Ad Hoc Rules Committee of the Whole

Wednesday, June 20, 2007
3:30 p.m.
This meeting will begin immediately following the previous session.

Board Room, 4th Floor

Public Conference Call Access Number: 1-866-297-6391 (listen only); Confirmation #: 1 8 1 7 8 8 2 7

AGENDA

1. Roll Call

2. Board Member Participation by Other Means

3. Public Participation

4. Minutes of the May Ad Hoc Rules Committee Meeting

*5. Rules for Adoption
   a. Part 25 (Certification) (*Linda Jamali*) *(Plenary pp. 17-43)*
   b. Part 350 (Secular Textbook Loan) (*Melissa Oller*) *(Plenary pp. 44-48)*
   c. Part 555 (Children's Mental Health Initiative) (*Jodi Fleck*) *(Plenary pp. 49-75)*

6. Part 226 (Special Education) (Tentative)

7. Less Red Tape Quarterly Informational Report (*Shelley Helton*) *(pp. 7-29)*

8. Committee Agenda Planning/Additional Items

9. 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 2:25 p.m. and noted that no members were participating by telephone. He announced that one individual had signed up for public participation.

3. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:** Bev Johns, Chair of the Illinois Special Education Coalition (ISELA), stated that she had major concerns about the process that had been used in presenting the changes in the special education rules that were being recommended for adoption. She noted that she had received a copy of these changes for the first time upon arriving for the meeting and stated that never in ISBE’s history had a document being recommended been distributed on such short notice. In her view, professionals, families, and others who work with students had not been represented in the development of the changes although they would be significantly affected by the rules.

Speaking to the issues of class size and case load, Ms. Johns indicated that all controls over case load would be eliminated for the next two school years and that she found this very disconcerting. She went on to note that the work load provisions would not take effect for at least two years and that there were concerns with those as well.

The Superintendent and Board members agreed that these issues would be considered as part of the relevant agenda item, and Ms. Johns was thanked for her remarks.

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Chris Ward moved approval of the minutes of the April 18, 2007, meeting. Dean Clark seconded the motion. Andrea Brown identified a needed correction to the statement that she had participated in a lengthy conversation with representatives of the Chicago Public Schools in connection with administration of the state assessments at special education facilities. Instead, she had been recalling a conversation on that topic between the Board as a whole and those representatives and had expressed the understanding that the rule amendment would solve the problem identified by the district. The motion was amended accordingly and the minutes were approved as corrected.

5. **RULES FOR INITIAL REVIEW:**

- PART 100 (Requirements for Accounting, Budgeting, Financial Reporting, and Auditing)
- PART 110 (Program Accounting Manual)
- PART 125 (Student Activity Funds and Convenience Accounts)
General Counsel Darren Reisberg invited Division Administrator Deb Vespa and staff member Lou Ferratier to provide an overview of these three related items. Ms. Vespa explained that the goal of amending these requirements was to achieve a clearer picture of the status of certain school district funds and the actual costs of the fundamental components of education. She provided specific examples, such as the segregation of funds in the tort fund in order to keep restricted funds from being mixed with monies used for operational purposes. Further, the bonding and interest fund would be opened up into a broader "debt" fund, while "site and construction" would become "capital improvements" (exclusive of transportation, required by law to be kept separate).

Ms. Vespa also indicated that the new rules would provide for appropriate internal controls over student activity funds and convey a knowledge base that would be useful to districts in establishing adequate internal controls. This material, instead of being kept in a separate Part as is previously the case, would be incorporated into the main set of accounting rules so that district staff would only need to look in one place for information and requirements. She explained the deferred implementation date as providing a needed opportunity for working with software companies and others so there would be time to adjust systems. She emphasized that no levies would be abolished; the names of funds were being modified to reflect the line items covered.

Vinni Hall complimented the staff for the work done on the rules and stated she had found them very clear. With regard to student activity funds, she requested clarification of the rules’ effect on classroom-based fund-raising activities. Information was provided regarding the establishment of accounts, the ownership of the funds by the students rather than by the district, and the role of a fund's custodian.

Dean Clark asked whether any substantive changes were being made in connection with the working cash fund, and there were none. Joyce Karon asked whether account numbers would basically remain the same, and it was affirmed that they would. Lou Ferratier clarified that there would be some new account numbers to "create room" for new initiatives and requirements but that the existing ones were not being changed. There should be no impression in the field that "everything" was going to be changed.

General Counsel Darren Reisberg noted that a new procedure would be implemented, involving a motion at the conclusion of the meeting recommending action on the rules to the full Board at the plenary session.

6. RULES FOR ADOPTION

Mr. Reisberg noted that three of the items being presented for adoption had come before the Board for initial review at the February meeting.

PART 1 (Public Schools Evaluation, Recognition and Supervision)

Rules Coordinator Sally Vogl reminded the Board of the origins of this rulemaking, which was essentially a set of technical corrections to eliminate duplicate provisions. The rules had incorporated two contingencies as a result of enactment of a state law that was later followed by disapproval of certain provisions by the U.S. Department of Education. She explained that one additional change was being recommended for adoption in connection with classification of scores on the various state assessments. It had been noted at the April Board meeting that the same labels were being given to groups of scores achieved on the accommodated state assessment as for the ISAT and the PSAE. However, Ms. Vogl pointed out that Section 1.30(h) needed to be revised because it currently provided for a different set of labels for reading scores on the accommodated assessment.

It had been verified that no scores would fall into different groups by virtue of the differing labels, and on that basis this revision should be seen as a technical correction rather than a substantive change.
Mr. Reisberg suggested that agenda item 6b (Special Education) be deferred until after the other sets of rules had been discussed, in light of the expectation that it would take the greatest amount of time.

PART 475 (Contested Cases and Other Formal Hearings)
Mr. Reisberg indicated that no public comment had been received on the proposed amendment to this Part, which would simply reflect long-standing agency practice. Due process is afforded in the affected instances, but not a full evidentiary hearing. There were no questions.

PART 485 (Appeal Proceedings Before the State Teacher Certification Board)
Mr. Reisberg noted that there had been no public comment on this new set of rules either, but that some suggestions and questions had been raised by the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules (JCAR). Some of those had been very useful and had led to several changes that were being recommended for adoption. Board members raised no questions or issues on this Part.

PART 226 (Special Education)
Returning to agenda item 6b, Mr. Reisberg recalled the December 2006 adoption of these amendments and the January 9 objection and filing prohibition that had been issued by JCAR. He then provided an overview of the outreach and consultation that had occurred, culminating in the version of the rules that was being recommended for adoption. In particular, he highlighted Dr. Koch’s communications with the members of JCAR, the absence of a response that would have clarified the specific basis for the filing prohibition, and the resulting necessity for filing a notice of refusal to modify the rules in accordance with the general statement that had been issued. He also described the ongoing consultation that had occurred with representatives of the Illinois Federation of Teachers, the Illinois Education Association, the Illinois Association of School Administrators, the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education, and the State Advisory Council on Education of Students with Disabilities. Further clarification from the U.S. Department of Education had also been sought.

Mr. Reisberg indicated that the entire process had been very time-intensive and that the receipt of greater specificity from JCAR at its April 18 meeting had been helpful in enabling the agency to focus on the areas of the rules that would need to be modified. These centered on “RTI”, class size, and work load. He concluded this summary by explaining that apparent consensus had been reached just the previous evening. While it would certainly have been desirable to have a product to distribute sooner or to have more time to consider the changes, the timeline associated with JCAR’s filing prohibition dictated that a revised version must be adopted and available for JCAR’s review at its June 12 meeting. Of course, individuals who continued to have unresolved concerns would be free to comment on them that day or during the plenary session and to communicate with JCAR in the period leading up to JCAR’s meeting.

Mr. Reisberg then went on to summarize the changes being recommended for the Board’s consideration.

Section 226.130 (Additional Procedures for Students Suspected of or Having a Specific Learning Disability)
- The implementation deadline would be moved from the 2008-09 school year to 2010-11.
- The State Superintendent would, by January 1, 2008, be developing a plan for state assistance in terms of professional development and other resources. The plan would be developed in cooperation with the organizations representing teachers and administrators, as well as the State Advisory Council on Education of Students with Disabilities, whose membership is broadly representative of the stakeholders and certainly includes parents.
- Each district would, in turn, develop a plan for devoting resources to the transition to a process of the required type. This would presumably be based in part on the state-level plan, and districts could integrate these into their district improvement plans if they so wished.
Mr. Reisberg noted that, because of the serious concerns that had been voiced in connection with immediate implementation of the new procedures, the U.S. Department of Education had been consulted. ISBE had learned that USDE was not only comfortable with but even encouraged a period of transition, rather than expecting immediate implementation.

**Section 226.730 (Class Size for 2009-10 and Beyond)**

**Section 226.731 (Class Size Provisions for 2007-08 and 2008-09)**

- No substantive change would be made to the version adopted in December, but the effectiveness of the new provisions would be deferred for two years instead of one and the effectiveness of the current provisions extended accordingly.

**Section 226.735 (Work Load for Special Educators)**

- This Section would address “work load” instead of “case load”. “Case load” had not previously been defined or regulated at the state level, except for speech-language pathologists, but this Section would encompass all special educators.
- The requirement for districts to have policies on staffing decisions would be discussed here and revised to refer to plans for work load.

Once it had been clarified that many in school districts had been misunderstanding what the requirements in the rules meant, a strong push arose to have some control over work load in the rules. Mr. Reisberg indicated his belief that the response that had been developed would prove very helpful. By virtue of these changes, the 60-student limit for speech-language pathologists would remain in effect, but their work load would also be subject to the provisions of the district-level plan. He then explained the basis for the district-level plans and their content and noted the relevance of labor relations law as concerns employees with exclusive bargaining representatives and contracts already in effect. He then invited questions from the Board members.

Brenda Holmes complimented Superintendent Koch and the staff for their outreach efforts and work on these rules and expressed what she believed to be the fundamental question: With this language, would the groups that had raised concerns to JCAR now be in agreement so that the rules could move forward? Dr. Koch responded affirmatively. Ms. Holmes then asked Ms. Vogl for information on the process of transmitting the rules for JCAR’s review and stated that it might be prudent to include in that transmittal some of the background information Mr. Reisberg had just provided, particularly with regard to ISBE’s efforts to resolve the issues and Dr. Koch’s repeated offers to make himself available to provide information to JCAR’s members. She noted the lack of response on JCAR’s part and expressed surprise that JCAR had not specifically identified the outstanding issues until the middle of April. She wished it to be made clear to JCAR that ISBE had done everything that could possibly be done to concentrate on the salient issues and resolve them.

Ms. Holmes also stated that, in view of the large number of constituent groups Dr. Koch and the staff had met with, it could safely be assumed that every other interested entity had had access to at least one of those groups. In response to her question as to whether he considered the “waterfront” to have been covered, Dr. Koch again responded affirmatively. He indicated that, in his time with the agency, he had never seen a more comprehensive process for public input. On that basis, he believed the rules were finished and ready to go.

Andrea Brown asked whether the Management Alliance had been included in the meetings at which the language of Section 226.735 had been developed, and their involvement was confirmed. Dr. Koch indicated a high level of confidence because the work load plans would encompass all the types of effort captured in the standards published by the American Speech Language and Hearing Association (ASHA).

Vinni Hall commented that some portions of Part 226 would require time to implement and that she had come to realize there would always be an opportunity to change rules if some aspects were found not to be working well. She reiterated the Board’s central concern for children and
noted that the rules are a tool in the delivery of services to them, as well as a means of meeting federal requirements. She expressed the hope that those in the affected public would read the rules that evening and come forward with any comments. On that basis she believed the Rules Committee should recommend that the rules move forward.

Joyce Karon noted the degree to which the affected constituent groups had been empowered through this process and their vested interest in the resulting provisions. Speaking directly to the representatives of the IEA and the IFT who were present, she voiced the hope that those organizations would communicate the extent of their involvement so their members would understand that the final version had not been developed in isolation. Since the organizations had been able to work directly on the rules and come up with the solutions, she hoped they would “carry the water” out in the field, and the same with respect to the organizations representing management.

Chris Ward moved to approve all the rules that had been discussed for action by the full Board in the plenary session. Vinni Hall seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

7. COMMITTEE AGENDA PLANNING/ADDITIONAL ITEMS
Darren Reisberg outlined the items that were expected to be ready for action at the June meeting. These included initial review of amendments to Part 25 (Certification) with regard to the new “master principal” designation and adoption of amendments to the same Part for the teacher leader endorsement, the alternative route to administrative certification for NBPTS-certified teachers, and the new thumb-printing requirements for certification testing. The roster of rules ready for adoption also included the amendments to Part 180 (Health/Life Safety Code for Public Schools) and Part 350 (Secular Textbook Loan), as well as new Part 555 (Children’s Mental Health Initiative Grants). It was expected that 45 minutes would be sufficient time for discussion of those items.

8. ADJOURNMENT
Dean Clark moved that the meeting be adjourned. David Fields seconded the motion, and the meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.
ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING
June 20-21, 2007

TO: Ad Hoc Rules Committee of the Whole

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

Agenda Topic: Less Red Tape Update

Materials: Summary of New Submissions and Responses

Staff Contact(s): Shelley Helton

Purpose of Agenda Item
The purpose of this agenda item is to update Board members about the status of Less Red Tape submissions and to provide a summary of Less Red Tape activity.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
The purpose of the Less Red Tape 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.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
This item is informational only.

Background Information
In October 2004, the agency created an email account system so that its constituents could submit ideas for streamlining agency rules and processes. As of June 6, 2007, the agency had received a total of 472 submissions (not including spam emails) concerning more than 86 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 18 new submissions received since the March 2007 report and the responses provided for those issues that have been resolved.

Analysis and Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action and Communications
All of the 18 submissions received since the March 2007 report have been resolved.

Nearly a third of the submissions received during this reporting period addressed the requirements for the Technology Integration Plan (TIP). An approved technology plan is required for school districts wishing to receive certain federal grants. Agency staff have aligned the planning elements to the federal requirements, and a template with those elements is provided for districts’ use. By the end of the year, the TIP should be included as part of the interactive report card site, which houses the School Improvement Plan and the District Improvement Plan. As such, common data elements among the plans can be retrieved for use in the TIP. Both of these efforts will help ease the reporting burdens on school districts.

A summary of the status of Less Red Tape inquiries by submission and issues is provided below for calendar year 2007 (all of the issues from 2006 have been resolved and that chart
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>2007 (18 submissions to date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved (all issues resolved)</td>
<td>18</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.
Illinois State Board of Education

STATUS REPORT:

COMPREHENSIVE RULES REVIEW
AND
LESS RED TAPE INITIATIVE

June 20, 2007

Rod R. Blagojevich, Governor

Illinois State Board of Education
Jesse H. Ruiz, Chairman • Dr. Christopher J. Ward, Vice Chair • Dr. Vinni M. Hall, Secretary
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Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent 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

In accordance with P.A. 93-1036, effective September 14, 2004, the agency began a comprehensive review and overhaul of its rules immediately following the appointment of the new Illinois State Board of Education. The purpose of this review was to identify how the rules could 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 (LRT) Campaign”, accessible at lessredtape@isbe.net. Ideas generated through the LRT 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 includes the action that has occurred since the last report in March 2007 and is organized as follows.

• **Section 1** describes the progress of the comprehensive review of the State Board of Education’s rules.

• **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 2007 legislative initiatives resulting from the rules review and LRTs.

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 contains only those sets of rules that are still under review (descriptions provided below). Rules upon which action has been completed or those where revisions were not necessary are no longer included in the listing. New Parts or amendments to existing Parts that have resulted from legislative action also are not discussed in this report.

The rules presented below are organized by Part number. The State Board of Education has more than 50 separate Parts. As a result of the comprehensive review, 24 Parts of rules were amended and 19 Parts were repealed. Of the repealed Parts, the content of eight sets of rules was incorporated into other existing Parts in an effort to avoid duplication and enable constituents to find information with similar topics in one location.

In process
PART 100 – REQUIREMENTS FOR ACCOUNTING, BUDGETING, FINANCIAL REPORTING, AND AUDITING
PART 110 – PROGRAM ACCOUNTING MANUAL
PART 125 – STUDENT ACTIVITY FUNDS AND CONVENIENCE ACCOUNTS

These three rulemakings will provide for a comprehensive updating and streamlining of this material.

New Part 100 has been developed to address the same issues as have always been included in Part 110 beginning with the 2008-09 school year. While the structure of the chart of accounts has not been changed, the existing rules have been streamlined to the extent possible while still offering a coherent system for optional codes that can be used to respond to local needs and circumstances. 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.

This new Part will eventually replace current Part 110, and it also subsumes current Part 125, but those two sets of rules need to be retained for now because Part 100 is not intended to apply to the 2007-2008 school year. An amendment to each of the retained Parts has been proposed in order to make this timetable apparent.
(Board reviewed proposed rules in May; public comment period ends July 16.)

In process
PART 226 – SPECIAL EDUCATION

These rules have been substantially reworked to address IDEA reauthorization and eliminate any unnecessary state-imposed burdens. The proposed amendments were published in the Illinois Register in March 2006 and the public comment period ended September 15, 2006. The Board adopted a revised version that incorporated numerous changes in response to public comment, but the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules (JCAR) prohibited its filing.
(Board adopted additional revisions in May; scheduled for JCAR review in June.)
Progressing
PART 254 – VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Staff in the divisions of Rules and Waivers, Legal, and Career Development and Preparation 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 not yet scheduled.)
**SECTION 2 – CHANGES TO AGENCY PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES**

The [lessredtape@isbe.net](mailto: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 March 2007 has been removed. Action on items that were still in progress at that time and those that are new are described below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lessredtape Suggestion</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. While an item analysis will not be provided, staff will continue to work with ACT to make this possible in the future. It is anticipated that examples of these reports will be posted on the Student Assessment website in the near future.</td>
<td>Progressing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Staff submitted to the federal government this spring an application for funding to develop a longitudinal data system.</td>
<td>Progressing. Staff are awaiting a response as to whether the agency will receive a grant award.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve IWAS to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 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 have been in place for 17 different reporting and funding plans, including for all four of the systems mentioned in the lessredtape submission.**  

**Additions for FY 2008 funding are:**  
• IDEA Part B Flow Through,  
• IDEA Part B Preschool,  
• IDEA Discretionary,  
• IDEA Preschool Discretionary, and  
• Continuation Application for the Preschool for All Children Program.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lessredtape Suggestion</th>
<th>Agency Response</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Include the Public School Update (form 60-63).</td>
<td>This form is used by each school district to update information about the district and its schools (e.g., names of district and schools, addresses, telephone numbers, superintendent, principals). 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>Staff are beginning the development phase of the on-line system for schools and districts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**District Planning Requirements**

Streamline the technology planning process and make it easier to complete.

ISBE is currently developing an online TIP template, to be available later this year, that will be hosted on the Interactive Illinois Report Card (http://iirc.niu.edu/) website as a consolidated e-Plan in conjunction with the School Improvement Plan template and the District Improvement Plan template. Districts will have the options of completing the TIP in isolation from the other plans or in combination with either or both of the other plans. The website is being designed to consolidate the common elements of each plan and eliminate duplicative efforts.

Districts now may either use the template available, which includes all federal requirements, or use a Word or Excel format that is based on the proposed template.

Fall 2007.

**Reporting**

Make the online immunization survey less cumbersome and time-consuming to complete.

Numerous changes were implemented for the next reporting cycle, including:

1. Using a System Listing page rather than a dropdown menu, which caused confusion.
2. Incorporating a function to view the documentations while a user is entering data. The user doesn’t need to open up a new instance of the browser (Internet Explorer or Netscape).
3. Allowing school summary and district summary of data that has been submitted to be printed.
5. Mechanism to help users decide whether they have to submit data (e.g., when a student is enrolled in another facility, like a special education facility, but the student’s school of residence submits the data).

Available for 2007-08 reporting cycle.
SECTION 3 – DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION (RESULTING FROM THE RULES REVIEW AND THE LESS RED TAPE INITIATIVE)

Rules Review: Eleven parts of rules were repealed in October 2005 because the programs that they governed had not been funded for several years and future funding was unlikely. Governmental Relations staff prepared an amendment to HB 2004 to repeal these programs, but the amendment did not move forward. Below are the statutory sections responding to the rules review that were included in the amendment.

- 105 ILCS 5/1C-2, Professional Development Block Grant (repealed Part 160)
- 105 ILCS 5/2-3.59 and 2-3.60, Staff Development Plans (repealed Part 30)
- 105 ILCS 5/2-3.61, Summer School (repealed Part 230)
- 105 ILCS 5/2-3.65, Comprehensive Arts Program (repealed Part 250)
- 105 ILCS 5/2-3.93, Alcohol and Drug Education Initiative (repealed Part 225)
- 105 ILCS 5/2-3.94, Scientific Literacy (repealed Part 220)
- 105 ILCS 5/2-3.117, School Technology Program (repealed Part 255)
- 105 ILCS 5/2-3.124, Liability Insurance (repealed Part 56)
- 105 ILCS 5/13B-40 through 13B-40.35, Alternative Learning Opportunities Program Gants (Part 240, Subpart B)

Additionally, P.A. 94-1105, which took effect June 1, 2007, repealed:

- 105 ILCS 5/2-3.54, Mathematics and Science Loan Program (Part 360), and
- 105 ILCS 5/2-3.106, Urban Education Partnership Program (Part 245).

LRTs: The only issue brought to the agency’s attention through Less Red Tape to be addressed in legislation was legally mandated school holidays, as discussed below.

HB 2006: This bill addresses both school holidays and parent-teacher conference days. The House passed the bill May 15, 2007, and the Senate referred it to the Rules Committee on May 22, 2007.

School Holidays: Under the bill, Section 24-2 of the School Code would be amended to provide school districts and others eligible to apply for waivers and modifications with the flexibility to determine locally whether to hold school on a legally mandated school holiday or use the day for another purpose (i.e., teachers’ institutes, parent-teacher conferences or staff development). Entities exercising this authority would be required to hold a public hearing, including providing notice of the hearing to the public and educators, and provide instruction to students about the significance of the holiday, either on the holiday if students are in session or on the day immediately preceding or following the holiday if students are not present. Entities now must seek approval from the State Board of Education for a modification of Section 24-2 if they wish to use legally mandated holidays for a purposes other than nonattendance days.

Parent-Teacher Conferences: While not a subject of an LRT submission, the scheduling of parent-teacher conferences locally under certain circumstances without having to go through the waiver process would provide school districts with needed flexibility. The circumstances that would be codified by the bill in Section 18-8.05 of the School Code either have been allowed by agency policy or have been the frequent subject of waiver applications. Under these circumstances, the time devoted to parent-teacher conferences would count as an actual pupil attendance day for the purposes of meeting the requirements for a legal school calendar under Section 10-19 of the School Code when a district:
- Holds at least two hours of parent-teacher conferences in the evening following at least five clock-hours of student attendance plus holds at least three clock-hours the next day; or
• Holds multiple evening sessions following at least five clock-hours of student attendance, provided that the total time used for parent-teacher conferences is equal to five clock-hours.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Message (as originally submitted)</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>624</td>
<td>Illinois High School Association</td>
<td>There was a commercial on IHSA games that showed presidents who played in HS sports. I was disappointed at the last statement. People who participate in HS sports tend to go farther then those that don't. This is a slap in the face for those who do not have the ability to participate. This type of attitude does not speak well of the IHSA. I played in HS sports and I felt sorry for those who couldn't. This is the most abusive use of insensitivity I have ever saw. You should denounce this commercial. There's more to life than HS athletics.</td>
<td>Participating in extracurricular activities in high school -- including athletic programs -- helps students acquire team-building and leadership skills that could be a benefit later in life. Participation in extracurricular activities has become a critical element in many admission policies of institutions of higher education, as well. This being said, however, I am not aware of any evidence presented that singles out sports participation as an accurate gauge to one's future success in life. The IHSA is not a division of the Illinois State Board of Education, nor does it report to our agency. I would suggest that any comments you wish to convey about this commercial be sent directly to the IHSA. For your convenience, I am providing the group's contact information below. Illinois High School Association  P.O. Box 2715  Bloomington, IL 61702-2715  Telephone: (309) 663-6377  Fax Number: (309) 663-7479, available 24 hours a day. Website: <a href="http://www.ihsa.org/">http://www.ihsa.org/</a> The State Board of Education appreciates your concern about improving the quality of education in Illinois.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625</td>
<td>Technology Plans</td>
<td>Could someone possibly investigate the latest round of technology planning requirements? We have serious deadlines to meet and ISBE has dropped the ball on getting correct information. There was supposed to be a technology planning meeting held for Area IV schools in January that was cancelled and rescheduled to March 15. Now this meeting is cancelled. The alleged deadline for schools with plans expiring in 2007 is April 15. Schools with plans expiring in 2008 (of which we are one) are required to have draft plans completed by September of 2007 (not much time considering most staff is off during the summer). We were also promised that the plans could be submitted on-line, but that has not happened, resulting in significantly more paper and work in preparing and formatting hard copies of the plans (not to mention the numerous copies required to be sent for the peer review). Another aspect of this is that the plan allegedly requires some policies to be adopted by the school board. I am also a school board member in my home district and feel that requirement usurps the authority of the local school board. Administrative policies that are approved by the board (such as found in an Acceptable Use Policy or student handbook) should suffice to meet the federal guidelines. An ISBE employee does not have the authority to mandate a school board adopt a particular policy (if it is legislated or at least mandated</td>
<td>I invite you to review State Superintendent Christopher A. Koch's message included in the April 30 Weekly Bulletin, accessible at <a href="http://www.isbe.net/board/archivemessages/message_043007.pdf">http://www.isbe.net/board/archivemessages/message_043007.pdf</a>.  • Completion of technology integration plans (TIP) is entirely voluntary.  • Districts must have an approved TIP to receive federal Enhancing Education Through Technology (EETT) funds and/or to receive federal E-rate funding. There are other state programs that also require districts to have an approved TIP on file with ISBE to be considered for competitive funding.  • ISBE provides a template for electronic submission of the TIP, but use of the template is not required at this time.  • Districts may submit TIPs to ISBE in their choice of formats. The template provided by ISBE includes all federal requirements for EETT and for E-rate. Those districts opting, however, to use a different format other than the provided template must still meet the TIP requirements outlined in the resources provided on ISBE’s website found at <a href="http://www.isbe.net/curriculum/elearning/html/tech_plan_info.htm">http://www.isbe.net/curriculum/elearning/html/tech_plan_info.htm</a> to receive approval.  • Information about the completion of a TIP is available on ISBE’s website at <a href="http://www.isbe.net/curriculum/elearning/html/tech_plan_info.htm">http://www.isbe.net/curriculum/elearning/html/tech_plan_info.htm</a>.  • ISBE’s intent in publishing all the resources cited above is to provide</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>
</tbody>
</table>
| 625 (con’t.)|         | by the State Board, that is different). Many districts have significant concerns over this process. Some improvements were made over the previous process, but it seems for every step forward, we take two steps back. | districts with the guidance to write plans that are approvable. ISBE desires to support districts so that they can confidently request federal funding knowing they have fulfilled all TIP requirements.  
- Once approved, tech plans are active for three years.  
- Tech plans are approved by trained peer reviewers.  
- There is no deadline for submission of tech plans to ISBE. This will be an ongoing process. Those districts, however, applying for E-rate funds must have an approved plan on file with ISBE by July 1 of each fiscal year for which they are applying for funding.  
- This past winter, ISBE published a TIP submission deadline of April 15, 2007, for those districts planning to apply for E-rate funding and requiring an approved plan by July 1, 2007. A submission date of April 15 was established as a reasonable date whereby ISBE could process and guarantee an approved plan by July 1; TIPs submitted after that date cannot be guaranteed a July 1 approval date.  
- Districts are welcome to submit TIPs at any time of the year.  
- Those districts applying for EETT must have an approved TIP prior to ISBE releasing funding regardless of the time of year. Districts may apply for EETT formula funding anytime during the fiscal year via the IWAS E-Grants system.  
- Staff from regional Learning Technology Centers (LTC) are available to provide assistance for completion of the TIP. Information about the LTCs can be found at [http://www.isbe.net/curriculum/elearning/html/ltc.htm](http://www.isbe.net/curriculum/elearning/html/ltc.htm).  
- Developing TIPs should be a collaborative process among the various stakeholders in the district. Writing the TIP should not be the sole responsibility of one or two district personnel.  
- ISBE is currently developing an online TIP template that will be available later this year. When completed, the TIP template will be hosted on the Interactive Illinois Report Card ([http://iirc.niu.edu/](http://iirc.niu.edu/)) website as a consolidated e-Plan in conjunction with the School Improvement Plan template and the District Improvement Plan template. Districts will have the options of completing the TIP in isolation from the other plans or in combination with either or both of the other plans. The website is being designed to consolidate the common elements of each plan and eliminate duplicative efforts.  
- Much effort has been afforded to minimizing the requirements of the TIP. ISBE staff has researched the federal requirements for EETT and for E-rate and feel confident that little else has been included in the TIP template. The exception is the accompanying inventory template. The inventory template is finely granulated to allow districts to simply record the quantity of hardware, software, and connectivity options on hand. The inventory template has been designed for two reasons: First, |
<p>| | | | |
|             |         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                                                                                                                                                                                                 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Message (as originally submitted)</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>625 (con’t.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>ease of use, and second, to advance Goal 3 of the Illinois State Board of Education’s Comprehensive Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan charges ISBE with the effort of assessing second-generation technology needs in school districts and to advocate for funding proposals to meet those needs (more information can be found at <a href="http://www.isbe.net/pdf/strategic_plan_2005.pdf">http://www.isbe.net/pdf/strategic_plan_2005.pdf</a>).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- ISBE does not currently have an avenue for measuring the state of technology in school districts. The culmination of statewide data collected from the TIP inventory template will advance our understanding of existing conditions so that ISBE can target advocacy efforts to meet those needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Board policies that have already been adopted regarding the requirement to have an Acceptable Use Policy are acceptable provided that such policies meet the requirements outlined under the E-Rate and EETT programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The State Board of Education appreciates your keeping staff informed of the problems experienced by school districts and will continue to work with you to find solutions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>626</td>
<td>Technology Plans</td>
<td>What really bothers me is that this is a Never Ending Story. Seems like I just got approved for my last tech plan and now they want me to revise it and then write a new plan that only lasts 3 years. The tech planning process has become a burden to the tech staff (me) taking me away from supporting technology in our building. I believe in tech planning, just not at the level that the state is requiring, so we can have a few dollars from the feds. I would like to see how other states are handling USAC requirements. I am on the list serv for Indiana tech coordinators and they do not discuss tech planning problems. I wonder if they have any? The research and survey work required for tech planning takes so much time that I do not have time to take care of all the other state reports and local technology problems. I do not have a staff who can pickup the slack when I am busy writing a tech plan. Committee members help with data collection and input, but I do the writing. Help I am buried in a bureaucratic black hole and can't get out. OK, I guess I could give up on the $3000.00 I get from E-rate.</td>
<td>See response to #625.</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>627 (con’t.)</td>
<td>consumers. If you can find time today please give me or one of my associates a call.</td>
<td>As a way of providing more information about home-schooling in Illinois, you will find copied below a sample of the type of information staff share with parties interested in home-schooling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sample Home-schooling Information**

Thank you for your inquiry on home-schooling. The state of Illinois is not involved in regulating home-schooling. Home-schooling is considered another form of private schooling in this state and the only requirements in the School Code are from Article 26, the Compulsory Attendance Act:

"… the following children shall not be required to attend the public schools:
1. Any child attending a private or a parochial school where children are taught the branches of education taught to children of corresponding age and grade in the public schools, and where the instruction of the child in the branches of education is in the English language."

Please be aware that as of January 1, 2005, the compulsory attendance law has changed. The law now requires that students between the ages of 7 and 17 (formerly 16) attend public school or its equivalent.

If a parent teaches his (or her) child the branches of education (language arts, biological/physical sciences, math, social sciences, fine arts, health and physical development), in English, then he or she will be fulfilling the requirements of the law. The parent should also plan to spend a comparable amount of time in the home school to the time the student would have on subjects if the child were to remain in public school. While there are no requirements in the law for credentials that must be held by a home-school teacher, the parent should believe that the person providing the actual instruction to the student is qualified and competent to do the job.

The state of Illinois does not give advice on the best way to home-school, or suggestions for textbooks, curriculum, etc. In Illinois, regional superintendents (elected officials who represent one or more counties) are responsible for enforcing the Compulsory Attendance Act and they are interested in knowing that students in their area are being home-schooled. Registration of home-schooled students is optional in this state; parents may choose to notify their regional superintendent if they wish. A directory of regional superintendents can be found on the State Board’s website at [http://www.isbe.net/regionaloffices/pdf/roedirectory.pdf](http://www.isbe.net/regionaloffices/pdf/roedirectory.pdf).

Please be aware that if, after a period of home-schooling, a parent decides to enroll his child in the local public school, that school has the authority to test the student to determine what grade he or she should attend. There are many Internet sites devoted to home-schooling (see below for examples). In most cases, typing in "home school" or "home schooling" on any of the main Internet search engines will bring up a large number of sites. Home-schooling is often covered in newspapers and magazines.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Message (as originally submitted)</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>628</td>
<td>Report Cards</td>
<td>I would suggest a different format for the School Report Cards. The colored graphs are nice, but our district reproduces them in black and white. Thus sometimes the meaning of the graphs becomes confusing for parents.</td>
<td>The suggestion to use color graphs came from the field and was endorsed by the State Board of Education's Report Card Advisory Council; it has generally been well-received. One way to address the concerns you noted would be to encourage parents to view the report card online where they can see the color graphs. If the parents don't have access to a computer, then they can go to the local library. Additionally, the district might consider a PowerPoint presentation for the parents and the public that is provided during a parent meeting or a board meeting. The State Board appreciates your efforts to provide timely and useful information to your community, and I hope that these suggestions help mitigate some of the difficulties that you are experiencing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Do you have a listing of all the teaching workshops, classes and seminars in the area. I have some professional development money that I would like to use before the year is up.</td>
<td>Unfortunately, the State Board of Education does not maintain such a listing. You might contact your school administration, the Regional Office of Education in your area (see <a href="http://www.isbe.net/regionaloffices/pdf/roedirectory.pdf">http://www.isbe.net/regionaloffices/pdf/roedirectory.pdf</a>), or if applicable, a nearby institution of higher education to see if any are offering training or educational opportunities that might complement your professional development needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630</td>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>When I took out student loans to continue to work with special education students (many of them disadvantaged), I was assured that most, if not all of my loans would be forgiven, due to the population I have worked with the past seven years. However, as I work for private schools who are assigned public school students (therapeutic day schools), and the districts we serve are all listed on the &quot;approved list&quot;, but our particular school is not. I even secured documentation from the districts that my claim was legitimate, but was rejected. Naturally, this is a hardship on my family, and I am certain that I am not the only professional in this predicament. Truthfully, had I known that I would have had these difficulties, I would have had to rethink continuing my education to enter this branch of education (I have been teaching for over thirty years, but the last seven in special education), as we really could not afford it. I would appreciate some assistance in this matter.</td>
<td>While the State Board of Education is responsible for making determinations about loan deferrals for the federal Stafford student loan program, it only does so based on the count of low-income students in public schools. Further information about loan deferral and forgiveness programs can be obtained from the Illinois Student Assistance Commission at: Illinois Student Assistance Commission 1755 Lake Cook Road Deerfield, IL 60015-5209 Phone: 800.899.ISAC (4722) 8 a.m. - 5 p.m. CST E-mail: <a href="mailto:collegezone@isac.org">collegezone@isac.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>631</td>
<td>Postsecondary</td>
<td>I am currently a Day-To-Day Substitute Teacher that has been working every day (except Summer School) since December 2, 2003. I enjoy and love teaching. At this time I can not attend evening classes to receive my much needed Teaching Certificate, because I am currently raising my two grandsons. Recently I applied for a TeachingFellowship but I was denied due to my low G.P.A. in undergraduate school. My Master's is in Education. Please let me know whether or not something is going to be changed or resolved about others as myself that Can teach and have Proven ourselves to be worthy as an Educator.</td>
<td>Thank you for your submission to the Less Red Tape email account concerning your efforts to be accepted into a teaching fellowship program. While the State Board of Education applauds your efforts to further your education, it does not administer any teaching fellowship programs. In order to challenge the standards used to admit candidates to the program in which you are interested, you would need to contact the institution offering the program. If that institution is an institution of higher education, then you might also want to contact the Illinois Board of Higher Education, which is responsible for public postsecondary education institutions and some private institutions, as follows: Illinois Board of Higher Education</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>631 (con’t.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>I wish you luck in furthering your education, and please let know if you have any other concerns or questions about the teacher certification process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632</td>
<td>Technology Plans</td>
<td>I would love to see our tech plans more streamlined like other states. Please do what you can to make this happen. We are tired here at little [identifying information deleted] of taking so much time and effort to complete the plan, taking us away from the building, for so little money that we receive. It would be nice if we could also get more reliable help with the very cumbersome plan that we must now develop. Just a thought.</td>
<td>See response to #625.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>633</td>
<td>Technology Plans</td>
<td>I have been communicating via email with tech coordinators from all over the state who are frustrated with the technology planning process as it has been implemented by ISBE. The requirements for writing a tech plan are nearly impossible for a small or medium sized district to meet.</td>
<td>See response to #625.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I met with Representative [identifying information deleted] and three people from ISBE to voice my displeasure, frustration, and yes, even anger at the complexity of the process to get a technology plan approved in Illinois. Since that meeting, I have had two different people including an ISBE employee suggest that I write to <a href="mailto:lessredtap@isbe.net">lessredtap@isbe.net</a>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>While our school district does not have an approved tech plan at this time, we were not planning to complete one until next year. I was starting to get information together to get ready to start our plan next fall. Upon hearing the complaints of my peers about the process, the constantly changing rules and formats I decided that I must do something about this bureaucratic nightmare that is technology planning in Illinois.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Why is it that a medium sized school district in Illinois must have a tech plan that is 97 pages long while a similar sized district in Indiana has a tech plan that is 9 pages long. When this question was posed to ISBE reps in my meeting with Rep. [identifying information deleted], the answer was that Indiana writes a BIG state plan and the districts write &quot;addendums&quot;. I was told that the Illinois districts did not want to do that. So I looked up the BIG Indiana tech plan. While the one I found may have been out of date, it was only 14 pages long.</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>633 (con’t.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>If ISBE is serious about reducing paper work and reducing &quot;red tape&quot;, it can start by eliminating this ridiculous technology plan altogether or streamlining the process so that it can be accomplished in a reasonably amount of time. We have a tech director in southern Illinois who estimates that he has spent over 300 hours on his district's tech plan. While he may be exaggerating, I would not doubt that he has spent over 100 hours on it. It is interesting that ISBE is requiring that these plans be submitted by April 15th in order to be approved for E-Rate. Choosing &quot;Tax Day&quot; for the due date for these plans seems appropriate. I only wish that I could complete our district's tech plan in three or four times the amount of time that it takes for me to prepare my income tax returns. There are several districts throughout Illinois - including ours - who have determined that the pittance that we receive as a result of having an approved tech plan is not worth the time, effort, and stress required to write one of these plans. The required surveys for these plans could not possible pass any kind of scientific &quot;muster&quot; applied by anyone who has taken even a lower level statistics course. Most schools do not get a representative sample. They get 30-40 people - mostly teachers and friends - to fill out the survey and call it quits. Even those who make a more legitimate effort - sending surveys home, etc. - will not get a response that any statistician would call a representative sample. So while the plans need to be data driven, the data that drives the plans can in many, and I would even venture to say most, cases would be considered invalid by a good actuary. So these surveys are simply tasks performed to satisfy the political whims of the ISBE and/or USAC. Something has to be done.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634</td>
<td>Certification</td>
<td>I have an elementary certificate. What would I have to do to get a secondary certificate in French?</td>
<td>To qualify for a subsequent teaching certificate, you will be required to complete an approved secondary program at an Illinois institution. You will want to contact an Illinois college or university that offers an approved secondary program in French. Below is the website for the directory of Illinois colleges and universities that offer approved programs. You might want to check pages 70 and 71 in the back of the directory. Then you will want to contact the institutions and find which program meets your needs. If you decide to complete the program, then the institution will recommend you for the secondary certificate. If your goal is to teach French to high school students, you have another option, if you already hold a French endorsement on your elementary certificate. There are special endorsement rules for our foreign language teachers. If a teacher holds a teaching certificate with a foreign language endorsement, then the teacher has the ability to add an endorsement in the same foreign language to the same certificate but at a different grade level. In fact, the endorsement may be extended beyond the grade level of the...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
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<td>Message (as originally submitted)</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
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<tr>
<td>--------</td>
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<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634( con’t.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>teaching certificate. An endorsement application and fee (ISBE form # 73.52 with the $30 fee) must be submitted through a Regional Office of Education requesting the endorsement. You may download the form at the website below and I will also provide a link to the directory of ROEs. To qualify for the Senior High French endorsement (if you already hold a French endorsement on the elementary certificate), you will need to successfully complete the Assessment for Professional Teaching (APT) test for grades 6-12 (#103)—OR—the APT for K-12 (#104). You will not need any additional French courses. The website for testing is also included below.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.isbe.net/profprep/PDFs/Directory.pdf">http://www.isbe.net/profprep/PDFs/Directory.pdf</a> <a href="http://www.isbe.net/regionaloffices/pdf/roedirectory.pdf">http://www.isbe.net/regionaloffices/pdf/roedirectory.pdf</a> <a href="http://www.icts.nesinc.com/">http://www.icts.nesinc.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>635</td>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>Hello! I am interested to subscribe to your above title[early childhood education] for one copy, one year subscription...could you please advise me your foreign individual rate/year? thank you and hoping to receive your reply shortly. best regards!</td>
<td>You have reached an email account that is used by people in Illinois to suggest ways in which the Illinois State Board of Education may lessen statutory or regulatory burdens on public school districts, teachers and others that the State Board may regulate. The State Board is a government agency of the State of Illinois and does not publish and sell materials. I am providing a link to the agency's website and a specific link to the web page of the agency's Early Childhood Division to help you better define what you are needing: <a href="http://www.isbe.net/">http://www.isbe.net/</a> <a href="http://www.isbe.net/earlychi/default.htm">http://www.isbe.net/earlychi/default.htm</a> Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
<td>Student Information System</td>
<td>If the process with SIS is supposed to be streamlined, then why is ISBE adding additional requirements to the data that has to be submitted. If the state only has to provide summary data to the Federal Government, then why are districts having to provide specific behavior data identifying the student? How many parents do you think would be happy to hear that their child's behavior information is being sent to the state, especially after all of the problems the state has had concerning ISAT test results and the negative publicity that the SIS has received. The faith and confidence of the Student Information System is quickly diminishing when we cannot get meaningful responses to questions that we ask. It's difficult to support a system that is constantly changing and one that we see no results from. The SIS has been in place for a couple of years now. What data has been made available to school districts that has come directly from the SIS to show trends? How is this extra data that needs to be submitted helping the local districts? Once again, it creates more work on the local level, but yet there are no additional funds provided to pay for the extra time that personnel must spend supplying the state with the data. This is data When SIS was initially introduced to schools and school districts, the State Board of Education informed them that the SIS would be used to collect data now being gathered through individual efforts and would allow the agency to eventually eliminate, among other data collection efforts, the fall housing, end-of-year, bilingual, and prekindergarten reports. This means that the SIS will continue to change as those efforts are included in the system. Additionally, as the U.S. Department of Education requires additional data be collected, State Board staff will try to weave those into SIS. You mentioned negative publicity regarding SIS; however, the data in SIS comes directly from school districts and the records at the agency are only as good as the data that are maintained at the local level. As for reports coming from SIS, there are several that relate to student assessment correction reports and staff will be building additional reporting capacity into the system this year. Eventually, you will be able to see the performance trends for each of the students enrolled in your district. As you indicated, the behavior data is currently collected on the end-of-year report and this is one of the data collections that eventually will be eliminated. State Board staff appreciate the data burden that is placed on districts but believe that reporting individual data will reduce much of the error that occurs in the aggregate data received. Also, since the data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
636 (con’t.)

that is already provided to the state on a summary basis on the End of Year Report Card. Why does the process in reporting need to be changed? What are the consequences/penalties if districts choose not to or are unable to provide the additional information requested? As you may recall there were many districts throughout the state that didn't adhere to the initial call for using the SIS. Nothing ever happened to them. I'd like to know what type of discussions were had with districts throughout the state not just Chicago, before some of these requirements were implemented. I know a pilot was done initially with SIS. However, it seemed that even once it went "live", it was still a pilot project.

637 Certification

The reading credentials requirements chart is very confusing to read. It states that if someone is assigned as a reading teacher and had a reading teacher endorsement prior to 6/30/07, that teacher can provide technical assistance and teach students assigned as a reading specialist and had a reading teacher endorsement only (no specific program), prior to 6/30/04 that teacher can provide technical assistance and teach students. Those two things conflict since the ISBE certification guidelines read reading specialists are the only ones who can both teach reading and provide technical assistance. Thus, schools can't ask a reading teacher to provide technical assistance. The problem comes for those teachers, like me who have received their endorsements between the time period of 6/30/04 and 6/30/06. They are stuck with reading teacher endorsement on their certificate even though they can, by state guidelines provide the technical assistance that a specialist can. As I search for a job, and fill out online applications, districts are requiring reading specialist collected on behavior is reported to the federal Office of Special Education Programs, a district that does not supply the information might possibly have its funding withheld. There were only 22 districts that had initial problems in submitting data to SIS. Those districts received a letter from the State Superintendent informing them that they were in violation of the School Code and that their recognition status could possibly be affected. Most of those districts were in the process of buying new vendor packages or switching from one process to another. City of Chicago School District 299 is the only district at this time that is not part of SIS. Staff meet weekly with staff from the Chicago school district, which should have all of its schools in its system sometime this month. State Board staff talked with school superintendents during the SIS feasibility study and during the initial pilot-testing of the system. During those conversations, individuals had an opportunity to provide recommendations and make comments. Staff used the information they received to make changes in SIS, such as eliminating the dental and immunization data and the school foods data from the system. The agency appreciates the time you have taken to share your concerns with staff and encourages you to continue to provide them with comments and suggestions as they improve the system so that it is provides the greatest benefits to school districts and the state.

Note: Subsequent to agency staff sending this response, districts have continued to express concern regarding the agency’s directive for districts to submit student-specific disciplinary data. Staff are continuing to evaluate this directive, which is not required either by state or federal law.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Message (as originally submitted)</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>637 (con’t.)</td>
<td>endorsements. This is understandable since ISBE guidelines state that they are the only ones who can provide tech assistance. I, however, don't know what to do. If I check the box that says I have the reading specialist endorsement, I know it's not really the endorsement that I have, but if I check the reading teacher endorsement, I know that I actually have certification that entitles me to fulfill the duties of a reading specialist. Why not have all of those reading endorsements (that don't include specialized masters programs) prior to 6/30/06 be endorsed the same way? It would save me a lot of difficulties as I apply for positions. I think it would also make it easier for districts hiring as they look at compliance issues. Thank You</td>
<td>Your main concern appears to be how to communicate your qualifications as you apply for a job as a reading specialist. You have stated that you hold a reading teacher endorsement and it was issued between June 30, 2004, and June 30, 2006. You have the ability to teach reading and provide technical assistance. You are qualified to do both and that is stated on the reading chart (i.e., &quot;assigned as a reading teacher and had a reading teacher endorsement prior to 6/30/06 ... can provide technical assistance and teach students&quot;). Districts may employ you or any other person who is qualified to teach reading and provide technical assistance for reading positions. The hiring district, however, may want all of its reading teachers to be reading specialists. That is a district decision and that is acceptable. The State Board has identified the minimum requirements, but a school district may require more of its employees. The K-12 reading certificate or the current reading specialist endorsement exceeds the requirements of the reading teacher endorsement. If you do not hold a reading specialist certificate/endorsement, then you may download a copy of your qualifications from your personal ECS files. You may print the &quot;Previous Credentials&quot; page and that will provide evidence that you are qualified to teach reading and provide technical assistance. Ultimately, the hiring school district has the ability to require that its teachers hold the reading specialist certificate/endorsement. Since you do not hold the reading specialist certificate/endorsement, then you would not be able to fill the position in school districts making such a requirement. I also want to clarify the reading chart provision that states that an individual assigned as a reading specialist and who has a reading teacher endorsement only (no specific program) prior to 6/30/04 can provide technical assistance and teach students. The &quot;Guide to Requirements&quot; that you mention as conflicting with this provision is referring to the current reading teacher endorsement requirements when it states that “except as noted under the reading teacher requirements, the reading specialist is the only person authorized to teach reading and provide technical assistance or professional development to teachers.” The individual will only be able to teach reading and will not be able to provide technical assistance. Under the current rules, the holder of a reading specialist endorsement is qualified to provide technical assistance. I hope this information is helpful to you as you apply for reading positions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>638</td>
<td>School Uniforms</td>
<td>Hi, i'm a student at [identifying information deleted] middle school in [identifying information deleted], IL and i think that are school should get uniforms. I think this because at are school i have noticed 3/4 of the girls violated school dress codes by short shorts, and low cut shirts and stuff. And the teachers don't say anything to half of them! I've done some research and on almost all the websites they say that they've done studies saying that after schools got uniforms First of all, there is a state law that allows local boards of education to adopt school uniform policies, if they so choose. I have copied that law below. While it is true that some research shows academic and behavioral improvements in schools with uniform policies, it is evident from that research that school uniforms are often just one of many tools educators use to make their schools more effective learning communities. In Illinois, school districts have a great deal of local control to determine the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
638 (con’t.)

academically, the kids grades went up! and there are alot more reasons, like reducing violence, and gangs. And creating unity. And kids would argue saying it would take away there creativity. but 3/4 of people at [identifying information deleted] wear the same thing! The expensive name brand clothes such as hollister, abercrombie and fitch, american eagle, etc... And for the kids who don't they get made fun of for what they want to wear. I don't know how i could maybe get someone else involved that could actually enforce the idea of uniforms. So a email back on how to get started would be appreciated. Thank you.

Staff Response

policies and actions that will best meet the needs of their students. Since the state law does not mandate, or require, that all schools have uniform policies, you might begin your quest by going to your school's student council and parent-teacher organization to explain to them the benefits of school uniforms. You could also write to the district superintendent and members of the school board -- or address the board in person at one of its meetings -- about the ways in which you believe uniforms will help improve your school. If you decide to attend a board meeting, then you might want to inquire first about the process your board uses to take comments from residents at its meetings. I wish you luck in your endeavors.

(105 ILCS 5/10-22.25b)

Sec. 10-22.25b. School uniforms. The school board may adopt a school uniform or dress code policy that governs all or certain individual attendance centers and that is necessary to maintain the orderly process of a school function or prevent endangerment of student health or safety. A school uniform or dress code policy adopted by a school board: (i) shall not be applied in such manner as to discipline or deny attendance to a transfer student or any other student for noncompliance with that policy during such period of time as is reasonably necessary to enable the student to acquire a school uniform or otherwise comply with the dress code policy that is in effect at the attendance center or in the district into which the student's enrollment is transferred; and (ii) shall include criteria and procedures under which the school board will accommodate the needs of or otherwise provide appropriate resources to assist a student from an indigent family in complying with an applicable school uniform or dress code policy. A student whose parents or legal guardians object on religious grounds to the student's compliance with an applicable school uniform or dress code policy shall not be required to comply with that policy if the student's parents or legal guardians present to the school board a signed statement of objection detailing the grounds for the objection. This Section applies to school boards of all districts, including special charter districts and districts organized under Article 34. (Source: P.A. 89-610, eff. 8-6-96.)

639

Technology Plans

Please read the comments below from a popular technology listserv in the state then please tell me how this process is under control.

-----Original Message-----

Subject: Re: Tech Plan Returned

Why in the world does anyone need to regurgitate the report card date on the tech plan. The report card data comes from ISBE. Now they are telling [identifying information deleted] that he hasn't summarized the report card data correctly? C'mon. If this isn't bureaucracy at its worst I don't know what is.

Staff Response

To ensure confidentiality for a district’s individual data, the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) does not comment specifically on any one district’s technology integration plans (TIP). It is not the intention of the TIP to be a reporting tool to ISBE, but rather the plan should be a meaningful mechanism for district personnel to look at and analyze data. To address the district report section adequately within the Data and Analysis Section, the summary boxes should include the following information:

- Summary,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Message (as originally submitted)</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 639    |         | [identifying information deleted] is a guy in a small school who is trying his best to meet the ridiculous requirements of this tech planning process. He has spent many, many hours trying to jump through the continually moving hoops that are the tech criteria and he is getting "shot down". This is wrong. [identifying information deleted] wrote: Okay, I'm finally working on my corrections and I need some help because I'm obviously not smart enough to do this thing. Every section that I have the reviewers tell me I don't meet because I don't have such and such, but to me I've already addressed 90% of what they are asking for. For example, my first section "Report Card Data" came back as not meeting requirements and the exact statements I received were: No summary of educator data is included. More summary is required for demographics data. No analysis of the data or trends is included in the Summary and Analysis section. Now here is exactly what I put in this section: In comparison to the State, the Axxxxxxx Community Unit School District is below the state average in the areas of Low-Income, Limited English proficiency, dropout rate, chronic truancy, mobility, and is above the state average in attendance rate. The District has very low average class sizes in comparison to the rest of the state especially in the 8th grade and high school. The District also has a very low Pupil-Teacher ratio in the high school in comparison to the state. All other educator data is in line with the state averages. All other demographics are in line with the state averages. All schools within the Axxxxxxx Community Unit School District have made a trend of making adequate yearly progress. The District is above the state average in every ACT Assessment areas except for Reading. The Elementary and Grade-School are above the state average in all ISAT Assessment areas except for 5th grade Reading. The High School is below the state average in all PSAE Assessment areas. (I must be crazy, but don't I address everything that the reviewers say I don't have? When you're in a rural district of 450 students there is only so much useful data that I can throw out there.) As shown in the Excel file you provided, Illinois reports student enrollment to the National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core Data (NCES CCD) for five racial/ethnic categories. We have been reporting enrollments to NCES for these five categories for many years. We do not include the multiracial/ethnic category because NCES CCD collects enrollment data only for the five categories. Currently, the NCES CCD system does not provide for the reporting of a sixth category. However, NCES is aware that we do have 15,798 students who are not included among the five original racial/ethnic categories. (2,097,503 – 2,081,705 = 15,798 =
| 640    | Reporting| The state of Illinois collects student enrollment and other data using 6 racial/ethnic categories. Common core data is reported using only 5 race/ethnic categories. My question concerns the process of translating state enrollment data collected using 6 categories into the 5 federal race/ethnic categories. If there is a policy document that explains this I would appreciate receiving a copy. If it is the policy to not report and leave out the multiracial students altogether (that appears to have been the case looking at 2004-05 NCES CCD) I would appreciate knowing that as well. As shown in the Excel file you provided, Illinois reports student enrollment to the National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core Data (NCES CCD) for five racial/ethnic categories. We have been reporting enrollments to NCES for these five categories for many years. We do not include the multiracial/ethnic category because NCES CCD collects enrollment data only for the five categories. Currently, the NCES CCD system does not provide for the reporting of a sixth category. However, NCES is aware that we do have 15,798 students who are not included among the five original racial/ethnic categories. (2,097,503 – 2,081,705 = 15,798 =

|        |         |                                  |                |
|        |         |                                  |                |
|        |         |                                  |                |
|        |         |                                  |                |
|        |         |                                  |                |
|        |         |                                  |                |
|        |         |                                  |                |
|        |         |                                  |                |
multiracial/ethnic students. The first two figures are found in the Excel file you provided.)

Though not currently reported to NCES CCD, the multiracial/ethnic category is included in other federally mandated reports. Illinois' NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report includes multiracial/ethnic students as one of the categories. Since 2004, we have computed AYP for schools for all six racial/ethnic categories provided they meet the minimum number criterion. We have reported assessment data and AYP information in school report cards for six racial/ethnic categories, including the multiracial/ethnic category, since 2004.

I hope this information is responsive to your inquiry and helps you to better understand the data collection processes here at the State Board of Education.

---

Hello. I am new to the grants, but I would simply like to ask if those on the technical side of things could look into a couple of improvements, if they aren't already.

First, as I try to review the grant I'm working on one last time before submitting it, it took a lot of time to click on the tab for each individual part of the grant (10-15 for the Early Childhood grant). It takes time to load each page, etc. Pretty tedious stuff. Secondly, trying to print the grant was fairly frustrating as well. Having to click on each tab, then click "printer friendly", and waiting for each individual page to come up, etc. took quite some time.

On the iirc site, working on the e-plans, the plans are converted to a PDF file and is located under a tab marked "view plan". That makes it very easily to view the 40 pg. plan, as you can scroll through it. It can also be printed from there. It's very convenient and efficient.

I assume that this has already been discussed, but I was directed to this email address by a very helpful person in your call center. I must admit that, in the past two months, I have been very pleased with the telephone and email help that I have received from people at all levels of your organization.

The State Board of Education appreciates your taking the time to send these concerns to the agency, as well as to express your satisfaction with the Illinois Interactive Report Card system.

You indicated that it is very time-consuming to review your application on e-GMS before you submit it to the State Board of Education. You used as an example the Early Childhood Block Grant Continuation Application. Agency staff are experiencing unusually slow response time due to the high volume of users in the e-GMS system. They are working to improve response time for all grants. Some of the Early Childhood pages are especially slow to load and save because they are lengthy and/or complex. In future applications, staff plan to decrease the length and complexity of pages in order to improve loading and save times.

You also indicated that it would help if an entire grant application could be printed at one time, rather than having to print each section individually, as is now the case. One of the goals of e-GMS was to reduce the amount of paper submitted between local education agencies and the agency. Therefore, the system was designed to reduce the capability of printing the entire application at one time. Although e-GMS is still a fairly young system, staff's goal is to continually improve the system to meet the needs of local education agencies. The agency's ability to add enhancements to the system, however, are limited by the availability of both financial and human resources.

Please know that agency staff carefully consider suggestions submitted, and the possibility of a printing enhancement will be explored in the future.