrative Code 1.430 and 1.440; see text below). In addition, Section 27-1 of the School Code provides that the "primary purpose of schooling is the transmission of knowledge and culture through which children learn in areas necessary to their continuing development and entry into the world of work. Such areas include the language arts, mathematics, the biological, physical and social sciences, the fine arts and physical development and health. Each school district shall give priority in the allocation of resources, including funds, time allocation, personnel, and facilities, to fulfilling the primary purpose of schooling" (emphasis added). Finally, the Illinois Learning Standards for the Fine Arts set forth what students should be able to achieve in the fine arts (see http://www.isbe.net/ils/fine_arts/standards.htm) at certain points in their schooling.

It is clear from the law, agency rules and the ILS that the fine arts are not "optional" courses; on the contrary, each school district must include as part of its curriculum courses of study in art and music. During the 2005 legislative session, the Illinois General Assembly also appropriated $2 million for art education and foreign language. We will keep you informed as details of that funding are worked out. The State Board of Education appreciates your continued attention to maintaining the quality of all educational programs and opportunities in Illinois schools and invites you to attend one of its upcoming hearings on the FY 2007 budget (see attached schedule below).

You inquired as to what alternatives exist for his education during the time in which he is serving his expulsion. School districts in Illinois are governed by policies developed by both their local boards of education and by laws enacted by the Illinois General Assembly and any administrative rules pertinent to those laws that the Illinois State Board of Education develops. In regards to issues of discipline, state law contained in the School Code requires that each school board maintain a parent-teacher advisory committee to develop, with the board, policy guidelines on student discipline and to furnish a copy to parents within 15 days after the start of the school year (or after a child enrolls, for students who transfer to the school after the start of the year). You should be able to get a copy of this policy, if you do not already have one, and determine how it addresses the situation concerning your son. The School Code also requires a school board to expel a student for a period of time of at least one year if the student brings a gun or other weapon to school, including "'look alikes' of any weapon," which would include a gun, rifle, shotgun, or any other object if used or attempted to be used to cause bodily harm, including but not limited to, knives, brass knuckles, or billy clubs. The law does allow the district superintendent, with the local board of education's approval, to modify the term of expulsion, but you have indicated you have been unsuccessful in persuading your school to reconsider your son's punishment.

A student who is subject to suspension or expulsion may be eligible for a transfer to an alternative school program in accordance with Article 13A of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/13A-0.5 et seq.]; this program is commonly referred to as a Regional Safe Schools Program. As for your son's situation, State Board of Education staff have contacted the school district and were told that it does not provide transfers to a Regional Safe School that serves its region. State law does not require that a school district provide students who have been expelled with alternative education. Additionally, state law allows each school district to adopt a policy preventing a student from enrolling in the district if he or she is currently serving a suspension or expulsion from another school district. Most school districts have adopted these type of policies.

The expulsion of your son for having a toy gun is a local matter and in accordance with state law, the district had an obligation to expel him for at least a year, although as noted above, the term of the expulsion could have been modified.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Message (as originally submitted)</th>
<th>Resolved</th>
<th>Response (substantive portion only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/10/05</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>Hello I tried to find conferences on ISBE to earn CPDUS. Where can I find information regarding conferences? Thank You.</td>
<td>10/24/05</td>
<td>Although the State Board of Education's electronic Professional Provider system is not intended to be used as a search vehicle for educators looking for conferences and workshops, it may serve as a general resource by allowing you to view information about approved courses offered by providers throughout the state. In order to review the providers' information, you must access the Professional Provider link at <a href="http://tapps1.isbe.net/PDP/Default.asp">http://tapps1.isbe.net/PDP/Default.asp</a> and log in as a guest user (click on gray box below the password information). You can then view a listing of several categories of approved courses that will provide you with the provider's name, the course title and a short description of the course. You may then contact the provider directly to get further information about when and where the course will be offered in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/05</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>To whom it may concern: The administration at [identifying information deleted] CUSD think the way ACT participation is calculated and reported on the school report card is very misleading. I just wanted to share our experience.</td>
<td>10/27/05</td>
<td>On October 12, 2005, you received an email explaining how ACT calculates the participation rates that the State Board of Education uses on the school report card. The State Board of Education recognizes that school districts would like to see their ACT participation rate be reported as 100 percent. But as indicated on the report cards and explained in the email you received, the ACT data reported are only for graduating seniors who took the ACT without accommodations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Original Message-----  From: ISBE  
[identifying information deleted]  
Sent: Wednesday, October 12, 2005 11:55 AM  
Subject: RE: % taking the ACT  

We have looked at the issue of determining participation rates since the Prairie State Achievement Examination, which includes the ACT, was first administered. For instance, staff considered the option of using information from the PSAE. We discovered that when the average ACT scores of juniors from the PSAE (which would include the scores of all students taking the test regardless of whether accommodations were needed) were compared to the scores provided to us by ACT, Inc. (which are currently reported on the report cards), the PSAE ACT scores were clearly lower. Obviously, this would not be a viable solution since the average ACT scores would be lower for many districts despite those districts showing an increase in participation rates. Furthermore, if the PSAE ACT scores of juniors are used, we would have to divide the number tested by the grade 11 fall enrollment to derive the participation rate. The results did not come as close to 100 percent as one would expect, as there are generally about 10,000 fewer students statewide in grade 12 compared to those in grade 11.

We would appreciate your thoughts on ways in which the State Board of Education can better compute ACT participation rates for use in the report cards. We will continue to explore other options, and we do have some proposals for the Report Card Advisory Council to consider when it next meets. The Council consists of superintendents, principals, teachers, PTA representatives, business, and others. If you have any recommendations about improving the ACT participation rate, then please send them to me.
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We would appreciate your thoughts on ways in which the State Board of Education can better compute ACT participation rates for use in the report cards. We will continue to explore other options, and we do have some proposals for the Report Card Advisory Council to consider when it next meets. The Council consists of superintendents, principals, teachers, PTA representatives, business, and others. If you have any recommendations about improving the ACT participation rate, then please send them to me.

We have looked at the issue of determining participation rates since the Prairie State Achievement Examination, which includes the ACT, was first administered. For instance, staff considered the option of using information from the PSAE. We discovered that when the average ACT scores of juniors from the PSAE (which would include the scores of all students taking the test regardless of whether accommodations were needed) were compared to the scores provided to us by ACT, Inc. (which are currently reported on the report cards), the PSAE ACT scores were clearly lower. Obviously, this would not be a viable solution since the average ACT scores would be lower for many districts despite those districts showing an increase in participation rates. Furthermore, if the PSAE ACT scores of juniors are used, we would have to divide the number tested by the grade 11 fall enrollment to derive the participation rate. The results did not come as close to 100 percent as one would expect, as there are generally about 10,000 fewer students statewide in grade 12 compared to those in grade 11.

We would appreciate your thoughts on ways in which the State Board of Education can better compute ACT participation rates for use in the report cards. We will continue to explore other options, and we do have some proposals for the Report Card Advisory Council to consider when it next meets. The Council consists of superintendents, principals, teachers, PTA representatives, business, and others. If you have any recommendations about improving the ACT participation rate, then please send them to me.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Message (as originally submitted)</th>
<th>Resolved</th>
<th>Response (substantive portion only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/20/05</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>My suggestion is that any transcript that is official and already in English, should be acceptable. To force applicants to get a translation is expensive, and slows down the whole process. It also could be construed as insulting to that country. At the least, it should not be required for those who are applying for substitute certificates. For those people, only if there is a question about the degree being equal to our bachelors should they have to go through that process. I feel sure that ISBE would have people that are competent to do that anyway, at least in the majority of cases.</td>
<td>10/31/05 Although it seems reasonable to suggest that a transcript from an out-of-country postsecondary institution that is provided in English should be accepted without question, there are several issues that still need to be addressed in reviewing that transcript. For instance, some foreign institutions may only require three years of study for a bachelor's degree. These transcripts must be reviewed to determine if the person submitting the transcript has sufficient coursework to be considered as meeting Illinois requirements for any type of certificate, including the substitute certificate. As another example of the need to examine foreign transcripts, we often find that the length of the courses does not equate to the semester-hour system and hence, must be examined by professionals with the expertise to determine equivalency of those courses with what is required here in Illinois.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/ilcs/ilcs3.asp?ActID=1005&amp;ChapAct=105%26nbsp%3BILCS%26nbsp%3B5%26nbsp%26ChapterID=17%26nbsp%26ChapterName=SCHOOLS%26nbsp%26ActName=School%26nbsp%26Code%26nbsp%264E">http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/ilcs/ilcs3.asp?ActID=1005&amp;ChapAct=105%26nbsp%3BILCS%26nbsp%3B5%26nbsp%26ChapterID=17%26nbsp%26ChapterName=SCHOOLS%26nbsp%26ActName=School%26nbsp%26Code%26nbsp%264E</a>. In addition, rules governing Public Schools Evaluation, Recognition and Supervision (Part 1) reiterate this requirement at 23 Illinois Administrative Code 1.10(b)(1) (see <a href="http://www.isbe.net/rules/archive/pdfs/oneark.pdf">http://www.isbe.net/rules/archive/pdfs/oneark.pdf</a>). The law establishing local learning objectives was put into place in 1985, at the same time that the State Board of Education was to establish goals defining what students should know and be able to do in seven designated fundamental learning areas as a result of their schooling. In 1997, these broad goal statements were expanded to include the Illinois Learning Standards (ILS) and later the related performance descriptors (found at <a href="http://www.isbe.net/ils/Default.htm">http://www.isbe.net/ils/Default.htm</a>). The ILS provide much more detailed statements of what students should know and be able to do as the result of their schooling than did the original goals. In addition, all school districts are subject to the single statewide accountability system required under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. This system serves as the basis for statewide assessments and all sanctions imposed under state and federal law. As a result of these changes at the state and federal level, the State Board of Education recognizes that the primary purpose for local learning objectives and assessments (i.e., school improvement) is no longer supportable when all school districts must adhere to the requirements of the statewide accountability system. While school districts should remain free to establish local objectives, the State should not mandate that such objectives be established nor should it be required to approve such objectives, as is currently provided in the law. The agency hopes to draft a bill for the Illinois General Assembly's consideration that would amend Sections 2-3.63 and 27-1 of the School Code to allow school districts to determine locally whether to adopt local learning objectives and assessments. Until the School Code is amended, however, school districts are still required to meet the requirements pertaining to local learning objectives and assessments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Lessredtape: New Submissions since September Update (text of spam email not included; current through October 31, 2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Message (as originally submitted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0454</td>
<td>Substitute certificate</td>
<td>Is there a reason the state makes substitute certificate holders pay on the remaining years of their certificate every time they register in a new place? I ask because I received my substitute certificate from ROE [identifying information deleted] in October 2004 and paid $20 for the 4-year certificate. In May 2005 I moved to [identifying information deleted] County to begin a teacher certification program. My program required me to register my existing substitute certificate in [identifying information deleted] County. I did not understand why I had to pay $15 for the remaining years on my certificate when I renewed my certificate in July 2005. Does it cost [identifying information deleted] County that much to keep my existing records on file after the state already said my transcript passed muster when I registered initially with ROE [identifying information deleted]? When I receive my K-9 teaching certificate later this year, will I have to pay to register my substitute certificate AGAIN when I move out of [identifying information deleted] County? I am trying to understand why people are not allowed to pay for their substitute certificates for one year or two years at a time when they KNOW they're not going to be in an area for 4 years. I realize the dollar amounts I am discussing are not great. However, I am trying to understand why substitutes have to pay more for moving to an area served by a different ROE while people with regular teaching certificates pay little to register their certificates. When some ROEs charge $50 for fingerprinting, an extra $15-$20 (as opposed to the $5 charged for regular teachers) seems a bit unfair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0455</td>
<td>Certificate Renewal</td>
<td>Hello I tried to find conferences on ISBE to earn CPDUS. Where can I find information regarding conferences?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0456</td>
<td>ACT Test</td>
<td>To whom it may concern: The administration at [identifying information deleted] CUSD think the way ACT participation is calculated and reported on the school report card is very misleading. I just wanted to share our opinion, for what it's worth. Thank you, Original Message----- From: ISBE [identifying information deleted] Sent: Wednesday, October 12, 2005 11:55 AM Subject: RE: % taking the ACT The ACT data in the report card are for the graduating class. While most of the students would have taken the ACT in Grade 11 as part of the PSAE, some students may have repeated the ACT on their own. In such cases, the student's latest scores are used in the school/district averages. To derive the percent tested in the report card, the number of students tested for the graduating class (provided by ACT, Inc.) is divided by the school's or district's Grade 12 fall enrollment. But the ACT data in the report card excludes students who took the ACT with accommodations (e.g. extended time)--this would generally reduce the number of students tested. ACT Inc. excludes them because they are considered a different population. Hence, the percent tested for ACT as reported in the report card is usually less than 100% even though 100% of the students in a school may have taken the PSAE. -----Original Message----- From: [identifying information deleted] Our 2005 HS report card states that 94% of students took the ACT. How is that number derived at? We actually had 100% take it. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0457</td>
<td>Duplication of #431 and #444 (see September Board packet)</td>
<td>I am an out-of-state applicant and it has been hard press to find information like where I send my application and what the application fee is! I have emailed and called and left messages since early September with no response. I cannot call the Springfield office because the phone number is designed for in-state only calls. There should be an out-of-state link on your site with all the information listed for out-of-state applicants: what information to fill out, where to send it, who to send it to, how much to pay, and phone numbers/email to contact with questions that don't just give auto-response every time. That would make things so much easier for those of us trying to make a move to Illinois. Thanks!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0458</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>We spend several weeks each year testing students using the ISAT and PSAE. In addition to these tests, when developing our school improvement plan it is required that you triangulate the data using another achievement test and teacher assessment. This additional testing requires a loss of instructional time and cost a great deal of money to purchase additional tests and scoring. I recently spent $6,000 to purchase additional testing material. It seems to me that if we believe the ISAT and PSAE are both valid and reliable, then why do we need to spend additional time and money for the purpose of triangulating data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0459</td>
<td>Assessments</td>
<td>My suggestion is that any transcript that is official and already in English, should be acceptable. To force applicants to get a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0460</td>
<td>Certification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Message (as originally submitted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0461</td>
<td>Spam</td>
<td>translation is expensive, and slows down the whole process. It also could be construed as insulting to that country. At the least, it should not be required for those who are applying for substitute certificates. For those people, only if there is a question about the degree being equal to our bachelors should they have to go through that process. I feel sure that ISBE would have people that are competent to do that anyway, at least in the majority of cases.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>