AGENDA

1. Roll Call

2. Board Member Participation by Other Means

3. Public Participation

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

*5. Rules for Initial Review

   a. Part 51 (Dismissal of Tenured Teachers under Article 24 and Dismissal (*pp. 5-8*) of Tenured Teachers and Principals under Article 34 of the School Code) (*Darren Reisberg*)

   b. Part 226 (Special Education) (*Jodi Fleck*) (*pp. 9-16*)

   c. Part 350 (Secular Textbook Loan) (*Frank Hanselman*) (*pp. 17-23*)

6. Information Item

   a. Less Red Tape Update (*Shelley Helton*) (*pp. 24-48*)

7. Committee Agenda Planning/Additional Items

8. 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 8:40 a.m. and noted that no members were participating by other means. He also announced that no one had signed up for public participation.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Joyce Karon moved approval of the minutes of the September 19, 2007, meeting. David Fields seconded the motion. It was adopted unanimously and the minutes were approved as presented.

5. RULES FOR INITIAL REVIEW: General Counsel Darren Reisberg introduced the set of amendments to Part 1 that was being presented, noting that it included a number of provisions not related to one another. He indicated that Division Administrators Randy Niles, Chris Schmitt, and Mark Haller were available for the discussion.

PART 1 (Public Schools Evaluation, Recognition and Supervision)
Rules Coordinator Sally Vogl provided an overview of the revisions being proposed in Section 1.100 as a result of P.A. 95-223, which established limits on waivers and modifications of Section 27-6 of the School Code with respect to daily physical education. She noted that there was no acknowledgment in the law of waivers and modifications approved prior to January 1, 2008. However, because the law is not retroactive, she indicated that the proposed rule would “start the clock” as of that date. That is, the first waiver or modification to be counted for each applicant would be the first one approved on or after that date; each subsequent request would be considered a renewal; no more than two renewals would be permitted per applicant; and no more than six cumulative years of approval could be granted.

Moving to Section 1.245, Waiver of School Fees, Ms. Vogl outlined the overlap between students' eligibility for fee waivers and their eligibility for free and reduced-price meals and identified the challenge now faced by districts connected to verifying that eligibility. She explained that new limits on verification of eligibility for the meals programs had been established at the federal level and that these would have an effect on how districts approached verifying eligibility for fee waivers as well. The purpose of the revision in Section 1.245 was to clarify this matter for districts.

Mr. Reisberg noted that the updating in Section 1.310 was straightforward and did not require discussion. Sections 1.430 and 1.440 were being revised in response to questions from the field regarding whether a “Constitution test” was required for graduation from the eighth grade and/or high school. Division Administrator Randy Niles stated that clarification had also been requested.
as to whether an exam *per se* is required or whether any other type of evaluation would suffice. Sally Vogl highlighted the need to review several different statutory provisions and determine their applicability to eighth grade and high school graduation. Specifically, there is no single “Constitution test” that is required by the State. An entire list of topics is required to be covered, and an examination is required for both eighth grade graduation and high school graduation. The examination would need to be broader than simply addressing the U.S. and Illinois Constitutions. She concluded by indicating that, when it becomes clear that the language of a rule does not make clear what is required, a change is warranted.

As a former history and government teacher, Brenda Holmes validated the need for stating these points clearly. Sally Vogl contrasted the “examination” referred to previously with the requirement for “evidence of comprehensive knowledge” in connection with U.S. history, illustrating how the two could easily be confused. Darren Reisberg mentioned that a reporter had raised this question with the Public Information office also.

Ms. Vogl then explained the origins of the amendments to Sections 1.510 and 1.515, both of which dealt with transportation. She stated that Section 1.510 needed to acknowledge the new requirements put in place by P.A. 95-260 to prevent children from being left on school buses. That Act is very explicit and, in and of itself, would not require rulemaking, but because an existing rule covered supervision of passengers, that rule would now be incomplete without a reference to the new requirements. She added that discussing this rule change with Division Administrator Tim Imler had prompted him to identify the need for the proposed change in Section 1.515 regarding recent first aid training for the individuals who train the instructors who, in turn train school bus drivers.

Finally, Darren Reisberg explained the origins of the proposed revision to Section 1.420(o), Media Programs. Questions from the field had led to a review of the compliance probe and, in turn, to the realization that the points covered in that document did not actually correspond to the rule because the rule provides no specifics. Regional superintendents voiced the concern that districts should not be cited for failure to meet requirements that were not specifically stated, so it was decided to review this area and determine what really should be included in these programs.

Randy Niles discussed the survey that had been sent to regional superintendents in an effort to gather information on how districts around the state were currently providing library media services. There had been wide variety in the responses, which was not surprising given the questions that had been raised in the field. An advisory committee had then been convened for the purpose of developing recommendations for what the required program of library media services should entail. Those recommendations were reflected in the rule being presented for consideration, and Mr. Niles indicated that there were some significant changes included. He acknowledged that districts currently have difficulty securing the services of qualified personnel and that more preparation programs would likely be needed to satisfy the demand.

Joyce Karon, who had been instrumental in convening the advisory committee, commented that, although she had stepped away from the deliberations after delivery of the charge to the group, she felt that what had come out of the work would resolve the conflicting interpretations and vacillation in this area that had prevailed for the many years she had been involved. In her view, it was also significant that questions from the field in general were being broadly viewed and steps taken to address areas of inconsistency or insufficiency. She stated her appreciation for these efforts.

Andrea Brown voiced her concern for understanding the requirements for library media specialists, the three-year phase-in of the proposed requirements, and their effects on small school districts. She wanted to ensure that the agency had measured their impact and identified what services would be available in the various parts of the state. She noted that staff currently serving in some school libraries hold differing credentials and that some do not hold master’s degrees. Further, she expressed the hope that responses from the field would be forthcoming.
during the comment period so that the implications of the proposal could be well understood. Of particular concern was the question of whether three years would be enough time to allow the requirements to be met. Randy Niles agreed with Dr. Brown’s concern for the reality of the situation in districts and indicated he thought the comments would improve the agency’s understanding of what would be feasible to require, particularly in small rural districts.

Sally Vogl offered the clarification that staff who met previous versions of the required qualifications for library positions would continue to be considered qualified and that use of the newer term “library information specialist” did not mean individuals with older endorsements would become ineligible. The long-standing agency policy had been “once qualified, always qualified”, and this field would be no exception. The other personnel-related aspect of the situation would involve the appropriate role and functions of non-certified individuals who assist in the library media program. Ms. Vogl also noted that various requirements stated in the proposed rule could be seen as “movable parts” to which appropriate exceptions or alternatives could be identified via public comment.

6. **COMMITTEE AGENDA PLANNING/ADDITIONAL ITEMS:** Darren Reisberg noted that a number of pieces of legislation enacted in 2007 would require rulemaking and that the process of identifying those was ongoing. Sally Vogl identified several specific items that had been drafted and would be coming forward in the next several months, including updates to the rules for special education and driver education arising out of legislation.

7. **ADJOURNMENT:** Brenda Holmes moved that the meeting be adjourned. David Fields seconded the motion, and the meeting was adjourned at 9:00 a.m.
ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING
November 14-15, 2007

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

Agenda Topic: Action Item: Rules for Initial Review – Part 51 (Dismissal of Tenured Teachers Under Article 24 and Dismissal of Tenured Teachers and Principals Under Article 34 of the School Code)

Materials: Recommended Rules

Staff Contact(s): Darren Reisberg, General Counsel

Purpose of Agenda Item
The purpose of this agenda item is to present the proposed amendment for the Board’s initial review.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
The Board will be asked to adopt a motion authorizing the solicitation of public comment on the proposed amendment to Part 51.

Background Information
Public Act 95-510, effective in late August of this year, amended Section 24A-4 of the School Code and added a new Section 34-85c affecting only the Chicago Public Schools. These provisions permit the school board and the exclusive representative of the district’s teachers to enter into an agreement that will constitute an alternative evaluation plan for teachers in certain, specified schools. Dismissal of affected teachers will also be governed by the terms of that agreement.

The Chicago Board of Education and the Chicago Teachers Union have executed an agreement encompassing the eight “Fresh Start Schools” and have submitted a copy of that agreement to ISBE as required by the law. There is no provision for ISBE’s approval or certification of the agreement. It will be kept on file as all other districts’ evaluation plans are.

The present amendment to Section 51.20 is a technical one, acknowledging that the requirements of Part 51 are not applicable to teachers who are affected by this agreement.

Analysis and Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action and Communications
Policy Implications: Please see above.
Budget Implications: None.
Legislative Action: None needed.
Communication: Please see “Next Steps” below.
Pros and Cons of Various Actions
Making this change will result in the rule's technical correctness. Failure to make the change would mean that the rule would not correctly reflect all applicable statutory provisions.

Superintendent's Recommendation
The Superintendent recommends that the State Board of Education adopt the following motion:

The State Board of Education hereby authorizes the solicitation of public comment on the proposed rulemaking for:

Dismissal of Tenured Teachers Under Article 24 and Dismissal of Tenured Teachers and Principals Under Article 34 of the School Code (23 Illinois Administrative Code 51),

including publication of the proposed amendment in the Illinois Register.

Next Steps
With the Board's authorization, staff will submit this proposed amendment to the Administrative Code Division for publication in the Illinois Register to elicit public comment. Additional means such as the Superintendent's message and the agency's website will be used to inform interested parties of the opportunity to comment.
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

NOTICE OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT

TITLE 23: EDUCATION AND CULTURAL RESOURCES
SUBTITLE A: EDUCATION
CHAPTER I: STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
SUBCHAPTER b: PERSONNEL

PART 51
DISMISSAL OF TENURED TEACHERS UNDER ARTICLE 24 AND DISMISSAL OF TENURED TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS UNDER ARTICLE 34 OF THE SCHOOL CODE

Section
51.10 Definitions
51.20 Applicability of this Part
51.30 Dismissal Proceedings, Notice to Tenured Teachers, and Compliance with Other Applicable Provisions of the School Code
51.40 Qualifications of Hearing Officers; Conditions of Service
51.50 Suspension Pending the Hearing (Repealed)
51.55 Pre-Hearing Procedures
51.60 The Hearing
51.70 The Decision
51.80 Waiver, Interpretation and Application of this Part

AUTHORITY: Implementing and authorized by Sections 24-12 and 34-85 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/24-12 and 34-85].


Section 51.20 Applicability of this Part

This Part applies to the dismissal for reason or cause of a tenured teacher (see Section 51.10 of this Part) under Section 24-12 or Section 34-85 of the School Code, other than a teacher for whom alternative procedures are established in an agreement entered into pursuant to Section 34-85c of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/34-85c].
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

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

Agenda Topic: Action Item: Rules for Initial Review – Part 226 (Special Education)

Materials: Recommended Rules

Staff Contact(s): Jodi Fleck, Division Administrator

Purpose of Agenda Item
The purpose of this agenda item is to present the proposed amendments for the Board’s initial review.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
The Board will be asked to adopt a motion authorizing the solicitation of public comment on the proposed amendments to Part 226.

Background Information
This rulemaking encompasses three separate technical changes necessitated by recent legislation.

- Section 226.220 (Development, Review, and Revision of the IEP) needs to be amplified with a provision acknowledging some requirements that were added to Section 14-8.02 of the School Code by P.A. 95-257, related to the development of an IEP for a child with a disability on the autism spectrum.

- A timeframe for requesting substitution of a hearing officer needs to be added to Section 226.635 (Appointment, Recusal, and Substitution of Impartial Due Process Hearing Officers), since none is now specified in Section 14-8.02a(f-5) of the School Code pursuant to P.A. 94-1100.

- Section 226.690 (Transfer of Parental Rights) needs to incorporate the possibility of a student’s delegation of rights as set forth in new Section 14-6.10 of the School Code (P.A. 95-372).

These proposed amendments have been provided to the executive committee of the State Advisory Council on Education of Students With Disabilities (ISAC) so that the members will receive advance notice of the initiation of this rulemaking. The next full ISAC meeting is scheduled for the first week in December, and this advance notice will ensure the council’s ability to prepare comments on the rules during that meeting if the members wish to do so.
Analysis and Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action and Communications
Policy Implications: Please see above.
Budget Implications: None.
Legislative Action: None needed.
Communication: Please see “Next Steps” below.

Pros and Cons of Various Actions
Adoption of these amendments will permit needed corrections and updates to the rules as outlined above. If the amendments are not promulgated, the rules will not correspond to recent statutory changes, and a necessary procedural element will be missing from Section 226.635.

Superintendent’s Recommendation
The Superintendent recommends that the State Board of Education adopt the following motion:

The State Board of Education hereby authorizes the solicitation of public comment on the proposed rulemaking for:

Special Education (23 Illinois Administrative Code 226),

including publication of the proposed amendments in the Illinois Register.

Next Steps
With the Board’s authorization, staff will submit these proposed amendments to the Administrative Code Division for publication in the Illinois Register to elicit public comment. Additional means such as the Superintendent’s message and the agency’s website will be used to inform interested parties of the opportunity to comment.
TITLE 23: EDUCATION AND CULTURAL RESOURCES
SUBTITLE A: EDUCATION
CHAPTER I: STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
SUBCHAPTER f: INSTRUCTION FOR SPECIFIC STUDENT POPULATIONS

PART 226
SPECIAL EDUCATION

SUBPART A: GENERAL

Section 226.10 Purpose
226.50 Requirements for a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE)
226.60 Charter Schools
226.75 Definitions

SUBPART B: IDENTIFICATION OF ELIGIBLE CHILDREN

Section 226.100 Child Find Responsibility
226.110 Evaluation Procedures
226.120 Reevaluations
226.130 Additional Procedures for Students Suspected of or Having a Specific Learning Disability
226.135 Additional Procedures for Students Suspected of or Having a Cognitive Disability
226.140 Modes of Communication and Cultural Identification
226.150 Evaluation to be Nondiscriminatory
226.160 Determination of Eligibility (Repealed)
226.170 Criteria for Determining the Existence of a Specific Learning Disability (Repealed)
226.180 Independent Educational Evaluation
226.190 Reevaluation (Repealed)

SUBPART C: THE INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAM (IEP)

Section 226.200 General Requirements
226.210 IEP Team
226.220 Development, Review, and Revision of the IEP
226.230 Content of the IEP
ILLINOIS REGISTER

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

NOTICE OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

226.240 Determination of Placement
226.250 Child Aged Three Through Five
226.260 Child Reaching Age Three

SUBPART D: PLACEMENT

Section
226.300 Continuum of Placement Options
226.310 Related Services
226.320 Service to Students Living in Residential Care Facilities
226.330 Placement by School District in State-Operated or Nonpublic Special Education Facilities
226.340 Nonpublic Placements by Parents Where FAPE is at Issue
226.350 Service to Parentally-Placed Private School Students

SUBPART E: DISCIPLINE

Section
226.400 Disciplinary Actions
226.410 Manifestation Determination Review (Repealed)
226.420 Appeals (Repealed)
226.430 Protection for Children Not Yet Eligible for Special Education (Repealed)
226.440 Referral to and Action by Law Enforcement and Judicial Authorities (Repealed)

SUBPART F: PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARDS

Section
226.500 Language of Notifications
226.510 Notification of Parents’ Rights
226.520 Notification of District’s Proposal
226.530 Parents’ Participation
226.540 Consent
226.550 Surrogate Parents
226.560 Mediation
226.570 State Complaint Procedures

SUBPART G: DUE PROCESS

Section
226.600 Calculation of Timelines
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>226.605</td>
<td>Request for Hearing; Basis (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.610</td>
<td>Information to Parents Concerning Right to Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.615</td>
<td>Procedure for Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.620</td>
<td>Denial of Hearing Request (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.625</td>
<td>Rights of the Parties Related to Hearings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.630</td>
<td>Qualifications, Training, and Service of Impartial Due Process Hearing Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.635</td>
<td>Appointment, Recusal, and Substitution of Impartial Due Process Hearing Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.640</td>
<td>Scheduling the Hearing and Pre-Hearing Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.645</td>
<td>Conducting the Pre-Hearing Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.650</td>
<td>Child’s Status During Due Process Hearing (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.655</td>
<td>Expedited Due Process Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.660</td>
<td>Powers and Duties of Hearing Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.665</td>
<td>Record of Proceedings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.670</td>
<td>Decision of Hearing Officer; Clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.675</td>
<td>Monitoring and Enforcement of Decisions; Notice of Ineligibility for Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.680</td>
<td>Reporting of Decisions (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.690</td>
<td>Transfer of Parental Rights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBPART H: ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>226.700</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.710</td>
<td>Policies and Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.720</td>
<td>Facilities and Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.730</td>
<td>Class Size for 2009-10 and Beyond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.731</td>
<td>Class Size Provisions for 2007-08 and 2008-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.735</td>
<td>Work Load for Special Educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.740</td>
<td>Records; Confidentiality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.750</td>
<td>Additional Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.760</td>
<td>Evaluation of Special Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.770</td>
<td>Fiscal Provisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBPART I: PERSONNEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>226.800</td>
<td>Personnel Required to be Qualified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.810</td>
<td>Special Education Teaching Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.820</td>
<td>Authorization for Assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.830</td>
<td>List of Independent Evaluators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
226.840 Qualifications of Evaluators

AUTHORITY: Implementing Article 14 and authorized by Section 2-3.6 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/Art.14 and 2-3.6].


SUBPART C: THE INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAM (IEP)

Section 226.220 Development, Review, and Revision of the IEP

The development, review, and revision of each child’s IEP shall conform to the requirements of 34 CFR 300.324 and 300.328. The additional requirements of this Section shall also apply.

a) When an IEP has been developed or revised, a notice in accordance with 34 CFR 300.503(b) and (c) shall be provided immediately to the parents, and implementation of the IEP shall occur no later than ten days after the provision of this notice.
b) Either a child’s educational provider or a child’s parent may request an IEP meeting at any time. Within ten days after receipt of such a request, the district shall either agree and notify the parent in accordance with 34 CFR 300.503 or notify the parents in writing of its refusal, including an explanation of the reason no meeting is necessary to ensure the provision of FAPE for the child.

c) The development of an IEP for a child who has a disability on the autism spectrum shall include consideration of the factors specified in Section 14-8.02(b) (1) through (7) of the School Code.

(Source: Amended at 32 Ill. Reg. _____, effective _____________)

SUBPART G: DUE PROCESS

Section 226.635 Appointment, Recusal, and Substitution of Impartial Due Process Hearing Officers

The appointment, recusal, and substitution of due process hearing officers shall conform with the requirements of Section 14-8.02a(f-5) of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/14-8.02a(f-5)]. A request for substitution of the hearing officer, as permitted by that Section, shall be submitted via letter or facsimile to the Due Process Coordinator at the State Board of Education and shall be postmarked or transmitted no later than five days after the party requesting the substitution receives notification from the State Board of the original hearing officer’s appointment.

(Source: Amended at 32 Ill. Reg. _____, effective _____________)

Section 226.690 Transfer of Parental Rights

This Section implements 34 CFR 300.520 and Section 14-6.10 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/14-6.10].

a) When a student with a disability reaches the age of majority (18 years of age; see 755 ILCS 5/11-1) or becomes an emancipated minor pursuant to the Emancipation of Minors Act [750 ILCS 30] (except for a student with a disability who has been adjudged as a disabled person pursuant to 755 ILCS 5/11a-2 §41a-4 or who has executed a Delegation of Rights that is in effect as provided in Section 14-6.10 of the School Code):
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

NOTICE OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

1) The school district shall provide any notice required by this Part to both the individual and the parents, and all other rights accorded to parents under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the implementing regulations at 34 CFR 300, and this Part shall transfer to the student; and

2) All rights accorded to parents under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the implementing regulations at 34 CFR 300, and this Part shall transfer to a child who is incarcerated in an adult or juvenile, State, or local correctional institution.

b) Whenever rights are transferred to a student pursuant to this Section, the district shall notify the student and the parents of the transfer of rights.

c) All notices that are required under this Part and 34 CFR 300 shall be provided to the student and the parent after the student reaches the age of majority.

(Source: Amended at 32 Ill. Reg. _____, effective ______________)
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
       Linda Riley Mitchell, Chief Financial Officer
       Darren Reisberg, General Counsel

Agenda Topic: Action Item: Rules for Initial Review – Part 350 (Secular Textbook Loan)

Materials: Recommended Rules

Staff Contact: Frank Hanselman, Fiscal & Procurement Division

Purpose of Agenda Item

The purpose of this agenda item is to present the proposed amendments to Part 350 for the Board's initial review.

Expected Outcomes of Agenda Item

The Board will be asked to adopt a motion authorizing the solicitation of public comment on the proposed amendments.

Background Information

This rulemaking is prompted by the need to revise some existing provisions so that up-to-date means of communication will be permitted as part of procedures discussed in Part 350. It is no longer useful to specify, for example, that the U.S. Mail is the only way in which required notifications can be submitted. These changes will bring the rules into alignment with the agency’s current electronic capabilities.

The other changes included are being made to conform to current style considerations and wording requirements.

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

Policy Implications: Please see above.
Budget Implications: None.
Legislative Action: None needed.
Communication: Please see “Next Steps” below.

Pros and Cons of Various Actions

Adopting these amendments will allow flexibility for districts in meeting the procedural requirements related to the acquisition and disposition of textbooks under these rules. If the changes are not made, staff will need to continue requiring the exchange of paper documents instead of allowing for other alternatives.
**Superintendent’s Recommendation**

The Superintendent recommends that the State Board of Education adopt the following motion:

The State Board of Education hereby authorizes the solicitation of public comment on the proposed rulemaking for:

Secular Textbook Loan (23 Illinois Administrative Code 350),

including publication of the proposed amendments in the *Illinois Register*.

**Next Steps**

With the Board’s authorization, staff will submit these proposed amendments to the Administrative Code Division for publication in the *Illinois Register* to elicit public comment. Additional means such as the Superintendent’s message and the agency’s website will be used to inform interested parties of the opportunity to comment.
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

NOTICE OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

TITLE 23: EDUCATION AND CULTURAL RESOURCES
SUBTITLE A: EDUCATION
CHAPTER I: STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
SUBCHAPTER j: TEXTBOOKS AND EQUIPMENT

PART 350
SECULAR TEXTBOOK LOAN

Section 350.10 Definition of Terms
Section 350.15 Acquisition Procedures
Section 350.20 Administrative Practices (Repealed)
Section 350.25 Disposal Procedures
Section 350.30 Fiscal Procedures (Repealed)

AUTHORITY: Implementing and authorized by Section 18-17 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/18-17].


Section 350.15 Acquisition Procedures

a) Students shall not be assessed a fee for any textbook or book substitute provided under the Secular Textbook Loan Program.

b) Eligible applicants shall provide parents with a brief written explanation of the textbook loan program and the process for a parent/guardian or student to request the loan of a secular textbook in a student handbook, newsletter or flyer or by similar means. A parent/guardian or student may request the loan of a secular textbook(s) by submitting an individual request (see Section 18-17 of the School Code). School districts shall develop procedures for taking a request from a parent/guardian or student.
c) Requested textbooks shall be those that have been adopted for use in the district or school and that are available from those vendors participating in the program. The State Board of Education each fiscal year shall provide on its [electronic textbook loan system](#) website the list of participating vendors and the list of secular textbooks that the State Board of Education has identified as eligible under the program.

d) By the end of November of each year, the State Superintendent Board of Education will identify the grade levels to be funded and calculate the per-pupil allocation. Those school administrators with schools eligible to participate will be notified in writing or electronically as to:

1) the total amount available to their students to be used for the grade levels identified for funding (the per-pupil allocation will be based upon the total amount of funds appropriated for the program and the total statewide public and nonpublic school enrollment in the specific grade levels to be funded, as of the last school day in September of the most recent current school year for which data are available); and

2) the password to be used to access the textbook loan website for the purposes of completing a Request Form.

e) The request Request Forms shall be completed by the school administrator. Electronic submission of the request Request Form shall certify compliance with Section 18-17 of the School Code and this Part, as well as with Article X, Section 3, of the Illinois Constitution, which provides in pertinent part that no funds may be used to help support or sustain any institution controlled by any church or sectarian denomination.

f) Each eligible applicant shall submit its completed request Request Form on or before March 15. Eligible applicants will be unable to access the electronic request system Request Form after this deadline.

g) Each school administrator shall be informed either in writing or electronically via U.S. mail by April 15 as to the specific textbooks that will be purchased.

h) On a form provided by the State Superintendent Board of Education, the school administrator shall confirm that the quantity and titles of all textbooks received are the same as ordered. Such confirmation shall be mailed or faxed to the State Board
of Education, using the address or fax number provided on the form, within seven
days after receipt of the textbooks.

i) All textbooks provided through the program shall be listed on an inventory
maintained by the State Board of Education. Each school shall identify (stamp)
the materials received under the program as "Property of the State of Illinois,
School Year _____".

j) Each recipient shall have procedures to assure the return of all textbooks from those
to whom they have been loaned.

(Source: Amended at 32 Ill. Reg. _____, effective _____)

Section 350.25 Disposal Procedures

a) Textbooks received under the Textbook Loan Program may not be disposed of out-
of-state or sold without the prior approval of the State Board of Education (Section
18-17 of the School Code) as provided in subsection (b) or (c) of this Section.

b) Disposal of Textbooks on Loan for Less than Five Years

Textbooks on loan for less than five years that a recipient determines are no longer
needed (e.g., elimination of program, wear, adoption of new textbooks) shall be
disposed of in the following manner:

1) On a form provided by the State Superintendent Board of Education, the
recipient shall submit to the State Superintendent Board a list of textbooks
that are no longer needed, giving the International Standard Book Numbers
(ISBN), quantity, grade level, and titles of the materials. If no ISBN is given
for the materials, then a description must be provided of the materials that are
no longer needed.

2) The State Superintendent Board of Education shall attempt to relocate these
textbooks to other Illinois schools.

A) A list of all textbooks that are no longer needed shall be made
available disseminated to all eligible applicants no later than in
September 30 of each year.
B) Requests for these textbooks shall be honored on a first-come, first-served basis.

C) Based on this effort, the State Board shall make appropriate notification to the sending and/or receiving schools and shall notify the State Superintendent of the exchange of textbooks purchased through the Illinois Textbook Program all parties in writing.

D) Receiving schools shall be responsible for all transportation arrangements and for all costs incurred in the transportation of the textbooks from the sending school.

3) Textbooks that cannot be relocated by the end of January to another Illinois school pursuant to subsection (b)(2) of this Section may be disposed of pursuant to the exemption from the Illinois Property Control Act that has been granted by the Director of the Department of Central Management Services. Upon request, a copy of the exemption will be provided to recipients that seek to dispose of textbooks pursuant to this subsection (b)(3).

c) Disposal of Textbooks on Loan for Five Years or More

Textbooks on loan for five or more years may be disposed of in such a manner as the school board, nonpublic school or other eligible school determines, including out-of-state disposal or sale, provided that:

1) The school administrator provides written or electronic notification to the State Superintendent Board of Education of the recipient’s intent to dispose of the textbooks. This notification shall:

A) Provide a list of textbooks that are no longer needed, which shall be reported by mail to the State Superintendent Board of Education giving the International Standard Book Numbers (ISBN), quantity, grade level, and titles of the materials. If no ISBN is given for the materials, then a description must be provided of the materials that are no longer needed.

B) Cite the proposed method for disposing of the textbooks.
2) Notification shall be sent to the State Board of Education by certified U.S. mail, return receipt requested.

3) Textbooks shall not be disposed of less than 30 days after notification to the State Board. The date of delivery on the return receipt shall constitute the date of notification. If the State Superintendent Board of Education identifies a disposition that better conserves public resources or better serves the interests of the public, then the State Superintendent Board of Education shall, within 30 days after notification, arrange with the school to dispose of the materials in some alternative manner. If the State Superintendent Board of Education does not arrange for any other such action within 30 days, then the school shall dispose of the books as indicated in the notice to the State Superintendent Board of Education.

(Source: Amended at 32 Ill. Reg. _____, effective _____________)
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 and Status of Rules Review

Materials: Summary of New Submissions and Responses
Status Report: Comprehensive Rules Review and Less Red Tape Initiative

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. Also included is the status of the agency’s comprehensive review of its administrative rules as required under Section 1A-4(F) of the School Code.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
The purpose of the Less Red Tape initiative and rules review 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 November 1, 2007, the agency had received a total of 491 submissions (not including spam emails) concerning more than 87 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 19 new submissions received since the June 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 19 submissions received since the June 2007 report have been resolved.

The number of submissions that the Less Red Tape email has received during this reporting period appears to be holding steady. The topics addressed varied greatly but remain timely as they express concerns about recent changes in laws (moment of silence) and newly implemented agency procedures (dental data collection), as well as offer suggestions for ways in which agency processes can be enhanced to be more efficient and effective for the users (Student Information System, I-WAS).
In the first 10 months of 2007, the Less Red Tape email account had received about half as many submissions as it had received for the same time period in 2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Number of Submissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004 (October through December)</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>114 (85 as of November 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 (through November 1)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the activity level of Less Red Tape has diminished since 2004, the email account still serves an important purpose as a vehicle to alert staff to ways in which the agency’s operations could be streamlined and improved. Increased activity on the account after legislation is enacted or new administrative requirements are put in place is evidence that the public remains aware of the opportunity to provide input through Less Red Tape. A reminder about the purpose of Less Red Tape and the opportunity to suggest improvements was included in last week's Superintendent’s Weekly Message.

A summary of the status of Less Red Tape inquiries by submission and issues is provided below for calendar year 2007.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>2007 (45 submissions to date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved (all issues resolved)</td>
<td>19</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 Update: New Submissions since June 2007 (text of spam email not included; current through November 1, 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Message (as originally submitted)</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>398, 406 Follow-up</td>
<td>Elections</td>
<td>(See June 2005 Board materials for complete submissions) We ask you to consider allowing trustees to reorganize on the same date that they canvass votes. This year, under the requirements of the code, trustees canvassed votes within 21 days of the April election and then were required to return the third Monday of May for reorganization. (…)</td>
<td>In May 2005, you submitted two inquiries to the lessredtape email account concerning the responsibility of canvassing after elections. As you probably know, during the 2006 legislative session, P.A. 94-647 amended the Election Code to abolish canvassing boards. (See <a href="http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/publicacts/fulltext.asp?Name=094-0647&amp;GA=094">http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/publicacts/fulltext.asp?Name=094-0647&amp;GA=094</a>.) However, a similar provision in the School Code remained, causing confusion at the local level. P.A. 95-141, effective August 13, 2007 (see <a href="http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/publicacts/fulltext.asp?Name=095-0141&amp;GA=095">http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/publicacts/fulltext.asp?Name=095-0141&amp;GA=095</a>), repealed Section 9-18 of the School Code, which required the board of education, regional office of education or board of directors, as applicable, to canvass votes within 21 days of an election. I hope this information is helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>642</td>
<td>e-grants</td>
<td>Good morning. I have a suggestion for making IWAS more user-friendly. Is there a way that you could have a print option that allows users to print all pages of the grant (in printer-friendly version) with just one click? Currently, we have to go into each section of the grant, i.e., if I want to print our entire NCLB grant, I have to go into each Title, and then individually pull up each page (some of which there are more than 10) and click Printer Friendly, and then print. Takes a great deal of time. It would be so much easier if we could just click one button and print everything.</td>
<td>One of the goals of e-GMS was to reduce the amount of paper submitted between local education agencies and the Illinois State Board of Education. 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. The State Board of Education appreciates your taking the time to submit your suggestion for additional improvements to e-GMS, and consideration of a printing enhancement will be explored in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>643</td>
<td>I-WAS</td>
<td>Greatly appreciate the reminders about the numerous reports due, however once the report is completed…we still get emails reminding us to submit. For example, the TRS Service Record was completed last week, but we received an email reminder yesterday. With all the reports required…it takes time to go back and make sure you did what you did…does that make sense? It would be nice (likely not possible) if once the report was completed, your name or email was taken off the list for mass emails.</td>
<td>It appears that the additional reminders concerning the Teacher Service Record (TRS) system were sent in error by Illinois State Board of Education staff. The last message that was broadcasted on June 11, 2007, was sent to all users, which was an oversight on the part of the helpdesk administrator. Data Systems staff have already notified the helpdesk about this issue and asked that broadcasts be carefully review before they are sent in order to prevent this from occurring in future. The Data Systems Division continues to explore and work with developers to update and enhance the IWAS system. State Board staff appreciate your bringing this problem to their attention and hope that you have found that the problems you were experiencing have been corrected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Hello, I am a children's author and work with a non profit company foundation to help children in need. My work is environmental and I am working with children across the usa and also in africa that are without environmental education and needs such as running water. My goal is to bring awareness with my books that have been published and also the new one that is being written about the need</td>
<td>The Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) is not involved in the project you mentioned (the Team Illinois initiative, under the direction of the Illinois Department of Human Services). The agency also does not coordinate locally initiated projects. I would suggest that you start by contacting the school district at: Dr. Barbara Jean Howery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for clean water. My work is used within the United Nations children's programs and I have worked for 10 years touring the USA motivating and developing projects. I want to develop a school to school project to help Pembroke. I have already started to connect with schools across the USA and would like to bring water to the area with fundraising and grants. I have a youth mentorship program that I have run for 7 years and take teens with me to take part in my touring and projects. I have interest in contacting and connecting with the team that is helping Pembroke and working with teen there as well. Please email me or guide me to someone who would be interested in having me help Pembroke. I see that the governors office has been involved and I would like them to know of my interest.

District Superintendent
Pembroke Community Consolidated School District 259
P.O. Box AA
Hopkins Park, Illinois 815-944-8168
You may get further information about the Team Illinois initiative by accessing a link to the Pembroke fact sheet at http://www.dhs.state.il.us/newTTest/Pembroke.htm to learn about activities in Pembroke Township. You would have to contact the Illinois Department of Human Services to determine whether the initiative is still being implemented. (Please see http://www.dhs.state.il.us/contact/ for contact information.)

We have passed along your inquiry to the Governor’s office, which has shared the information with the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency. Thank you for your interest in helping to improve an Illinois community; we wish you luck in your endeavors.

645 Employment
I hope all is well. I am very interested in learning about career opportunities within the 'Illinois State Board of Education'. Can you please point me in the right direction of whom or where I need to go in order to see what positions are available?

You may review position openings to determine your suitability by periodically checking ISBE's job postings at http://www.isbe.net/hr/Default.htm. Descriptions of each position, including the pay range, qualifications and requirements for application, are provided. I wish you luck in your job search.

646 Certification
Teaching certificates should be changed to be one certificate which lists the courses and grade levels that person can teach. There are many overlapping situations for many, many people. People coming from another state may have an elementary certificate that allows them to teach K-8. Ours is listed as K-9. Junior High or Middle school teachers don't actually fit into the elementary certificate or the high school certificate. Special education areas are also different, as they can go from birth to age 21. It would be so much easier to have one certificate with the qualifications listed on it. It would be much less confusing to the teacher and to the hiring board and administration.

Staff in the Division of Certification discussed a proposal similar to this one some time ago, exploring the pros and cons of single-certificate systems in other states. Staff concluded, however, that moving to a single certificate in Illinois would not really resolve any administrative problems cited by critics of the current system. In fact, a single-certificate system may create new problems that could complicate a teacher’s life given that the certificate(s) a teacher holds may be affected by other processes, such as registration, renewal, addition of new endorsements, and surrendering the certificate. Further, staff believe that the creation of the on-line Educator Certification System has largely resolved the difficulties you see with the current system by presenting in one display all the certificates a teacher holds and the subjects a teacher may teach. The teacher also may view the requirements for renewing the certificate that he or she is using. The system, which is accessible by both teachers and administrators, will help teachers better understand which assignments they may take and reduce the “pieces of paper” with which they have to deal.

The Division of Certification anticipates that additional changes will occur in the near future in other systems it operates that will assist districts in making assignments and help parents review the qualifications of their children’s teachers. Taken together, these improvements have negated a need to move to a single certificate, while providing the teacher and district with the information they need to understand their assignments and their requirements for renewal.

The Educator Certification System may be viewed online at
| 647 | Assessments | To Whom It May Concern: As a Regional Superintendent, I do not currently have immediate access to the state testing data for the school in “my” two counties. Our staff members, (RESPRO and School Improvement Staff), therefore, cannot see the data for the schools we are trying to help, unless we are on site at the schools. It would be helpful if we (the ROEs) could have the same access to student and school testing data as is available to the schools, at a time as soon as possible. | http://www.isbe.net/ECS/default.htm. |
| 648 | Student Information System | I feel there is a need for a Report "Read Only" function for building level administrators to access their buildings student data. With the current system I have to download all reports and edit spreadsheet and send them to principal, or give them administrative access which allows them to edit and correct data but I can't monitor any changes they might make. An intermediate level access between RCDTS general and RCDTS admin would be very helpful since users could generate data to meet their needs, and I (as district assessment director) would not have to worry about the security and veracity of the student information and test scores. | Your suggestion is timely since that improvement is currently under discussion. As with any system improvements, the decision to institute changes will depend on the availability of both financial and human resources, as well as an analysis of the benefits for the users of the system. The State Board of Education appreciates your taking the time to suggest ways in which your job can be done more effectively and efficiently, and staff will keep you informed about future improvements. |
| 649 | Certification | Here's my idea to streamline ed. rules and regulations...accept The American Speech and Hearing Association Certificate of Clinical Competence (ASHA-CCC’s) for all SLP's and get rid of IL licensure and Education Certificates for SLP’s. It has been ridiculous all the red tape and forms I have had to fill out and send in to get my IL license and my Education Certificate for a type 10. Not to mention all the money I have had to spend. And, I came from Iowa after practicing for 10 years...doesn't that hold any merit or couldn't you have reciprocity with neighboring states???? My recommendation to The inclusion of the requirement for licensure by Illinois Department of Financial and Professional Regulations (IDPR) to receive a nonteaching speech pathology certificate in the Illinois can be found in Section 14-1.09b of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/14-1.09b; copied below]. This requirement, first enacted in 2002, was the result of collaboration among many groups, including the Illinois Speech and Hearing Association (ISHA). The State Board of Education staff have noted your concern regarding IDPR licensure, which is required for the types 73, 74, and 79 speech and language certificates; however, it is not required for the type 10 speech and language. | |
any SLP moving into the state is to forget it and to look for a job elsewhere. It is just a scam by IL to get more money! No wonder there's an SLP shortage!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

| Staff in the agency’s Certification Division checked the status of your current certificate. A review of all information on file verifies that you submitted an application and $30 fee for a type 73 nonteaching speech and language certificate that was processed on August 18, 2006. An evaluation was completed that resulted in the issuance of a provisional certificate (type 74) on September 15, 2006, and a September 18, 2006, deficiency letter. The September 18, 2006, letter stated that the only deficiency was for the verification of licensure, which based on your out-of-state licensure and ASHA credentials could be met by submitting a copy of an application for an IDPR license. We have not received any additional documents from you since August 2006. The provisional certificate is valid through June 30, 2008. We do not have any record that you submitted an application for a type 10 teaching speech and language certificate. |

| **650 Asbestos** | Every 6 months our District pays for an asbestos inspection that evaluates the same areas of asbestos in our building. Every three years we pay for the required “three year inspection” to, again, analyze the same buildings and the same asbestos. In addition, our buildings are reviewed by the ROE every year and our District faithfully has architects complete the 10 year Health/Life/Safety inspections. This year we replaced asbestos tile and followed the abatement and containment regulations to the letter of the law by hiring asbestos professionals to test air-quality, monitor the abatement plan, and monitor (watch) the abatement process of the contractors. While I believe that our buildings should be safe, I think this repeated evaluation is excessive. The cost to the district to evaluate the same areas every six months along with an “intensive” 3 year evaluation is simply wasteful and redundant. Although this is just one person’s opinion, I believe that the monitoring process could, at the least, be reduced to a one-time per year evaluation (and even that seems excessive considering that district’s are required to follow very specific rules for any asbestos removal along with a yearly review by the ROE). The 3 year evaluation, a supposedly more thorough evaluation that the six previous, is simply one more waste of tax payer’s dollars. Anything to change this situation would be helpful. |

| **651 Substitutes** | Why cant we have a state wide substitute registration when we sign up for sub teaching….i have to sometimes do this five or more times because some districts want to do their own and will not accept information from other districts….make it a state wide registration…it would be good at every district and every area….use it like a substitute teacher id card….it would have our pictures, grades wanted to teach, and all that and it would only have to be done once a year and charge a yearly fee for this and since you have |
the database for this the district or school could look up that number or id number to verify it….of course if there is changes they can be made once and not every time we have to do this….this is getting silly….especially us with teaching certificates….we get caught in the maze every school year and every time we have to do this….a chip will have all our certificates, endorsements and such on it so any district can check it when we present this…..it would simplify this a lot…..our prints will be on the card or one of our thumb prints or such….I have a system like this in the military….why not state wide….we would appreciate this….call me I can design this system….it uses a lot of preexisting information….simple to do and implement if designed right….thanks

Your suggestion will be taken under advisement. Thank you for your concern.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>652</th>
<th>Supplemental General State Aid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Hello - Can someone please help with this. Thank you. | **You may have already received some of these documents, which include:**
| Subject: Fwd: RE: FY07 Final Plan For Improv of Instr For Disadv Stdnts.xls | - The preliminary plan approved by ISBE for CPS’s use of SGSA for school year 2007-08 (NOTE: This is all the documentation currently available for this school year).
| To: [identifying information deleted] <[identifying information deleted] @isbe.net> | - The final expenditure plan for FY 2006.
| Dear Mr. [identifying information deleted], | - The final plan for FY 2007.
| I would appreciate it if you would send the copies of the SGSA documents ISBE received and approved from CPS? | - The FY 2007 contravention report.
| You indicated previously that you would send a copy of the final Plan for Low-Income Students at the end of September. | - Additional SGSA distributed by school.
| Thank you for your assistance. | I hope these databases provide the information necessary to meet your request.

**652**

**Supplemental General State Aid**

Hello - Can someone please help with this. Thank you.

Subject: Fwd: RE: FY07 Final Plan For Improv of Instr For Disadv Stdnts.xls

To: [identifying information deleted] <[identifying information deleted] @isbe.net>

Dear Mr. [identifying information deleted],

I would appreciate it if you would send the copies of the SGSA documents ISBE received and approved from CPS?

You indicated previously that you would send a copy of the final Plan for Low-Income Students at the end of September.

Thank you for your assistance.

Date: Thu, 20 Sep 2007 13:56:02 -0700 (PDT)

From: [identifying information deleted]

Subject: RE: FY07 Final Plan For Improv of Instr For Disadv Stdnts.xls

To: [identifying information deleted] <[identifying information deleted] @isbe.net>

Hello Mr. [identifying information deleted],

The final report includes an accounting of the previous years' expenditures. So, I am interested in the spreadsheet indicating end of year expenditures for the 2005-2006 school year including the amount of SGSA expended, SGSA under/over spending, etc.

[Plan for the Improvement of Instruction for Disadvantaged Students in the Chicago Public Schools - School Year 2005-2006 Expenditure Report]

Additionally, if the 2007-2008 preliminary spreadsheet of school-by-school funding or contravention report is available, I would appreciate it if you could send it, too.

Thank you for your help.

[identifying information deleted] <[identifying information deleted] @isbe.net> wrote:
Sorry, I’ve been out of the office for a while. Are you requesting the CPS Contravention Report for the indicated year?

Sent: Monday, September 17, 2007 2:44 PM
To: [identifying information deleted]
Subject: Fwd: FY07 Final Plan For Improv of Instr For Disadv Stdnts.xls
Dear Mr. [identifying information deleted],
Can you please send the Expenditure Report spreadsheet for 2005-06 that should go along with the file you sent to me?
Thank you.

653 Dental Reports
Thank you for the 2006-2007 Dental Compliance and Health Status Report.
Once again, District [identifying information deleted] data are missing from the report. I understand, however, that [identifying information deleted] will be forwarding their data by the end of the week.
I have some questions and comments about the dental report:
• This may seem very obvious, but when you report that there are 768 active districts “without [identifying information deleted]” does this mean that the number of districts with relevant grades including [identifying information deleted] is 769? I counted 807 districts with enrollment in at least one of the mandated dental examination grades using the 2006-07-Fall Housing Report-District Summary. According to the fall report, these 807 districts enrolled an aggregate total of 461305 children including 147439 kindergarten students, 153264 2nd graders, and 160602 6th graders.

• In reference to the number of participating schools, it would be helpful if you indicated the total number of schools with any combination of mandated grades so we’ll know how many are missing. I could be wrong but I counted 3065 public schools [fall school enrollment report] with students in one of the mandated grades including 494 in District [identifying information deleted]. According to the report, there were 2,470 of these public schools without [identifying information deleted]. That suggests there were about 100 schools, in addition to [identifying information deleted] schools, that were unaccounted for in the report? Even if my count of the number of schools is incorrect it would be helpful to know the total number of schools that should have reported including [identifying information deleted] schools. I don’t believe the public should be expected to know how many schools there

• The number of districts provided was as of July 2007 and was based on the count-district-school (CDS) file (the master file that lists educational entities in Illinois) maintained by the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE). The CDS file is updated throughout the year. The Fall Housing Report provides the number of students enrolled as of the last school day in September of a particular school year. Enrollment data provided by 2006-2007 Dental Report was collected by the Dental Data Collection System and reflects the number of students enrolled as of May 15, 2007. The 2006-2007 Fall Housing Report provided enrollment as of last school day in September 2006.

• The number of schools provided was as of July 2007 and was based on the CDS file. The CDS file is updated throughout the year. As indicated above, the Fall Housing Report provides the number of students enrolled as of the last school day in September. Public schools located in City of [identifying information deleted] School District [identifying information deleted] will be included in the report when the district’s dental data for 2006-2007 school year is available.
Based on the number of nonpublic schools reporting (772 of 1174), it appears that a lower proportion of nonpublic schools reported their outcomes than public schools (about 66% vs. 77% (2,361/3065)).

If I am reading the report correctly, the total population of students in the reporting schools (private and public) was 400443. Is this number based on the fall enrollment count or measured at some other time?

I believe it would be helpful if you reported the number of students missed by district non-reporting. In other words, what was the total population of kindergarten, second grade, and sixth grade students in state schools, public and private, and of these, how many do we have outcomes for and how many outcomes are we missing? This story isn’t clearly told by solely reporting the numbers of participating districts or schools.

The 2006-07 fall housing report shows there were 461305 students in public districts in mandated dental examination grades. The report includes outcomes for 350371 public district children or about 76%. I do not know the number of nonpublic schoolchildren. [identifying information deleted]’s 92041 children accounted for 20% of public district schoolchildren in mandated dental examination grades. Explicitly reporting both the number of children in reporting schools and the number of children in non-reporting schools helps to clarify the significance of the absence of data from non-reporting schools. Even if Chicago data had been included, I still believe it’s helpful to know how completely the findings in the report represent the outcomes for all of the State’s children.

Will a revised or amended report be produced once [identifying information deleted] submits its data?

Reported findings did not change much from 2005-06 to 2006-07.

It would be interesting to know how often school authorities withheld school report cards.

It would be interesting to see the data disaggregated by district and school, similar to the immunization reports.

This number reflects student enrollment as of May 15, as indicated by the schools reporting data on the Dental Data Collection System.

If every school submitted its dental data, then ISBE could report the total student enrollment as of May 15 in the three grade levels for which data are submitted. Unfortunately, that was not the case and no system other than the Dental Data Collection System collects student enrollment as of May 15 of each year. That is the reason why the numbers reflect only those schools reporting.

Since the Fall Housing Report reflects student enrollment as of last school day in September and the Dental Data Collection System shows student enrollment in only schools reporting as of May 15 of the same school year – a different point in time -- the data are not the same. If all the schools submitted their dental data, then ISBE would be able to determine the total enrollments as of May 15 in the three grade levels for which data are submitted.

Yes.

Correct.

At this point, there is no mechanism to collect this information.

It will be done when [identifying information deleted] data is available.
• The addition of dental health status information such as the prevalence of dental sealants and untreated dental caries is appreciated. The 46.75% prevalence of dental sealants among examined 6th graders still falls short of the CDC Healthy 2010 goal of 50% of children with sealants by age 8.
• Although not strictly an education issue, from a public health perspective, it would be interesting to know whether the 6,195 mostly public district schoolchildren with urgent problems received care.
• Perhaps in future reports the current year will be compared with the previous one(s).

654 Certification

Certification form 73-03C is listed as having a date of 07/07. The only form available to download is dated 1/07. Please correct this error.

Staff in the Educator Certification Division have reloaded the form and it is now available at: [http://www.isbe.net/certification/pdf/73-03C_teaching_certificate.pdf](http://www.isbe.net/certification/pdf/73-03C_teaching_certificate.pdf). The State Board appreciates your bringing this to our attention when you discovered it and regret any inconvenience that this may have caused you.

655 Recertification

As I read the news and realize that student scores in Illinois are dropping, I am convinced that the "CPDU gathering" teacher recertification system is NOT working. I am a retired teacher who served on the LPDC. This is just more unnecessary paper pushing. STOP taking teachers OUT OF THE CLASSROOM and STOP taking their time away from any duty DIRECTLY RELATED to teaching, tutoring, mentoring students. I apologize to those who have gotten their PhD’s by writing books on educational theory, but the bottom line is quite simple. There are a few techniques that work, once learned, they can be used over and over again successfully. I would be happy to share MY theories with Dr. Koch, now that I have the time in my retirement. The future of education in Illinois is quite frightening until we get back to understanding that teaching the students, being with the students, talking to the students, motivating the students is most important. (How DID anyone learn anything before CPDU’s?)

Please understand that the legislation creating the system for continued professional development was initiated by the Illinois Education Association and the Illinois Federation of Teachers in response to a growing public concern that not all teachers in the classroom were keeping up with the latest content, pedagogy, and practices in education. The unions chose to be proactive in introducing this legislation in order to assist and recognize teachers for engaging in professional development and to motivate others to begin updating their skills and knowledge. For lifelong learners like you, this probably does not make sense because you have always continued to learn; however, this was not the case for all certified teachers in Illinois. Many of the activities for which credit is given are job-embedded, while many more would be attained by attending inservice training sessions already provided by school districts and Regional Offices of Education. Some school districts have professional development plans in place that meet or exceed the new requirements. The important thing to remember here is that it is possible for teachers to engage in meaningful activities at their schools to expand their own knowledge and skills as a professional while meeting certificate renewal requirements.

656 Kindergarten

I believe that children who turn 5 a few weeks after the Sept. 1st deadline, should be allowed to start kindergarten with the rest of the 5 year olds. It is so unfair to these children. My daughter [identifying information deleted] turns 5 on Sept 24, 2008 and because of this she cannot attend school. I cannot afford a private school and I have communicated my concerns with my local school district, but they offer no testing and refuse to meet with [identifying information deleted]. I made a phone call a few weeks ago to the

State law, under Section 10-20.12 of the School Code (105 ILCS 5/10-20.12), provides that a school board must provide schools for those children who are between the ages of 5 and 21 years. Children who attain the age of 5 years on or before September 1 of the current school term may be enrolled. The law also provides that "based upon an assessment of a child's readiness to attend school, a school district may permit a child to attend school prior to the dates contained in this Section." (Emphasis added.) As you can see, a school board is authorized but not required to enroll a child.
Springfield Board of Education and was told that every school district has their own board that can make the decision to test a child. It’s a shame that a child eager to start school is caught in the middle of this and not able to start kindergarten until she turns 6. I can understand if her birthday is later in the school year, but it's practically in the beginning of the school year. Can you please advise!

You may be interested to know that before 1985, a student in Illinois had to be 6 years old by December 1 in order to enroll in school. That law was amended by P.A. 84-126, effective July 1, 1985, and phased in the age 5 limit over a three-year period from as follows:

- By November 1 after the first day of the 1986-87 school term,
- By October 1 after the first day of the 1987-88 school term, and
- By September 1 after the 1988-89 school term and thereafter.

Unfortunately, there is nothing that the State Board of Education can do to assist you in convincing your school district to enroll your daughter before she turns 5 years old, as state law gives authority to school districts to determine many of their policies and procedures locally. Please let me know if I can provide you with any other information, however.

You also suggest that the Illinois State Board of Education’s administrative rules set forth a minimum amount of time per week (i.e., minutes) that physical education must be offered. I understand you have already had a lengthy conversation on October 19, 2007, with my colleague Winnie Tuthill about your concerns, as well as subsequent email correspondence.

**History.** First, let me provide you with a brief overview of physical education in Illinois. The requirement to provide some sort of physical education was first put in place in 1915, with the enactment of the Physical Training Act, which required any school or institution that received state support to provide such courses for at least an hour a week. That act was revised in 1927 to mandate physical education for students preparing for the teaching profession. By 1944, legislation had been enacted to require a minimum of 200 minutes of weekly instruction was changed to daily instruction of physical education, which included health education.

In 1973, the requirements for health education were removed from the physical education statute, following enactment of the Critical Health and Comprehensive Health Education Act in 1971 [statutory citation: 105 ILCS 110]. Efforts to relax the requirement of daily physical education first came in 1985, when exemptions were added to the law for students in grades 11 and 12 for ongoing participation in an interscholastic athletic program or to take a course required either for graduation or admittance to a postsecondary institution, provided that the failure to take such a course would prevent the student from graduating or being admitted to the postsecondary institution. Further changes were made in the last 10 years or so to add exemptions to

657 | Physical Education |
---|---
I am writing about elementary and middle school physical education requirements. I have been doing research on PE guidelines. The Illinois General Assembly recently signed PA-095-0223, concerning PE waivers. It took away the indefinite waiver, and as of January, 2008, schools will be able to sign up for a 2 year waiver, and only be able to renew it 2 times, maximum of 6 years.

My children are in [identifying information deleted], and many of our schools ability to provide PE is very limited, so I am trying to research whether K-8th grade at [identifying information deleted] has ever been on a waiver. The word I get from school administrators, is no. Yet, my children only get one 40 minute class of PE per week. According to the Illinois School Code, 105 ILCS 5/27-6, daily be is to be provided, for a compatible period of time as other subjects (we have 40 minute classes, so the daily PE should be 40 minutes), except on block scheduling days. The ISBE claims to have its PE policy in line with national guidelines.

National guidelines ask for 150 minutes per week for k-5th, and 225 minutes for 6th-12th. It would be easier for schools to meet the Illinois mandate, if it were mandated by minutes per week. Daily PE in Chicago, at 40 minutes per day, 5 days per week (assuming no block scheduling) would be 200 minutes per week. This appears to be unreasonable when national standards are asking for less, and virtually no elementary school in Chicago offers this, and over 25 percent of the state's districts are on physical education waivers.

Many elementary schools in America use recess time to meet PE minute requirements. I know of several in the [identifying information deleted] suburbs that do this. Most states specify who has not turned 5 years old on or before September 1. You may have already done so, but you should contact your school district to ascertain its policy regarding enrollment of students who are not the required age. Of course, the school district should be following any policy that its board has adopted and applying it uniformly to all students in the district.

You may be interested to know that before 1985, a student in Illinois had to be 6 years old by December 1 in order to enroll in school. That law was amended by P.A. 84-126, effective July 1, 1985, and phased in the age 5 limit over a three-year period from as follows:

- By November 1 after the first day of the 1986-87 school term,
- By October 1 after the first day of the 1987-88 school term, and
- By September 1 after the 1988-89 school term and thereafter.

Unfortunately, there is nothing that the State Board of Education can do to assist you in convincing your school district to enroll your daughter before she turns 5 years old, as state law gives authority to school districts to determine many of their policies and procedures locally. Please let me know if I can provide you with any other information, however.

You also suggest that the Illinois State Board of Education’s administrative rules set forth a minimum amount of time per week (i.e., minutes) that physical education must be offered. I understand you have already had a lengthy conversation on October 19, 2007, with my colleague Winnie Tuthill about your concerns, as well as subsequent email correspondence.
whether recess can or cannot be used to meet PE. New Jersey does, for example, but New York does not. PE advocates do not like to have recess minutes used, because sometimes schools get rid of formal PE altogether. Schools should not be allowed to drop formal PE, as it is necessary for child development.

I am asking the State Board of Education to be more specific with its Physical Education guidelines. Health education minutes are included in PE from 5th grade on. It would help tremendously to have the minimum minutes stated for formal physical education, health education, and recess.

If a school is to fill out a PE waiver, they should have more specific instructions as to what is PE. Many parents I know of would love to see recess included in k-8th grade schools. If we could have a definite number of minutes per week, that would be helpful. PE could be made up of one 40 minute formal PE class, and five 20 minute recesses (one per day), we would have a total of 140 minutes accounted for by national standards.

Recess. You suggest that recess be counted toward meeting the daily physical education mandate. For recess to count as a “class”, it would need to meet all of the following criteria:

- Is made up of a planned and structured curriculum (rather than just an “organized activity”) that focuses on the Illinois Learning Standards for Physical Development (Goals 19, 20 and 21; see http://www.isbe.net/ils/pdh/standards.htm) and the goals articulated in Section 27-7 of the School Code (105 ILCS 5/27-7), which is copied below;
- Is provided for an amount of time that compares “favorably with other courses in the curriculum” (regulation found at 23 Ill. Adm. Code 1.420(p)); and
- Is under the supervision of a certified teacher (not an aide or a parent).

School districts may schedule recess as part of a normal school day, but they are not required to do so either by law or by administrative rules. A school district is required to provide at least five clock-hours of school work each day and after meeting that requirement, may configure the day as it believes best meets the needs of its students and staff. Although many studies have shown the benefits of allowing children regular time during the school day for free play, it would be up to your school district to determine the amount of recess it wants to provide and whether the recess sessions provided would conform to the standards cited above so that they could be counted as meeting the daily physical education mandate.
The State Board of Education encourages you to work with your school and district administration to develop alternatives for it to use to ensure that all students are engaged in physical education on a daily basis and appreciates your concern for improving the quality of education for Illinois' children.

Staff at the Illinois Interactive Report card (IIRC) have reported that while the multi-racial/ethnic group category was to be included in the charts contained on the profile page, a programming error prevented them from being populated properly. You have already discussed this issue with IIRC staff directly by email and telephone, and it is our understanding that the problem will be fixed in a couple of days. Thank you for bringing this to our attention.

The Interactive Illinois Report Card (IIRC) lists data by five racial/ethnic categories. The Illinois School Report Card (ISCR) provides data disaggregated by six racial/ethnic categories. Why doesn’t the IIRC provide data disaggregated in the same fashion as the ISC?

The graphic pie chart representations of school and district enrollment are inaccurate and misleading. Even though all six groups are not represented in the pie chart, the pie chart gives the appearance of representing 100% of school or district enrollment. For the School had a Multi-racial enrollment of 17.5% in 2005-2006. Yet, this group was not represented in the graphic or the IIRC. Will the public see accurate representations of data for all groups in the 2007 IIRC?

Staff at the Illinois Interactive Report card (IIRC) have reported that while the multi-racial/ethnic group category was to be included in the charts contained on the profile page, a programming error prevented them from being populated properly. You have already discussed this issue with IIRC staff directly by email and telephone, and it is our understanding that the problem will be fixed in a couple of days. Thank you for bringing this to our attention.

The graphic pie chart representations of school and district enrollment are inaccurate and misleading. Even though all six groups are not represented in the pie chart, the pie chart gives the appearance of representing 100% of school or district enrollment. For the School had a Multi-racial enrollment of 17.5% in 2005-2006. Yet, this group was not represented in the graphic or the IIRC. Will the public see accurate representations of data for all groups in the 2007 IIRC?

I am completely OUTRAGED by the passing of this moment of silence - aside from the fact that it's completely unconstitutional - especially since "School Prayer" is RIGHT THERE in the name! The Gov. was right to veto it. Religious aspect aside - if teachers can get their entire class silent for that long, don't you think they'd want to tell them something useful?

The State Board of Education is not at liberty of relieving school districts of their responsibilities of complying with the Act. We suggest that you contact your state representative and senator and/or the bill’s sponsor to let them know of your dissatisfaction with the public act. Contact information for legislators may be found at [http://www.ilga.gov/]. The State Board appreciates your taking the time to share your thoughts about education.
The silence is going to get old really fast as well: Teachers are going to get annoyed with the daily interruption and will spend the silence reminding the children to be quiet! How is that effective? Many of these children are discipline problems as it is - they need to be put in situations where they are praised for good behavior, not disciplined because some suit in congress decided they need to be silent for a certain amount of time. This new law needs to go away - immediately. If my child wants to pray and reflect he can do it on his own time and not his teacher's. The line of separation of Church and State has been blurred over these many years - its time to redraw it where it was meant to be - not to blur it even further.

Below you will find a letter written to a school Principal in the School District. I send this letter out last week and still have not had a single response. I also left a message on Mrs. voicemail about this issue and also have not received a response. I would like to see something done about the way Illinois schools system works, when it comes to contacting parents as to the unexpected absence, academic/social progress and school events. Currently it seems that only one parent can have information on file with the school. I believe that it should not be that way if we really want no child left behind. I ask that there be some kind of act/law stating the IL school should have to upgrade their systems so that children with parents that don't live together both have their contact information in the system and that both parents be contacted, either by phone or mail. Please forward this on to the appropriate people, as I will also be sending to whom ever I feel need to see this.

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Academy school this morning concerning my son absence from school. I found out yesterday Wed. Oct 25 2007, my son has not been at school all week. His absence is due to not having his required shots. His mother was notified at least a month ago about this, and then reminded at the parent teacher conference. I assumed that she would have this taken care of, but I was wrong. This is partially my fault that I didn't make sure she had it done.

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 regarding a pupil to a parent of the pupil as provided by this Section, unless the school board first has been furnished with a certified copy of the court order prohibiting the release of such reports, records, notices or other documents to that parent. No such reports or records with respect to a pupil shall be provided to a parent who has been prohibited by an order of protection from inspecting or obtaining school records of that pupil pursuant to the Illinois Domestic Violence Act of 1986, as now or hereafter amended.

In addition, you also should be given access to your student's temporary and permanent records, as the Illinois School Student Records Act does not distinguish between custodial and noncustodial parents. (See 105 ILCS 10 at http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/ilcs/ilcs3.asp?ActID=1006&ChapAct=105%26nbsp%3BILCS%26nbsp%3B10%26nbsp%3B10%26nbsp%3BChapterID=17&ChapterName=SC HOOLS&ActName=Illinois+School+Student+Records+Act%2E.)

As you will note from these laws, a school district cannot refuse to provide this information to you. As part of the school recognition process, a school district must be in compliance with all laws and administrative rules governing it. As for your receiving electronic communication on the
[information deleted] has now missed the better part of a week of school. I was not notified of his absence by the school. Previous to this [identifying information deleted] had perfect attendance, so why would I have been concerned that this stuff wasn't taken care of. If I would have been notified that he still didn't have his shot on Monday he could have been back in school Tuesday. If I would have been called on Wednesday to be notified that he had missed 3 days of school due to not having his shot I would have at least been able to get him back to school on Thursday. Most of us know, but maybe not everyone, you don't even have to have an appointment to get the shot he needed, so why would it take longer than 1 day out of school not 4. That is where the concern should come in.

I understand your school has 300+ students, and some of them have bigger issues than missing a few days of school. I feel that if there is any kind of issue that a child misses school for more that a couple of days parents should be contacted. I want to push the issues that both parents should be notified if they are not living together, as to the unexpected absence, academic/social progress and school events. I do understand that this is a lot of phone calls and mailing, but if one of those calls made could help a child to be at school when he should it would be worth it.

If this is some kind of software issue with the schools computer systems. I would recommend that someone call the company and add the feature of having both parents information whether they live together or not.

Also during that conversation, I brought up the fact that I had signed up for "Email Updates" for that school. She informed me that they only thing the "Email Updates" are for is Alerts, but on the website where I signed up for these "Email Updates" it states " Each of our schools has an individual email list used to notify subscribers of school events, announcements, and emergencies." (found at [identifying information deleted]). I have not received a single email concerning any "Events" about the school. Now we may have a different understanding on what constitutes an event, but I would imagine that we can agree that a parent teacher conference would be considered an "Event". I recommend that you have someone look in to this. (eg. webmaster, mailing list administrator)

I don't mean that this is for me only, but for all the other parents out there that don't get the information about their children that they should due to the way your current system works. Most custody agreements state that both parents have an equal say in the child/children schooling and the school(s) need to accommodate for this. It's sad it has to come to this where parents don't communicate with each other about their child's progress in school, but some parents are lazy/forgetful and the child should not suffer for their district’s “alert” system, that situation is one in which you will need to address with your school administrators, and your letter indicates that you have already done so.

It is unfortunate that you are experiencing these difficulties. I hope the information that I have provided will be useful, and I will be forwarding this response to the State Board of Education’s Accountability Division for follow up.
parents faults. Please forward on to someone higher in command if either of you cannot handle this issue. I will be trying to find the contact information for the people who need to know about this. I will also be writing the state to have some kind or law/act put in place for this issue. I will call it "No Parent Left Behind".
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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 June 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 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.

Completed
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 provide for a comprehensive updating and streamlining of this material.

New Part 100 addresses 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 put in place in order to make this timetable apparent.
(Effective October 19, 2007)

Completed
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. JCAR prohibited its filing in January 2007 but lifted the prohibition in June after further changes had been made to address the outstanding concerns.
(Effective June 28, 2007)

**Progressing**

**PART 254 – VOCATIONAL EDUCATION**

Staff in the divisions of Rules and Waivers, Legal, and Career and Technical Education 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 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 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>Data Systems</th>
<th>Agency Response</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>Illinois did not receive an award for development of a data warehouse. This project is on hold until funding can be allocated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 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 have been in place for 17 different reporting and funding plans, including for all four of the systems mentioned in the Less Red Tape submission. | Progressing. Staff plan to have the modifications ready for testing and integrated with one IWAS-based system by the end of November or mid-December. After piloting the changes, staff will proceed to implement them in all IWAS-supported systems. |
2. Include the Public School Update (form 60-63).

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).

A programmer/analyst has been hired on contract 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.

Progressing. The internal administrative portion of the new Entity/CDS System is in parallel testing through November. Once complete, staff will begin the online portion of the Entity System that the field will use to update their information via IWAS.

3. Add additional programs to the Electronic Grants Management System (e-GMS).

Additions for FY 2008 funding are:
- IDEA Part B Flow Through,
- IDEA Deaf/Blind,
- IDEA Part B Preschool,
- IDEA Discretionary,
- IDEA Preschool Discretionary, and
- Continuation Application for the Preschool for All Children Program.

For FY 2009, the following programs will be added to the system:
- Career and Technical Education Improvement (CTEI)
- Perkins – Career and Technical Education (federal)
- Perkins – Grant to Department of Human Services
- Career and Technical Education – Work Experience and Career Exploration Program

FY 2008 completed; others in production for FY 2009.

### District Planning Requirements

| Streamline the technology planning process and make it easier to complete. | Staff are currently developing and pilot-testing an online Technology Improvement Plan (TIP) template 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 that need to update their technology plans and submit those by April 15, 2008, will use this template. Further work is needed to consolidate the common elements of each of these three plans and eliminate duplication. | The TIP was unveiled September 7, 2007, at the Annual Superintendents’ Conference. Field-testing occurred in October; became available online November 1. |
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. Staff will continue to push for repeal of these sections in the 2008 spring session.

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 575)
- 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)

LRTs: Legally mandated school holidays was the only issue brought to the agency’s attention through Less Red Tape to be addressed in legislation this session. HB 2006, which addressed both school holidays and parent-teacher conference days, passed in the House on May 15, 2007, but stalled in the Senate Rules Committee on May 22, 2007. Staff anticipate pursuing in the spring 2008 session legislation that will incorporate these amendments. A description of each issue is provided below.

- **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.