Ad Hoc Rules Committee of the Whole  
Wednesday, November 15, 2006  
1:45 p.m.  
(This meeting will begin immediately following the previous session.)  

Board Room  

Public Conference Call Access Number: 1-866-297-6391 (listen only)  
Confirmation # 1 6 2 6 7 0 4 4  

AGENDA  
1. Public Participation  

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

*3 Rules for Initial Review  
a. Part 1 (Public Schools Evaluation, Recognition and Supervision) (Plenary p. 19)  

4. Discussion Item  
a. Part 226 (Special Education) (p. 5)  

5. Information Items  
a. Quarterly Update on Comprehensive Rules Review and Less Red Tape (p. 8)  
b. Less Red Tape Summary (p. 33)  

7. Adjourn  

* Items listed with an asterisk (*) will be discussed in committee and action may be taken in the plenary session.
Chairman Ruiz called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

1. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: Deanna Durica, representing the Ounce of Prevention, was in attendance to discuss New Part 70 and the amendments to Part 235. Ms. Durica distributed materials that pertained to her discussion of the rules. She thanked the Board for supporting the recommendations of the Illinois Early Learning Council and the early childhood community and asked the Board to consider making changes to the proposed amendments to Part 235. In particular, she asked the Board to revisit Section 235.300(c), which would allow for funding decisions to be based in part on the need to make programs available on a statewide basis or to provide resources to school districts and communities with varying demographic characteristics. Ms. Durica shared her concerns with this provision and gave the Board her alternative suggestions regarding the funding of these programs according to the greatest concentration of eligible children.

Kay Henderson, Division Administrator for Early Childhood Programs, provided information in response to the concerns expressed by Ms. Durica.

Lauri Morrison Frichtl, Executive Director of the Illinois Head Start Association, was also in attendance to discuss the amendments to Part 235. She gave an overview of the Head Start organization and its goals of breaking the cycle of poverty and improving children’s success in school and later in life. She thanked Ms. Henderson for her collaboration but voiced the concern that the amendments to Part 235 might result in a failure to utilize Head Start to capacity and thus lead to a loss of the federal funds that flow to Illinois for that program. She advocated a safeguard that would maintain the current scope of Head Start in Illinois.

2. MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER AD HOC RULES COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
Dr. Vinni Hall moved that the minutes of the Ad Hoc Rules Committee of the Whole for the September meeting be approved. Dr. David Fields seconded the motion. The motion to approve the committee minutes passed with voice vote approval.

3. DISCUSSION OF RULES FOR INITIAL REVIEW
Chairman Ruiz turned the meeting over to General Counsel Darren Reisberg. Mr. Reisberg asked Linda Jamali and Sally Vogl to come to the Board table.

PART 60
(The “Grow Your Own” Teacher Education Initiative)
Ms. Jamali explained to the Board that the set of changes being presented was twofold, incorporating some revisions that reflect statutory changes and others that are based upon the agency’s experience with implementing the “Grow Your Own” program. Specifically, she noted concerns on the part of the
participating institutions of higher education in terms of tracking amounts that form part of candidates’ forgivable loans. She also noted that one of the recent legislative changes clarified that the program is intended exclusively for candidates who do not already have a bachelor’s degree.

Dr. Hall raised concerns about coordination among the 2-year and 4-year institutions. Ms. Vogl clarified that in this case the institutions are members of consortia and thus have already agreed on their working relationships.

Board Member Brenda Holmes thanked the Superintendent for his updates and hard work with the higher education institutions. Ms. Jamali acknowledged the hard work of General Counsel Darren Reisberg and Sally Vogl.

NEW PART 70
(Early Childhood Teacher Preparation Assistance Grant)
Mr. Reisberg asked Division Administrator Kay Henderson to come to the Board table to discuss the new rules for the Early Childhood Teacher Preparation Assistance Grant and indicated that Shelley Helton was also available by telephone. Mr. Reisberg noted that the version of new Part 70 that would be sent out for public comment was identical to the emergency version being presented for adoption.

Ms. Henderson noted that the purpose of the Preschool For All program was to expand the number of young children receiving high-quality preschool education by focusing not only on those who are determined to be at risk of academic failure but also those from families of low to moderate income who are not considered to be at risk academically and children from other families that choose to participate. In reviewing the totality of the related “quality initiatives” for which funds had been made available, it had been determined that ISBE would need to establish through rulemaking its method for funding two initiatives: increasing the teacher supply and providing social and emotional consultation services to teachers in the program. New Part 70 (Early Childhood Teacher Preparation Assistance Grant) would address the first of those. The rules would provide authority under which ISBE can issue an RFP for planning grants to community-based organizations, educational entities, and institutions of higher education so that candidates for teacher preparation can be identified and plans can be made for implementation in Fiscal Year 2008. Funds would then be used to deliver early childhood teacher preparation programs to those individuals. Ms. Henderson explained that the intention was to focus on areas where programs are currently having a difficult time attracting qualified teachers. She stated that individuals who are currently employed in early childhood programs in the very hard-to-serve areas would be targeted. Ms. Henderson also noted a great need for bilingual and minority teachers willing to teach in state-funded preschool education programs that are offered in community-based settings so that ethnically diverse populations can be served.

4. RULES FOR ADOPTION

PART 235
(Early Childhood Block Grant)
Mr. Reisberg reminded the Board that the amendments to Part 235 had come before the Board for initial review at the June meeting.

Ms. Henderson discussed the Preschool for All Children program and stated that it sets the prioritization requirements for funding for two years (i.e., School Years 2006-07 and 2007-08). She said that the goal of the program is to provide educational services to all 3- to 5-year-old children whose families choose to participate. She commented on the lack of accurate data and the agency’s limited ability to obtain current information regarding where the children are and their eligibility.

Board Member Andrea Brown expressed concerns related to children who are served by both the pre-kindergarten program and Head Start. Dr. Brown foresaw a very “tight-fisted” program, particularly if Head Start programs were to lose money, pointed to a need to make sure what kind of return the state would be getting on both federal and state tax dollars. She expressed the concern that, under Preschool for All Children, not every child who is at risk would be served but in some places money might not be spent very wisely and there might be duplication of services.
Ms. Henderson mentioned that those were all concerns that had been raised, particularly in southern Illinois. Ms. Henderson pointed out that collaboration at the local level does not mean just one thing and it does not necessarily mean dual enrollment for every child who is in Head Start.

Chairman Ruiz commented to Ms. Henderson about an item of testimony that had been distributed to the Board and asked whether the Illinois Early Childhood Asset Map (IECAM) was ready. Ms. Henderson responded that it was in the developmental stage and was nearing the point of being a functional source of data. In future it would provide the most current information about enrollment in all of the preschool programs and the characteristics of communities and counties. This information would be very helpful in making determinations about funding. Chairman Ruiz pointed out Ms. Durica’s materials and asked Ms. Henderson to verify that the agency was not yet in a position to implement that type of system.

5. ADDITIONAL ITEMS
   None.

6. ADJOURNMENT
   Dr. David Fields moved to adjourn the committee meeting. Mr. Ed Geppert seconded the motion and the meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.
TO: Ad Hoc Rules Committee of the Whole
   Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Dr. Randy J. Dunn, State Superintendent of Education
       Christopher Koch, Assistant Superintendent

Agenda Topic: Special Education Regulations – Process and Class size/Case Load

Materials: None

Staff Contact(s): Christopher Koch, Beth Hanselman

Purpose of Agenda Item
To further discuss the rulemaking process and the purpose of the proposed amendments with regard to class size/caseload. The majority of the comments received have been on class size and caseload.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
This agenda item is linked to GOAL 3 Expanding Data-Informed School Management & Support Practices)

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
To better understand the proposed changes in the rules and the feedback received through the public comment process.

Background Information
The proposed amendments have previously been provided to board members. Federal law requires public reporting of all state regulations that exceed federal requirements. Federal law also promotes streamlining of state regulations specifically stating to “minimize the number of rules, regulations and policies to which the local educational agencies and schools located within the State are subject under this title”. Because the proposed regulations were an effort to streamline, there was not a need to draft extensive new language. In areas where language was revised, such as with regard to class size, a task force inclusive of teachers, administrators, parents and others was convened over months to consider language for rulemaking. Three teachers participated on this task force. The process for rulemaking in this instance has been expanded to accommodate the diverse interests represented.

In proposing state regulations, five questions were asked:
1) Was language duplicative of federal?
2) Does language offer express protection of students?
3) Do our experiences with general supervision support need for regulation?
4) What has public comment been so far?
5) What does existing research say?
Extensive opportunities for public comment have taken place with regard to these regulations. Feedback has been provided to ISBE by outside groups and individuals to inform our proposed rulemaking both before and during rulemaking.

These include:
- Complaints, mediation, due process, and compliance activities (since IDEA 1997)
- Public survey of rules that exceed federal. (2004 – following HR 359)
- Focus groups on IDEA Reauthorization. (seven held in 2005)
- Public hearings (9 held between March 2006 – September 2006).
- Numerous public presentations on the regulations since March 2006.

Also, it is worthwhile to dispel the notion that the August issuance of the final federal regulations impeded people's ability to comment meaningfully on ISBE’s rules. Three points at least are relevant here.

1. There were few significant differences between the proposed and the final federal regulations.
2. ISBE would always be bound by the final version, regardless of any input we might receive as comments. This also means we are obligated to make a careful comparison to ensure that our rules correctly reference and correspond to the final version of the federal regulations. That comparison would be made whether or not there were any comments about it, and we would not be able to deviate from federal requirements no matter who voiced concerns about them.
3. The great volume of comments we have received are about provisions that are unique to Illinois and not connected to federal requirements – namely, case load and class size. No one’s feedback on those rules was dependent upon the issuance of the final federal regulations, because that issue is not addressed at the federal level.

As indicated above, ISBE received a wide range of comments on these proposed amendments and have purposely decided upon a six-month comment period (four times the required time span) to afford all interested parties with an opportunity to place their opinions on the record. It is our view that having a written proposal to react to gives parents, advocates, teachers, and administrators the clearest way to identify their concerns and make those known. Everyone who submitted comments can be assured that they will be given due consideration.

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

Policy Implications: Changes to the class size/caseload regulations are important to all school districts. Federal law, state law, and board policy support student placements in the least restrictive environment.

Budget Implications: Class size and case load limits directly affect school budgets.

Legislative Action: None needed; however JCAR will review these rules once adopted.
Communication: Extensive comment has been received on the issue of class size and case load – more than for any other area in the special education rulemaking.

Pros and Cons of Various Actions

Pros: The proposed changes to the rule on class size/caseload would eliminate the current reliance on categorical nomenclature and address the lack of uniformity in the definition of “general education classroom” within the state. Changes in caseload reflect lack of consensus for definition with continued requirement for state enforcement.

Cons: Not acting on class size and case load would result in continued system with its inherent problems for regulation. There is no consensus on how to address class size and case load. There is confusion about what is currently required. Inclusion of students with disabilities in general education classrooms is not uniformly supported by testimony. There is great variance in the availability of supports for students with disabilities in general education settings, according to the comments received.

Superintendent’s Recommendation

The Superintendent supports the proposed regulations; however, no action is being considered until such time as all public comment has been analyzed and the rules modified as necessary.

Next Steps

ISBE staff will continue to finish the analysis of comment and recommendations for changes to the proposed rules. A final set of rules will be presented at the December meeting for Board action.
STATUS REPORT:
COMPREHENSIVE RULES REVIEW
AND
LESS RED TAPE INITIATIVE

November 15, 2006

Rod R. Blagojevich, Governor

Illinois State Board of Education
MEMORANDUM

To: Illinois State Board of Education Members

From: Darren Reisberg, General Counsel

Re: Report on Comprehensive Rules Review and Less Red Tape Initiative

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 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, P.A. 94-875, effective July 1, 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 P.A. 94-875.

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 number. 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 or amendments to existing Parts that have resulted from legislative action also are not discussed in this report.

Before each Part is a note indicating whether the review has been completed and amendments, as necessary, have been promulgated.

Action completed

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. (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 requirements that needed to be retained from Part 275 (Pupil Transportation), and new Section 1.515 has been added to set forth the 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 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. (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.

(Effective June 30, 2005.)

• **State Accountability Framework:** 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 the agency’s 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 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 percent 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.

(Effective November 23, 2005.)

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

The revisions to Part 1 eliminated 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 routinely exceeded 100 pages in length per school. Numerous lessredtape 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 either by 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 among 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 at 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 each district 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, also have 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.

As a result of feedback from school district personnel, upgrades to the e-Plans will be made. The new district improvement plan template will integrate the 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.

Highlights of the new templates:

- Trend data available for multiple years continues to be an especially helpful feature. State assessment data automatically populate the screens for users.
  - This year the screens will organize the state assessment data by grade for every grade tested in the school/district, highlighting any areas under the required benchmarks in red.
  - Each data screen will prompt the analysis of these data right on the screen. Users will be prompted to draw conclusions about their data and to consider factors that may have contributed to the results.
  - A final screen in the data section will populate all the conclusions/factors so that users may note what key factors will be addressed in the action plan.
- The sections of the template will be reordered to begin with the data followed by the action plan, which better matches the way that school/district teams plan.
- Users should be able to select the type of plan that they need or want to create. Once they select plan, the IIRC should open the template with the prompts appropriate for their school/district (e.g., a single school district wishing to complete a district improvement plan will open a template that automatically provides the district and the school improvement requirements so that they do one, not two plans; a district in status may create their tech plan while completing their revised plan per NCLB, Section 1116).
- Schools/districts will not submit paper copies. ISBE monitoring and review will be from on-line documents. All of the required plans will be in Illinois e-Plans. We
believe this will be welcome: one template for all required users posted in one place. The templates do not preclude planning beyond the requirements for NCLB but they do prompt what is required by the law.

**Action completed**

**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.

   (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 contained 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).
     (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.
(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.
(Effective April 21, 2006.)

3. **Obtaining Endorsements or Certification**

- **Endorsing Teaching Certificates**: 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.
(Effective 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 be able to supervise other certified staff members.
(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.
(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.
(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 also will be available. Each eligible applicant will be approved to reflect the level of educational attainment and interpreting skill that he or she has demonstrated.
(Effective July 28, 2005.)

- **Speech-language Pathologists**: The revisions to Section 25.252 and the addition of Section 25.255 responded to P.A. 93-1060 and deal with the certification of non-teaching speech-language pathologists.
(Effective October 3, 2005.)

- **Temporary Substitute Teaching Permit**: At a special meeting called in mid-September 2005 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.
(Regular rule effective 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.
(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.
(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. (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. (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. (Effective July 28, 2005.)

**Action completed**

**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 City of Chicago School District 299 (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. (Effective June 30, 2005.)
In process
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 February 2007.)

Action completed
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). (Effective July 28, 2005.)

Action completed
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” is 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 rulemaking 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) permit division of the cost for all special education administrative services by the number of special education pupils rather than by the total number. (Effective October 5, 2006.)
Action completed
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.
(Effective June 30, 2005.)

Action completed
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.
(Effective June 30, 2005.)

Action completed
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 also were streamlined to eliminate unnecessary requirements or those that are adequately covered by statute or applicable standards, such as:
- Elimination of requirement for the district facility inventory;
- Allowing a district to delegate authority to seek variances to an individual (i.e., district administrator or architect);
- Allowing multiple variances to be submitted on the same application;
- Elimination ISBE-specified scaling and format requirements for specifications;
- Deletion a separate certification requirement for sprinkler systems; and
- Deletion 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.)

Action completed
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.)

**In process**

**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 ended September 15, 2006, and the proposed amendments and any recommendations for changes in response to public comment are slated to come before the Board for adoption in December 2006.

**Action completed**

**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 also will be reflected.

(Effective October 23, 2006.)

**Action completed**

**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.

(Effective February 28, 2006.)

**Action completed**

**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 P. 94-440, districts no longer have to submit a detailed breakdown of program costs when virtually all districts are reimbursed based upon the appropriation level. (Effective October 3, 2005.)

Progressing

PART 254 – VOCATIONAL 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. The new rules will be titled “Career and Technical Education” (Initial board review anticipated in early 2007.)

Action completed

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). (Regular rules effective November 29, 2005.)

Action completed

PART 305 – SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE

Amendments to Part 305 not only addressed the highly-publicized nutrition requirements for beverages and foods sold to students in grades 8 and below before school and during the regular school day in those schools participating in federal meals programs, but also
addressed outdated and redundant provisions that have not been changed since the rules were promulgated in 1978.

In particular, Part 305 has been reorganized to better reflect specific subject areas, which are addressed in separate sections. The rules more clearly tie the requirements of Illinois’ School Breakfast and Lunch Program, such as criteria for student eligibility and standards for meal reimbursement, to those already used at the federal level so that schools participating in both programs are not held to different requirements. The amendments also update requirements pertaining to student workers and procedures governing the acceptance by participating schools of government-donated commodities through the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Food Distribution Program.

(Effective October 17, 2006.)

**Action completed**

**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.

(Effective June 30, 2005.)

**Action completed**

**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.

(Effective March 29, 2005.)

**Action completed**

**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.

(Effective April 25, 2006.)

**Action completed**

**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.

(Effective June 30, 2005.)

**Action completed**

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

Part 525 governs the way in which services and programs authorized under Section 2-3.62 of the School Code (“Educational Service Centers”) are provided through the regional offices of education located outside of Cook County; by the regional office of education and three Intermediates Service Centers located in suburban Cook County; and by the Chicago Intermediate Service Center. Legal and program staff have reviewed Part 525 and have determined that amendments to this Part are not needed at this time.

**Action completed**

**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. (Effective October 19, 2005.)

**Action completed**

**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.)

**Action completed**

**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 2005, and became effective October 31, 2005. At the same time, 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.
The lessredtape@isbe.net email account has generated numerous suggestions for commonsense changes to the agency’s policies and procedures. The description of the items that were completed as of the last update presented to the Board in June 2006 have been removed. Action on items that were still in progress at that time and those that are new are described below.

### Lessredtape Suggestion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Agency Response</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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, and these will be available starting with the 2006 test results. While an 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>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Systems

| 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. An RFSP is being developed and will be released in mid-December for services to assist agency staff in making further refinements to the system requirements, data elements, reports, and data policies for the future development of a statewide Data Warehouse. The contractor also will assist ISBE in applying for federal funding for the development of the system. | Progressing. RFSP release anticipated release: December 06. |

### Improve IWAS to:

1. List due dates.

   A. 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.

   B. Automatic reminders are now in place for 17 different reporting and funding plans, including for all four of the systems mentioned in the lessredtape submission.

2. Include the Public School

   This form is used by school districts to update information about the district and its schools (e.g., names

   Ongoing. RFSP for
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lessredtape</th>
<th>Agency Response</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suggestion of form 60-63.</td>
<td>of district and schools, addresses, telephone numbers, superintendent, principals).</td>
<td>Entity System released November 6, 2006, with anticipation of a contract being in place by December 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Merge the Online Teacher Information System (OTIS) and the Certification Renewal Tracking System (CeRTS) into a single system, Educator Certification System (ECS).</td>
<td>The agency has released an RFSP to hire a programmer/analyst to assist ISBE staff with the design and implementation of the Entity System. This system will be the central repository for identifying data of entities to which our applications apply. It will provide a way to automatically update information (name, administrator, address, etc.) for each entity without that entity having to contact the user of each application. Once this system is in place, school districts and schools will be able to update the information on-line via IWAS.</td>
<td>Completed; September 2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the Electronic Grants Management System (e-GMS) to:</td>
<td>The Educator Certification System (ECS) is now in place. Educators will be able to use the system both to submit professional development activities for certificate renewal purposes and access their certification files in order to update addresses, apply for subsequent certificates or endorsements, pay fees, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Add Learning Technology Center budgets.</td>
<td>One staff member who worked on e-GMS part of the time has now been assigned to the system full time. The agency also is seeking another full-time design staff member.</td>
<td>Progressing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Copy data from one year to the next in NCLB application.</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. After discussions with the contractor, staff believe that every school district should evaluate the success of its grant programs and the needs of the district each year and revise the application accordingly. Staff find districts less likely to do that if the application is copied for them.</td>
<td>Removed from consideration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**District Planning Requirements**

| Streamline the technology planning | The action plan portion of the technology plan now has all information logically flowing in one direction. Each | Will be available |
### Lessredtape

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion</th>
<th>Agency Response</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>process and make it easier to complete.</td>
<td>district will write a vision statement, provide its data (in boxes that include instructions) and then complete the action plan. Each district will write its goals, strategies and activities in one place that also includes the budget. An online technology inventory has been designed so districts will no longer have to send in a complete listing of the technology inventory in a separate Excel spreadsheet. If any district decides to do a DTIP (combination of district improvement plan/technology plan), then it only has to complete three additional screens.</td>
<td>starting in December 2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms</th>
<th>Agency Response</th>
<th>Status</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>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting</th>
<th>Agency Response</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make the online immunization survey less cumbersome and time-consuming to complete.</td>
<td>Several lessredtape submissions discussed the difficulty of completing the immunization survey, which was revised for this current reporting period (fall 2006). Districts now have to report data by grade level, rather than for the school as a whole. This change was made in response to a request by the Illinois Department of Public Health, which reports the data ISBE collects to the Centers for Disease Control. Up until this time, Illinois had been one of only three states that were not reporting grade-level data. Data Analysis staff agreed to look at the system for possible improvements for the 2007-08 school year. In particular, it will examine the feasibility of the system printing a summary report and for making the process more user-friendly overall.</td>
<td>Progressing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 3 – DESCRIPTION OF P.A. 94-875 (SB 2829)

P.A. 94-875 arose out of suggestions obtained through the lessredtape@isbe.net email account and ideas generated through the administrative rules review process. The bill reflected more than four months of discussions and negotiations with the management alliance, regional superintendents, teachers’ unions and other interested constituents.

The specific components of P.A. 94-875, effective July 1, 2006, are described below, along a summary of actions regarding implementation.

- **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). P.A. 94-875 eliminated 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. Amendments to rules governing Public Schools Evaluation, Recognition and Supervision (Part 1) that address these statutory changes will be presented for initial Board review in November 2006. Specifically, P.A. 94-875:
  
  o **Removed 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 **Eliminated 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.) As per NCLB, schools will continue to have federal School Support Teams.

  o **Removed 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.)
Monitoring plans will be streamlined as districts and schools complete improvement plans via the Illinois e-Plans at the Interactive Report Card site. Districts and schools will not submit any hard copies of the required plans, and State Board of Education staff will review plans via the website.

- **Eliminated 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.)

  The planning templates have been streamlined to prompt districts and schools about what must be included in the plan. The template comprises four sections: data and analysis, action planning, required description of the planning process, and board approval and assurance. The last section collapses a number of criteria from the previous school improvement plan rubric into district assurances. State assessment data are automatically populated in the templates; districts and schools are no longer required to copy these data into their plans for the agency’s use. (Implementation is progressing.)

- **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:

  - **Administration of the Health/Life/Safety Code.** P.A. 94-875 eliminated 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).) (No further action needed. Completed.)

  - **Waivers and Modifications of the School Code.** P.A. 94-875 eliminated 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
After the bill was signed into law, all school districts were informed of the change in procedures through the waivers website (see http://www.isbe.net/isbewaivers/default.htm), the updated application, and the June 26, 2006, issue of the Superintendent’s Weekly Message (see http://www.isbe.net/board/archivemessages/message_062606.pdf).

(Completed.)

- 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. P.A. 94-875 reduces the length of the required notice to save districts money. The publication requirements are adapted from the requirements for municipalities found in the Municipal Code. (Revisions to Section 10-17 of the School Code.)

While Section 10-17 has been amended, the law still requires publication of the statement of affairs, albeit an abbreviated version, in a newspaper of general circulation for the district. Special interest groups, in particular the Illinois Press Association, lobbied successfully to weaken the State Board's original proposal by introducing their own version, which was signed into law. It was this version that was eventually enacted into law.

The School Business and Support Services Division notified school districts about the new requirements via the September 25, 2006, issue of the Superintendent’s Weekly Message (see http://www.isbe.net/board/archivemessages/message_092506.pdf) and provided information about the new law on its website (see http://www.isbe.net/sfms/afr/asp.htm).

(Completed.)

- Criminal Background Checks. P.A. 94-875 allowed 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 Section 10-21.9 and Section 34-18.5 of the School Code.)

The Legal Division published an announcement of the new requirements in the July 24, 2006, issue of the Superintendent’s Weekly Message (see http://www.isbe.net/board/archivemessages/message_072406.pdf), provided a presentation about the changes to the Illinois Association of Regional Superintendents of Schools, and will be updating online guidance addressing requirements for criminal background checks.

(Completed.)
- **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.)

  The Funding and Disbursement Division has updated its website and the Pupil Transportation Reimbursement Claim form to reflect the new deadlines. (Completed.)

- **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. P.A. 94-875 eliminates this requirement from the School Code. (Repeal of Section 2-3.11b of the School Code.) (No further action needed. Completed.)
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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. At its two-year mark, the agency had received a total of 417 submissions (not including spam emails) concerning more than 80 different subjects from superintendents, school staff, regional offices of education, higher education staff, and individuals.

Included with this executive summary is a database of the 38 new submissions received since the June quarterly report and the responses provided for those issues that have been resolved.

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

Of the 38 submissions received since the June quarterly report, 37 have been resolved and one was “spam” (i.e., no response needed and not included in the total of requests received).

Interest in the lessredtape initiative has substantially decreased during calendar year 2006. As lessredtape enters its third year, the email account is receiving, on average, less than a dozen submissions a month. By contrast, from its inception to the end of calendar year 2004 (a three-month period of time), the email account received 156 submissions. The next calendar year, lessredtape logged 176 submissions – more than twice the number the account has received in the first 10 months of calendar year 2006.
Only 10 of the 89 issues addressed in the submissions submitted this calendar year concerned agency rules, the original focus of the lessredtape initiative. About a quarter of the issues raised in submissions received (22 out of 89 issues) addressed activities outside of the responsibility of the State Board of Education (i.e., “agency”), such as employment issues, higher education, informational requests, and complaints about decisions and activities that are a matter of local, rather than state, control. The majority of the submissions (31) addressed agency processes and electronic systems, and 26 focused on statutory mandates.

A summary of the status of lessredtape inquiries by submission and issues is provided below for calendar year 2006 (all of the issues from 2004 and 2005 have been resolved and those charts are not being included). 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>2006 (85 submissions to date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved (all issues resolved)</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Response</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An update of action taken as a result of issues raised in the submissions is summarized in the accompanying document titled “Status Report: Comprehensive Rules Review and Less Red Tape Initiative”.

**Superintendent’s Recommendation**

No recommendation is being made at this time.
Lessredtape: New Submissions since June Update (text of spam email not included; current through October 31, 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Message (as originally submitted)</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>548</td>
<td>Transcripts</td>
<td>i need my Transcript ok thank you from you so i can sent to my college at Minnesota State University Moorhead Office of Admissions thank you</td>
<td>The Illinois State Board of Education does not retain records of students who attend public elementary and secondary schools in Illinois. You must get your transcript from the high school from which you graduated. Good luck in your future endeavors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>549</td>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>To Whom this may concern, Just to let you know, that I have had nothing but trouble submitting my information to the new system for the dental report!!!! I constantly received messages that stated &quot;the server was not accepted&quot;. I had to repeatedly close out the report page and then resubmit! Very time-consuming! Other nurses in our area also had problems with the program. I had a wonderful woman, [identifying information deleted], who was very patient with me and I finally succeeded in submitting this report. She stated that the immunization report will be included in this program next fall. If that is the case, I hope you look into the problems so many people have been having with this report.</td>
<td>As you know this is the first year that school districts have been required to submit the dental information. The staff of the Data Analysis and Progress Reporting Division will continue to work with the Data Systems Division to refine and improve this system for next year. Often times difficulty with various technological systems only becomes apparent after those systems are made operational, despite the numerous pilot-tests conducted beforehand. The State Board hopes that the problems that you described did not inconvenience you too greatly, and staff will keep these in mind as they move forward with system improvements. The State Board appreciates the effort you made to bring these issues to its attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>My eight year old son is being penalized not only for his learning disabilities, but for his health issues as well. My son has a variety of health issues including but not limited to chronic ear infections, asthma, upper respiratory infections, throat infections, a reduced immune system, and encopresis. He has suffered numerous ailments since the time of his birth. At best he has suffered over 32 ear infections, 12 throat infections, 22 upper respiratory infections, 18 viral infections, and has had numerous surgeries. My son is chronically ill from about November through April every year. Every year I ask what else can be done. Due to this my son has missed an extreme amount of school, all able to be documented through records that my son is in no way a truant. It was not an issue when he was in attendance at private schools, but has become a huge issue since his transfer to public school. In addition he has learning disabilities that I am now being blamed for along with his attendance and that the label is just a coping mechanism. As a parent thoroughly interested in education and now a single parent I am in utter shock as to how we have been treated and the mere manipulation of the system that has been allowed by our abusers through the channels of education. My first husband and my son's biological father were extremely controlling as well as physically, sexually and mentally abusive. We continue to suffer under his control, extreme political power and financial capabilities. My second husband turned out to be even worse. My problems with the school began when I asked my current husband to leave. At the time I was on a leave of absence from work with a fractured foot, recovering from meningitis, my car...</td>
<td>Your email concerning your son was sent to the lessredtape email account here at the State Board of Education. While you raise many issues that are not under the control of the State Board of Education, I did check with our Division of Special Education concerning your complaints about your son's placement. You may already have this information, but if not, you may want to review your rights as a parent of child with an IEP as outlined in the State Board's publication titled, &quot;A Parents Guide - The Educational Rights of a Student with Disabilities,&quot; located at <a href="http://www.isbe.net/spec-ed/html/parent_rights.htm">www.isbe.net/spec-ed/html/parent_rights.htm</a>. Should you wish to file a complaint on behalf of your child, you may do so by following the procedures in this manual. Should you have questions regarding special education services or how to file a complaint with our office, you may also call the Special Education Department at (217) 782-4870. In addition, I believe that Donna Luallen, division administrator for the Accountability Division, has sent you an email requesting additional information. She has not yet received a reply. Once she has that information, then she will be able to further investigate your concerns.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
was at an undisclosed shop, and he took our only phone making it rather difficult to communicate. We were also very scared of what he was capable of and I have now been made aware of the fact that it was him that started the trouble at the school. Within a week he attempted to file an Order of Protection under the grounds that I was keeping our stepson at home and that he was not really sick (11/17/05) among other allegations. He failed to appear in court, I had no knowledge of this at the time, and it was denied. That same day he went to school changed the Emergency Card information, the student card information and went to the scheduled conference with my son's teacher as he was home sick. My husband was provided a document in regards to special education testing that needed to be signed for further testing to be done. I had no knowledge of this, as my son was already in speech class and had an IEP. All of these documents had been dated as 11/17/05 and all absences had been excused until that very day. I finally began to put the pieces together when my first husband filed for custody of our son under numerous allegations including that I had refused testing, my son was a truant, our son was failing, and that I had intentionally kept him from going to school. I was ordered to sign for this testing. (2/7/06). I no doubt would have signed the testing if I had known about it previously. My children have been better educated at home than a majority of homeschooled children as I have made learning everything about the world around them an everyday occurrence since they were babies. We have visited extensive amounts of museums, but most importantly it occurs from counting the stairs as we climb, listening to classical music to enhance memory, to imaginative play as explores or having a "Boston Tea Party", explaining why, what how, things work, teaching everything from cooking with a variety of spices learning taste, touch, culture, to learning about the creatures that inhabit our forest while going for a hike. I made arrangements to attend a meeting on 2/10/06. I asked that it be acknowledged that this was the first information that I had on it, but they refused claiming that my dated signature was proof. The day prior she had admitted that her contact had been with my husband and never with me. My son had the testing and an IPE meeting was scheduled. None of my son's medical records were included except one from the vision center requesting that certain accommodations be made. I was told at that point that my son was at a first grade reading level but nearly 5th grade math level. I made it perfectly clear that I was well aware of his reusing problems, had worked with him over the years, have teaching materials at home, worked with his teacher last year, had checked out additional reading materials and he was attending Sylvan Learning Center 2-3 times a week. Another IPE was
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Message (as originally submitted)</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>established a month later as a plan for the following year making many more accommodations. In the meantime I had pushed his teacher to make a majority of the accommodations requested by his eye therapist. All the while the school had an extreme attitude towards us, did not change his attendance record, did not offer us any assistance, and harassed my son and myself. Apparently either both my husband and/or the school contacted the regional attendance co-op. I have a letter from the principal dated December 7, 2005 threaten to contact the co-op even though I had clearly explained our situation and the health of my son. Oddly enough a letter with the same date appeared in court from the regional attendance co-op stating that it was the second notice sent. By that date my son only has 3 unexcused absences, including 2 half days and had the medical records been requested it should have been only 1. I went to the regional attendance office with every intent to talk to the supervisor, supplying him with a copy of my sons medical records, questioning all of this and confused by what their organization is, asking for direction and for this lady to leave us alone in particular my son whom she was pulling out of class. Apparently this upset her as she only became more intimidating and uncooperative with us and failed to allow the school to excuse dates by notes provided by the doctor claiming them to be insufficient. Telling me that my son needs to be physically seen by a doctor each and every day of his illness to have it excused. Tell me if your child had a virus or an ear infection would you take her in every single day until she was better? No. It is not reasonable or feasible by any means. I was also told to take my son to the nurse who herself has even told me that it is not an emergency room and several times has failed to look at my son even with me there. He has also been denied even going to the nurse. There was absolutely nothing that I could do to satisfy the school, my ex-husband or the courts. The very fact that I took my son to more doctors when the school was telling me that I had too was used against me in court attempting to say that I was intentionally ringing up large medical bills and taking my son to the doctor to keep him out of school. When the hearing was concluded the judge said &quot;we would not even be here today if the attendance had not become such an issue.&quot; Then my sons guardian ad item (demanded and paid for by my ex-husband), said that he had never missed a day of school and that my son should live with his father. My son does not even know his father and is very afraid of him. The judges only comments in reference to it was that more labels were being pinned on my son instead of making him accountable and that he would be a person that would end up on SSI. Very disgusting as my sons role model is Teddy Roosevelt and would like to follow in his foot steps not only...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Message (as originally submitted)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>as a president, but as a conservationist. Therefore, my son is being taken away from me because the school failed to follow-up from the previous years IEP, to make the accommodation at the beginning of the year, to include his medical records and have him classified as having other medical conditions, and to make all the necessary accommodations for him. Instead they took our abuser's word, harassed us, failed to excuse doctor excused and/or documented absences, and then contacted my first husband who as previously stated had never ever been to a school he attended and to this day has never been to the school, yet is allowed to take my son. I realize that you must be thinking that there has to be something else. No there is not. This is it. In addition, this will be used against me in my current divorce case as he has now filed for custody and it gives him an automatic 90% advantage. Not to mention that we have lost everything having spent over $19,000 in legal expenses that could have kept us in our house. I want to know who to contact? What can be done? Certainly this is not the typical course of action? My son's life as he knows it should not be ripped away from him because he was ill and missed school. The school and the officials need to be held liable for their actions. I will seek a complete investigation, for the school to provide council and/or funds to get my son back, for all legal expenses, pain and suffering, and a settlement to restore our lives prior to all of this if ever there is such a thing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|       |         | You suggest that the State Board of Education, in choosing software to use with its computer systems, should make that software available to school districts, saying it is too costly for districts to purchase. You are particularly concerned about the use of Adobe Acrobat software for the completion of online forms. In order to save the form -- rather than just saving the data entered at a particular time -- the computer user must have Adobe 5.0 or greater activated on his or her computer.
You can appreciate that state resources also are limited, as they are on the local level, and that the State Board, through the General Assembly, has to set priorities for the use of those limited resources. While your district may not employ Adobe 5.0 or greater software at this time, district staff might consider other methods to make completion of the forms online less time-consuming. These methods include reviewing the form first to identify the data that need to be collected or tabulated, and producing narrative passages in a word processing format, such as Word or WordPerfect, saving them there, and then copying the text into the appropriate space on the form. You and your staff may already be using these or other techniques to make your work easier and more efficient.
Individual divisions in the agency often create their own forms to be used to gather data about programs and services or to complete grant applications and proposals. Due to the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 and other state |
initiatives, the pressure to document academic achievement and teacher quality continues to mount, resulting in the need for the State Board to collect a greater amount of information from school districts than ever before. Many of the collection methods that are developed are electronic applications. In fact, it is often school district personnel who have urged us to provide them with less paper and as a result, we believe that these electronic improvements have produced fiscal and human resource cost-savings for both the State Board and for school districts. Please know that as new online methods are developed and made operational, the needs of school districts are paramount in our minds. While we recognize that the shift to a paperless system can and does create confusion and more work initially for some school districts, we hope that in the long term, district personnel will appreciate that these systems can be more effective and efficient for them to use.

As you know from a review of the footnotes in the report, the bulk of the Commission's recommendations are nonsubstantive in nature (e.g., clarify text; remove obsolete or duplicative language and "elapsed" dates; make language consistent with current practice or other parts of the Code). Other changes are characterized as making the Code more "reader-friendly". To that end, the Commission proposed that the sections within several Articles be reorganized and/or combined, and subheadings be added to make navigation through them easier (see Articles 14 [Children with Disabilities], 17 [Budgets - Tax Rates - Tax Warrants], 18 [Common School Fund], 21 [Certification], 27 [Courses of Study - Special Instruction] and 34 [Cities of Over 500,000 Inhabitants - Board of Education]). In addition, some sections have been moved to other Articles that more directly deal with the subject matter in question.

The most substantive change proposed addressed the Articles dealing with school district reorganization. The Commission's recommendations to consolidate the requisite Articles into a new Article 11E was the basis for P.A. 94-1019, effective July 1, 2006 (http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/publicacts/94/PDF/094-1019.pdf). Article 11E, in part, combines Articles 7A, 11A, 11B and 11D, which have been repealed, and adds additional reorganization options for districts.

After the report was released, the Legislative Reference Bureau, the General Assembly's bill writing arm, indicated that drafting all of the changes in the report at one time would be difficult and time-consuming; the report, when printed, numbers nearly 1,000 pages. Therefore, the State Board began the process by preparing and introducing SB 1856 (http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/BillStatus.asp?DocNum=1856&GAID=8&DocTypeID=SB&LegId=20230&SessionID=50&GA=94) in 2005. Your comments in your submission suggest that you have reviewed that bill. As you can see from the website, the bill, which was referred to the Rules Committee last year, proposed the elimination of numerous obsolete and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Message (as originally submitted)</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>553</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>Can you please see that something is done about this individual who is selling fake diplomas with real school names (which are trademarked) and also selling birth certificates. Below is an email from him showing his business name VersaPrint. His website is <a href="http://www.diplomasandtranscripts.com">http://www.diplomasandtranscripts.com</a> Thank You!</td>
<td>The Illinois State Board of Education has responsibility for regulating public elementary and secondary schools in the state; however, it does not issue diplomas to students who graduate from high school. Individual school districts, charter schools, or alternative schools issue such diplomas. The State Board also does not have an enforcement or investigative unit to provide the type of service you request. I would recommend that you contact your local Better Business Bureau or law enforcement officials to lodge a complaint. We are sorry that we cannot be of further assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554</td>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>In the process of comparing District 299 students’ suspensions with students’ suspensions statewide I noticed that the numbers in the “TOTAL” column for Illinois [see above report] seemed to be inconsistent with the row totals. For example, the amount listed for “TOT SUSPEND ONLY ONCE” is 98,705. Yet, the sum of the numbers in the row is 98,336. It seems that none of the “TOTAL”s for the numbers of suspended students is consistent with the sum of the numbers listed in the row. I have attached a spreadsheet with the Illinois data copied from the report. The “Row Sum” is, as indicated, the sum of the numbers in each row. This inconsistency between the reported “TOTAL” and the apparent total was not noted in the [identifying information deleted] report. Thank you for your attention.</td>
<td>7-31-06 As we discussed in June, the reporting format does not seem to line up the same from various program settings. Some programs shrink the empty spaces that represent the number 0; others delete the whole block of spaces that indicate &quot;0's&quot; and shift the total numbers to cover the spaces. Our staff members have programmed and viewed various formats from different settings. The resulting one attached here may line up well for you on all 328 pages. Please take a look. You’ll notice that all the numbers remain the same, but the placements of the numbers are shifted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555</td>
<td>Parent rights</td>
<td>I am hoping that your Board will update the parental rights laws in Illinois. I am the non-custodial parent of two children and I am court ordered to receive all information regarding my children. Some school districts think that even though your kids don’t live with you, that you must not care. Please make it more strict so school districts have to follow your school codes. They have my court order but they do not care. They said that they are following what their “codes” say, and do not care what a court order says. I would be happy to speak in front of anyone on the board regarding this matter. Thank you very much.</td>
<td>Section 10-21.8 of the School Code (105 ILCS 5/10-21.8) grants noncustodial parents access to school information and records, provided that a court order is not issued denying such access. I have copied the law below. Sec. 10-21.8. Correspondence and Reports. In the absence of any court order to the contrary to require that, upon the request of either parent of a pupil whose parents are divorced, copies of the following: reports or records which reflect the pupil’s academic progress, reports of the pupil’s emotional and physical health, notices of school-initiated parent-teacher conference, notices of major school-sponsored events, such as open houses, which involve pupil-parent interaction, and copies of the school calendar regarding the child which are furnished by the school district to one parent be furnished by mail to the other parent. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this Section a school board shall not, under the authority of this Section, refuse to mail copies of reports, records, notices or other documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Message (as originally submitted)</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>556</td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>The law that prohibits educators from obtaining benefits when the school year is over is UNFAIR, thanks to the educators who got with the politicians to play with taxpayers money and come up with this dumb law. This law needs to be reconsidered ASAP.</td>
<td>Thank you for your submission to the lessredtape email account concerning “obtaining benefits when the school year is over”. In order to respond, if appropriate, we would need additional information, such as the type of benefits to which you are referring and the circumstances under which those benefits are paid. If you have a citation to the law referenced in your email, then that also would be most helpful in our research. As soon as we receive the additional information, we will respond more fully. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557</td>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>How do I get financial aid for my daughter going to college. Our AGI in 05 was 85,000, but I have two other children in private schools because I can not send them to our public school out of fear &amp; safety. I pay $17,000 for college; $7,600 for one high school and $6,500. for another this does not include books, fees or other stuff. How does the middle income people survive or send their children to school?</td>
<td>The State Board of Education is only responsible for prekindergarten through grade-12 education, so it would not have any information that would be useful to you. You might already know that most public and private postsecondary institutions rely on the FAFSA (Free Application for Federal Student Aid; see <a href="http://www.fafsa.ed.gov/">http://www.fafsa.ed.gov/</a>) when determining financial aid awards. If you have not already completed this document for each of your students, then you should do so. In Illinois, scholarship information can be obtained from the Illinois Student Assistance Commission. Its College Zone website might be useful; see <a href="http://www.collegezone.com/informationzone/3392_3409.htm">http://www.collegezone.com/informationzone/3392_3409.htm</a>. Finally, numerous private scholarships are available for myriad purposes, and the Internet provides several search engines to help your students access information about those scholarships. While I do not know the location of those search engines, I would suggest you do a Google or other search for &quot;college scholarships&quot; or one using similar key words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>There,s no sound classroom learnng without the student,s self discipline and respect for the teacher who at that instant in class</td>
<td>You are correct that students do not learn well in environments where they fear for their safety or are being disrupted by other students. School districts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff Response

represents:- the parents, a guardian, a guide, a babysitter and a family member to the children intrusted into his/her hands. A class is a set up whereby, every student is entitled to abide by some rules that would enhance, a smooth learning environment that would benefit the society as whole, and for the individual to embrace the future without regrets. Uniform is a direct way of discipline to detect defaulters. are charged with maintaining discipline in schools. Section 24-24 of the School Code addresses the actions that teachers may take to maintain discipline and ensure safety in schools (see http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/ilcs/ilcs4.asp?DocName=010500050HArt%2E+24&ActID=1005&ChapAct=105%26nbsp%3BILCS%26nbsp%3B5%2F&ChapterID=17&ChapterName=SCHOOLS&SectionID=49306&SeqStart=131200&SeqEnd=134600&ActName=School+Code%2E). Section 10-20.14 directs school boards to establish and maintain parent-teacher advisory councils to establish discipline guidelines in consultation with the board of education; such policies should include provisions "to address students who have demonstrated behaviors that put them at risk for aggressive behavior, including without limitation bullying, as defined in the policy" (see http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/ilcs/ilcs4.asp?DocName=010500050HArt%2E+10&ActID=1005&ChapAct=105%26nbsp%3BILCS%26nbsp%3B5%2F&ChapterID=17&ChapterName=SCHOOLS&SectionID=48899&SeqStart=51000&SeqEnd=71800&ActName=School+Code%2E). Additionally, Article 13A of the School Code establishes the Regional Safe Schools Program, an alternative education program for students determined to be disruptive. The program allows for certain disruptive students to be administratively transferred from their home schools to a safe school program as a way for a school district to "to ensure a safe and appropriate educational environment for all of its students" (see http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/ilcs/ilcs4.asp?DocName=010500050HArt%2E+13A&ActID=1005&ChapAct=105%26nbsp%3BILCS%26nbsp%3B5%2F&ChapterID=17&ChapterName=SCHOOLS&SectionID=17225&SeqStart=86100&SeqEnd=88000&ActName=School+Code%2E).

Communication

The Division of English Language Learning (DELL) makes every effort to communicate with school district personnel through Student Information System. You suggested that the Student Information System (SIS) be used as a centralized database to "pull" information for use in both the performance report and for application purposes. It is hoped that when fully implemented, SIS will simplify the reporting and application processes for many programs. Given the scope of the project, however, SIS is being implemented one phase at a time to allow for refinements to be made perfect the system. Currently, 90 percent of all districts in Illinois are part of the SIS reporting network. It is anticipated that by the fall of 2008, all districts will contribute to the success of SIS by inputting all requested student data. Full implementation of SIS is expected to:

- minimize the amount of paperwork required for reporting purposes,
- increase the state’s capacity to follow a student’s progress over time,
- provide better quality data to drive more enlightened policy decisions resulting in enhanced educational opportunities for all children,
- reduce data collection burdens on schools and districts, and
- enhance the use and relevance of state data by districts and schools.

Reporting

The amount of paperwork that we submit, multiple ways and multiple times, in order to receive state entitlement dollars to support our ELL programming is an area where we could eliminate red tape. Communication and grant reporting comes from separate systems than do our other grant applications. Is there a reason that the SIS is not used at a centralized level to pull for both performance reports and for entitlement dollars rather than having each district replicate number of students, school site, language, language code, several times each year? Is there a reason that ELL uses a DELL broadcast for messages rather than a consistent system throughout ISBE? Is there a reason that ELL forms and grant apps are done in Excel downloads that are not compatible with MAC systems? Please streamline this process...In a district where the state money supports less than 10% of what is actually spent on our ELL program, it should not take the amount of time & frustration that the process currently takes. Thank you for examining the ELL grant app & reporting system and for streamlining this process to draw on information that is already reported through SIS. In addition, please
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Message (as originally submitted)</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>consider using IWAS to list the grant apps, performance reports, and due dates in a consistent manner so that it is easier for administrative reps to stay on top of all deadlines and requirements in a consistent manner.</td>
<td>the State Superintendent’s Weekly Message, which is sent to all superintendents; DELL e-broadcasts; and information posted on DELL’s webpage at <a href="http://www.isbe.net/bilingual">http://www.isbe.net/bilingual</a>. In addition, bilingual program reminders (e.g., application workshops and professional development opportunities) are sent by email to bilingual program directors. Supporting information is available to the general public at all times at <a href="http://www.isbe.net/bilingual">http://www.isbe.net/bilingual</a>. Individuals who wish to be added to the DELL e-broadcast list can do so by calling DELL at 312-814-3850. You will find that these methods of communication are those generally used throughout the agency. Information of a general nature is routinely shared through the weekly messages, while program-specific information is transmitted to intended recipients through user list-serves and division web pages. <strong>Accessibility in MAC formats.</strong> DELL is currently in the process of converting the consolidated application into an ACCESS database format. Once this conversion is completed, the application will be accessible on both Windows and MAC platforms. We will be testing the new system during FY 2007. <strong>IWAS.</strong> DELL expects to add its applications to the e-GMS online grant system, which uses IWAS, to streamline the application and reporting processes. Since the consolidated application and reporting requirements are incredibly complicated, it will take time to convert to an online process. While staff recognize that it may be less time-consuming for school district personnel to complete the application and reports online, they also acknowledge that it is even more important to introduce an electronic process that has been adequately tested so that it does not create unanticipated problems for school districts. Please keep in mind that this process is under continuous evaluation and modification. <strong>Deadlines.</strong> Most programmatic deadlines are established by federal mandates, state law (Article 14C of the School Code; see <a href="http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/ilcs/ilcs4.asp?DocName=010500050HArt%2E14C&amp;ActID=1005&amp;ChapAct=105%26nbsp%3BILCS%26nbsp%3B5%26nbsp%3B%26nbsp%3B%2F&amp;ChapterID=17&amp;ChapterName=SCHOOLS&amp;SectionID=49138&amp;SeqStart">http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/ilcs/ilcs4.asp?DocName=010500050HArt%2E14C&amp;ActID=1005&amp;ChapAct=105%26nbsp%3BILCS%26nbsp%3B5%26nbsp%3B%26nbsp%3B%2F&amp;ChapterID=17&amp;ChapterName=SCHOOLS&amp;SectionID=49138&amp;SeqStart</a> =107100000&amp;SeqEnd=108600000&amp;ActName=School+Code%2E or ISBE rules (23 Ill. Adm. Code 228; see <a href="http://www.isbe.net/rules/archive/pdfs/228ARK.pdf">http://www.isbe.net/rules/archive/pdfs/228ARK.pdf</a>). We will continue to review the reporting timelines and will make adjustments, where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>The blood born pathogens video school employee's are required to watch every year. Every district that I have been in we all watch it every year. Just thought I would throw that out there. Maybe we could cut out watching the blood video ever year. Maybe just new teachers and or hires. I have that tape pretty much memorized. Federal regulations found at 29 C.F.R. 1910.1030(g)(2), (see <a href="http://www.osha.gov/pls/oshaweb/owadisp.show_document?p_table=STANDARDS&amp;p_id=10051">http://www.osha.gov/pls/oshaweb/owadisp.show_document?p_table=STANDARDS&amp;p_id=10051</a>) require that any employee who might come in contact with blood-borne pathogens receive health and safety training at least annually. The Illinois Department of Labor incorporated the federal regulations,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Message (as originally submitted)</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561</td>
<td>Dupe of #560</td>
<td>effective January 29, 1993, in 56 Illinois Administrative Code 350.280(a)(5) (see <a href="http://www.ilga.gov/commission/jcar/admincode/056/056003500C02800R.html">http://www.ilga.gov/commission/jcar/admincode/056/056003500C02800R.html</a>). For the purposes of the state regulations, an &quot;employee&quot; is defined as individual who works for a public entity, including school districts (see Section 350.20 at <a href="http://www.ilga.gov/commission/jcar/admincode/056/056003500A00200R.html">http://www.ilga.gov/commission/jcar/admincode/056/056003500A00200R.html</a>). Therefore, each school district in Illinois is required to provide training to all of its employees at least once a year. As you can see from the federal rules, however, the training need not consist of a video but must address all of the requirements found at 29 C.F.R. 1910.1030(g)(2). In order to assist public entities in meeting the federal requirements, training materials, including a video, were provided at the time the state regulations took effect. Your school district most likely is continuing to use these materials to meet its training obligation. If you believe that a more effective method can be used to provide training about blood-borne pathogens within your district, then you are encouraged to share your ideas with your district administration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562</td>
<td>Rules</td>
<td>The R&amp;R's are there. All that has to be done is to follow them!!!!!!!!!!!! School districts' adherence to all mandates -- state and federal law and regulations -- is required in order to receive state recognition as a public school district. Without further information, however, I cannot specifically address any concern you many have in this regard. Please let me know if you wish information about a particular set of state rules, all of which can be reviewed at <a href="http://www.isbe.net/rules/default.htm">http://www.isbe.net/rules/default.htm</a>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563</td>
<td>Dress Code</td>
<td>Hello, I am from [identifying information deleted] Illinois. My daughter is a cheerleader for the [identifying information deleted] Junior High School 8'th grade. I am concerned about something and don't really whom to write to. This year the School Board District [identifying information deleted] enacted a dress code. The dress code is fine, but is unrealistic in some ways. The girls skirts cannot be more than two inches above the knee. The problem is that the cheerleading outfits, which I have noticed are the same throughout nearly all schools in Illinois, are much shorter than that. The school says the outfits show to much skin. Okay so they should wear granny skirts and be the laughing stock in state competitions, and at school events, games. The cheerleaders wore their outfits to school on picture day, and were told they cannot wear them to school anymore. They can only wear them at the school events. I am wondering what the difference is from in school, and at school events. The classmates still see the same whether in a school event or at a game. I think it is hypocritical to have a double standard. I think that since we parents pay 200 bucks for the uniform rental fee, that since they cannot be worn on a day when there is a game, that the school should foot the Section 10-22.25b of the School Code (105 ILCS 5/10-22.25b), authorizes a school board -- but does not required it -- to adopt a school uniform or dress code policy that governs all or certain individual attendance centers. I have copied that law below for your edification. As you can see, your school board, rather than the State Board of Education, has the discretion to determine appropriate attire for its students within the parameters set by law. If you have a specific concern about the dress code policy implemented by your district, I would suggest you contact the district superintendent or your board of education representative. Thank you for taking an active role in your child's education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Message (as originally submitted)</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>564</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Would like more information re. the laws in IL for education of children with special ed concerns. My son has an IEP based on emotional/behavioral disturbance and is diagnosed with Oppositional Defiant Disorder. He is almost 15 and a freshman in High School and his main problem is truancy from school. He absolutely hates going to school. I do have the copy of parental rights of disabled child but would like more specific information re. the laws concerning an emotionally disturbed child like mine. Have gone to web sites like Wrights law.com and findlaw.com but need more specifics to help me get my son the help he needs.</td>
<td>It would necessary and appropriate for your son's truancy problems to be addressed in his IEP with a behavior plan. If there currently is such a plan and that plan is not working, then I would suggest that you meet with school personnel to review the plan. Should you wish to discuss this situation with a consultant in the State Board's Department of Special Education Services, then please provide your telephone number and a consultant will contact you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>I am writing you because there is a Christian school network that has not been reporting teachers who have been caught for engaging in sexual acts with minor students. the most outstanding case are three teachers -- [identifying information deleted] -- who were let go from [identifying information deleted] Christian for engaging in acts with students. They were not registered as sex offenders nor were there any measures to keep them from teaching again, not even so much as information being passed to other schools. This pertains to me because my adopted mother, [identifying information deleted] teaches at [identifying information deleted] Christian School in the [identifying information deleted] area of [identifying information deleted]. She was taken to court by a parent for physical abuse of a third grader. She was not prosecuted but I can tell you that her abusive behavior was something I experienced at home. I was threatened by her husband so I didn't speak up. Please advise how I can file a formal complaint or get an investigation into these matters. Thanks</td>
<td>Please be advised that you should contact the police and your local office of the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services to file a complaint and/or begin an investigation into any suspected child abuse or neglect on the part of school staff members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>566</td>
<td>Certification</td>
<td>It seems to me that we are walking backwards in the process of certification. I'm a teacher from [identifying information deleted] with 25 years of experience, eight of them in the U.S with certificate type 29, but after taking many years of classes in IL. universities I couldn't obtain my certificate 03 because now the evaluation of credits is not done through the state, but through the universities, and what they plainly told me is this: &quot;Mr. [identifying information deleted]. If you were trained as a teacher in another country and achieved the equivalent of a U.S. bachelor's degree, then you may apply for the comparable certificate in Illinois, and a transcript evaluation may be completed. If you had a major appropriate to the certificate you wish to obtain, student teaching, clinical experiences and the exceptional child course, then you would only have to pass the required tests. Specific documents must be submitted when someone has been trained in a foreign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Message (as originally submitted)</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deleted</td>
<td>you have to understand that we, the universities, besides being educational institutions, are mainly businesses and we can't afford to give you credit for more than 50% of your credits&quot; So, my wife and I, as well as too many teachers, lost our jobs and are forced to work in factories while so many students are in need of good teachers. I would like to hear your comments. Please write me back. Thank you!</td>
<td>country. Please see the following website for the required documentation: <a href="http://www.isbe.net/certification/html/foreign_credential.htm">http://www.isbe.net/certification/html/foreign_credential.htm</a>. Additionally, applicants who have received their teacher education in a foreign country must have their transcripts reviewed by one of the private evaluation services listed on the website provided above before State Board of Education staff can evaluate their transcripts. These organizations will convert foreign credentials into equivalent American courses and semester credits and determine the equivalence of your credentials to an American degree. By state law, applicants must have a bachelor's degree and 120 semester hours of college credit for any of the professional certificates. A bachelor's degree means the equivalent of a U.S. bachelor's degree. Many foreign countries grant bachelor's degrees after only 14 years of elementary, secondary and college education; these degrees are not equivalent to U.S. degrees. Persons with such backgrounds will need to attend an Illinois college, complete an approved teacher education program and receive another bachelor's degree. If applicants' teacher training occurred during their high school experience or at a lower level, then they will not be able to be certificated in Illinois unless they attend an Illinois college and complete a state-approved teacher education program. Applicants must use one of the services listed; we will not accept evaluations completed by other sources. The evaluation must be a detailed evaluation, listing each course completed with its semester hours and including a statement of degree equivalence. Applicants may forward copies of the foreign language documents made from the original and so certified by the regional superintendent, but the original foreign credentials evaluation must be sent to this office. If you were trained as a teacher in another country but you did not achieve the equivalent of a U.S. bachelor’s degree or if you have the equivalent of a U.S. bachelor’s degree but were not trained as a teacher, then the process would be different. You would be required to complete an approved teacher education program at an Illinois university or college and then be recommended for the certificate. You do not have the option to apply for the certificate through the transcript evaluation process. You may have received a transitional bilingual certificate per your degree and the successful completion of the appropriate language proficiency tests without the completion of a teacher education program. You might consider completing an alternative program for certification. Please see the following website for further information about this option: <a href="http://www.isbe.net/profprep/alternative.htm">http://www.isbe.net/profprep/alternative.htm</a>.</td>
<td>ISBE Helpdesk response: I apologize you found the SIRS approval system troublesome. We've had very few concerns about the process because it was designed to ensure that administrators view each incident reported. We were concerned that if we had a blanket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Message (as originally submitted)</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>approval option, some reported incidents would be submitted without being read or reviewed. I have forwarded your concerns to Lessredtape at ISBE. Thank you for your comments. I hope this justification gives you a better understanding of why this particular application was designed in this manner. Thank you, [identifying information deleted] Helpdesk Support</td>
<td>If I can be of further assistance, then please let me know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>568</td>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>I would like to suggest that with the newly mandated Annual Statement of Affairs form (50-37), this contradicts the Governor &amp; ISBE's mantra of 'less red tape', as this new form will require a lot of time to complete and duplicates other required information. Is there an oversight panel to review this? Thank you</td>
<td>Over the last two years, the lessredtape email account has received several suggestions to do away with the requirement that school districts publish their statement of affairs annually in a newspaper of general circulation for their districts. State Board of Education management agreed that this was a good idea and proceeded to introduce legislation that included this change. Unfortunately, as is often the case with the legislative process, special interest groups, in particular the Illinois Press Association, lobbied successfully to weaken the State Board's original proposal by introducing their own version. It was this version that was eventually enacted into law. State legislators are aware of the need to look at Section 10-17 again, and may move legislation during the spring 2007 session to eliminate this burdensome requirement, retaining the requirement the information be supplied to the State Board of Education for posting on its website. If you have any other specific suggestions for how better to address the requirements of Section 10-17, please let us know. Thank you for your continued interest in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>569</td>
<td>Substitutes</td>
<td>Hello, I would like to know why the schools in [identifying information deleted] County allow anyone with an associates degree or better to substitute teach? [identifying information deleted] county requires a degree only in any form. These people are walking into the classrooms with degrees in horticulture, etc., and being turned loose on our children. They have no experience and some have never stepped foot in a classroom. This is absurd and not only a waste of the taxpayers money but a slap in the face to a &quot;certified teacher&quot; who has gone to school to be a teacher. The children deserve to have qualified educators in the classroom. According to the Illinois law-unless I am misinterpreting it states that you have to have the appropriate certificate and experience to be a substitute teacher in Illinois. If this is the case then why does [identifying information deleted] and many other [identifying information deleted] County schools allow this to go on? The [identifying information deleted] County office does not appear to be in compliance with the state law. Please advise.</td>
<td>In order to serve as a substitute teacher, an individual must apply for a substitute certificate at the regional office of education that serves the area in which the school district or districts are located. While a college degree is one requirement for holding a substitute certificate, it is not the only one. The law is copied below with the relevant sections highlighted. I also copied the administrative rules pertaining to those individuals who have two years of teaching experience. I would suggest that you contact the [identifying information deleted] County Regional Office of Education if you believe that an individual is serving as a substitute without the proper certification or qualifications. That office's number is 815-740-8360. Thank you for being committed to excellence in education. § 105 ILCS 5/21-9. Substitute certificates and substitute teaching Substitute certificates and substitute teaching. (a) A substitute teacher's certificate may be issued for teaching in all grades of the common schools. Such certificate may be issued upon request of the regional superintendent of schools of any region in which the teacher is to teach. A substitute teacher's certificate is valid for teaching in the public schools of any county. Such certificate may be issued to persons who either (a) hold a certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Message (as originally submitted)</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Dear Educators and School Administrators: I have applied both in [identifying information deleted] District [identifying information deleted] and ISBE because I believe that I can contribute. I ask that the agency has available on its website a listing of job openings. If you access <a href="http://www.isbe.net/hr/Default.htm">http://www.isbe.net/hr/Default.htm</a>, then you will find a listing of available positions, requirements for those positions and the process for obtaining them.</td>
<td>valid for teaching in the common schools as shown on the face of the certificate, (b) hold a bachelor of arts degree from an institution of higher learning accredited by the North Central Association or other comparable regional accrediting association or have been graduated from a recognized institution of higher learning with a bachelor's degree, or (c) have had 2 years of teaching experience and meet such other rules and regulations as may be adopted by the State Board of Education in consultation with the State Teacher Certification Board. Such certificate shall expire on June 30 in the fourth year from date of issue. Substitute teacher's certificates are not subject to endorsement as described in Section 21-1b of this Code [105 ILCS 5/21-1b]. (b) A teacher holding a substitute teacher's certificate may teach only in the place of a certified teacher who is under contract with the employing board and may teach only when no appropriate fully certified teacher is available to teach in a substitute capacity. A teacher holding an early childhood certificate, an elementary certificate, a high school certificate, or a special certificate may also substitute teach in grades K-12 but only in the place of a certified teacher who is under contract with the employing board. A substitute teacher may teach only for a period not to exceed 90 paid school days or 450 paid school hours in any one school district in any one school term. However, for the 2001-2002, 2002-2003, and 2003-2004 school years, a teacher holding an early childhood, elementary, high school, or special certificate may substitute teach for a period not to exceed 120 paid school days or 600 paid school hours in any one school district in any one school term. Where such teaching is partly on a daily and partly on an hourly basis, a school day shall be considered as 5 hours. The teaching limitations imposed by this subsection upon teachers holding substitute certificates shall not apply in any school district operating under Article 34 [105 ILCS 5/34-1 et seq.]. History Administrative Rules found at 23 Ill. Adm. Code 25.455 (emphasis added) Section 25.455 Substitute Certificates Pursuant to Section 21-9 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/21-9], a Substitute Certificate may be issued to an applicant who has had two years of teaching experience. Such an individual shall present evidence of having a minimum of 60 semester hours of college credit, including six semester hours in the field of professional education earned in a recognized institution of higher learning, effective July 1, 1966. Teaching experience for a Substitute Certificate is defined as teaching in an elementary or secondary school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Message (as originally submitted)</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>571</td>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>I'm curious why we have to submit the Teacher Salary Survey since we have submitted our collective bargaining agreement with a 3 year salary schedule last year. I was told I do not have to submit the contract again this year, but I do need to send a copy of our salary schedule and complete the online salary survey. It's time consuming and redundant!</td>
<td>Section 2-3.103 of the School Code provides that &quot;each school district shall attach to the completed survey form which it returns to the State Board of Education as required by this Section a copy of each salary schedule, salary policy and negotiated agreement which is identified or otherwise referred to in the completed survey form.&quot; The law requires that this be done each school year. The State Board then must compile the information received into a &quot;statewide salary and benefit survey report based upon the survey applying. Additionally, a listing of education jobs outside of the State Board of Education can be found at <a href="http://www.isbe.net/employment.htm">http://www.isbe.net/employment.htm</a>. I wish you luck in your job search.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Message (as originally submitted)</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>572</td>
<td>SIS</td>
<td>All students have unique ID's through the Student Information System (SIS). Currently home schools report the student demographic data for their out-of-district placed students. Home schools do not necessarily know changes in the out-of-district placed students' data; for example, free-and-reduced lunch status, 504, homeless, etc. Instead of the home schools being responsible for all data submittal, consider having the serving schools enter data for their students (this way it is up-to-date and accurate) and not make it the home school responsibility. Other states (Michigan and Indiana) are currently following this procedure and data is then merged for reporting purposes at the state level.</td>
<td>We appreciate your providing your teacher salary information to the State Board, as required, and recognize that, as with many state-required reports, it is often time-consuming to complete and submit the survey. If you believe the law should be changed, then you could contact your state legislators to see if any are interested in pursuing such legislation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>573</td>
<td>Postsecondary</td>
<td>[identifying information deleted] Community College in [identifying information deleted],( IL) refused to give me back my money ($300) for the class I had dropped, inasmuch the college did not present any written agreement between me and them, saying that money for dropped class is not refundable.Is the college doing legal stilling? Who can I talk about that?Please answer my question , or direct to the proper representatives.</td>
<td>#573 and 574: Thank you for your recent submissions to the lessredtape email account concerning higher education. Please know that the Illinois State Board of Education is not responsible for postsecondary education in Illinois and as such, we are unable to address your concerns. I have included the contacts of the responsible agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>574</td>
<td>Postsecondary</td>
<td>This letter is intended for the appropriate student bodies that include most importantly the President of the University, the Dean of the University, the State Board of Education, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Board of Trustees, Financial Aid Office, Student Judicial Affairs, Fashion Design Department, and Miscellaneous contacts for anyone that may want to reach out and lend a helping hand to resolve this issue. I will be trying to contact the financial aid office by telephone here in the next few days. In the mean time I would appreciate any clarification as to why the outstanding balance on a recent school bill is $3,034.07. From my understanding after hearing the conversations with my fiance she signed up for a class in August of 2005 and took out a Subsidized Student Loan to pay for the class and the balance at that point was $61.00 to pay to the forms completed and returned.&quot;</td>
<td>Illinois Board of Higher Education (pubic universities; <a href="http://www.ibhe.org/">http://www.ibhe.org/</a>) Address: Illinois Board of Higher Education 431 East Adams, 2nd Floor Springfield, Illinois 62701-1404 Phone: (217) 782-2551 Fax: (217) 782-8548 TTY: (888) 261-2881 General Information: <a href="mailto:info@ibhe.org">info@ibhe.org</a> Technical Problems: <a href="mailto:webmaster@ibhe.org">webmaster@ibhe.org</a> Illinois Community College Board (community colleges; <a href="http://www.iccb.state.il.us/">http://www.iccb.state.il.us/</a>) 401 East Capitol Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
school. She sent this money in to make the balance $0.00. She took the class based on Molly Edwards' "Advisement" for 3 months thinking this was going to go towards her graduation credit. On a meeting with [identifying information deleted] in October of 2005, she was advised to drop the class (after the allowed time frame for dropping a class without penalty) and was told that everything would be alright. She was deliberately told the wrong information by an "Advisor" of the university that is now costing her rather than helping her. To my understanding [identifying information deleted] practices only allowing advisors the ability to drop a class for this very reason, to avoid situations like these. [identifying information deleted] still went ahead and dropped the class, knowing that this would put [identifying information deleted] under the allowed credit hours for a semester. Where on the other hand [identifying information deleted] took the necessary steps to "try" and protect herself by signing up for a supposed required class to graduate and promptly stayed on task during those 3 months thinking this is helping her get to her goal. She received the proper notification after registering for the class before the billing deadline where the financial aid was expected to be enough to pay the charges and received the message on her statement that her account has been granted an automatic cancellation waiver and that her classes for the semester would not be cancelled. Additionally, it has also been brought to my attention that [identifying information deleted] was not a suitable "Advisor" at the time and any actions taken by Mrs. Edwards should be considered void based on the merit that she unheartedly stated to [identifying information deleted] "I'm working overtime for this, because you got added into my department" and continued to act like students from the Fashion Department were directly bothering her. During the time of the old Fashion Department's Advisor, there were no problems at all and everything went smoothly. As soon as Mrs. [identifying information deleted] was given the "responsibility" of the Fashion Department, it seems as if something needed to be addressed here, especially with this issue. It is of upmost importance to understand that if someone doesn't speak out about the negativity that was directed towards [identifying information deleted], then know one at the University (especially the important bodies of the Dean's Office, President, Student Affairs, State Board of Education, Ethics Office, and more) would know. I have also been informed that [identifying information deleted] no longer advises the Fashion Department, where [identifying information deleted] has taken over for this department. Furthermore, [identifying information deleted] University pledges to: a. maintain the high quality of its programs of "instruction", research.
and public "service";  b. to monitor judiciously the development of and addition to these programs; and  c. to sustain, through these programs, its diverse and comprehensive educational contribution to the people of [identifying information deleted] Illinois, the state, and the nation. A statement from the president states that "with all campuses combined, [identifying information deleted] has more than 35,000 students. Our faculty and staff are second to none and are "eager" to help students achieve their educational goals. We're proud of our "exceptionally friendly" and "helpful faculty", staff and students. A lot of students are out on their own with no instructions or direction from parents and a lot of times from my experience, attending [identifying information deleted] State University, we turn to our advisors for the best and most useful "instruction" and "service" to guide us in the right direction. With this said, I find it hard to believe that [identifying information deleted] would accidentally miss the opportunity, while being such and "eager" staff member to help a student achieve her educational goals, to inform [identifying information deleted] that "Enrollment changes can have a significant impact on your current financial aid as well as your future financial aid eligibility. Your tuition and fees may be adjusted whenever you add, drop or withdraw based on the [identifying information deleted] Refund Policy. As a result of dropping or withdrawing from your classes, your financial aid may be reduced, or in some cases canceled. Also, dropped or withdrawn classes are counted in determining your future financial aid eligibility through the Satisfactory Progress Policy. For additional information, contact the Financial Aid Office prior to dropping or withdrawing from your classes. Thank you for your time and if you are willing to expedite the process for this unacceptable behavior and instruction to a student of yours at [identifying information deleted] University [identifying information deleted] please feel free to give me a call at [identifying information deleted]. [identifying information deleted] did not ask me to do this for her, I am doing this only because I attended two wonderful universities and in no way have I ever been treated to the point where I'd feel as if I was being pushed to the side and being told there is nothing that the University can do for me because of an "advisors" lack of ability or intentional misleading. Faculty that should be called out on situations like this need to happen more often and need to go directly to the important bodies because it is easy for employees to hide behind doors in such a large environment and a lot of times can get away with it. Bare in mind, it is the students that are paying the 50,000-60,000 dollars to attend what they thought and are directly told is a "Great School" based on the words taken right from the website that are listed within this
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Message (as originally submitted)</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>575</td>
<td>IWAS</td>
<td>On IWAS, is there any way to modify the System Listing to show if our district had already completed this by a checklist or if ours was past due? We receive the general emails that are sent to every district regarding deadline notices but it may not apply to our district. Sometimes, we get confused with the name because so many report names are similar but we think we've already submitted that one. Otherwise, instead of listing them as Annual, etc., is there any way to list them in chronological order by due dates so we have a better idea of which order to complete the state reports?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In February 2006, the State Board of Education updated the IWAS system to reflect due dates on the system listing of individual applications. The Data Systems Division is currently working on implementing an application status (i.e., &quot;Not Started&quot;, &quot;In Progress&quot;, &quot;Completed,&quot; &quot;Past Due&quot;) on the system listing which will allow the user to quickly know the status of his or her individual applications without having to enter the application and check it. Staff are also working to develop the ability to display the applications by due dates, which will require that each individual application in IWAS be modified to accomplish this task. The agency does not have a completion date for this project, as we are in the requirements-and-detail design phase of the project at this point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>576</td>
<td>Postsecondary</td>
<td>Dear sir when I went to school the Illinois state board of education applied to adults who worked in some occupation obtained from some form of education, and some form of Certificate or Licensure obtained in the state of Illinois. If this is still true, please send me a copy of training for Brenda Joyce Hall Practical nurse training 09/1971 to 09/1972 Lic. in the state of Illinois 1973 certified issued 09/1972 at Ike if Chicagoes Public High school and made to order by the U.S. Department of Labor and did read: &quot;This Certificate is to certify that BRENDA JOYCE HALL has completed courses in Practical nursing offered by M.D.T.A. Practical Nursing Division of the Chicago Bd of Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thank you for your submission to the Lessredtape email account concerning an LPN certification for Ms. Hall. The State Board of Education does not issue such certifications. I would suggest you contact the school that Ms. Hall attended. I hope your search is successful.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>577</td>
<td>Immunizations</td>
<td>PLEASE consider redesigning the way in which we input the immunization data. It is very tedious to have to select a drop down for every immunization and for every grade and for every compliant or noncompliant exception. Plus the site doesn't print a report of the totals. It would be much easier to collect the data in a format like the Immunization Data Entry Worksheet. In the elementary setting where an early childhood or Pre K is present we have 7 grades to account for. This is a very time consuming task and frankly, we're too busy taking care of kids!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In the last week or so, the agency's lessredtape email account has received several inquiries about the revised online immunization and health examination survey. I will respond to all of the issues raised in a single email, since many of the comments were similar. <strong>Grade-Level Reporting.</strong> The State Board of Education worked with the Illinois Department of Public Health (IDPH) to design a survey to collect immunization information that conformed to the variables utilized by the Centers for Disease Control (CDC). While Illinois is not required by a state or federal mandate to collect immunization data in the reporting format of the CDC, our state was one of only two states that was unable to submit data in a standard format. Since the information is provided to the State Board rather than IDPH, an effort was made this year to update the survey instrument to collect the data by grade level, as the CDC has requested. Grade-level, rather than school-level, data will provide greater detail that could facilitate revisions in existing public health policies or the adoption of new policies. Collection by grade level also aligns with the way in which data for dental reporting is collected. Staff in the Data Analysis and Progress Reporting Division recognize that the new system is a little more time-consuming, but they also note that the system has advantages and is designed to produce fewer errors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Each user now enters data only for those grade levels that the school...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Message (as originally submitted)</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>serves, since the system excludes those grades levels not served.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Each user provides data only for immunizations required for a particular grade. For instance, since the HIB is required only for prekindergarten students, it will not be listed for other grade levels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Each user will be able to determine whether an error has been made by reviewing the &quot;Validate Data Page&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• If in any grade level, all students are reported as &quot;compliant,&quot; then a user does not need to enter any data for other status categories (e.g., medical, religious).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Despite these advantages, staff acknowledge that the new system is more cumbersome to use, and they will work on identifying improvements that will make it more user-friendly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Summary Report.</strong> One person requested the system allow for the printing of a summary report that includes the totals for the district. Staff believe that this is something that can be accommodated in the 2007-08 reporting cycle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Lack of Advance Notice.</strong> Due to some unexpected change in staff, the announcement of the new system was not made as early as the division would have liked. Staff appreciate your understanding and attention to meeting the requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Drop-down Menus.</strong> Drop-down menus provide the most efficient method for entering data for all grades and immunization categories. If you have specific suggestions for ways in which these can be made easier to use, then please let us know.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Exclusion Procedures.</strong> There have been no changes in either the dates or procedures for excluding students who do not provide the required proof by the deadline.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Tracking Totals.</strong> It was suggested that tallies of data should be done by grade level rather than by immunization category. This is a good suggestion, and staff will investigate the technical and financial feasibility of making this change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>578</td>
<td>Immunizations</td>
<td>I have just completed the Immunization Survey and must tell you that it was quite cumbersome this year. I much prefer the form that combines all grade levels rather than having to identify numbers for every grade level.</td>
<td>See response under #577 above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>579</td>
<td>Immunizations</td>
<td>Did you receive my e-mail? I think it was too long and too seething and so did not go your way. The content was detailed about the new Immunization electronic submission and the absolute ridiculousness of ISBE/IDPH changing the rules AFTER the game is played. New rules October 16? Our data is collected by then. Cannot spend hours and hours recompiling. Would agree to 2007, but 2006 would take another staff person with lots of time and no students. We have students that come first.</td>
<td>See response under #577 above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580</td>
<td>Immunizations</td>
<td>Not sure who to ask, but our nurse wants to know if the students who are still here from the hurricane have to have shots &amp; physicals this year?</td>
<td>During the 2005-06 school year, students who came to a school district due to Hurricane Katrina were to be treated as homeless students. Homeless ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Message (as originally submitted)</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>581</td>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>I cannot get back into the Teacher Service Record to finish up my data entry. I received the following error. Please help as soon as possible. Thanks very much.</td>
<td>I apologize for not getting back to you sooner, as lessredtape submissions are only logged once a week. A staff member from the State Board of Education's Data Analysis and Progress Reporting Division will be calling you soon. Again, we are sorry for the delay in getting you a response and appreciate your patience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582</td>
<td>Supplemental General State Aid</td>
<td>Copy of emails sent to Public Information regarding Chicago’s use of Supplemental General State Aid (SGSA). Information supplied by Public Information during the week of October 25, 2006.</td>
<td>I understand from staff in our Public Information Division that you have received the information that you requested. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>583</td>
<td>Immunizations</td>
<td>As a school nurse, I am very concerned about the latest version to submit physical and immunization data. The pulldown windows are cumbersome and the data is not saved in a logical manner to track tallies. (It would make more sense to group all K data, 1st grade data, etc. and let the computer sort it by immunization after entry. I spent over an hour today doing data entry on just one school. Since I have multiple schools, I feel my time could be better spent dealing directly with the students I serve. If we must enter data by grade level, please return to a grid format to make data entry simpler.</td>
<td>See response under #577 above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>584</td>
<td>Immunizations</td>
<td>To Whom It may Concern, I recently learned that there have been MAJOR, LAST MINUTE changes to the exclusion rules. I am a District [identifying information deleted] nurse in charge of 3 schools. I started working on obtaining essential health information for my 850 students the first day I walked into the building mid-August. I am still involved with this same task 2 months later. In my opinion whoever made this new rule at the last minute does not have the slightest idea what the job of SCHOOL NURSE means. We devote most of the first quarter of school to the exclusion process. We all work very hard to try to accumulate the most accurate numbers for you. I find it very unfair and somewhat insulting that you think we have the time to redo all of our figures at this stage of the year. Of my 850 students that I care for some are</td>
<td>See response under #577 above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Message (as originally submitted)</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585</td>
<td>Immunizations</td>
<td>Why would one send an e-mail giving the rules of immunization data collection AFTER the exclusion date? AFTER the health records all had been reviewed? AFTER the Immunization School Survey sheets were tallied? AFTER no hint, no notices, no e-mails, no directions from IASN or IDPH School Health that a change was coming? Why would ISBE want student support staff spending more time with PAPER and DATA instead of working with students, treating asthmatics and diabetics? Why paper? Why not people? From ISBE: Student Health Data Date: 10/16/2006 3:16:28 PM Subject: Student Health Data System for Immunization Now Available in IWAS Student Health Data now encompasses both the immunization and dental forms. The system will remain open until November 15 for submission of immunization data. There are several links on Data Analysis website to help you navigate the new system. Please go to <a href="http://isbe.net/research/htmls/immunization.htm">http://isbe.net/research/htmls/immunization.htm</a> to find the following information: User Guide for Electronic Submission We request that you read the user guide before entering your data. There are many helpful screen shots along with step by step instructions. How to calculate actual unduplicated count Data Entry Helper Sheet Worksheet (Updated 9/12/06) Thank you.</td>
<td>See response under #577 above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>