TO: Governmental Relations Committee of the Whole

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

Agenda Topic: Legislative Update and 2011 Legislative Agenda

Materials: List of 96th General Assembly Task Forces (p. 14)
           List of Filed Federal Legislation (pp. 15-23)

Staff Contact(s): Nicole Wills, Governmental Relations
                 Cynthia Riseman, Governmental Relations

Purpose of Agenda Item
The purpose of the agenda item is to provide the Board with (a) an update on the statutory task forces and similar bodies which the Agency was directed as a result of the 2010 Spring legislative session to establish (and/or in which the Agency was directed to participate); (b) a summary of salient federal legislative proposals; and (c) an introduction to the Agency’s legislative proposals for the 2011 legislative agenda.

96th General Assembly Task Forces
Staff have been working on implementation of all relevant legislation from Spring 2010, including establishing three task forces as directed by statute: the School Bullying Prevention Task Force, the Instructional Mandates Task Force, and the Performance Evaluation Advisory Council (required by PA 96-0952, PA 96-1374, and PA 96-861 respectively).

The School Bullying Prevention Task Force is charged with exploring the causes and consequences of bullying in schools, identifying promising practices in school districts that reduce incidences of bullying and evaluating the effectiveness of schools’ current policies and bullying prevention programs. A report on the task force findings is due to the Governor and General Assembly on or before March 1, 2011. The State Superintendent is responsible for making all appointments to the Task Force. He has already done so and we anticipate the Task Force having its first meeting in early October. The Agency has developed a webpage for this Task Force. See http://www.isbe.net/SBPTF/default.htm.

The Instructional Mandates Task Force will examine current instructional mandates governing public schools and make recommendations concerning existing mandates and the imposition of future mandates. In addition, the Task Force is to include in its recommendations information about necessary funding to carry out the identified instructional responsibilities. A report on the recommendations and findings is due to the Governor and General Assembly on or before July 1, 2011. The Agency has developed a webpage for this Task Force. See http://www.isbe.net/IMTF/default.htm. (Note that the work of this Task Force will built off of work begun by the Blue Ribbon Committee on Mandates that met twice in April 2010. http://www.isbe.net/blue_ribbon/default.htm.)

The Performance Evaluation Advisory Council has been meeting monthly since May 2010. This group is charged with (a) assisting the State in development the system of supports necessary for teacher and principal evaluation reform (including developing appropriate templates, data systems, and evaluator pre-qualification and training programs) and (b) making recommendations to the State on critical decision-points related to the incorporation of student
growth in these reformed evaluations. The Council is comprised of representatives from school management, teachers unions, and higher education, as well as national experts in the area of evaluation reform. The Agency has developed a webpage for this Council. See http://www.isbe.net/PEAC/default.htm.

A list of all task forces ISBE sits on or is responsible for convening is included.

**Pending Federal Legislation**
We have attached a summary of federal education-related legislative proposals. While this summary does not include every federal education-related bill (since over 171 bills alone have been introduced on re-authorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)), we thought you would find it interesting to see the range of issues currently before Congress.

**Proposed Spring 2011 Legislative Agenda**
Over the past several months, the Agency’s Governmental Relations staff have been working with Agency divisions to develop legislative proposals for the spring 2011 legislative session.

Potential legislative initiatives for spring 2011 include:

- Revamping the Educator Certification System (Article 21 of the School Code);
- Aligning State and Federal Accountability Standards;
- Further alignment of Financial Oversight Panels and School Finance Authorities;
- Revisions to the Textbook Loan Program;
- Removing bilingual education from the Educational Services Block Grant for Chicago;
- Permanently terminating the General State Aid Hold Harmless program;
- Applying the Alternate Double Whammy formula to all Property Tax Extension Limitation Law (PTELL) to school districts statewide (to address the General State Aid-related issues raised by School District U-46 and others);
- Less Red Tape/Clean-up; and,
- Elimination or Modification of Unfunded Mandates.

**Certification Structure in Article 21**
This proposal would rewrite the existing provisions in Article 21 of the School Code regarding teacher certification and education preparation—the result being the creation of a new Article of the School Code and a new system for educator licensure. Changes include strengthening educator preparation and professional development requirements, consolidating types of licenses, increasing middle school endorsement requirements and making changes to the Illinois Teaching Excellence Program. In addition to these substantive legal changes, the proposal seeks to streamline and realign the provisions of Article 21 to make it more user-friendly. The changes to these provisions would become effective at various points from enactment through July 1, 2013.

**State Educator Preparation and Licensure Board**
- Would change the name of the current State Teacher Certification Board to the State Educator Preparation and Licensure Board given that, as a result of the proposal, what are now certificates will become “licenses” and in order to emphasize this Board’s role in evaluating the applications and operation of educator preparation programs.
- Would add two more higher education faculty or administrators to the Board’s composition because so much of the Board’s work revolves around educator preparation programs; and,
Would make clear that the current State Teacher Certification Board members in place prior to the amendatory act will retain their seats when it becomes the State Educator Preparation and Licensure Board.

**Consolidate Types of Educator Licenses and Requirements**

Currently, individuals may obtain multiple certificates for various grade levels, supervisory areas, and specialty areas. This proposal would reduce the number of available licenses to three, each of which would list the validity dates, grade levels and subjects for which an individual is eligible to be employed. This proposal would also eliminate the leveled certification system that is currently in place. The three licenses that would be available include:

- **Illinois Professional Educator License.** Qualified educators would be issued a professional educator license endorsed in each area and grade level for which they are eligible to seek employment in teaching, administration, and/or school service. Each professional educator license would be valid for five years and requires professional development for renewal.

- **Illinois Educator License with Stipulations.** An educator would receive this License, as opposed to a Professional Educator License if: (a) there was an expiration date; (b) the license holder was limited to one particular position; or (c) completion of an approved education program is not required. Examples of the types of endorsements on this license that currently exist as certificates include: (1) provisional educator, (2) alternative provisional educator, (3) alternative provisional superintendent's endorsement, (4) resident teacher, (5) provisional vocational, (6) alternative provisional vocational, (7) transitional bilingual, (8) visiting international teacher, and (9) paraprofessional. Educator licenses with stipulations vary in their period of validity and renewal requirements.

- **Substitute Teaching License.** A Substitute Teaching License would be valid for five years (instead of four, which is currently the validity period). Also, individuals would not have to pay a separate registration fee for each region in which the individual wishes to teach.

With the three license system, the Initial, Standard, and Master certificates will be eliminated. Staff envisions that the new licenses would be issued as soon as the new TCIS/ECS system is in place, which is expected to occur no later than July 1, 2013. No educator will lose any credential in the move from certificate to license.

**Grade Level and Subject Area Endorsements**

- Because this legislation would eliminate multiple certificates from the current certification structure, the proposal in this area would require that licenses be endorsed for every content area, instructional support area and/or administrative area for which the license holder is eligible.

- A major change included in the proposal would require all elementary teachers to hold the “self-contained general education endorsement”, but also require any individual teaching in grades 5 through 8 to hold a more specific endorsement if he or she teaches in core content areas (English/language arts, mathematics, science, social science and/or reading). Teachers in grades 9-12 would continue to be required to hold endorsements in the specific areas for which they provide instruction.

- As is current practice, additional endorsements can be established by the State Board through the administrative rulemaking process. The only endorsements specifically established in statute would be: the teacher leader endorsement; the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards endorsement; and the
Instructional Support endorsement, which all exist in some form in the current Article 21. In addition, the proposal would include the requirements for a Superintendent endorsement, Principal endorsement and a Chief School Business Official endorsement.

Alternative Routes to Educator Licensure
Numerous alternative programs for teacher certification exist in the current version of Article 21. This proposal would streamline these options and require more focused instruction for the candidate. Alternative Educator Licensure Programs may be offered by a state approved college or university, a state approved not-for-profit organization or a combination of both. The program would consist of various phases, which would include a course of study (which at minimum includes instructional planning); instructional strategies (including special education, reading and English Language Learning); classroom management, how to assess and use data to drive instruction; a two year residency, and a comprehensive assessment of the candidates teaching effectiveness. This program would eventually replace the alternative routes established in the existing Article 21.

Provisions for the Alternative Route to Administrative Certification and the Alternative Route to Administrative Certification for National Board Certification would continue to exist under the new Article and would be updated with new terminology.

Qualifications of Educators
The proposal would remove the requirements that, in order to receive a license, an individual be of “good health” and “a citizen of the United States or legally present and authorized for employment”. Because “good health” is not something currently assessed at the point of certification, Agency staff believe it prudent to remove the requirement from the statute. In addition, Agency staff advocate for removing the reference to an individual being a citizen or legally present because it is more a condition of employment than a licensure issue.

Educator Testing
Proposed changes in this area would require a candidate to pass the content area test prior to beginning student teaching. In addition, a candidate would be required to pass the APT examination for the appropriate grade levels in order to successfully complete his or her student teaching requirement.

Illinois Educator Excellence Program
This program pertains to individuals holding or seeking to hold the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards endorsement on a Professional Educator License. The proposal would change the way in which an appropriation for this program would be prioritized—placing a greater emphasis on using the incentive funds to assist individuals with applying to and completing the program, as opposed to bonus funding for those individuals who have completed the process.

Fee Structure for Educator Licenses and Registration
The proposal would consolidate the different fee provisions in Sections 21-1b, 21-16 and 21-17 into one section—and, more notably, would raise the fees. Certificate application and endorsement fees are currently $30, and have been at that amount since July 1, 1994. Before then, application fees were $20 since 1964 and endorsement were $20 since 1986.

The proposed would include setting (a) a $100 application fee for any of the three licenses for an individual who has completed an approved Illinois education program - the Professional Educator License, an Educator License with Stipulations or a Substitute Teaching License; and (b) a $150 application fee for individuals who hold a valid, comparable credential from another state or another country. Staff is proposing the out-of-state educator application fee to be
higher than the in-state fee because of the time that is required to complete such evaluations of comparability. In addition, the registration fee would increase and individuals would be required to pay $10 per year (currently it is $5 per year), with fees directed to the Regional Office of Education for the purpose of providing professional development to educators.

Certification fees are currently deposited into the Teacher Certification Revolving Fund and would continue to be deposited into the Fund under the proposed changes. This Fund enhances and maintains the Teacher Certification Information System (TCIS), the Educator Certification System (ECS), and the Illinois Administrator Academy Management System (IAAMS). It also supports agency teacher certification personnel costs, equipment to link Regional Offices of Education to ISBE teacher certification data bases and updates to technology used to process certificate and endorsement applications.

Licensure Renewal
The current requirements for certificate renewal have been criticized for being confusing and cumbersome, and for failing to ensure that educators receive high quality and meaningful professional development. Under this proposal, the renewal system would be overhauled. Over the past few months, the Agency Divisions of Certification and Educational and School Development have been engaging in discussions with groups including the IEA, the IFT, the Regional Offices of Education and the IPA to work on this critical issue.

Based in part on those discussions, proposed changes would include:

1. Improving the educator’s knowledge of instructional practices and procedures consistent with the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, National Staff Development Council Standards, Illinois Professional Teaching Standards, Illinois Professional Leadership Standards, and/or Professional School Personnel Standards;
2. Increasing or strengthening the educator’s knowledge of a specific content area;
3. Improving the educator’s mastery of skills and knowledge regarding the improvement of teaching performance in classroom settings and assessment of the levels of student performance in the schools; and,
4. Improving the quality and degree of student services to support teaching and learning.

The proposed new system would begin no later than July 1, 2013 and would be significantly less complicated than the current system. The new system would limit professional development to two options or a combination of the two options in order to accrue 9 Continuing Professional Development (CPD) Credits, which would be the equivalent of 135 professional development hours over the 5-year renewal cycle. Educators could choose to complete 9 semester hours of college coursework from an accredited institution of higher learning (each semester hour would be the equivalent of 1 CPD) or to complete 9 Illinois Education Academy courses, which would total 135 hours. An educator could also choose a combination of those two options. The Illinois Educator Academy courses will be modeled after the Illinois Administrators Academy. Outside providers can offer the courses if they are approved by ISBE and fulfill the purposes outlined above.

Aligning State and Federal Accountability Standards

Align state and federal accountability designations and status to address the following problems and needs:

- Currently, the different terms used in state and federal law lead to confusion throughout the system.
• Districts can avoid NCLB sanctions for schools through the local Title I funding allocation process. As a result, many of the State's lowest-performing high schools are not subject to interventions under federal law; and,

• The State's accountability system needs to account for changes to the federal accountability system resulting from the State's approved Differentiated Accountability model.

**FOP/SFA Alignment**

Agency options for assisting school districts having serious financial difficulties are limited by the School Code. Pursuant to Article 1B of the School Code, the State Board can place a school district under a Financial Oversight Panel (FOP) if the district meets certain conditions and has already been certified by the State Board as in financial difficulty (under Article 1A-8 of the School Code). Placing a school district under an FOP requires official State Board action and FOPs are empowered with certain responsibilities concerning a district’s finances. There are currently three districts under FOPs in the state – Proviso THSD 209, Venice CUSD 3 and Cairo USD 1.

There have been instances, though, where our Agency believed a district needed stronger financial interventions than an FOP was statutorily able to offer. Those districts have been placed under School Finance Authorities (SFAs), but only after specific legislation was passed in each instance to establish the particular SFA. Currently, two districts are under SFAs – Round Lake Area Schools #116 (105 ILCS 5/1E) and Hazel Crest School District 152-5 (105 ILCS 5/1F).

This proposal would create a new FOP for all future districts needing financial intervention. The new FOP would consist of a five member board and have the duties and powers similar to those that exist for the current FOPs and SFAs. School districts under current FOPs and SFAs would continue to operate as they have been while in existence, but any future FOPs would operate under the parameters of the new statute.

Should this legislative initiative move forward and pass through the General Assembly, the State Board would have the ability to place a school district, if it has been certified in financial difficulty, under a new FOP established under the Article. The triggers for being able to certify a district as in financial difficulty are explicitly set forth in Section 1A-8 of the School Code and Agency staff is not proposing to change those triggers. This new FOP would have all of the powers of FOPs in Article 1B of the School Code but, more importantly, certain of the powers that exist for the SFAs in Articles 1E and 1F.

For example, the Hazel Crest School Finance Authority under Article 1F is able to recommend to the State Board a reorganization of the school district, which could then be acted upon by the State Board (105 ILCS 5/1F-25), and can unilaterally levy all property tax levies (105 ILCS 5/1F-25). Under this proposal, the new FOP would be able to recommend reorganization to the General Assembly and would have the ability to approve the levy amount (but not levy taxes unless the district failed to do so).

In addition, responding to some stakeholder concerns that the State Board should not have the ability to put a district under an entity with expansive powers, Agency staff would propose language to explicitly prohibit the new FOPs from unilaterally canceling or modifying a collective bargaining agreement that is in force as of the date of the Panel’s establishment and from leasing, subleasing, purchasing or building additional school buildings or grounds without referendum approval.
Staff is also proposing to combine these changes with some other changes in Articles 8 and 17 of the School Code regarding school district financial and accounting practices:

- Changes to 105 ILCS 5/8-6 would require a treasurer to reconcile the balances with the districts bookkeeping department (which is current practice), but would have to be in conformity with a template developed by ISBE. In addition, districts on the financial watch or warning list, those that are required to submit deficit reduction plans or those certified in financial difficulty would be required to submit the cash balances to ISBE quarterly. Those districts would also be required to transmit bank reconciliation reports from the school treasurer to ISBE quarterly. These actions will allow ISBE school finance staff to better monitor school districts in an effort to assist districts before the intervention of an FOP is needed.

- Changes to 105 ILCS 5/17-1 would require districts that have an Annual Financial Report (AFR) showing the district having a deficit (i.e. an unbalanced budget) to submit a deficit reduction plan to ISBE within 30 days. School districts are currently required to submit a deficit reduction plan if the school district budget is not balanced. Since the AFR details actual expenditures and revenues for a school district, this requirement will better identify school district’s actual expense issues.

### Textbook Loan Program

The Illinois Textbook Loan Program (ILTP) provides schools serving students in public and ISBE recognized nonpublic schools the loan of secular textbooks, instructional computer software and related educational resources. The program was legislatively established in 1961 and while minor changes have taken place to the program in recent years, the fundamental program remains mostly intact.

In those years where funds are so appropriated, eligible school districts and non-public schools receives a per-pupil amount of money based on fall enrollment figures. The program switches between K-6 students and 7-12 students every other year, so a school district would receive the per pupil amount multiplied by the number of eligible students for the particular grades included in the fall enrollment count. Districts and eligible non-public schools then can submit orders to ISBE between November 15th and March 15th using a list of vendors available on a database produced by ISBE. ISBE does the actual purchasing, as well as vouchering of the funds to the vendors after we have received confirmation from the school districts and schools that they have received all materials on the purchase order. Funds are never actually sent to the districts since the district instead makes purchases and ISBE pays vendors directly for those purchases with the allotted money.

Because the materials are actually purchased by ISBE, they are property of the State of Illinois on loan to both public and nonpublic students. The law allows that after 5 years a school district can dispose of the books in a manner determined by the local board if the State Board has been notified in advance of the pending action. We have provided a mechanism whereby an entity can post materials that it no longer needs, which allows other schools to contact the entity and obtain those materials. The receiving school is responsible for all transportation and shipping of the materials in those circumstances. While this sharing mechanism is available, districts and non-public schools are not required to post materials or utilize it.

ILTP first received an appropriation in 1976 totaling $10,000. Funding increased through the 1980s and early 1990s until the legislature almost tripled the appropriation to $24 million in Fiscal Year 1998 and again doubled the appropriation in Fiscal Year 2000 to $48 million. Due to State fiscal conditions, the ILTP was not funded in Fiscal Year 2010 or 2011.
Staff has proposed to remove ISBE’s involvement with the purchasing of and payment for the textbooks and related materials. Under this proposal, any future funds for the ILTP would be distributed to eligible entities on a per pupil basis for the purchase of textbooks and related materials, similar to the process used for distribution of ADA Block Grant funds. Districts and schools would then be able to order materials directly.

Disbursing the money directly to eligible school districts and recognized non-public schools would relieve the Agency of time-consuming and unnecessary administrative responsibilities. For example, in Fiscal Year 2009, the last year the ILTP was funded, Agency staff had to process 6,153 vouchers to various vendors. Under this proposal, the number of vouchers would be reduced to approximately 2,500 (i.e., the vouchers directly from the Agency to the school districts and recognized non-public schools). In addition, because of delays in the vendor payments for textbooks, the State has incurred over $1.5 million in the last fiscal year in prompt payment interest penalties.

**Bilingual Education/Educational Services Block Grant**

In 1996, PA 89-15 created an educational services block grant in Article 1D of the School Code to allow flexibility and efficiency in the distribution to, and use of certain grants by, the Chicago Public Schools (CPS), including the grant for the provision of State-required bilingual education services. This block grant distribution of funds means that the formula for determining the amount of funds for CPS for bilingual education services is determined by multiplying the State fiscal-year appropriation to ISBE for bilingual education by CPS’s percentage share of those programs as they stood in FY95.

At the time PA 89-15 was enacted, CPS served approximately 58% of all English Language Learner (ELL) students in Illinois and received a corresponding share of the total State bilingual funding. Over the past 10 years, however, CPS’s share of the State-wide ELL population has precipitously fallen. As of the 2009-2010 school year, approximately 77% of the total number of ELL students in the State resided in districts outside of Chicago. Because of PA 89-15, though, CPS still receives its fixed percentage of State bilingual funding (subject to the caveat described below in *italics*).

In 2010, ISBE initiated HB 5886 which would have removed bilingual education from the educational services block grant for CPS, but was unable to move the legislation during that session. The Agency is recommending that the State Board again approve introduction of a legislative proposal to allow State bilingual dollars to be permanently distributed Statewide in a more equitable fashion.

*(Please note: An important caveat here is that CPS only receives its fixed percentage of funding when the General Assembly specifically appropriates a Bilingual Education line item in the ISBE Budget. For the past two years, the General Assembly has not done so and the Agency has therefore distributed bilingual education dollars more equitably throughout the State. Because we assume the General Assembly will at some point resume its practice of specifically appropriating a Bilingual Education line item in the ISBE Budget, we believe a permanent legislative fix is necessary.)*

**Terminating the General State Aid Hold Harmless Program**

GSA Hold Harmless is authorized by Section 18-8.05(J) of the School Code and provides that any district that would have received less General State Aid in a given fiscal year than it received in Fiscal Year 1998 is eligible to receive up to the amount of the difference in what have come to be known as GSA “Hold Harmless” funds. At the time the GSA Hold Harmless program was initiated, it was designed to assist with transition to a new funding formula.
Over the past two years, the State Board has pursued a legislative phase-out and eventual elimination of the General State Aid Hold Harmless provisions in the School Code. The Board has taken the position that the continuation of GSA Hold Harmless prevents the General State Aid formula for functioning as it was designed to function.

In Fiscal Year 1999, the first year that districts were eligible for this program, 261 districts received GSA Hold Harmless funding. The number of districts receiving such funding has fluctuated over the years. In Fiscal Year 2010, the number was down to 101 districts; however, of those 101 districts, only 21 had received Hold Harmless funds every year since Fiscal Year 1999 (62 of the 101 districts were not eligible for the funds back in Fiscal Year 1999 and 18 were eligible in 1999 but have been eligible only intermittently over the years).

Despite the State Board’s efforts, the General Assembly did not approve a legislative phase out or elimination of GSA Hold Harmless, but it did, in Fiscal Year 2010, appropriate only 43.68% of the amount that would have been due to Hold Harmless districts (requiring a corresponding proration to those districts). For Fiscal Year 2011, the State Board (in addition to its legislative proposal) proposed a budget that cut GSA Hold Harmless funding by 50% of the Fiscal Year 2010 appropriation. The General Assembly, as noted above, did not approve the legislative proposal and also chose to keep the GSA Hold Harmless funding at the Fiscal Year 2010 level. The Governor, though, used his powers under the Emergency Budget Act to place a reserve on the entirety of the GSA Hold Harmless line item.

If the State Board chooses to once again pursue a legislative effort around GSA Hold Harmless, there are two options: (a) the State Board could propose to phase out GSA Hold Harmless over a set number of years and not allow new districts to receive GSA Hold Harmless funds (i.e., “close the door” to new districts), or (b) the State Board could propose legislation that would eliminate entirely the GSA Hold Harmless program, beginning with Fiscal Year 2012. The latter option has not been proposed by the Board before, but may be a direction in which the State Board wishes to go since the Governor has already placed a total reserve on GSA Hold Harmless funds for Fiscal Year 2011.

**Alternate Double Whammy**

With the advent of the changes to the state aid funding formula and the Property Tax Extension Limitation Law (PTELL) in 1999 and 2000, state law changed with respect to the calculation of General State Aid (GSA), including the calculation of Equalized Assessed Valuation (EAV) for districts. EAV is an important component to GSA because it is the primary component used in determining school districts’ local wealth. This measure of local wealth, expressed as the available local resources per student, is compared to the Foundation Level to determine how much in GSA funding a district will receive.

The calculation of the amount of available local resources for districts in PTELL counties is different than those not under PTELL. Often PTELL counties are referred to as “tax capped” counties, though this phrase can be misleading. PTELL does not “cap” either individual property tax bills or individual property assessments. Instead, PTELL limits annual tax extension growth by allowing a taxing district to receive a limited inflationary increase in tax extensions on existing property, plus an additional amount for new construction.

The PTELL limit slows the growth of revenues to taxing districts when property values and assessments are increasing faster than the rate of inflation. As a whole, property owners have some protection from tax bills that increase only because the market value of their property is rising rapidly. If a taxing district determines that it needs more money than is allowed by the
limitation, it can ask the voters to approve an increase to the limiting rate (further described below) for up to four years.

School districts located in PTELL counties are limited not only by the statutorily-set maximum tax rates for the individual funds for which the district levies but also by the calculated total maximum tax rate for the district as determined by PTELL. This total maximum tax rate for the district is referred to as the "limiting rate." The "limiting rate" is the maximum operating tax rate that a school district may impose under the extension limitation. The sum of all tax rates for individual funds cannot exceed the limiting rate.

The General State Aid Formula provides an adjustment for those districts impacted by PTELL. This adjustment was never guaranteed to be a dollar-for-dollar replacement for local revenue lost due to property tax caps. It was designed to be an attempt to take these losses into consideration when lining up districts for available GSA funding. PTELL districts noted that the law already limited the growth in their annual tax extensions. They felt they were further penalized because the new formula implemented in FY 1999 multiplies an assumed tax rate by the district’s full EAV. This produced an assumed amount of local property wealth that many PTELL districts could not achieve due to the limits of PTELL. The solution was to create an EAV that for most districts is much less than the district’s actual EAV. In each year, ISBE takes a PTELL district’s prior year EAV and multiplies it by an index which is equal to the current year maximum possible tax levy divided by the prior year actual tax levy. This means that, by statute, we are inflating a district’s EAV by a factor that mimics the limits of PTELL on tax extensions. For most districts, this PTELL-adjusted EAV is much less than the district’s actual EAV.

* * * *

Over the last several years in particular, we have observed three specific situations where school districts had issues with the tax rates used in the PTELL adjustment. While all three issues are different, the commonality they all share is the tax rates used in determining local share.

**Huntley Consolidated School District 158**
Huntley Consolidated School District 158, which overlaps two counties, pursued several pieces of legislation because of an issue the district had with their tax extension. For the 2001 payable in 2002 taxes, McHenry County used the prior year EAV data for the property in Kane County because Kane County did not yet have final data and wasn’t ready to extend taxes. This was done in accordance with applicable law (which requires using prior year or estimated data in these situations). However, District 158 had a large amount of new property in Kane County in 2000 and McHenry County used the same amount in their calculations in 2001 (since final data was not available and an estimate was not given by Kane County). New property is only outside of the tax cap for the first year, so the use of prior year data in the next year made it seem as though the district had access to greater EAV than it actually did. Ultimately, in using the prior year data, McHenry County overextended taxes and though the data was corrected the next year, it was done so by adjusting the data after the Limiting Rate was calculated (per statutory requirements). The result was a larger limiting rate than would have otherwise been calculated and ultimately, the district’s PTELL-adjusted EAV grew at a greater pace. Since we carry a district’s PTELL-adjusted EAV forward annually and inflate it by the PTELL adjustment, the district has complained that they have been permanently harmed (despite the fact that they still benefit from the PTELL adjustment).

**Elgin School District U-46**
In compiling data for SB 2283 last spring, which was introduced on behalf of the Huntley School District (see above), ISBE staff learned that 83 school districts overlap counties and are subject
Elgin U-46, the second largest school district in the state, was one of these 83 districts, overlapping Kane, DuPage and Cook counties.

While compiling this data, we learned of another issue with the tax rates when there are overlapping counties. In Elgin’s case, each year Kane and DuPage Counties use estimated EAV for Cook County in the extension of taxes because Cook County is never ready to extend at the same time. The GSA formula uses the limiting rate and operating tax rate from what has historically been set as the school district’s “home county” for districts that overlap counties and are subject to PTELL. For Elgin, the home county has always been Kane County and the Illinois Department of Revenue (IDOR) sends ISBE the rates only for the home county. The “home county” is not defined in Illinois statute or rule; applicable law simply requires that IDOR provide and ISBE use “the applicable tax rate used in extending taxes for the funds of the district.” Over time, the largest portion of EAV has switched from Kane to Cook (though in IDOR’s and ISBE’s systems, Kane is still considered the district’s home county). For FY 2011, if the tax rates from Cook County were used in the calculation of the district’s extension, the district would receive more funding from the state; however that would not necessarily be the case each year.

U-46 pursued legislation - SB 2499 - that would have essentially required IDOR to send ISBE the limiting rate and individual tax rates of the county where the district’s majority of EAV lies. While the bill passed both chambers of the General Assembly, the Governor vetoed it, because it was only a temporary solution that was designed to benefit a single school district.

*Bloom Township High School District 206*

The Illinois Constitution states that the legislature may provide for the fair apportionment of the tax burden of districts which lie in more than one county. The statutory provision is found in Section 18-155 of the Property Tax Code. When districts opt for apportionment, each county would have different tax rates for the district. Allowances are made for the counties to use estimated or prior year data if they are ready to extend taxes and one or more of the other counties are not final. Districts may opt for apportionment to ensure that each county in which the district lies bears that burden of taxation as though all parts of the overlapping district had been assessed at the same proportion of actual value.

ISBE receives tax files from the IDOR that are reported utilizing each district’s home county. ISBE does not receive tax rates for the other overlap counties.

On March 30, 2010, Bloom Township HS Dist No. 206 filed a lawsuit against ISBE claiming that ISBE is improperly calculating the school district’s GSA. At issue is the fact that Bloom Township has property in both Will and Cook Counties. Bloom Township HS Dist has taken advantage of tax apportionment, a process by which the tax burden in multi-county taxing districts can be equalized by the IDOR when the assessment process between or among the counties is not uniform. The school district complains that the tax rates provided by IDOR post-apportionment are inaccurate. Yet statute requires ISBE to use the tax rates used in extending taxes and these are the tax rates after apportionment.

* * * * *

In each case listed above, a school district has protested the calculation of their GSA claim and, in each case, the root of the complaint related to the tax rates used to adjust that district’s EAV and determine its calculation of local wealth. Current statute does not contemplate how to determine which tax rates are used when districts overlap multiple counties. To deal with these issues, ISBE staff recommends changing the way the PTELL-adjusted EAV is calculated.
limiting rate increase. The legislation requires the State to use the previous EAV of property in the district multiplied by an amount equal to one plus the Consumer Price Index (CPI) percentage increase (and adjusted for new and disconnected property) and use this amount as the new EAV. This mechanism for calculating local wealth completely removes the tax rates from the formula.

Staff believes that legislation can be introduced to apply this same method of calculating local wealth to all districts in PTELL counties and it would address the issues outlined above and any others caused by the use of tax rates in the calculation. This seems to be the most appropriate solution to the problem of estimated data since it would remove the use of limiting rates and operating tax rates from the GSA calculation. These rates are what are skewed by the use of estimated data and apportionment. Removing them from the GSA calculation would eliminate complaints that tax rates used in the PTELL adjustment are altered or drawn from the incorrect county.

When calculating GSA, agency staff currently inflates the EAV used in the prior year’s GSA calculations by the Extension Limitation Ratio (ELR) (current year maximum revenue possible divided by prior year’s actual revenue raised). For FY 11 that means the calculation of ELR is as follows:

\[
\text{ELR} = \frac{(2008 \text{ EAV} \times \text{2008 Limiting Rate})}{(2007 \text{ EAV} \times \text{2007 Operating Tax Rate})}
\]

It is important to remember that for most PTELL districts, this EAV being calculated for purposes of GSA is much less than the district’s actual EAV. In FY 11, more than 85% of districts had a PTELL-adjusted EAV that was less than a district’s actual EAV.

The proposal to apply the alternate double whammy (DW) adjustment to all districts means ISBE staff would be inflating the prior year’s EAV by the Consumer Price Index (CPI). The chief advantage of using CPI instead of the ELR is the removal of tax rates from the annual inflator applied to a district’s PTELL or DW EAV. The tax rates present numerous problems for both ISBE and for the districts because there are questions of accuracy about those rates and also questions about which rates should be used for the many districts that overlap multiple counties.

For those districts that overlap multiple counties, the IDOR provides ISBE with tax rates for the home county of a district – something assigned years ago. For districts, this creates confusion and claims that rates from other counties should be used. For districts subject to apportionment, tax rates are altered. When apportionment produces operating tax rates that are above the limiting rates, it results in slower EAV growth than is actually occurring. When apportionment produces operating tax rates that are below the limiting rates, it results in faster EAV growth than may be occurring and complaints from districts that they are being treated unfairly. Finally, what we’ve learned from studying this issue for the past year is that PTELL is not applied in the same way in every county. We think that the rates are not always comparable data from one district to the next and one county to the next.

The proposed change would treat all PTELL districts the same. Our initial review shows us that this method will grow a district’s EAV used in the formula at a rate that would more closely approximate the actual growth in a district’s extension.
**Less Red Tape/Clean-up**
Over the past few years, the State Board has approved and the General Assembly has passed a bill that combines suggestions by Agency staff to amendment or repeal outdated or otherwise problematic provisions of the School Code. A number of the proposals are included because they have become findings in audits by the Illinois Auditor General. The Agency intends to propose another “Less Red Tape/Clean-up” bill in the 2011 spring session.

**Unfunded Mandates**
Earlier this spring, staff convened a working group in advance of the passage of HJR 74 which would have established a mandates task force. Suggestions of unnecessary and/or burdensome mandates were provided by school district personnel, regional offices of education and other stakeholders. State Board staff continue to look at initiatives and suggestions to reduce administrative burden and requirements on districts that may be able to be pursued during the next legislative session.

**Next Steps**
Staff will move forward with drafting legislative proposals in accordance with the discussion that takes place at the September Board meeting and, where and when appropriate, will proceed with securing legislative sponsors for the spring 2011 legislative session.
## Legislatively Created Task Forces of the 96th General Assembly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Force Title</th>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Public Act</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring Success In Schools Task Force</td>
<td>HB 605</td>
<td>PA 96-364</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
<td>Task Force report submitted by ISBE. Copies available upon request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEED Certification Task Force</td>
<td>HJR 45</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>TF has been meeting bi-monthly and plans to report by November 1, 2010.</td>
<td>Task Force plans to submit report according to statutory deadlines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal History Records Check Task Force</td>
<td>SB 1677</td>
<td>PA 96-632</td>
<td>TF continues to meet regularly.</td>
<td>Monthly meetings are planned through the end of the year with a task force report planned to be submitted in January 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Allergy Guidelines Committee</td>
<td>HB 281</td>
<td>PA 96-349</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.isbe.net/food_allergy/default.htm">http://www.isbe.net/food_allergy/default.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and Community Accountability Study Committee</td>
<td>SJR 5</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>TF has not yet met. Governor’s office in process of finalizing appointments.</td>
<td><a href="http://appointments.illinois.gov/appointmentsDetail.cfm?id=327">http://appointments.illinois.gov/appointmentsDetail.cfm?id=327</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Force Title</th>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Public Act</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interagency and Partnership Advisory Council on Lupus</td>
<td>HB 4587</td>
<td>PA 96-1108</td>
<td>No membership by ISBE necessary</td>
<td>Legislation was subject to appropriation; IDPH will not convene TF until funding becomes available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Mandates Task Force</td>
<td>HB 4209</td>
<td>PA 96-1374</td>
<td>Membership information continues to be gathered by the Governor’s office.</td>
<td><a href="http://appointments.illinois.gov/appointmentsDetail.cfm?id=379">http://appointments.illinois.gov/appointmentsDetail.cfm?id=379</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Accountability**  
**H.R.2451: Student Bill of Rights**  
*Sponsor: Rep Fattah, Chaka [PA-2]*  
*Introduced: 5/15/2009*  
*Cosponsors: 0*  
*Summary:* This bill would direct the Secretary of Education to make annual determinations as to whether each state's public school system provides all its students with educational resources to succeed academically and in life. Requires such education to enable students to: (1) acquire knowledge and skills necessary for responsible citizenship; (2) meet challenging academic achievement standards; and (3) compete and succeed in a global economy. Requires each system to do so by: (1) satisfying certain opportunity to learn indicators for all its schools, including highly effective teachers and equitable instructional resources; (2) providing educational services in local educational agencies (LEAs) that receive funds for disadvantaged students that are, taken as a whole, at least comparable to educational services provided in LEAs not receiving such funds; and (3) complying with any final federal or state court order in any matter concerning the adequacy or equitableness of the system. Requires withholding of specified portions of its federal funding for administrative expenses if a system: (1) fails to meet a yearly interim goal; (2) does not remedy, after two school years, a failure to provide comparable educational services to schools that receive funds for disadvantaged children; or (3) does not comply with a court order.

**Accountability**  
**H.R.4837: School Accountability Improvement Act**  
*Sponsor: Rep. Don Young, R-Alaska*  
*Introduced: 3/12/2010*  
*Cosponsors: 0*  
*Summary:* This bill would amend ESEA to alter requirements for adequate yearly progress (AYP) assessments of student groups by: (1) allowing states to vary the number of students sufficient for such an assessment from local educational agency (LEA) to LEA and from school to school; (2) lowering the percentage of students in a failing group who must show improvement from the preceding year for a school to avoid corrective action; (3) changing the method of counting students in more than one group; (4) allowing states to use alternative methods of defining AYP; (5) allowing states to use a combination of AYP assessments; (6) exempting a higher percentage of students from such assessments; (7) giving states greater flexibility in the use of alternative assessments for disabled students and those not proficient in English; (8) allowing states to continue to include students in the disabled and limited English proficient student groups for three years after their status as disabled or limited English proficient ends; and (9) allowing multiple assessments of the same student prior to the following school year and measurement of the achievement of students as if they were in their prior grade.

**Accountability**  
**S.3316: No Child Left Behind Flexibility and Improvements Act**  
*Sponsor: Sen Collins, Susan M. [ME]*  
*Introduced: 5/5/2010*  
*Cosponsors: 1*  
*Summary:* This bill would amend ESEA to revise requirements relating to annual yearly progress (AYP) of students and schools, statewide and local accountability systems, special education, limited English proficiency students, funding levels and academic assessment deferrals, highly qualified teachers, and reading activities and for other purposes.

**Charters**  
**H.R.4330: All Students Achieving through Reform (All-STAR) Act**  
*Introduced: 12/16/2009*  
*Cosponsors: 20*
Summary: This bill would award competitive grants to certain eligible entities and, through them, subgrants to successful public charter schools to allow such schools to expand or replicate to serve additional students.

**Charters**  
**H.R.5488: Charter School Transparency and Accountability Act**  
*Sponsor:* Rep Baca, Joe [CA-43]  
*Cosponsors:* 0  
*Introduced:* 6/9/2010  
*Summary:* This bill would require each authorized public chartering agency, after the end of each school year, to publish on the Internet a detailed breakdown of the financial expenditures during that school year of each authorized or approved charter school that received, directly or indirectly, funds provided during the school year by the Secretary of Education.

**Charters**  
**S.2932: 21st Century Charter School Act**  
*Cosponsors:* 0  
*Introduced:* 1/20/2010  
*Summary:* This bill would amend the Charter School program of ESEA and would make public and private nonprofit entities eligible for program grants. (Currently, state educational entities are eligible for such grants.) and sets forth additional factors that are to work in favor of grant applicants, including that their state gives public charter schools funding commensurate with that provided to other public schools, has no cap on such schools, and gives the schools a high degree of autonomy.

**Charters**  
**S.3441: All Students Achieving through Reform Act of 2010 or All-STAR Act of 2010**  
*Sponsor:* Sen Durbin, Richard [IL]  
*Cosponsors:* 2  
*Introduced:* 5/27/2010  
*Summary:* This bill would amend ESEA to direct the Secretary of Education to award competitive grants to certain eligible entities and, through them, subgrants to successful public charter schools to allow such schools to expand or replicate to serve additional students.

**College/Career**  
**S.1129: Pathways to College Act**  
*Sponsor:* Sen Durbin, Richard [IL]  
*Cosponsors:* 5  
*Introduced:* 5/21/2010  
*Summary:* This bill would authorize the Secretary of Education to award competitive five-year grants to local educational agencies that serve mostly high-need high schools for programs to increase the number of students from low-income families who attend college. Defines "high-need high schools" as those where at least one-half of the students are from low-income families, and other purposes.

**College/Career**  
**S.3595: A bill to strengthen student achievement and graduation rates and prepare young people for college, careers, and citizenship through innovative partnerships that meet the comprehensive needs of children and youth.**  
*Sponsor:* Sen Brown, Sherrod [OH]  
*Cosponsors:* 1  
*Introduced:* 7/15/2010  
*Summary:* This bill would authorize renewable five year grants to states and, through them, subgrants to local consortia that include a local educational agency (LEA) and other community partners to: (1) ensure the academic, physical, social, emotional, and civic development of disadvantaged youth; and (2) strengthen their families and communities.
**Data**  
*Cosponsors:* 1  
*Introduced:* 4/14/2010  
*Summary:* This bill would authorize the Secretary of Education to award competitive grants to states to improve access to, and the sharing and use of, education data to improve student outcomes.

**Family Engagement**  
**H.R.5211: Family Engagement in Education Act**  
*Cosponsors:* 29  
*Introduced:* 5/5/2010  
*Summary:* This bill would amend title I of ESEA to allocate funds to states and, through them, local educational agencies (LEAs) to develop certain policies and practices to strengthen family engagement in their children's education and establishes a new part E (Family Engagement in Education Programs) under title V of the ESEA requiring the Secretary of Education to provide funding to each state to establish a State Family Engagement Coordinating Council to assure coordination and integration of family engagement activities across the education spectrum and for other purposes.

**Green Schools**  
**H.R.0058: Green Schools Act**  
*Sponsor:* Rep. Kirk, Mark Steven [IL-10]  
*Cosponsors:* 1  
*Introduced:* 1/6/2009  
*Summary:* This bill would direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to establish a program awarding matching grants to local educational agencies for green school construction and improvement projects that create healthy learning environments while saving natural resources and money and would amend the Internal Revenue Code to extend, through 2013, the Qualified Zone Academy Bond program (which provides tax credits to the holders of such bonds, which in turn finance low or no interest loans for the improvement of public schools serving low-income areas).

**Homeless**  
**H.R.5285: Educational Success for Children and Youth Without Homes Act of 2010**  
*Sponsor:* Rep. Biggert, Judy [IL-13]  
*Cosponsors:* 5  
*Introduced:* 5/12/2010  
*Summary:* This bill would amend the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act's program of grants to states and, through them, subgrants to local educational agencies (LEAs) for the education of homeless youths to: raise the minimum allotment for each state; require the Secretary of Education to establish or designate a Federal Office of the Coordinator for Education of Homeless Children and Youths; authorize the Secretary to award grants or enter into contracts for evaluation, dissemination, and technical assistance activities for educational programs for homeless youth; triple authorized FY2010 appropriations from those authorized for FY2009 and other purposes.

**Leadership**  
**H.R.5886: Investment in Quality School Leadership Act**  
*Sponsor:* Rep. Lowey, Nita M. [NY-18]  
*Cosponsors:* 0  
*Introduced:* 7/27/2010  
*Summary:* This bill would establish competitive grants to consortia to establish programs that serve a state or region and provide superintendents, principals, and prospective superintendents and principals, particularly those serving, or intending to serve, in high-poverty, low-performing school districts and
schools, with ongoing, intensive professional development opportunities to improve their capacity to serve as effective leaders and successfully implement standards-based reforms.

**Mentoring**  
H.R.5753: To amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to award grants to eligible entities to establish, expand, or support an existing school-based mentoring program to assist at-risk middle school students with the transition from middle school to high school  
*Sponsor:* Rep Carson, Andre [IN-7]  
*Cosponsors:* 0  
*Introduced:* 7/15/2010  
*Summary:* This bill would amend ESEA to reauthorize appropriations under Title I part H (School Dropout Prevention) and establishes a transition-to-success mentoring program under part H of the ESEA requiring the Secretary of Education to award five-year grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) or partnerships between LEAs and community-based nonprofit organizations to establish, expand, or support school-based mentoring programs to assist at-risk students in transitioning from middle to high school.

**Nutrition**  
H.R.4638: Healthy Start Act  
*Sponsor:* Rep. Stephanie Herseth Sandlin, D-S.D.  
*Cosponsors:* 26  
*Introduced:* 2/22/2010  
*Summary:* This bill would amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to provide commodity assistance to states participating in the school breakfast program established under the Child Nutrition Act of 1966.

**Nutrition**  
H.R.5738: School EATS Act  
*Sponsor:* Rep Rahall, Nick J., II [WV-3]  
*Cosponsors:* 4  
*Introduced:* 7/14/2010  
*Summary:* This bill would amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to award competitive grants to states, local educational agencies, or school food authorities to reduce the amount of processed food served each day under the school lunch and breakfast programs.

**Nutrition**  
H.R.5812: To conduct a pilot program in support of efforts to increase purchases of local fresh fruits and vegetables for schools and service institutions by giving several States the option of receiving a grant from the Secretary of Agriculture for that purpose in  
*Sponsor:* Rep Welch, Peter [VT] (introduced 7/21/2010)  
*Cosponsors:* 0  
*Introduced:* 7/21/2010  
*Summary:* This bill would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a pilot program (3 states) under which a participating state, in lieu of obtaining any or a portion of the state's allotment of specialty food crops for use in the school lunch and breakfast programs, receives a grant in an amount equal to the value of the commodities for FY2011 and FY2012.

**Nutrition**  
S.3342: Healthy Schools Partnership Act  
*Sponsor:* Sen Durbin, Richard [IL]  
*Cosponsors:* 1  
*Introduced:* 5/11/2010  
*Summary:* This bill would amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a demonstration project awarding grants to school food authorities that collaborate to improve school nutrition.
**H.R.5340: Local Education Authority Returns Now (LEARN) Act**

*Sponsor:* Rep Garrett, Scott [NJ-5]  
*Cosponsors:* 13  
*Introduced:* 5/19/2010  
*Summary:* This bill would allow a state to opt out of K-12 education grant programs and the requirements of those programs, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit to taxpayers in such a state, and for other purposes.

**H.R.5894: Pregnant and Parenting Students Access to Education Act of 2010**

*Sponsor:* Rep Polis, Jared [CO-2]  
*Cosponsors:* 16  
*Introduced:* 7/28/2010  
*Summary:* This bill would authorize formula grants to states and, through them, competitive subgrants to local educational agencies (LEAs) to establish or enhance educational programs and related services that enable pregnant and parenting students to enroll in, attend, and succeed in school.

**S.3086: Equity in Excellence Act**

*Sponsor:* Sen. Chris Dodd, D-Conn.  
*Cosponsors:* 2  
*Introduced:* 3/8/2010  
*Summary:* This bill would amend title I of ESEA to establish an Equity in Excellence Grant program authorizing the Secretary of Education to award competitive grants to eligible entities for efforts to ensure that the academic achievement rates of high-achieving students in grades one through four, who are from impoverished families and served by high-need local educational agencies (LEAs), do not fall behind the achievement rates of their more advantaged, high-achieving peers.

**H.R.2597: Positive Behavior for Safe and Effective Schools Act**

*Sponsor:* Rep Hare, Phil [IL-17]  
*Cosponsors:* 37  
*Introduced:* 5/21/2009  
*Summary:* This bill would Amends the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) to allow states to allocate school improvement funds under title I of the ESEA for coordinated, early intervention services for all students. Includes among such services, schoolwide positive behavior supports, defined as a systematic approach to embed proven practices for early intervention services in order to achieve important social outcomes and increase student learning, while preventing problem behaviors.

**S.3733: A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to allow State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and schools to increase implementation of school wide positive behavioral interventions and supports and early intervening**

*Sponsor:* Sen Bennet, Michael F. [CO]  
*Cosponsors:* 3  
*Introduced:* 8/5/2010  
*Summary:* This bill would amend part D of title I of the ESEA to require states that receive funds for the education of neglected or delinquent children or youth to use positive behavioral interventions and supports and early intervening services to improve such students' academic performance and reduce their need for discipline.

**H.R.5946: To establish a competitive pilot program that utilizes community, innovation, and technology to improve physical fitness education and curriculum in elementary schools and secondary schools.**
This bill would award competitive grants to local educational agencies and charter schools to improve physical fitness education and curricula in elementary and secondary schools.

**Rural issues**  
**H.R.1755: Rural Early Education Access Act**  
*Sponsor:* Rep Hare, Phil [IL-17]  
*Cosponsors:* 4  
*Introduced:* 3/29/2009  
*Summary:* This bill would direct the Secretary of Education to award renewable five-year matching grants to states and, through them, subgrants to rural preschool providers.

**Rural issues**  
**H.R.3078: Investment in Rural After-School Programs Act of 2009**  
*Sponsor:* Rep Hare, Phil [IL-17]  
*Cosponsors:* 9  
*Introduced:* 6/29/2009  
*Summary:* This bill would Amends the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to award grants to local educational agencies, educational service agencies, community-based organizations, or other entities to improve, expand, or establish rural after-school programs that provide students with a broad array of activities when school is not in session that improve their academic performance and promote their positive development.

**Safety**  
**H.R.5184: To amend the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act to include bullying and harassment prevention programs.**  
*Cosponsors:* 5  
*Introduced:* 4/29/2010  
*Summary:* This bill would amend the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act to require: (1) states to use grants for safe and drug-free schools to collect and report information on the incidence of bullying and harassment; and (2) local educational agencies (LEAs) and schools to use subgrants to prevent and respond to incidents of bullying and harassment.

**Safety**  
**S.3390: Student Nondiscrimination Act**  
*Sponsor:* Sen Franken, Al [MN]  
*Cosponsors:* 25  
*Introduced:* 5/20/2010  
*Summary:* This bill would prohibit public school students from being excluded from participating in, or subject to discrimination under, any federally-assisted educational program on the basis of their actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity or that of their associates and considers harassment to be a form of discrimination.

**Safety**  
**S.3739: Safe Schools Improvement Act of 2010**  
*Sponsor:* Sen Casey, Robert P., Jr. [PA]  
*Cosponsors:* 10  
*Introduced:* 8/5/2010  
*Summary:* This bill would amend the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act to require: (1) states to use grants for safe and drug-free schools to collect and report information on the incidence of bullying and harassment; and (2) local educational agencies (LEAs) and schools to use subgrants to prevent and respond to incidents of bullying and harassment. Requires such LEAs or schools to: (1) notify parents and students annually of conduct prohibited in their school discipline policies, that now...
must include bullying and harassment; and (2) establish grievance procedures for students and parents to register complaints regarding such conduct.

**School Improvement** H.R.5071: ESEA Fiscal Fairness Act

*Sponsor:* Rep. Fattah, Chaka [PA-2]  
*Cosponsors:* 1  
*Introduced:* 4/2/2010

*Summary:* This bill would amend part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to condition local educational agency (LEA) receipt of school improvement funds on: (1) an average state and local spending per pupil in each school receiving school improvement funds of at least 97% of such spending per pupil across all schools that are not receiving such funds; and (2) an average state and local spending per pupil in each higher poverty school of at least 97% of such spending per pupil across all lower poverty schools, if the LEA is serving all of its schools under part A. Allows LEAs to meet such requirement across all schools or among schools serving a particular grade span if they compare schools within no more than three grade spans.

**STEM/Science/Computer Science** H.R.5094: To authorize the National Science Foundation to carry out a pilot program to award innovation inducement cash prizes in areas of research funded by the National Science Foundation.

*Cosponsors:* 1  
*Introduced:* 4/21/2010

*Summary:* This bill would authorize the National Science Foundation to carry out a pilot program to award innovation inducement cash prizes in areas of research, including science, technology, engineering and math education, funded by the National Science Foundation.

**STEM/Science/Computer Science** H.R.5116: America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010

*Cosponsors:* 101  
*Introduced:* 4/22/2010

*Summary:* This bill would establish the STEM Education Coordination Act of 2010 which requires the Director of OSTP to establish a committee under the National Science and Technology Council that has the responsibility of coordinating federal programs and activities in support of STEM education, including at NSF, DOE, NASA, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Department of Education, and all other federal agencies that have programs and activities in support of STEM education, and for other purposes.

**STEM/Science/Computer Science** H.R.5929: To provide grants to State educational agencies and institutions of higher education to strengthen elementary and secondary computer science education, and for other purposes.

*Sponsor:* Rep. Polis, Jared [CO-2]  
*Cosponsors:* 0  
*Introduced:* 7/29/2010

*Summary:* This bill would direct awards to states: (1) two-year grants to develop comprehensive plans to strengthen elementary and secondary computer science education; and (2) five-year matching grants to implement the improvements proposed in their comprehensive plans.

**STEM/Science/Computer Science** S.3732: A bill to establish within the Department of Education the Innovation Inspiration school grant program, and for other purposes.

*Sponsor:* Sen. Shaheen, Jeanne [NH]  
*Cosponsors:* 6
Introduced: 8/5/2010
Summary: This bill would authorize competitive matching grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) or secondary schools if the LEAs do not apply to: (1) promote science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) in secondary schools; (2) support the participation of secondary school students in nonprofit robotics or STEM competitions; and (3) broaden secondary school students' access to STEM careers. Gives priority to grant applications that address the needs of: (1) rural or urban schools; (2) low-performing schools or school districts; or (3) LEAs or schools that serve at least 10,000 poor children or a student population at least 20% of which is poor.

Teachers & Leaders H.R.5218: Great Teachers for Schools Act
Introduced: 5/5/2010
Summary: This bill would amend title II of ESEA to create a new part E (Building School Capacity for Effective Teaching) which would provide for school improvement and professional development for teachers, principals, instructional staff, and other school leaders, and for other purposes.

Teachers & Leaders H.R.5336: Teacher Principal Improvement Act
Introduced: 5/18/2010
Summary: This bill would amend title II (Preparing, Training, and Recruiting High Quality Teachers and Principals) of ESEA to create a new Part E: Building School Capacity for Effective Teaching and Leadership which would authorize grants to states for subgrants to local educational agencies (LEAs) to improve teacher and principal quality through a system of teacher and principal induction, professional development, and evaluation that is developed, implemented, and evaluated in collaboration with local teacher, principal, and school leader organizations and preparation programs.

Teachers & Leaders H.R.5495: To build capacity and provide support at the leadership level for successful school turnaround efforts.
Sponsor: Rep Payne, Donald M. [NJ-10] Cosponsors: 1
Introduced: 6/9/2010
Summary: This bill would amend ESEA to award a competitive grant to a partnership between a nonprofit organization and an institution of higher education (IHE) to establish a school leadership academy that develops and provides evidence-based leadership training to school leaders (turnaround leaders) and their supporting mentors (turnaround mentors) to transform and improve turnaround schools.

Teachers & Leaders S.3469: A bill to build capacity and provide support at the leadership level for successful school turnaround efforts.
Sponsor: Sen Bennet, Michael F. [CO] Cosponsors: 1
Introduced: 6/9/2010
Summary: This bill would amend ESEA to award a competitive grant to a partnership between a nonprofit organization and an institution of higher education (IHE) to establish a school leadership academy that develops and provides evidence-based leadership training to school leaders (turnaround leaders) and their supporting mentors (turnaround mentors) to transform and improve turnaround schools.
**Teachers & Leaders**  S.3658: A bill to provide professional development for elementary school principals in early childhood education and development.

*Sponsor:* Sen Udall, Mark [CO]  
*Cosponsors:* 4  
*Introduced:* 7/27/2010

**Summary:** This bill would award competitive grants to partnerships to: (1) provide high quality professional development to elementary school principals in early childhood education and development; (2) gain a knowledge base and capacity to provide high quality early childhood education; and (3) collaborate with early childhood education providers, services providers, and families in creating a continuum of high quality development and learning for children in the community and school settings.