ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Belleville THSD 201
Lindenwood University, 2600 W. Main St. Ste. 150, Belleville, Illinois

Plenary Session
March 20-21, 2013

This meeting will also be audio cast on the Internet at: www.isbe.net

MARCH 20, 2013

10:00 – 11:00 a.m.    Honor Roll Visit
                      Westhaven Elementary School
                      118 Westhaven School Road, Belleville

11:30 – 12:30 p.m.    Tour of Belleville THSD 201 East Campus
                      Belleville THSD 201 East Campus
                      2555 West Blvd, Belleville

12:30 – 1:30 p.m.     Lunch
                      Belleville THSD 201
                      2600 West Main Street, Suite 150, Belleville

1:30 – 5:00 p.m.      Convene Plenary Session
                      Belleville THSD 201
                      2600 West Main Street, Suite 150, Belleville

*5:00 p.m.            Closed Session (as needed)
                      Belleville THSD 201
                      2600 West Main Street, Suite 150, Belleville

MARCH 21, 2013

8:30 a.m. – 11:00 a.m. Reconvene Plenary Session
                      Belleville THSD 201
                      2600 West Main Street, Suite 150, Belleville

11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Lunch
                      Belleville THSD 201
                      2600 West Main Street, Suite 150, Belleville

*11:00 a.m.            Closed Session (as needed)
                      Belleville THSD 201
                      2600 West Main Street, Suite 150, Belleville

* The meeting will begin at the conclusion of the previous session.

This meeting will be accessible to persons with disabilities. Persons planning to attend who need special accommodations should contact the Board office no later than the date prior to the meeting. Contact the Superintendent's office at the State Board of Education.

Phone: 217-782-2221; TTY/TDD: 217-782-1900; Fax: 217-785-3972.
NOTE: Chairman Chico may call for a break in the meeting as necessary in order for the Board to go into closed session.
I. Roll Call/Pledge of Allegiance
   A. Consideration of and Possible Actions on Any Requests for Participation in Meeting by Other Means

II. Presentations/Showcases
   A. SIG Schools Update – Egyptian CUSD 5, Sandoval CUSD 501, IARSS

III. Resolutions & Recognition
   A. Craig Hedin, Board Member, Mount Vernon District 80 (p. 4)
   B. Steve Wallace, Board Member, Mount Vernon District 80 (p. 5)

IV. Public Participation

V. *Superintendent’s Report - Consent Agenda
   All action consideration items listed with an asterisk (*) are considered to be routine and will be enacted in one motion and vote. Any board member who wishes separate discussion on any item listed on the consent agenda may remove that item from the consent agenda, in which event, the item will be considered in its normal sequence.
   A. *Approval of Minutes:
      1. Plenary Minutes: February 20, 2013 (pp. 6-11)
   B. *Rules for Initial Review
      1. Part 20 (Standards for Endorsement Elementary Education) (pp. 12-127)
      2. Part 21 (Standards for Endorsement in the Middle Grades) (pp. 12-127)
      3. Part 25 (Certification) (pp. 12-127)
      4. Part 26 (Standards for Certification in Early Childhood and in Elementary Education) (pp. 12-127)
      5. Part 27 (Standards for Certification in Specific Teaching Fields) (pp. 12-127)
      6. Part 226 (Special Education) (p. 128-143)
   C. *Rules for Adoption
      1. Part 252 (Driver Education) (pp. 144-160)
   D. *Contracts and Grants Over $1 Million
      1. Request for New Intergovernmental Agreement – East St. Louis School District (pp. 161-165)
      2. Request for RFSP – Survey of Learning Conditions (pp. 166-168)
      3. Request for RFSP – SIG Lead Partners (pp. 169-173)
      4. Request for RFSP – Local Assessment Support (pp. 174-176)
      5. Contract Renewal of Illinois Interactive Report Card, Northern Illinois University (pp. 177-179)
   E. *FY12 Financial Audit Report (p. 180)

End of Consent Agenda
F. Financial Profile (pp. 181-190)
G. Special Education Expenditure/Revenue Report (pp. 191-197)
H. Charter School Commission Appointment (pp. 198-201)
I. A Request for RFSP for School Improvement Grants (pp. 201-1-201-2)

VI. Discussion Items
A. Budget Update (pp. 202-209)
   1. Advance Illinois GSA Proposal
B. Legislative Update (pp. 210-212)
C. District Oversight – Monthly Update
D. Other Items for Discussion

VII. Announcements
A. IBHE Liaison Report
B. P-20 Council Liaison Report
C. Superintendent’s/Senior Staff Announcements
D. Chairman’s Report
E. Member Reports

VIII. Information Items
A. ISBE Fiscal & Administrative Monthly Reports (available online at http://isbe.net/board/fiscal_admin_rep.htm)

IX. Adjourn

This meeting will be accessible to persons with disabilities. Persons planning to attend who need special accommodations should contact the Board office no later than the date prior to the meeting. Contact the Superintendent's office at the State Board of Education. Phone: 217-782-2221; TTY/TDD: 217-782-1900; Fax: 217-785-3972.

NOTE: Chairman Chico may call for a break in the meeting as necessary in order for the Board to go into closed session.
WHEREAS, Craig Hedin has served as a member of the District 80 Board of Education in Mt. Vernon for a total of 16 years and was President twice; and

WHEREAS, Craig has demonstrated keen insight and a deep commitment to education during the many challenges District 80 has faced during his tenure; and

WHEREAS, Craig is described as a visionary who acted as a leader through strategic planning and goal setting sessions that enabled the district and community to clearly see the direction the district was heading; and

WHEREAS, Craig has been a tireless advocate for improving education by supporting lower class sizes, employing instructional coaches, increasing professional development efforts and creating after-school programs all of which led to increased test scores in every District 80 school; and

WHEREAS, Craig’s friendly demeanor coupled with his high visibility in the schools he serves and the community, have enabled Craig to build positive, trusted relationships with administration, staff and parents that have helped produce productive contract agreements that assisted in leading the district away from the Early Warning List and onto Financial Recognition status; and

WHEREAS, Craig has decided it is time to step down from the Board and pursue other areas of interest.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION extends its sincere appreciation and gratitude to Craig Hedin for his commitment to the District 80 Board of Education and his numerous contributions to the field of education.
WHEREAS, Steve has served as a member of the District 80 Board of Education in Mt. Vernon for the past 12 years; and

WHEREAS, Steve’s knowledge of the staff and community of District 80 provided the Board with a sharp insight during the meetings that helped his fellow Board members resolve many of the challenges District 80 faced during his tenure; and

WHEREAS, Steve’s inquiring mind enabled him to ask informed questions that encouraged the Board to consider information from various viewpoints before decisions were made; and

WHEREAS, Steve’s leadership on the Financial Committee coupled with his sharp attention to detail and deep understanding of finances afforded the Board with the ability to make wise financial decisions that helped move District 80 to Financial Recognition status; and

WHEREAS, Steve’s tireless efforts on the Buildings and Grounds Committee helped complete major renovations to three schools and begin construction of a new school building without increasing taxes or the use of a school construction grant; and

WHEREAS, Steve has decided it is time to step down from the Board and pursue other areas of interest.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION extends its sincere appreciation and gratitude to Steve Wallace for his commitment to the District 80 Board of Education and his numerous contributions to the field of education.

Gery J. Chico, Chairman
Steven R. Gilford, Vice Chairman
Vinni M. Hall, Secretary

James W. Baumann, Member
Curtis W. Bradshaw, Member
Andrea S. Brown, Member

David L. Fields, Member
Melinda A. LaBarre, Member
Illinois State Board of Education Meeting  
via video conference  
February 20, 2013

Chicago Location: ISBE Video Conference Room, 14th Floor  
100 W. Randolph, Chicago, IL

Springfield Location: ISBE Video Conference, 3rd Floor  
100 N. First Street, Springfield, IL

ROLL CALL

Mr. Gery Chico, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 10:35 a.m. Chairman Chico asked Ms. Kim Clarke to call the roll. Dr. Christopher Koch, State Superintendent of Education, was in attendance in Chicago. A quorum was present.

Members Present in Springfield
Dr. Andrea Brown  
Dr. David Fields

Members Present in Chicago
Mr. Gery Chico, Chairman  
Dr. Vinni Hall, Secretary  
Mr. Steven Gilford, Vice Chairman

Members Absent
Ms. Melinda LaBarre  
(Coined meeting at 10:35 a.m.)

Members Present by Phone
Mr. James Baumann

Chairman Chico announced that Board member Jim Baumann will be participating by phone, however, he will not be voting during this meeting.

RESOLUTIONS AND RECOGNITIONS

Dr. Hall moved that the State Board of Education adopt the resolution recognizing Dr. Monique Chism for her commitment to the agency and her numerous contributions to the field of education. Dr. Fields seconded the motion and it passed with a unanimous roll call vote.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Springfield Public Participation
The following people provided testimony on the Part 226 (Special Education) rule changes:

- Daryl Morrison, Illinois Education Association
- Cynthia Risema, Illinois Federation of Teachers
- Michael Jacoby, Illinois Association of School Board Officials
- Brian Schwartz, Illinois Principals Association
- Deb Fornoff, Parent of a child with Downs Syndrome and ISAC Member
- Rodney Estvan, Education Policy Analyst for Acess Living of Chicago
- Bill Phillips, Illinois Association of School Administrators
- Elizabeth Conran, Chair of Illinois State Advisory Council and Children with Disabilities and a Parent.
- Representative Roger Eddy, Illinois Association of School Boards

Pension Cost Shift
Jessica Handy from Stand for Children informed the Board of a concept that Stand for Children is proposing to the legislature as they go through their budget process. They see the TRS cost shift as probably the most equitable place to look, if and only if it means preserving education funding to more equitable
funding streams. Ms. Handy suggested that as we are asked to give the General Assembly budget scenarios and projections that the TRS normal cost the state provides be one component of the education funding picture that could perhaps be looked at before we get further into General State Aid.

**Chicago Public Participation**
The following people provided testimony on Part 226 (Special Education) rule changes:

- Margaret Wakelin, Equip fo Equality
- Mike Carlson, Father of a deceased child and a child with Autism, and Chairman of the Local School Council
- Kristine Mayle, Financial Secretary of the Chicago Teachers Union, Chair of the IFT Special Education Committee and Liaison to the Chicago Teachers Union Special Education Committee and a Special Education Teacher.
- Judy Hackett, Superintendent of NNSEO a Special Education Cooperative in the Northwest Suburbs and Representive of the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE).

Chairman Chico announced written testimony and comments will be accepted before any final action is taken.

- Katie Bailey, Evans-Cahokia Consolidated School School District #65 spoke on setting a higher ISAT standard and the use of of data.
- Rita Maniotis, Resident of Berwin, parent of a student attending Morton District High School #201, and PTO Secretary spoke of her concerns on the graduation credit requirements being changed from 24 credits to just 20 credits to graduate. Ms. Maniotis ask that the State Board review the basic standards for educational programs so that students can earn at least the recommended credits to meet the requirements of admission to our state universities.

**Waivers**
Ryan Linnig, Superintendent and Principal of Dimmick Community Consolidated School District #175 in LaSalle County was seeking waivers from three areas of the Illinois School Code which is based upon the reforms implemented under PERA and SB 7

**CONSENT AGENDA**

**Motion:**
Dr. Fields moved that the State Board of Education hereby approves the consent agenda, with the exception of Agenda Items IV. B.1. Part 226 (Special Education) and IV.E. Spring 2013 Waiver Report. Mr. Gilford seconded the motion and it passed with a unanimous roll call vote.

The following motions were approved by action taken in the consent agenda motion.

**Approval of Minutes**
The State Board of Education hereby approves the minutes for the February 20, 2013, board meeting.

**Rules for Adoption**

**Part 30 (Programs for the Preparation of Principals in Illinois)**
**(23 Illinois Administrative Code 30)**
The State Board of Education adopted proposed amendments for 23 Ill. Adm. Code 30 (Programs for the Preparation of Principals in Illinois). These amendments address statutory changes made by P.A. 97-607, effective August 6, 2011. P.A. 97-607 repealed (or will repeal later this year) much of Article 21 in the School Code, which addresses educator certification. The law establishes the
Illinois licensure system, beginning July 1, 2013; requirements for that system are set forth in new Article 21B.

Most of the amendments are technical in nature, including updating statutory citations, revising the name of the licensure board, and modifying requirements in the principal preparation program to conform to the new law. In addition, in response to a concern raised at the January Board meeting, a technical change was made to Section 30.30, General Program Requirements, to better communicate that the leadership qualities exhibited by principals should align to the success factors and competencies outlined in “The Principal Internship: How Can We Get It Right?”, published by the Southern Regional Educational Board.

Contracts and Grants Over $1 Million

Approval of Intergovernmental Agreement:
Board of Trustees Illinois State
The Board hereby authorizes the State Superintendent to increase the Intergovernmental Agreement with Board of Trustees Illinois State University whereby is expected to exceed $1 million over the term of the contract. The total amount of the contract is $1,800,000 with an end date of June 30, 2014.

Approval of Intergovernmental Agreement with Illinois Department of Human Services (Early Learning Challenge)
The State Board of Education authorizes the State Superintendent to enter into a new Intergovernmental Agreement with the Illinois Department of Human Service in the amount of $20,939,776 effective February 1, 2013 through December 31, 2016, for the transfer of funds for Race to the Top, Early Learning Challenge, Phase 2. Subsequent amendments are not to exceed a total of $23,601,495.

Approval of Intergovernmental Agreement:
Illinois Department of Human Services (Gateway to Opportunity Scholarship Program)
The State Board of Education authorizes the renewal of the Intergovernmental Agreement with Illinois Department of Human Services contract for the Gateways to Opportunity Scholarship Program; through June 30, 2014, with an increase of the contract’s maximum amount not to exceed $2,000,000.

Approval of Intergovernmental Agreement
(World-Class Innovations in Developing Assessment (WIDA)
Consortium for the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS for English Language Learners (ELLS)
The Illinois State Board of Education hereby authorizes the acquisition of the Intergovernmental Agreement with the WIDA Consortium through June 30, 2016. The Intergovernmental Agreement’s initial term is not to exceed $16,297,441.

The WIDA Consortium provides for the development and administration services for the ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS for ELLs® assessment(s).

Contract Renewals
Illinois Alternate Assessment (IAA)
The Illinois State Board of Education hereby authorizes the renewal of the Illinois Alternate Assessment contract with NCS Pearson, Inc. with an increase of the contract’s maximum amount not to exceed $20,154,071.

Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT)
Developmental Contract
The Illinois State Board of Education hereby authorizes the renewal of the Illinois Standards Achievement Tests (ISAT) development with NCS Pearson, Inc. with
Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) Administrative Contract

The Illinois State Board of Education hereby authorizes the renewal of the Illinois Standards Achievement Tests (ISAT) administration contract with NCS Pearson, Inc. with an increase of the contract’s maximum amount not to exceed $107,939,235.

Prairie State Achievement Examination (PSAE), EXPLORE and PLAN, Locating Information Career Readiness Certificate Program (NCRC)

The Illinois State Board of Education hereby authorizes the renewal of the Prairie State Achievement Examination (PSAE) administration and development contract, and the administration of the EXPLORE and PLAN assessments with ACT, Inc. with an increase of the contract’s maximum amount not to exceed $118,173,600.

END OF THE CONSENT AGENDA

IV. B.1. PART 226 (SPECIAL EDUCATION) RULES FOR INITIAL REVIEW

The proposed changes would repeal Section 226.730, which addresses class size restrictions for special education classrooms and includes a definition of “general education classroom” that is used when considering placement of students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment. Additionally, Section 226.731 is proposed for repeal since its provisions are no longer in effect. Staff believe that the class size limitations can diminish the ability of the school districts to make decisions based on the needs of each student with a disability and in some cases, may negatively affect the access a student with a disability may have to the broad array of coursework available to his or her nondisabled peers.

Motion
Chairman Chico moved that the State Board of Education hereby authorizes 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. Dr. Fields seconded the motion and it passed with a roll call vote. 5-1  Vinni Hall voted no.

SPRING 2013 WAIVER REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Chairman Chico announced that the Dimmick CCSD 175 is requesting three waiver changes; they will be discussed and voted on individually.

Chairman Chico explained that Dimmick in their first waiver request is seeking to waive the requirement that an individual serving as both the Principal and Superintendent can be evaluated separately as the “Principal” by an individual from outside the district. Chairman asked the Board on whether to support the waiver request. The Board Members votes are as follows: Curt Bradshaw NO, Andrea Brown NO, David Fields NO, Steve Gilford NO, Vinni Hall NO, Gery Chico YES. 5-1 in favor of denying the request.

The second Dimmick request is seeking a waiver for the requirement to complete the ISBE approved Consortium for Educational Change’s online training module. The Board Members votes are as follows: Curt Bradshaw NO, Andrea Brown NO, David Fields NO, Steve Gilford Yes, Vinni Hall Yes, Gery Chico YES. 3-3  Tie vote.

The Board withdrew their vote and remain silent on the second waiver request.

Chairman Chico commented that on our third and last request Dimmick is seeking
a waiver to allow attendance at the Annual Triple I Conference to count toward the requirement of the four hour minimum training for board members in the areas of education, labor law, financial oversight accountability and fiduciary responsibilities. The Board Members votes are as follows: Curt Bradshaw NO, Andrea Brown NO, David Fields NO, Steve Gilford NO, Vinni Hall NO, Gery Chico NO. 6-0 in favor of denial.

Motion
The State Board of Education hereby forwards the following waiver requests to the General Assembly with recommendations for legislative disapproval:

- The request from Dimmick CCSD 175 (WM100-5740-3) requesting that the full board of education evaluate the superintendent/principal in place of an evaluator holding the Type 75 administrative certificate who has gone through the prequalification process and passed the required State assessment;
- The request from Dimmick CCSD 175 (WM100-5740-1) requesting that the board of education attend the Joint Annual Conference in lieu of the required minimum of four hours of professional development leadership training; and
- The requests from Meridian CUSD 101 (WM100-5763-1 and WM100-5763-2) to move from a 5-day to a 4-day school week and to make multiple changes to the daily schedule in order to provide a minimum term of at least 166 days with 150 days of actual pupil attendance.
- The requests from Bluford CCSD 114 and Webber Township HSD 204 (WM100-5755 and WM100-5756) to forward a petition to voters for the formation of a Partial Elementary Unit District, which would not encompass the territory of Farrington CCSD 99.

The State Board of Education hereby forwards the remaining 69 waiver requests summarized in the Spring 2013 Waiver Report to the General Assembly without comment.

DISCUSSIONS

ITEM

Legislative Update
Nicole Wills and Amada Elliott, Governmental Relations Liaisons provided the Board with a summary of items introduced in the General Assembly and an update on Board legislative initiatives.

Budget Update
Superintendent Koch said he attended several meetings concerning the budget, last night’s meeting was with the Department of Revenue and chaired by Representative Bradley, they were very concerned with proration. He also attended a meeting with the Black Caucus where they discussed budget and the education funding formula.

Chairman Chico noted that three of our former ISBE Chairmen, Ron Gidwitz, Lou Mervis and Jesse Ruiz wrote a letter to the Chicago Tribune supporting our request to return the funding that has been cut over the last four years. The Chairman asked everyone to continue to let their legislators know about the dire financial conditions our local school districts are in.

Other Items For Discussion
Matt Vanover reported that The NCLB Waiver Survey has had 657 districts respond to the evaluation, of which 72% said that they would attempt to implement the new evaluation system by 2016. Matt stated that they are currently working on identifying the districts that have not responded and staff will begin reaching out to survey them as well.

ANNOUNCEMENTS
Chairman Chico introduced Dr. Proshanta Nandi from the Illinois Board of Higher
Education (IBHE) who was present at the meeting today. The Illinois Board of Higher Education met on February 5, 2013 at the Kendall College in Chicago. Dr. Nandi shared with the Board a written summary of the meeting highlights.

The next IBHE meeting was held on April 2, 2013 at Elgin Community College in, Chicago.

Matt Vanover introduced Katherine Galloway who will be our new ISBE Board Services Coordinator. Ms. Galloway will be starting on April 1st and comes to us from the Senate Democratic Staff.

Dr. Brown moved that the meeting be adjourned. Dr. Halled seconded the motion and it passed with a unanimous voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 2:01 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dr. Vinni Hall
Board Secretary

Mr. Gery J. Chico
Chairman
TO: Illinois State Board of Education
FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
Susie Morrison, Deputy Superintendent/Chief Education Officer
Nicki Bazer, General Counsel

Agenda Topic: Action Item: Proposed Rules and Amendments for Initial Review:
New Part 20, Standards for Endorsements in Elementary Education
New Part 21, Standards for Endorsements in the Middle Grades
Part 25 (Certification)
Part 26 (Standards for Certification in Early Childhood Education and in Elementary Education)
Part 27 (Standards for Certification in Specific Teaching Fields)

Materials: Recommended Rules

Staff Contacts: Linda Tomlinson, Assistant Superintendent

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

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
This proposal relates to Goals 1 and 2 (student achievement and highly prepared and effective teachers and school leaders), as it addresses the knowledge and skills that teachers in the elementary and middle grades must possess in order to ensure that all students are prepared for success after high school, as well as establish standards for optional gifted education endorsements.

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

Background Information
Parts 26 and 27 (Standards for Certification in Early Childhood Education and in Elementary Education, and Standards for Certification in Specific Teaching Fields) are two of six sets of the agency’s administrative rules that establish the framework for the following:

- improvement of teaching and learning;
- foundation for the design of educator preparation programs at colleges and universities;
- criteria for the approval of preparation programs at colleges and universities; and
- basis for state licensure tests.

Further, the rules define the overall knowledge and skills that teachers must have in their professional roles to ensure that Illinois students meet or exceed the expectations defined by the Illinois Learning Standards.
Both parts of rules were promulgated in 2002. Since that time, only Part 27 has been amended to add additional teaching fields. Various improvement efforts relative to the education profession have resulted in changes that are not reflected in the standards set forth in the rules. For Part 26, in particular, the incorporation into the Illinois Learning Standards of the Common Core State Standards for English language arts and mathematics necessitate changes in the standards for elementary education and implementation of standards specific to the middle grades. Proposed new Parts 20 and 21 will address standards for these grade levels that specifically focus on literacy and mathematics skills that teachers must possess before entering the classroom.

Full implementation of the proposed new standards for elementary education and middle grades will occur by February 1, 2017, for elementary, and by February 1, 2018, for middle grades. In the case of elementary education standards, this delayed effective date will allow sufficient time for existing programs to align their course of study to the new standards and for candidates currently enrolled to complete these programs and be issued the elementary education endorsement before the new standards take effect. To minimize the effect of making a transition from the existing standards to the new standards, the proposed amendments prohibit institutions from placing candidates after February 1, 2014, into existing programs that have not shown alignment to the new standards. For the middle grades, candidates must complete certain coursework but not an approved program, so any institution wishing to offer a middle grade program will be submitting a proposal for a new program approval rather than revamping a currently approved program.

Two optional endorsements also are being proposed for gifted education teacher and gifted education specialist, and those standards will be placed in Part 27 as new Sections 27.490 and 27.495, respectively. While educators will not be required to obtain either endorsement for employment in gifted programs, the credential will focus both educators and professional preparation toward the unique needs of this population and the knowledge and skills to best meet these students' needs. These standards will take effect immediately.

Companion changes are being proposed in Parts 25, 26 and 27 to recognize the availability of the new endorsements in elementary education, middle grades and gifted, as well as to update terminology used regarding certification so that it reflects the new licensure system that will take effect on July 1, 2013.

Each set of proposed amendments were discussed with the State Educator Preparation and Licensure Board at its meeting on March 8, 2013. The Licensure Board recommended each of these rulemakings be presented, as proposed, for consideration by the State Board of Education. Only one member of the Licensure Board raised a concern, which addressed the exclusion of kindergarten from the grade span requiring the elementary education endorsement.

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

**Policy Implications:** As noted above, the incorporation into the Illinois Learning Standards of the Common Core State Standards in English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects, and the Common Core State Standards in Mathematics represents potential for a shift toward college and career readiness in the preparation of students in kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12). The proposed Standards for Endorsements in Elementary Education (new Part 20) and the proposed Standards for Endorsements in the Middle Grades (new Part 21) seek to realize this potential through the integration of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) into teacher preparation standards used for program
approval and content-area examinations so as to embody the content and pedagogical
to work with children in these specific grade/age bands.

The proposed standards address the preparation of teachers working with students in the
elementary grades (defined as grades 1 through 6) and in the middle grades (defined as grades
5 through 8). Recognizing that the academic and social-emotional developmental needs of
students in the elementary grades as different from those of students in the middle grades, the
standards set forth in the proposed rules create separate endorsements that allow for the
focused preparation of a teaching force attuned to the distinct needs of each student group.

The need for this shift in preparation philosophy is well documented and supported by the
Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI) and the Association for Middle Level
Education (AMLE). Currently, the standards for each grade ban address only literacy and math;
however, it is the intent that standards specific to other core subject areas, such as science and
and the social sciences, will be added once those standards are developed.

The standards set forth in the proposed rules reflect the input and deliberations conducted over
the past two years of stakeholders from across the state. These stakeholders, representing
higher education, K-12 practitioners, policymakers, and professional organizations, have
proposed grade-range-specific standards aligned to the CCSS and embodying the Illinois
Professional Teaching Standards, which are set forth in Part 24 (Standards for All Illinois
Teachers). The proposed standards in math and literacy are aligned to what teachers need to
know and be able to do in order to prepare students to be college and career ready.

In addition to the CCSS and their related documents, the literacy standards have been
influenced and supported by the work of the International Reading Association, reports of the
National Reading Panel (2000), the National Early Literacy Panel (2008), and the National
Literacy Panel for Language Minority Children and Youth (2006), studies commissioned by the
U.S. Congress and the U.S. Department of Education, and work funded by the Carnegie
Corporation. In relation to the middle grades, research and standards of the National Council of
Teachers of English also have provided great influence.

Many of the resources consulted in the mathematics standards work are encapsulated in the
Board of the Mathematical Sciences, consisting of 16 national and international organizations
representing both math education and other math professions, issued the report outlining and
supporting six recommendations for the education of teachers of math. These
recommendations incorporate the CCSS, draw on current research, address the needs of
students at various grade ranges, and are reflected in the sets of standards presented in the
proposed rules.

The proposed standards for optional endorsements for gifted education teacher and the gifted
education specialist represent a potential opportunity for institutions of higher education and K-
12 educators to expand knowledge about gifted and talented education and better serve all
students. These standards were developed in consultation with the Advisory Council on the
Education of Gifted and Talented Children, including an advocate for twice-exceptional children
(students with disabilities identified as gifted), and draw from the standards developed by the
National Association for Gifted Children.

Budget Implications: None.
Legislative Action: None needed.
Communication: Please see “Next Steps” below.
Pros and Cons of Various Actions
It is timely and appropriate to begin the alignment of standards specific to literacy and mathematics to the CCSS, as educators, both in higher education and elementary and secondary institutions, work to infuse the standards into their programs and the curriculum. The addition of optional endorsements for gifted education teacher and gifted education specialist will enable educators who choose to do so to further their knowledge and skills in this specialty to better meet the needs of the students they serve; however, no gifted educator will be required by the State to hold this endorsement as a condition of employment.

Not proceeding with the implementation of the new standards has the potential to disadvantage educators who might find themselves not properly prepared to provide instruction aligned to the CCSS and limit their ability to ensure that each of their students is ready for college or a career upon graduation.

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

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

- Standards for Endorsements in Elementary Education (23 Illinois Administrative Code 20)
- Standards for Endorsements in the Middle Grades (23 Illinois Administrative Code 21)
- Certification (23 Illinois Administrative Code 25)
- Standards for Certification in Early Childhood Education and in Elementary Education (23 Illinois Administrative Code 26)
- Standards for Certification in Specific Teaching Fields (23 Illinois Administrative Code 27)

including publication of the proposed amendments in the Illinois Register.

Next Steps
With the Board's authorization, staff will submit the proposed amendments to the Administrative Code Division for publication in the Illinois Register to elicit public comment. Additional means, such as the Superintendent's Weekly Message and the agency's website, will be used to inform interested parties of the opportunity to comment on this rulemaking.
PART 20
STANDARDS FOR ENDORSEMENTS IN ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

SUBPART A: GENERAL

Section 20.10 Purpose and Effective Dates of Standards

SUBPART B: STANDARDS

20.100 General Standards
20.110 Literacy Standards for Elementary Teachers
20.120 Mathematics Standards for Elementary Teachers
20.130 Dispositions

AUTHORITY: Implementing Article 21B and authorized by Section 2-3.6 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/Art. 21B and 2-3.6].

SOURCE: Adopted at 37 Ill. Reg. _______, effective _________.

SUBPART A: GENERAL

Section 20.10 Purpose and Effective Dates of Standards

a) This Part establishes the standards that, together with the standards set forth in Standards for All Illinois Teachers (see 23 Ill. Adm. Code 24), shall apply to the issuance endorsements for elementary education (i.e., grades 1 through 6) on professional educator licenses pursuant to Article 21B of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/Art. 21B]. The standards set forth in this Part shall apply both to candidates for an endorsement in elementary education and to the programs that prepare them. That is:

a) beginning July 1, 2013, approval of any teacher preparation program or course of study in elementary education, whether currently approved or newly proposed, pursuant to the State Board’s rules for Educator Licensure (23 Ill. Adm. Code 25, Subpart C) shall be based on the
congruence of that program’s or course’s content with the standards identified in this Part;

2) on or before February 1, 2017, the examinations required for issuance of an endorsement in elementary education shall be based on the standards identified in this Part;

3) on or before February 1, 2017, each elementary education program seeking approval for the first time or re-approval of an existing program shall establish a partnership with one or more community colleges to ensure the articulation of coursework between the two institutions and as applicable, the alignment of community college coursework relevant to elementary education to the standards set forth in this Part.

b) In addition to demonstrating congruence with the standards set forth in this Part, each elementary education program or course of study shall meet the requirements set forth in 23 Ill. Adm. Code 25.97 (Endorsement for Elementary Education (Grades 1 through 6)).

c) Beginning July 1, 2014, no candidate shall be admitted to an elementary education program that has not been approved under this Part. Any candidate who is enrolled in an elementary program not approved under this Part shall complete the program and have the elementary endorsement issued no later than January 31, 2017.

SUBPART B:  STANDARDS

Section 20.100  General Standards

Effective elementary education teachers possess the knowledge and skills articulated in the "Elementary Standards and Supporting Explanation" (2007) published by the Association for Childhood Education International, 1101 16th St., N.W., Suite 300, Washington, D.C. 20036 and posted at http://acei.org/programs-events/ncate.html. (No later amendments to or editions of these standards are incorporated.)

Section 20.110  Literacy Standards for Elementary Teachers

a) The Language and Literacy Curriculum

Effective elementary teachers:
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1) understand and use the scientific basis of teaching to plan, evaluate and modify instruction (i.e., use of appropriate research in identifying and implementing effective instructional practices);

2) know the developmental sequence of language and literacy skills, along with age-level or grade-level benchmarks of development;

3) understand the Illinois Learning Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects (23 Ill. Adm. Code 1.Appendix D, State Goals for Learning), their organization, progressions and the interconnections among the skills;

4) understand and evaluate the components of a comprehensive curriculum that develops students’ literacy skills and strategies and ensures that instructional goals and objectives are met;

5) understand the role of early, systematic and explicit teaching of the foundational literacy skills;

6) understand and use research-based instructional strategies that have been demonstrated to be particularly successful for supporting struggling readers; and

7) understand a wide range of developmentally appropriate literacy assessments (i.e., standardized assessments, diagnostic measures, universal screening, curriculum-based assessments and progress monitoring), recognizing their purposes, strengths and limitations.

b) Foundational Knowledge

1) Language

Effective elementary teachers understand:

A) the nature and communicative role of various features of language, including semantics, syntax, morphology and pragmatics;

B) major theories and stages of first and second literacy acquisition and the role of native language in learning to read and write in a second language;
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C) the theories, principles and practices of emergent literacy, including the development of oral language and its relationship to the developmental process of reading and writing acquisition;

D) language, reading and writing development across the elementary years, using supporting evidence from theory and research;

E) the role of academic language in developing students’ understanding of concepts, content, skills and processes; and

F) conventions of standard English grammar and usage (e.g., irregular plural nouns, past tense of irregular verbs, subject-verb agreement, pronoun-antecedent agreement, conjunctions, prepositions, interjections, perfect verb tenses).

2) Alphabetic Code

Effective elementary teachers understand:

A) phonological awareness (sound structure of words, including syllables, onsets and rimes, phonemes), its development (from word and syllable separations to phonic segmentation) and relationship to reading and writing proficiency;

B) the orthographic-phonological system, including sound-letter relationships, and common English spelling patterns and their relationship to pronunciation; and

C) structural analysis (i.e., syllabication, affixes, root words) for decoding unknown words.

3) Text

Effective elementary teachers understand:

A) the quantitative, qualitative and individual factors that affect text complexity, including how to estimate text readability;

B) the organizational structures, literary devices, rhetorical features, text features and graphics commonly used in literary and informational texts;
C) the characteristics of various genre or forms of literary and informational text;

D) a variety of textual and programmatic resources for addressing the needs of struggling readers, including resources that are high-interest, low-readability; and

E) the role, perspective and purpose of text in specific disciplines.

c) Using Research-Based Instructional Approaches

1) Decoding and Fluency

Effective elementary teachers:

A) assist students in developing basic print and text concepts (e.g., alphabet, high frequency words, directionality, book formats, spaces);

B) implement phonological awareness instruction, including the teaching of segmentation and blending;

C) provide explicit and systematic phonics instruction, including the teaching of letter-sound relationships, common spelling patterns, irregular forms and affixes; and

D) use a variety of approaches for teaching students to read text fluently (i.e., with sufficient accuracy, rate and expression).

2) Reading Comprehension

Effective elementary teachers:

A) select high-quality texts that match student needs and educational goals;

B) identify text features that may impede comprehension (e.g., author's assumption of prior knowledge, use of unusual key vocabulary, complexity of sentences, unclear cohesive links, subtlety of relationships among characters or ideas, sophistication
of tone, complexity of text structure, use of literary devices or data);

C) scaffold reading to enable students to understand and learn from challenging text (e.g., re-reading, pre-teaching of vocabulary or key information not provided in the text);

D) introduce texts efficiently, providing a clear purpose for reading (and without revealing information the students can learn from reading the text);

E) guide close reading discussions that require students to identify the key ideas and details of a text, to analyze the text’s craft and structure (including the tone and meaning of words), and critically evaluate the text;

F) provide instruction in interpreting graphic features (e.g., tables, charts, illustrations, tables of contents, captions, headings, indexes) and their relationship to text;

G) ask high-level text-dependent questions;

H) guide the reading of multiple texts to enable students to comparatively analyze and evaluate information and to synthesize information from the texts into a coherent understanding of a topic;

I) teach students to use reading strategies to improve comprehension (e.g., predicting, purpose setting, sequencing, connecting, visualizing, monitoring, questioning, summarizing, synthesizing, making inferences, evaluating);

J) teach students to recognize literary elements and devices across literature genres and forms of informational text;

K) provide instruction in the use of note-taking, previewing, identifying main idea and supporting details, and reviewing strategies to clarify and solidify comprehension;

L) teach students to trace and evaluate the argument and specific claims in a text and to distinguish claims that are supported by reasons and evidence from claims that are not supported;
M) teach students to analyze the organizational structure of texts (e.g., sequentially, causally, comparatively), and how specific sentences, paragraphs and larger portions of the text relate to each other and the whole; and

N) teach students to recognize features of text common to individual disciplines.

3) Writing

Effective elementary teachers:

A) provide opportunities for students to write for authentic purposes in multiple forms and genres to demonstrate the power and importance of writing throughout their lives;

B) engage students in using writing to develop an understanding of content area concepts and skills;

C) provide feedback to written work to guide students' revisions;

D) provide instruction in producing coherent and clear writing with organization, development, substance and style appropriate to the task, purpose and audience;

E) provide instruction in creating a text that introduces an opinion on a topic, supports the opinion with information and reasons based on facts and details, uses appropriate transitional devices and concludes with a statement supporting the opinion;

F) provide instruction in creating an informative and explanatory text that introduces a topic supported by logically ordered facts, definitions, details, examples, quotations and other types of information; uses precise language, academic vocabulary and appropriate transitional devices; and concludes with a statement related to the topic;

G) provide instruction in creating a narrative text based on real or imagined experiences or events that introduces a narrator and/or characters; uses dialogue, description and pacing to develop and
organize a sequence of events; uses concrete words, phrases, sensory details and transitional devices; and uses a conclusion that follows from the experiences or events;

H) provide instruction in writing arguments to support claims in an analysis of substantive topics or texts using valid reasoning and relevant and sufficient evidence;

I) teach students to conduct research projects using evidence drawn from multiple sources, including how to select and develop topics; gather information from a variety of sources, including the Internet; synthesize information; and paraphrase, summarize and quote/cite sources;

J) provide instruction in the conventions of standard English grammar and usage (e.g., irregular plural nouns, past tense of irregular verbs, subject-verb agreement, pronoun-antecedent agreement, conjunctions, prepositions, interjections, perfect verb tenses);

K) provide instruction in the conventions of standard English capitalization, punctuation and spelling;

L) provide instruction in using technology to produce and publish writing and to interact and collaborate with others; and

M) use "conferencing" to motivate and scaffold students' development throughout the writing process.

4) Speaking and Listening

Effective elementary teachers:

A) engage students in a variety of oral language activities, including whole and small group collaborative discussion, asking questions, reporting on a topic and recounting experiences;

B) teach students to listen actively and critically in order to understand, evaluate and respond to a speaker's message;
C) instruct students in presenting ideas and information using facts and relevant details to support main ideas and using presentation software, media and visual displays appropriate to the purpose and audience; and

D) provide instruction in the conventions of standard English grammar and usage.

5) Vocabulary

Effective elementary teachers:

A) for the instructional focus, select appropriate words central to the meaning of the text and likely to be unknown, academic vocabulary, meaning families and word relationships;

B) introduce students to forms of language that enhance vocabulary and understanding of language (e.g., idioms, figurative language, poetic devices, synonyms, antonyms, homonyms, adages, proverbs);

C) introduce word-solving strategies for clarifying the meaning of unknown words, including contextual analysis, structural analysis and the use of reference materials;

D) plan lessons that promote oral and written language development and the use of newly acquired vocabulary across disciplines;

E) understand and implement the forms and functions of academic language to help students develop and express content understandings;

F) utilize authentic text to help students develop word consciousness; and

G) actively engage students in using a wide variety of strategies for developing and expanding vocabularies.

d) Using Materials, Texts and Technology

Effective elementary teachers:
1) use a wide range of quality literature and informational texts;
2) select literature and informational texts that address the interests, backgrounds and learning needs of each student;
3) use research-based criteria for selecting and evaluating instructional materials for use in the teaching English language arts;
4) estimate the difficulty level of text using readability measures and qualitative factors and makes text accessible to students;
5) use culturally responsive texts to promote students’ understanding of their lives and society; and
6) use a variety of technology to support literacy instruction (e.g., computers, cameras, interactive websites, blogs, online research).

e) Monitoring Student Learning through Assessment

Effective elementary teachers:

1) use a variety of developmentally appropriate literacy assessments, including standardized assessments, diagnostic tools, universal screening, curriculum-based assessments and progress monitoring tools;
2) monitor student progress in meeting developmental benchmarks in literacy;
3) assess students’ interest, engagement and response to instruction to guide teaching;
4) use assessment data, student work samples and observations from continuous monitoring of student progress to plan and evaluate literacy instruction;
5) provide feedback to students on their work to help them understand their own progress and how to improve performance;
6) communicate results of assessments appropriately;
7) engage students in self-assessment;
8) recognize how to maintain and use accurate records of students’ performance and progress in meeting literacy standards; and
9) interpret and use assessment data to analyze individual, group and classroom literacy performance and progress.

f) Meeting the Needs of Diverse Learners

Effective elementary teachers:
1) understand the impact of cultural, linguistic, cognitive, academic, physical, social and emotional differences on language development and literacy;
2) plan and implement targeted literacy instruction that is responsive to the strengths and needs of each student (i.e., English language learners, struggling learners, gifted learners) to ensure high rates of success;
3) seek appropriate assistance and support for struggling readers and writers;
4) collaborate and plan with other professionals to deliver a consistent, sequenced and supportive instructional program for each student;
5) differentiate strategies, materials, pace, levels of text and language complexity to introduce concepts and skills to meet the diverse learning needs of each student;
6) make content accessible in appropriate ways to English language learners;
7) deliver literacy instruction within a multi-tier system of support in order to meet the needs of all students;
8) use data-based decision-making to target interventions to the needs of struggling readers; and
9) deliver instruction explicitly to struggling readers (i.e., modeling, prompting, guided practice, response and corrective feedback).

g) Constructing a Supportive Language and Literacy Environment
Effective elementary teachers:

1) understand motivation and engagement and the use of the "gradual release of responsibility" approach to design learning experiences that build student self-direction and ownership of literacy learning;

2) establish classroom routines that promote independence, self-direction, collaboration and responsibility for literacy learning;

3) use a strategic combination of flexible groupings (individual, group, and whole class) to meet the learning needs of each student efficiently and effectively;

4) incorporate student choices in determining reading and writing materials and activities; and

5) build collaborative classroom communities that support and engage all students in reading, writing, listening, speaking, viewing and visually representing.

Section 20.120  Mathematics Standards for Elementary Teachers

a) Core Content Area Knowledge

1) College Algebra

Effective elementary teachers:

A) identify, solve and apply linear and absolute value equations and inequalities;

B) identify and interpret the domain, inverse (if it exists) and graph polynomial, rational, exponential and logarithmic equations;

C) identify the sum, difference, quotient, product of two functions and the resulting domain;

D) identify the composition of two functions and the resulting domain;
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E) identify and solve polynomial, rational, exponential, and logarithmic equations and inequalities, and apply these methods in solving word problems;

F) solve systems of linear equations using the augmented matrix method;

G) recognize and graph conic sections; and

H) input and interpret data and use technology to find the appropriate regression.

2) Statistics

Effective elementary teachers:

A) construct, identify and interpret frequency distributions, histograms, cumulative frequency tables, ogives and box plots;

B) identify, calculate and interpret measures of central tendency and dispersion;

C) identify, calculate and apply the methods of counting;

D) identify, calculate and interpret probabilities and expected value;

E) define random variables as well as analyze and interpret the probability distributions they generate;

F) identify and describe the sampling distribution of sample means and sample proportions;

G) create and interpret confidence intervals for single population means and proportions;

H) identify, analyze and perform formal tests of hypotheses concerning single population means and single population proportions; and

I) identify, calculate and interpret the correlation coefficient and regression equations.
b) The Mathematics Curriculum

Effective elementary teachers:

1) understand the Illinois Learning Standards for Mathematics, their organization, progressions and the interconnections among the domains; and

2) know the developmental sequence of mathematics skills, along with age-level or grade-level benchmarks of development.

c) Foundational Knowledge

1) Standards for Mathematical Practice

Effective middle grade mathematic teachers enable students to acquire the skills necessary for strong mathematical practice in that they are able to:

A) make sense of problems and persevere in solving them;

B) reason abstractly and quantitatively;

C) construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others;

D) model with mathematics;

E) use appropriate tools strategically;

F) attend to precision;

G) look for and make use of structure; and

H) look for and express regularity in repeated reasoning.

2) Counting and Cardinality

Elementary teachers are prepared to develop student proficiency and address common misconceptions related to counting and cardinality and:
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A) Demonstrate an understanding of the intricacy of learning to count, assisting students to:

i) know the names of numbers and orally present them in order, starting from the numeral 1 and from various other numbers; being able to recognize written numerals and the quantity each represents; and knowing the names of numbers, starting with eleven, with special attention paid to helping students understand the differences between numbers ending in "teen" and those ending in "ty";

ii) count the number of objects using one-to-one correspondence, regardless of the way in which the object is arranged, and understand cardinality (connecting number name to quantity, the last number of the count, and nesting of numbers) to counting out a given number of objects; and

iii) compare numbers by matching quantity represented with objects or pictures or written numerals; and

B) recognize the role of ten and the difficulties English language learners face because the base-ten structure is not evident in all of the English words for numbers.

3) Operations and Algebraic Thinking

Elementary teachers are prepared to develop student proficiency and address common misconceptions related to operations and algebraic thinking and:

A) solve addition, subtraction, multiplication and division problems with unknowns in any position;

B) demonstrate an understanding of addition and subtraction relationships and multiplication and division relationships, including the use of properties of operations (i.e., the field axioms);

C) demonstrate an understanding of the equal sign as meaning “the same amount as” rather than “calculate the answer”;
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D) demonstrate an understanding of the meaning of 0 and why division by 0 leads to an undefined answer;

E) understand and apply the meaning and uses of remainders, factors, multiples, parentheses, and prime and composite numbers;

F) recognize the following strategies when using the operations of addition and subtraction: counting all, counting on, and converting to an easier problem by composing or decomposing ten;

G) recognize extensions of the strategies enumerated in subsection (c)(3)(F) of this Section in multiplication, division and beginning work in expressions and equations;

H) strategically use algebraic tools, such as tape diagrams, number lines, bar models, math racks and double number lines;

I) extend understanding of arithmetic and operations to algebraic expressions and equations, and solve one- and two-step equations and inequalities; and

J) view numerical and algebraic expressions as “calculation recipes”, describing them in words, parsing them into their component parts, and interpreting the components in terms of a context.

4) Numbers and Operations in Base Ten

Elementary teachers are prepared to develop student proficiency and address common misconceptions related to numbers and operations in base ten and:

A) understand how the place value system relies on repeated groupings of any fixed natural number quantity (including ten) and can demonstrate how to use oral counting, objects, drawings, layered place value cards and numerical expressions to help reveal place value structure;

B) understand how to compare numbers, fractions and decimals using the symbols for "greater than", "less than", and "equal to";

C) understand composing and decomposing numbers using the
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commutative, associative and distributive properties to efficiently use place value methods for addition, subtraction, multiplication and division;

D) extend place value system knowledge to decimals and view decimals as numbers that can be placed on number lines and explain the rationale for decimal computation methods;

E) understand and distinguish between the appropriate use of computation strategies and computation algorithms, as defined in the Illinois Learning Standards for Mathematics, recognizing the importance of “mental math” and derive various algorithms and recognize these as summaries of reasoning, rather than rules;

F) extend place value system knowledge to negative, rational and irrational numbers; and

G) use mathematical drawings, manipulative materials or mathematical properties to reveal, discuss and explain the rationale behind, as well as validate or dismiss, any computational algorithm that a student might present.

5) Number and Operations – Fractions

Elementary teachers are prepared to develop student proficiency and address common misconceptions related to numbers and operations involving fractions and:

A) understand and apply fractions as numbers that can be modeled from a length perspective (number line), an area perspective (pattern blocks, geoboards, etc.), and a discrete perspective (set of dots or circles);

B) understand and apply the concept of unit fractions, benchmark fractions and the whole (referent unit) as defined in the Illinois Learning Standards for Mathematics;

C) extend the associated meanings of the properties of operations from whole numbers to fractions;

D) understand and use equivalent fractions, including those of whole
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numbers, to reveal new information and as a tool for comparison or to perform operational procedures;

E) understand and apply the connection between fractions and division, and demonstrate how fractions, ratios and rates are connected via unit rates;

F) demonstrate an understanding of decimal notation for fractions, and compare decimal fractions;

G) represent ratios and equivalent ratios as an application of equivalent fractions, and solve ratio and rate problems using tables, tape diagrams, number lines and double number lines;

H) understand the connection between a proportional relationship and a linear relationship, and recognize the connection between an inversely proportional relationship and a reciprocal relationship;

I) defend the ordering of a list of fractions using common denominators, using common numerators, comparing to benchmark fractions or using reasoning; and

J) understand the connection between fractions and decimals, particularly with regard to decimal computations.

6) Measurement and Data

Elementary teachers should be prepared to develop student proficiency and address common misconceptions related to measurement and data and:

A) understand and apply the general principles of measurement; that is, measurement requires a choice of measureable attribute, that measurement is comparison with a unit and how the size of a unit affects measurements, and the iteration, additivity and invariance used in determining measurement;

B) recognize and demonstrate the relationship of different units;

C) connect the number line to measurement;
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D) demonstrate an understanding of area and volume and give rationales for area and volume formulas that can be obtained by compositions and decompositions of unit squares or unit cubes;

E) use data displays to ask and answer questions about data;

F) understand the measures used to summarize data, including the mean, median, interquartile range and mean absolute deviation, and use these measures to compare data sets;

G) examine the distinction between categorical and numerical data and reason about data displays; and

H) recognize the connection of categorical and measurement data to statistical variability and distributions.

7) Geometry

Elementary teachers should be prepared to develop student proficiency and address common misconceptions related to geometry and:

A) compose and decompose shapes and classify shapes into categories, and justify the relationships within and between the categories;

B) understand geometric concepts of angle, parallel and perpendicular, and use them to describe and define shapes;

C) describe and reason about spatial locations (including the coordinate plane);

D) reason about proportional relationships in scaling shapes up and down;

E) describe the connections (relationships) between geometric properties and arithmetic and algebraic properties, and adapt a problem in one domain to be solved in the other domain;

F) summarize and illustrate the progression from visual to descriptive to analytic to abstract characterizations of shapes; and
G) use the coordinate plane to graph shapes and solve problems.

d) Using High Leverage Instructional Practices

Effective elementary teachers:

1) choose and use mathematical tasks that entail complex mathematical work, build basic skills and allow for multiple answers or methods;

2) teach and use the content-specific language of mathematics;

3) lead whole-class math discussions (e.g., number talks) that engage all learners;

4) respond productively to students' “errors” by probing the underlying thinking and providing targeted feedback;

5) appraise, choose and modify tasks and texts for a specific learning goal;

6) use specific mathematically focused positive reinforcement;

7) use public recording (posters, whiteboard) to collect and probe mathematical thinking (e.g., demonstrating multiple answers and methods; exploring when an algorithm may be the best solution and when another approach may provide an easier solution);

8) diagnose common (and not so common) patterns of student thinking; and

9) assess students’ mathematical proficiency and teach responsively.

e) Using Materials, Tools and Technology

Effective elementary teachers:

1) apply mathematical content and pedagogical knowledge to select and use instructional tools, such as manipulatives and physical models, drawings, virtual environments, spreadsheets, presentation tools, websites and mathematics-specific technologies (e.g., graphing tools and interactive geometry software), recognizing both the insight to be gained and any limitations;
2) empower students to make sound decisions about the appropriate use of mathematical tools;

3) when making mathematical models, recognize that technology can enable one to visualize the results of varying assumptions, explore consequences, examine characteristics and compare predictions with data;

4) select mathematical examples that address the interests, backgrounds and learning needs of each student; and

5) evaluate curricular materials for appropriate level and depth of content, focus on and relevance to required learning goals, and incorporation of the Illinois Learning Standards for Mathematics.

f) Monitoring Student Learning through Assessment

Effective elementary teachers:

1) engage in purposeful classroom assessment aligned to appropriate learning expectations for every student and monitor student progress in meeting developmental benchmarks in mathematics;

2) provide a variety of well-designed one-step, two-step and complex multi-step assessment items and performance tasks, incorporating real-life situations to allow students to demonstrate their learning;

3) ensure that assessments are responsive to, and respectful of, cultural and linguistic diversity and exceptionalities, and are not influenced by factors unrelated to the intended purposes of the assessment;

4) guide students in developing the skills and strategies to assess their work and set appropriately ambitious goals for their progress as mathematicians;

5) analyze student work to determine misunderstandings, misconceptions, predispositions and newly developing understandings, and use the results of this analysis to guide instruction and provide meaningful feedback; and

6) communicate the purposes, uses and results of assessments appropriately and accurately to students, parents and colleagues.

G) Meeting the Needs of Diverse Learners
Effective elementary teachers:

1) understand the impact of cultural, linguistic, cognitive, academic, physical, social and emotional differences on mathematics development and progression of knowledge;

2) plan and implement mathematics instruction that capitalizes on strengths and is responsive to the needs of each student;

3) use a variety of approaches and classroom-based intervention strategies to respond to the needs of struggling and/or advanced learners;

4) seek appropriate assistance and support for struggling and/or advanced learners;

5) collaborate and plan with other professionals to deliver a consistent, sequenced and supportive instructional program for each student;

6) differentiate strategies, materials, pace and levels of cognitive complexity to introduce concepts and skills to meet the learning needs of each student; and

7) make content accessible in appropriate ways to English language learners and students with exceptionalities.

H) Constructing a Supportive Mathematics Environment

Effective elementary teachers:

1) create an environment that empowers every student to engage in the practice set forth in subsection (c)(1) of this Section;

2) motivate and engage students by designing learning experiences that build self-direction, perseverance and ownership of mathematics;

3) guide students to work productively and collaboratively with each other to achieve mathematics learning goals by using a strategic combination of individual, group and whole class instruction to meet the learning needs of each student efficiently and effectively;
4) provide tools that are accessible and developmentally appropriate;

5) establish norms and routines for classroom discourse that allow for the respectful analysis of mistakes and the use of mathematical reasoning for mindful critique and argument; and

6) create opportunities and expectations that all students use appropriate written and oral mathematical language, including English language learners and students with exceptionalities.

I) Professionalism, Communication and Collaboration

Effective elementary teachers:

1) continually engage in intensive, ongoing professional growth opportunities that serve to increase mathematical knowledge for teaching, such as lesson study or continuing coursework;

2) analyze instruction for the purpose of self-reflection and making improvements and make use of strategies such as journal writing, video self-analysis and peer observation;

3) communicate and collaborate with other professionals, such as within a professional learning community, to plan teaching, discuss student needs, secure special services for students and manage school policies; and

4) communicate and collaborate with families to support student needs and discuss student progress.

Section 20.130 Dispositions

Elementary education teachers are committed to building the capacity of every student to reach his or her highest potential as a learner. The development of the learner is shaped by not only the content and pedagogical knowledge of the teacher but also by the professional and technical dispositions that are consistently exhibited. As such, effective elementary teachers:

a) value and promote the importance of math, science, literacy and the social studies, and demonstrate how these content areas interrelate with all areas of educational content currently and in the future;
b) exhibit high levels of self-efficacy related to core content areas of math, science and literacy, and seek to develop beliefs of self-efficacy in their students;

c) demonstrate the ability to be thoughtful and responsive listeners and observers;

d) demonstrate the ability to persevere, appropriately seeking out resources and support when presented with personal or professional challenges; and

e) embody the Code of Ethics for Illinois Educators (23 Ill. Adm. Code 22) and the Standards for All Illinois Teachers (23 Ill. Adm. Code 24), as applicable to the educator, in the learning environment.
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SUBPART A: GENERAL

Section 21.10 Purpose and Effective Dates of Standards

a) This Part establishes the standards that, together with the standards set forth in Standards for All Illinois Teachers (see 23 Ill. Adm. Code 24), shall apply to the issuance of endorsements in the middle grades (i.e., grades 5 through 8) on professional educator licenses pursuant to Article 21B of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/Art. 21B]. The standards set forth in this Part shall apply both to
candidates for endorsements in middle grades and to the programs that prepare them. That is:

1) beginning July 1, 2013, approval of any teacher preparation program or course of study in middle grades, whether currently approved or newly proposed, pursuant to the State Board’s rules for Educator Licensure (23 Ill. Adm. Code 25, Subpart C) shall be based on the congruence of that program’s or course’s content with the standards identified in this Part;

2) on or before February 1, 2018, the examinations required for issuance of an endorsement in middle grades shall be based on the standards identified in this Part; and

3) on or before February 1, 2018, each middle grades program seeking approval shall establish a partnership with one or more community colleges to ensure the articulation of coursework between the two institutions and as applicable, the alignment of community college coursework relevant to middle grades education to the standards set forth in this Part.

b) In addition to demonstrating congruence with the standards set forth in the Part, each program or course of study in the middle grades shall meet the requirements set forth in 23 Ill. Adm. Code 25.99 (Endorsement for Middle Grades (Grades 5 through 8)).

c) The Literacy Standards for All Teachers of Middle Grades set forth in Section 21.120 of this Part, together with the standards set forth in Standards for All Illinois Teachers (see 23 Ill. Adm. Code 24), shall apply to the issuance of the special PreK-12 or K-12 endorsement on a professional educator license pursuant to Article 21B of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/Art. 21B]. The standards set forth in Section 21.120 of this Part shall apply both to candidates for the special PreK-12 or K-12 endorsement and to the programs that prepare them. That is:

1) on or before February 1, 2018, approval of any teacher preparation program or course of study that prepares teachers to teach in prekindergarten through grade 12 or kindergarten through grade 12 pursuant to the State Board’s rules for Educator Licensure (23 Ill. Adm. Code 25, Subpart C) shall be based on the congruence of that program’s or course’s content with the literacy standards identified in Section 21.120 of this Part; and
SUBPART B: STANDARDS FOR ALL TEACHERS IN THE MIDDLE GRADES

Section 21.100 General Standards

Effective teachers in the middle grades possess the knowledge and skills articulated in the "Middle Level Teacher Preparation Standards" (2012) published by the Association for Middle Level Education, 4151 Executive Parkway, Suite 300 Westerville, OH 43081 and posted at http://www.amle.org/ProfessionalPreparation/AMLEStandards/tabid/374/Default.aspx. (No later amendments to or editions of these standards are incorporated.)

Section 21.120 Literacy Standards for All Teachers in the Middle Grades

Each teacher in the middle grades shall possess the knowledge and skills articulated in this Section.

a) The Disciplinary Literacy Curriculum

Effective middle grade teachers:

1) understand and use the scientific basis of teaching to plan, evaluate and modify instruction (e.g., use of appropriate research in identifying and implementing effective instructional practices);

2) know the developmental sequence of language and literacy skills, along with age-level or grade-level benchmarks of development, particularly for adolescent learners;

3) understand the Illinois Learning Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects (23 Ill. Adm. Code 1.Appendix D, State Goals for Learning), their organization, progressions and the interconnections among the skills;

4) understand the role of systematic and explicit teaching of literacy skills; and

5) understand the influence of students’ literacy skills on their performance on discipline-specific assessments.
b) Foundational Knowledge

1) Language

Effective middle grade teachers understand:

A) the nature and communicative role of various features of language, including semantics, syntax, morphology and pragmatics;

B) major theories and stages of first and second literacy acquisition and the role of native language in learning to read and write in a second language;

C) language, reading and writing development across the middle school years using supporting evidence from theory and research;

D) the role of academic language in developing students’ understanding of concepts, content, skills and processes; and

E) conventions of standard English grammar and usage (e.g., irregular plural nouns, past tense of irregular verbs, subject-verb agreement, pronoun-antecedent agreement, conjunctions, prepositions, interjections, perfect verb tenses).

2) Text

Effective middle grade teachers understand:

A) the quantitative, qualitative, and individual factors that affect text complexity, including how to estimate text readability;

B) the organizational structures, literary devices, rhetorical features, text features and graphics commonly used in literary and informational texts;

C) the characteristics of various genre or forms of literary and informational text; and

D) the role, perspective and purpose of text in specific disciplines.
c) Using Research-Based Instructional Approaches

1) Reading Comprehension

Effective middle grade teachers:

A) select high-quality texts that match student needs and educational goals;

B) identify disciplinary text features that may impede comprehension (e.g., author’s assumption of prior knowledge, use of unusual key vocabulary, complexity of sentences, unclear cohesive links, subtlety of relationships among characters or ideas, sophistication of tone, complexity of text structure, use of literary devices or data);

C) scaffold reading to enable students to understand and learn from challenging text (e.g., re-reading, pre-teaching of vocabulary or key information not provided in the text).

D) introduce texts efficiently providing a clear purpose for reading and refrain from revealing information that students can learn from reading the text;

E) guide close reading discussions that require students to identify the key ideas and details of a text, analyze the text’s craft and structure (including the tone and meaning of words) and critically evaluate the text;

F) teach students to trace and evaluate the argument and specific claims in a text and to distinguish claims that are supported by reasons and evidence from those claims that are not supported;

G) provide instruction in interpreting graphic features (e.g., tables, charts, illustrations, tables of contents, captions, headings, indexes) and their relationship to text;

H) guide students to use note-taking, previewing, identification of main idea and supporting details, and review strategies to clarify and solidify comprehension;
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I) ask high-level text-dependent questions;

J) support students in analyzing the organizational structure of texts (e.g., sequentially, causally, comparatively) and in considering how specific sentences, paragraphs and larger portions of the text relate to each other and to the text as a whole;

K) assist students with recognizing features of text common to individual disciplines;

L) guide students to identify and analyze content in texts that indicates point of view, perspective, purpose, fact, opinion, speculation and audience;

M) guide the reading of multiple texts to enable students to comparatively analyze and evaluate information and synthesize information from the texts into a coherent understanding of a topic; and

N) model and encourage the use of reading strategies to improve comprehension (e.g., predicting, purpose-setting, sequencing, connecting, visualizing, monitoring, questioning, summarizing, synthesizing, making inferences, evaluating).

2) Writing

Effective middle grade teachers:

A) provide instructional support and opportunities for students to write routinely for authentic purposes in multiple forms and genres to demonstrate the power and importance of writing throughout their lives;

B) engage students in using writing to develop an understanding of content area concepts and skills;

C) support students in producing coherent and clear writing with organization, development, substance and style appropriate to the task, purpose and audience;

D) provide feedback to written work to guide students' revisions;
E) reinforce the process for writing arguments to support claims in an analysis of substantive topics or texts using valid reasoning and relevant and sufficient evidence;

F) provide instruction to students on how to create a text that introduces an opinion on a topic, supports the opinion with information and reasons based on facts and details, uses appropriate transitional devices and concludes with a statement supporting the opinion;

G) provide instructional support for creating a narrative text based on real or imagined experiences or events that introduces a narrator and/or characters; uses dialogue, description and pacing to develop and organize an sequence of events; uses concrete words, phrases, sensory details and transitional devices; and uses a conclusion that follows from the experiences or events;

H) facilitate the writing of informative and explanatory texts to examine and convey complex ideas and information clearly and accurately through the effective selection, organization and analysis of content;

I) instruct students in the skills necessary to conduct research projects using evidence drawn from multiple sources (including how to select and develop topics; gather information from a variety of sources, including the Internet; synthesize information; paraphrase, summarize and quote or cite sources);

J) provide support in using search terms effectively, assessing the credibility and accuracy of sources, avoiding plagiarism and following a standard format for citations;

K) facilitate the use of the conventions of standard English grammar (e.g., irregular plural nouns, past tense of irregular verbs, subject-verb agreement, pronoun-antecedent agreement, conjunctions, prepositions, interjections, perfect verb tenses); and

L) engage students in using technology to produce and publish writing and to interact and collaborate with others.
3) Speaking and Listening

Effective middle grade teachers:

A) engage students in a variety of oral language activities, including whole and small group collaborative discussion, asking questions, reporting on a topic and recounting experiences;

B) teach students to present ideas and information; use facts and relevant details to support main ideas; and use presentation software, media and visual displays appropriate to the purpose and audience;

C) support students in using conventions of standard English, eye contact, voice projection and enunciation in formal presentations; and

D) teach students to listen actively and critically in order to understand, evaluate and respond to a speaker’s message.

4) Vocabulary

Effective middle grade teachers:

A) for the instructional focus, select appropriate words central to the meaning of the text and likely to be unfamiliar, academic vocabulary, and word relationships;

B) support the use of word-solving strategies for clarifying the meaning of unfamiliar words, including contextual analysis, structural analysis and the use of reference materials;

C) support oral and written language development and the use of newly acquired vocabulary across disciplines;

D) understand and implement the forms and functions of academic language to help students develop and express content understandings;

E) utilize authentic text to help students develop word consciousness; and
F) actively engage students in using a wide variety of strategies for developing and expanding vocabularies.

d) Using Materials, Texts and Technology

Effective middle grade teachers:

1) use a wide range of high-quality literature and informational texts, including primary sources;

2) select literature and informational texts that address the interests, backgrounds and learning needs of each student;

3) estimate the difficulty level of text using readability measures and qualitative factors, and makes text accessible to students;

4) use culturally responsive texts to promote students’ understanding of their lives and society;

5) use a variety of technology to support disciplinary literacy instruction (e.g., computers, cameras, interactive websites, blogs, online research); and

6) use techniques for helping students navigate online sources, including the importance of critically evaluating the information available online by addressing sources, audience and purpose.

e) Monitoring Student Learning through Assessment

Effective middle grade teachers:

1) assess students’ interest, engagement and response to instruction to guide teaching;

2) use assessment data, student work samples and observations from continuous monitoring of student progress to plan and evaluate disciplinary literacy instruction;

3) provide feedback to students on their work to help them understand their own progress and how to improve performance;
4) communicate results of assessments appropriately;

5) engage students in self-assessment; and

6) recognize how to maintain and use accurate records of students’ performance and progress in meeting disciplinary literacy standards.

f) Meeting the Needs of Diverse Learners

Effective middle grade teachers:

1) understand the impact of cultural, linguistic, cognitive, academic, physical, social and emotional differences on language development and literacy;

2) seek appropriate assistance and support for struggling readers and writers;

3) collaborate and plan with other professionals to deliver a consistent, sequenced and supportive instructional program for each student;

4) differentiate strategies, materials, pace, levels of text and language complexity to introduce concepts and skills to meet the diverse learning needs of each student; and

5) make content accessible in appropriate ways to English language learners.

g) Constructing a Supportive Language and Literacy Environment

Effective middle grade teachers:

1) understand motivation and engagement and the use of the "gradual release of responsibility approach" to design learning experiences that build student self-direction and ownership of literacy learning;

2) establish classroom routines that promote independence, self-direction, collaboration and responsibility for disciplinary literacy learning;

3) incorporate student choices in determining reading and writing materials and activities; and
4) build collaborative classroom communities that support and engage all students in reading, writing, listening, speaking, viewing and visually representing their thoughts and ideas.

Section 21.130 Dispositions

Teachers in the middle grades are committed to building the capacity of every student to reach his or her highest potential as a learner. The development of the learner is shaped by not only the content and pedagogical knowledge of the teacher but also by the professional and technical dispositions that are consistently exhibited. As such, effective middle grade teachers:

a) value and promote the importance of interdisciplinary content that is part of the middle school concept and demonstrate how these content areas interrelate with all areas of educational content currently and in the future;

b) exhibit high levels of self-efficacy related to their applicable core content area of instruction, and seek to develop beliefs of self-efficacy in their students;

c) demonstrate the ability to be thoughtful and responsive listeners and observers;

d) demonstrate the ability to persevere, appropriately seeking out resources and support when presented with personal or professional challenges; and

e) embody the Code of Ethics for Illinois Educators (23 Ill. Adm. Code 22) and the Standards for All Illinois Teachers (23 Ill. Adm. Code 24), as applicable to the educator, in the learning environment.

SUBPART C: STANDARDS FOR LITERACY TEACHERS

Section 21.140 English Language Arts Standards for Literacy Teachers in the Middle Grades

In addition to the standards set forth in Subpart B of this Part, each literacy teacher in the middle grades shall possess the knowledge and skills articulated in this Section.

a) The Language, Literacy and Literature Curriculum

Effective middle grade literacy teachers:
1) understand and use the scientific basis of teaching to plan, evaluate and modify instruction (i.e., the use of appropriate research in identifying and implementing effective instructional practices);

2) know the developmental sequence of language and literacy skills, along with age-level or grade-level benchmarks of development, particularly for adolescent learners;

3) understand the Illinois Learning Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects, their organization, progressions, and the interconnections among the skills;

4) understand and evaluate the components of a comprehensive English language arts curriculum that develops students’ literacy skills and strategies, and ensures that instructional goals and objectives are met;

5) understand the role of systematic and explicit teaching of literacy skills in prekindergarten through grade 12;

6) understand the influence of students’ literacy skills on their performance on discipline-specific assessments;

7) understand the connections between the English language arts curriculum and developments in culture, society and education;

9) understand and use research-based instructional strategies that have been demonstrated to be particularly successful for supporting struggling readers;

10) know how adolescents read and compose texts and make meaning through interaction with media environments; and

11) understand a wide range of developmentally appropriate literacy assessments, recognizing their purposes, strengths and limitations, (e.g., standardized assessments, diagnostic measures, universal screening, curriculum-based assessments, progress monitoring).

b) Foundational Knowledge

1) Language
Effective middle grade literacy teachers understand:

A) language, reading and writing development across the middle school years, using supporting evidence from theory and research;

B) the nature and communicative role of various features of language, including phonology, semantics, syntax, morphology and pragmatics;

C) major theories and stages of first and second literacy acquisition and the role of native language in learning to read and write in a second language;

D) the role of academic language in developing students’ understanding of concepts, content, skills and processes;

E) the evolution of the English language and historical influences on its forms and how to integrate this knowledge into student learning;

F) conventions of standard English grammar and usage (e.g., irregular plural nouns, past tense of irregular verbs, subject-verb agreement, pronoun-antecedent agreement, conjunctions, prepositions, interjections, perfect verb tenses); and

G) the impact of language on society.

2) Alphabetic Code

Effective middle grade literacy teachers understand:

A) phonological awareness (sound structure of words, including syllables, onsets and rimes, phonemes), its development (from word and syllable separations to phonic segmentation) and relationship to reading and writing proficiency;

B) the orthographic-phonological system, including sound-letter relationships, and common English spelling patterns and their relationship to pronunciation; and
C) structural analysis (e.g., syllabication, affixes, root words) for decoding unknown words.

3) Text

Effective middle grade literacy teachers understand:

A) the quantitative, qualitative and individual factors that affect text complexity, including how to estimate text readability;

B) the organizational text structures, literary devices, rhetorical features, text features and graphics commonly used in literary and informational texts;

C) the characteristics of various genre or forms of literary and informational text;

D) the role, perspective and purpose of text in specific disciplines;

E) how to analyze a modern work of literature and determine how it draws on themes, patterns or events or character types from myths, traditional stories or religious works, such as the Bible, including describing how the material is rendered new; and

F) a variety of textual and programmatic resources for addressing the needs of struggling readers, including those that are high-interest, low-readability.

4) Literature for Adolescents and Younger Adults

Effective middle grade literacy teachers understand:

A) works representing a broad historical and contemporary spectrum of the United States, Britain and the World, including non-Western literature;

B) works from a variety of genres and culture, including adventure stories, historical fiction, mysteries, myths, science fiction, realistic fiction, allegories, parodies, satire and graphic novels;
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C) works of poetry, including narrative poems, lyrical poems, free verse poems, sonnets, odes, ballads and epics;

D) works of one-act and multi-act plays, both in written form and on film;

E) works of literary nonfiction, including subgenres of exposition, argument and functional text in the form of personal essays, speeches, opinion pieces, essays about art or literature, biographies, memoirs, journalism, and historical, scientific, technical, or economic accounts written for a broad audience;

F) works by female authors and authors of color; and

G) works that represent the many dimensions (e.g., philosophical, ethical, aesthetic) of human experience.

c) Using Research-Based Instructional Approaches

1) Decoding and Fluency

Effective middle school literacy teachers:

A) use a variety of developmentally appropriate approaches for teaching decoding (e.g., phonemes, sound-symbol relationships, spelling patterns, syllabication, structural analysis) of regular words, irregular words and multi-syllable words, in isolation and within texts; and

B) use a variety of approaches for supporting the fluent reading of text (i.e., with sufficient accuracy, rate and expression).

2) Reading Comprehension

Effective middle grade literacy teachers:

A) select high-quality texts that match student needs and educational goals;

B) identify text features that may impede comprehension (e.g., author’s assumption of prior knowledge, use of unusual key
vocabulary, complexity of sentences, unclear cohesive links, subtlety of relationships among characters or ideas, sophistication of tone, complexity of text structure, use of literary devices or data);

C) scaffold reading to enable students to understand and learn from challenging text (e.g., re-reading, pre-teaching of vocabulary or key information not provided in the text);

D) introduce texts efficiently, providing a clear purpose for reading (and without revealing information the students can learn from reading the text);

E) guide close reading discussions that require students to identify the key ideas and details of a text, to analyze the text’s craft and structure (including the tone and meaning of words) and to critically evaluate the text;

F) teach students to recognize literary elements and devices across literature genres and forms of informational text;

G) teach students to trace and evaluate the argument and specific claims in a text and to distinguish claims that are supported by reasons and evidence from claims that are not supported;

H) provide instruction in interpreting graphic features (e.g., tables, charts, illustrations, tables of contents, captions, headings, indexes) and their relationship to text;

I) provide instruction in using note-taking, previewing, identification of main idea and supporting details, and review strategies to clarify and solidify comprehension;

J) ask high-level text-dependent questions;

K) provide instruction in analyzing the organizational structure of texts (e.g., sequentially, causally, comparatively), and in considering how specific sentences, paragraphs, and larger portions of the text relate to each other and the whole;
L) assist students with recognizing features of text common to individual disciplines;

M) provide instruction and opportunities for students to identify and analyze content in texts that indicates point of view, perspective, purpose, fact, opinion, speculation and audience;

N) guide the reading of multiple texts to enable students to comparatively analyze and evaluate information, and to synthesize information from the texts into a coherent understanding of a topic;

O) guide the reading of multiple texts across similar themes to compare the approaches taken by the authors, and how the structures contribute to meaning and style; and

P) teach students to use reading strategies to improve comprehension (e.g., predicting, purpose setting, sequencing, connecting, visualizing, monitoring, questioning, summarizing, synthesizing, making inferences, evaluating).

3) Writing

Effective middle grade literacy teachers:

A) teach students to write routinely for authentic purposes in multiple forms and genres to demonstrate the power and importance of writing throughout their lives;

B) engage students in using writing to develop an understanding of concepts and skills;

C) provide instruction in producing coherent and clear writing with organization, development, substance and style appropriate to the task, purpose and audience;

D) provide feedback to written work to guide students' revisions;

E) provide instruction in writing arguments to support claims in an analysis of substantive topics or texts using valid reasoning and relevant and sufficient evidence;
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F) provide instruction in creating a text that introduces an opinion on a topic, supports the opinion with information and reasons based on facts and details, uses appropriate transitional devices and concludes with a statement supporting the opinion;

G) provide instruction in creating a narrative text based on real or imagined experiences or events that introduces a narrator and/or characters; uses dialogue, description and pacing to develop and organize a sequence of events; uses concrete words, phrases, sensory details and transitional devices; and uses a conclusion that follows from the experiences or events;

H) provide instruction in writing informative and explanatory texts to examine and convey complex ideas and information clearly and accurately through the effective selection, organization and analysis of content;

I) teach students to conduct research projects using evidence drawn from multiple sources, including how to select and develop topics; gather information from a variety of sources, including the Internet; synthesize information; paraphrase, summarize and quote and cite sources;

J) provide instruction in conducting online searches (i.e., assessing the credibility and accuracy of sources, avoiding plagiarism and following a standard format for citations);

K) provide instruction in the conventions of standard English grammar and usage (e.g., irregular plural nouns, past tense of irregular verbs, subject-verb agreement, pronoun-antecedent agreement, conjunctions, prepositions, interjections, perfect verb tenses);

L) provide instruction in the conventions of standard English capitalization, punctuation and spelling;

M) use sentence combining as a method to provide students with opportunities to embed words, phrases and clauses in a variety of grammatically appropriate forms of sentence structures;
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N) provide instruction in using technology to produce and publish writing and to interact and collaborate with others; and

O) use "conferencing" to motivate and scaffold students’ development throughout the writing process.

4) Speaking and Listening

Effective middle grade literacy teachers:

A) engage students in a variety of oral language activities, including whole and small group collaborative discussion, asking questions, reporting on a topic and recounting experiences;

B) instruct students in presenting ideas and information using facts and relevant details to support main ideas and using presentation software, media and visual displays appropriate to the purpose and audience;

C) provide instruction for students in using conventions of standard English, eye contact, voice projection and enunciation in formal presentations, and when to adjust speech to a variety of contexts and tasks;

D) teach students to listen actively and critically in order to understand, evaluate and respond to a speaker’s message; and

E) engage students in critical analysis of different media and communication technologies and their effects on students’ learning.

5) Vocabulary

Effective middle grade literacy teachers:

A) utilize authentic text to help students develop word consciousness;

B) for the instructional focus, select appropriate words central to the meaning of the text and likely to be unknown, academic vocabulary and word relationships;
C) introduce students to forms of language that enhance vocabulary and understanding of language (e.g., idioms, figurative language; poetic devices, synonyms, antonyms, homonyms, adages, proverbs);

D) teach the use of word-solving strategies for clarifying the meaning of unknown words, including contextual analysis, structural analysis and the use of reference materials;

E) actively engage students in using a wide variety of strategies for developing and expanding vocabularies;

F) provide instruction in oral and written language development and the use of newly acquired vocabulary across disciplines; and

G) understand and implement the forms and functions of academic language to help students develop and express content understandings.

d) Using Materials, Texts and Technology

Effective middle grade literacy teachers:

1) use a wide range of high-quality literature and informational texts, including primary sources;

2) select literature and informational texts that address the interests, backgrounds and learning needs of each student;

3) estimate the difficulty level of text using readability measures and qualitative factors and makes text accessible to students;

4) use culturally responsive texts to promote students’ understanding of their lives and society;

5) use a variety of technology to support disciplinary literacy instruction (e.g., computers, cameras, interactive websites, blogs, online research);

6) use techniques for helping students navigate online sources, including the importance of critically evaluating the information available online by addressing sources, audience, purpose and currency; and
7) use research-based criteria for selecting and evaluating instructional materials for use in the teaching of the language arts.

e) Monitoring Student Learning through Assessment

Effective middle grade literacy teachers:

1) understand and use a wide range of developmentally appropriate literacy assessments and rubrics (e.g., standardized assessments, diagnostic measures, universal screening, curriculum-based assessments and progress monitoring), recognizing their purposes, strengths and limitations;

2) monitor student progress in meeting developmental benchmarks in literacy, and maintain and use accurate records of students’ progress and performance;

3) assess students’ interest, engagement and response to instruction to guide teaching;

4) use assessment data, student work samples and observations from continuous monitoring of student progress to plan and evaluate literacy instruction;

5) provide feedback to students on their work to help them understand their own progress and how to improve performance;

6) communicate results of assessments appropriately;

7) engage students in self-assessment;

8) interpret and use assessment data to analyze individual, group and classroom literacy performance and progress; and

9) recognize how to maintain and use accurate records of students’ performance and progress in meeting literacy standards.

f) Meeting the Needs of Diverse Learners

Effective middle grade literacy teachers:
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1) understand the impact of cultural, linguistic, cognitive, academic, physical, social and emotional differences on language development and literacy learning;

2) plan and implement targeted literacy instruction that is responsive to the strengths and needs of each student (e.g., English language learners, struggling learners, gifted learners) to ensure high rates of success;

3) seek and provide for appropriate assistance and support for struggling readers and writers;

4) collaborate and plan with other professionals to deliver a consistent, sequenced and supportive instructional program for each student across all areas of the curriculum;

5) differentiate strategies, materials, pace, levels of text and language complexity to introduce concepts and skills to meet the diverse learning needs of each student;

6) make content accessible in appropriate ways to English language learners;

7) use data-based decision-making to target interventions to needs of struggling readers;

8) deliver literacy instruction within a multi-tier system of support in order to meet the needs of all students; and

9) deliver instruction explicitly to struggling readers (i.e., modeling, prompting, guided practice, response, corrective feedback).

g) Constructing a Supportive Language and Literacy Environment

Effective middle grade literacy teachers:

1) understand motivation and engagement and the use of the "gradual release of responsibility" approach to design learning experiences that build student self-direction and ownership of literacy learning;

2) establish classroom routines that promote independence, self-direction, collaboration and responsibility for disciplinary literacy learning, and
incorporate student choices in determining reading and writing materials and activities; and

3) build collaborative classroom communities that support and engage all students in reading, writing, listening, speaking, viewing and visually representing their thoughts and ideas.

SUBPART D: STANDARDS FOR MATHEMATICS TEACHERS

Section 21.150 Mathematics Standards for Middle School Math Teachers

In addition to the standards set forth in Subpart B of this Part, each mathematics teacher in the middle grades shall possess the knowledge and skills articulated in this Section.

a) Core Content Area Knowledge

1) Calculus

   Effective middle grade mathematic teachers:

   A) demonstrate knowledge of properties and notation of real numbers, properties of exponents and radicals, factoring techniques, solving polynomial equations and operations with rational expressions;

   B) on the Cartesian Plane, graph polynomial, rational and radical functions, and circles, and find horizontal and vertical asymptotes, and points of intersection of curves;

   C) define function, domain, range, inverse functions; operate on functions; and use functional notation;

   D) define one-sided, general and at infinity limits, and evaluate them by using the properties of limits;

   E) define and apply the properties of continuous functions and determine discontinuities;

   F) define first- and higher-order derivatives and evaluate them using constant power, constant multiple, product, quotient and chain rules and by implicit differentiation;
G) apply the rules of derivatives to find tangent line, slope, rate of change, velocity and acceleration, marginal analysis, increasing and decreasing functions, curve sketching with maxima and minima and concavity, and solving optimization problems;

H) demonstrate knowledge of properties of exponential and logarithmic functions and their derivatives;

I) demonstrate knowledge of basic anti-derivatives, explore integration using the notion of "area under the curve" to determine definite integrals and understand the "Fundamental Theorem of Calculus" as a tool to evaluate definite integrals and relate integration and differentiation; and

J) apply the above knowledge and skills to applications from natural, physical and social sciences.

2) Statistics

Effective middle grade mathematic teachers:

A) construct, identify and interpret frequency distributions, histograms, cumulative frequency tables, ogives and box plots;

B) identify, calculate and interpret measures of central tendency and dispersion;

C) identify, calculate and apply the methods of counting;

D) identify, calculate and interpret probabilities and expected value;

E) define random variables and analyze and interpret the probability distributions they generate;

F) identify and describe the sampling distribution of sample means and sample proportions;

G) create and interpret confidence intervals for single population means and proportions;
H) identify, analyze and perform formal tests of hypotheses concerning single population means and single population proportions; and

I) identify, calculate and interpret the correlation coefficient and regression equations.

b) The Mathematics Curriculum

Effective middle grade mathematic teachers:

1) understand the Illinois Learning Standards for Mathematics, their organization, progressions and the interconnections among the domains; and

2) know the developmental sequence of mathematics skills, along with age-level or grade-level benchmarks of development.

c) Foundational Knowledge

1) Standards for Mathematical Practice

Effective middle grade mathematic teachers enable students to acquire the skills necessary for strong mathematical practice in that they are able to:

A) make sense of problems and persevere in solving them;

B) reason abstractly and quantitatively;

C) construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others;

D) model with mathematics;

E) use appropriate tools strategically;

F) attend to precision;

G) look for and make use of structure; and

H) look for and express regularity in repeated reasoning.
2) Ratio and Proportional Relationships

Effective middle grade teachers are prepared to develop student proficiency and address common misconceptions related to ratio and proportional relationships and:

A) understand and apply fractions as numbers that can be modeled from a length perspective (number line), an area perspective (pattern blocks, geoboards, etc.), and a discrete perspective (set of dots or circles);

B) understand and apply the concept of unit fractions, benchmark fractions and the whole (referent unit) as defined in the Illinois Learning Standards for Mathematics;

C) extend the associated meanings of the properties of operations from whole numbers to fractions;

D) understand and use equivalent fractions, including those of whole numbers, to reveal new information and as a tool for comparison or to perform operational procedures;

E) understand and apply the connection between fractions and division, and how fractions, ratios, and rates are connected via unit rates, and solve problems and formulate equations for proportional relationships;

F) describe the relationship between fractions and terminating, periodic and delayed-periodic decimals;

G) reason about how quantities vary together in a proportional relationship, using tables, double number lines and tape diagrams as supports;

H) distinguish proportional relationships from other relationships, such as additive relationships and inversely proportional relationships; and

I) understand the connection between a proportional relationship and a linear relationship.
Effective middle grade teachers are prepared to develop student proficiency and address common misconceptions related to the number system and:

A) understand how the place value system relies on repeated groupings of any fixed natural number quantity (including ten) and can show how to use objects, drawings, layered place value cards and numerical expressions to help reveal place value structure, and extend place value system knowledge to negative, rational, irrational and real numbers;

B) efficiently use place value computation methods for addition, subtraction, multiplication and division with an understanding of composing and decomposing numbers using the commutative, associative and distributive properties, and, using multiple models, explain why rules for multiplying and dividing with negative numbers make sense;

C) derive various (multiple) algorithms and recognize these as summaries of reasoning, rather than rules, and distinguish between and understand the appropriate use of computation strategies and computation algorithms as defined in the Illinois Learning Standards for Mathematics, recognizing the importance of “mental math”;

D) understand and explain methods of calculating products and quotients of fraction, by using area models, tape diagrams and double number lines, and by reading relationships of quantities from equations;

E) understand the concepts of greatest common factor, least common multiple, units, scale, origin, quantities, integer exponents, rational exponents, irrational numbers, complex numbers and radicals; and

F) understand the connections between fractions and decimals, particularly with regard to decimal computations.

4) Expressions and Equations
Effective middle grade teachers are prepared to develop student proficiency and address common misconceptions related to expressions and equations and:

A) understand operations and their associated inverses, and use properties of operations to rewrite polynomial expressions to reveal new information and to solve equations;

B) illustrate the meaning of 0 and why division by 0 leads to an undefined answer;

C) explain each step in solving an equation as following from the equality asserted at the previous step, while using the equal sign appropriately;

D) create and solve, using multiple representations, one- and two-variable equations and inequalities with letters representing an unknown quantity, defining constraints as necessary, and understand and illustrate what it means to be a solution of one- and two-variable equations and inequalities;

E) use the structure of an expression to identify ways to rewrite it, and choose and produce an equivalent form of an expression to reveal and explain properties of the quantity represented by the expression;

F) strategically use algebraic tools, such as tape diagrams, number lines, double number lines, graphing calculators and computer algebra systems, to solve problems and connect the strategy for the solution to standard algebraic techniques;

G) validate or dismiss the chains of reasoning used to solve equations and systems of equations;

H) understand proportional relationships and arithmetic sequences as special cases of linear relationships;

I) derive and justify multiple forms for the equations of non-vertical lines; and

J) understand and apply properties of integer exponents and radicals.
to generate equivalent numerical expressions and solve problems.

5) Geometry

Effective middle grade teachers are prepared to develop student proficiency and address common misconceptions related to geometry and:

A) compose and decompose shapes, classify shapes into categories and justify the relationships within and between the categories, and summarize and illustrate the progression from visual to descriptive to analytic to abstract characterizations of shapes;

B) use multiple models to informally explain and prove geometric theorems about angles, angle relationships, parallel and perpendicular lines, circles, and parallelograms and triangles, including the Pythagorean theorem and its converse;

C) describe the connections (relationships) between geometric properties and arithmetic and algebraic properties, including proportional relationships, and adapt a problem in one domain to be solved in the other domain;

D) use the coordinate plane to reason about spatial locations, graph shapes and solve problems;

E) derive area formulas, such as the formulas for areas of triangles and parallelograms, considering the different height and base cases, including oblique cases;

F) demonstrate an understanding of dilations, translations, rotations and reflections, and combinations of these using dynamic geometry software and constructions;

G) understand congruence in terms of translations, rotations and reflections; understand similarity in terms of translations, rotations, reflections and dilations; solve problems involving congruence and similarity in multiple ways; and explain the criteria for triangle congruence and apply the congruence properties to prove geometric theorems and properties; and

H) understand area and volume, and give rationales for area and
volume formulas that can be obtained by compositions and decompositions of unit squares or unit cubes, and solve real-world problems involving area, volume and surface area of any two- or three-dimensional shape.

6) Statistics and Probability

Effective middle grade teachers are prepared to develop student proficiency and address common misconceptions related to statistics and probability and:

A) use data displays to ask and answer questions about data in real-life situations and demonstrate an understanding of measures used to summarize data, including but not limited to shape, center, mean, median, interquartile range, mean absolute deviation, spread and standard deviation;

B) examine the distinction between categorical and numerical data, reason about data displays and recognize the connection to statistical variability and distributions;

C) develop an understanding of statistical variability and its sources, and the role of randomness in statistical inference;

D) explore and explain relationships between two variables by studying patterns in bivariate data and two-way frequency tables;

E) use technology, including calculators, spreadsheets and tables, to create scatter plots, linear models, dot plots, histograms and box plots, as well as calculate correlation coefficients of data; and

F) calculate theoretical and experimental probabilities of simple and compound events, and understand why their values may differ for a given event in a particular experimental situation.

7) Functions

Effective middle grade teachers are prepared to develop student proficiency and address common misconceptions related to functions and:

A) define and use appropriately the concepts of function, input,
output, domain, range, rate of change, intercept, interval, end behavior, function notation, relative maximum and minimum, symmetry, zeros, graphical transformation, recursive formula, explicit formula, arithmetic and geometric sequence.

B) examine and reason about functional relationships represented using tables, graphs, equations and descriptions of functions in words, and translate between representations of graphs, tables, real-life situations or equations; and

C) examine the patterns of change in proportional, linear, inversely proportional, quadratic and exponential functions, and the types of real-world relationships these functions can model, and write expressions, equations and/or functions based on these patterns.

d) Using High-Leverage Instructional Practices

Effective middle grade teachers:

1) choose and use mathematical tasks that entail complex mathematical work, build basic skills and allow for multiple answers or methods;

2) teach and use the content-specific language of mathematics;

3) lead whole-class math discussions (e.g., math talks) that engage all learners;

4) respond productively to student “errors” by probing the underlying thinking and providing targeted feedback;

5) appraise, choose and modify tasks and texts for a specific learning goal;

6) use specific mathematically focused positive reinforcement;

7) use public recording (e.g., posters, whiteboard) to collect and probe mathematical thinking (e.g., demonstrating multiple answers and methods; exploring when an algorithm may be the best solution and when another approach may provide a more efficient solution);

8) diagnose common (and not so common) patterns of student thinking; and
9) assess students’ mathematical proficiency and teach responsively.

e) Using Materials, Tools and Technology

Effective middle grade teachers:

1) apply mathematical content and pedagogical knowledge to select and use instructional tools, such as manipulatives and physical models, drawings, virtual environments, spreadsheets, presentation tools, websites and mathematics-specific technologies (e.g., graphing tools, interactive geometry software), recognizing both the insight to be gained and any limitations;

2) empower students to make sound decisions about the appropriate use of mathematical tools;

3) when making mathematical models, recognize that technology can enable one to visualize the results of varying assumptions, explore consequences, examine characteristics and compare predictions with data;

4) select mathematical examples that address the interests, backgrounds and learning needs of each student; and

5) evaluate curricular materials for appropriate level and depth of content, focus on and relevance to required learning goals and incorporation of the standards set forth in subsection (c)(1) of this Section.

f) Monitoring Student Learning through Assessment

Effective middle grade teachers:

1) engage in purposeful classroom assessment aligned to appropriate learning expectations for every student and monitor student progress in meeting developmental benchmarks in mathematics;

2) provide a variety of well-designed one-step, two-step, and complex multi-step assessment items and performance tasks that incorporate real-life situations, to allow students to demonstrate their learning;
4) ensure that assessments are responsive to, and respectful of, cultural and linguistic diversity and exceptionalities, and are not influenced by factors unrelated to the intended purposes of the assessment;

5) guide students in developing the skills and strategies for them to assess their work and set appropriate goals for their progress as mathematicians;

6) analyze student work to determine misunderstandings, misconceptions, predispositions and newly developing understandings, and use the results of this analysis to guide instruction and provide meaningful feedback; and

7) communicate the purposes, uses and results of assessments appropriately and accurately to students, parents and colleagues.

g) Meeting the Needs of Diverse Learners

Effective middle grade teachers:

1) understand the impact of cultural, linguistic, cognitive, academic, physical, social and emotional differences on mathematics development and progression of knowledge;

2) plan and implement mathematics instruction that capitalizes on strengths and is responsive to the needs of each student;

3) use a variety of approaches and classroom-based intervention strategies to respond to the needs of each learning, particularly those who are struggling or advanced;

4) seek appropriate assistance and support for struggling and/or advanced learners;

5) collaborate and plan with other professionals to deliver a consistent, sequenced and supportive instructional program for each student;

6) differentiate strategies, materials, pace and levels of cognitive complexity to introduce concepts and skills to meet the learning needs of each student; and

7) make content accessible in appropriate ways to English language learners and students with exceptionalities.
h) Constructing a Supportive Mathematics Environment

Effective middle grade teachers:

1) create an environment that empowers every student to engage in the practices set forth in subsection (d) of this Part;

2) motivate and engage students by designing learning experiences that build self-direction, perseverance and ownership of mathematics;

3) guide students to work productively and collaboratively with each other to achieve mathematics learning goals by using a strategic combination of individual, group and whole class instruction to meet the learning needs of each student efficiently and effectively;

4) provide tools that are accessible and developmentally appropriate;

5) establish norms and routines for classroom discourse that allow for the respectful analysis of mistakes and the use of mathematical reasoning for mindful critique and argument; and

6) create opportunities and expectations that all students, including English language learners and students with exceptionalities, use appropriate written and oral mathematical language.

i) Professionalism, Communication and Collaboration

Effective middle grade teachers:

1) continually engage in intensive, ongoing professional growth opportunities that serve to increase mathematical knowledge for teaching, such as lesson study or continuing coursework;

2) use self-reflection to analyze instruction and make improvements and make use of strategies such as journal writing, video self-analysis and peer observation;

3) communicate and collaborate with other professionals, such as within a professional learning community, to plan teaching, discuss student needs, secure special services for students and manage school policies;
4) communicate and collaborate with families to support student needs and discuss student progress; and

5) maintain professional connections to improve mathematics instruction at local, state, regional and national levels.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25.10</td>
<td>Accredited Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.11</td>
<td>New Certificates (February 15, 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.15</td>
<td>Standards for Certain Certificates (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.20</td>
<td>Requirements for the Elementary Certificate (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.25</td>
<td>Requirements for “Full” Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.30</td>
<td>Endorsement in Teacher Leadership (Through December 31, 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.32</td>
<td>Teacher Leader Endorsement (Beginning September 1, 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.35</td>
<td>Acquisition of Subsequent Certificates; Removal of Deficiencies (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.37</td>
<td>Acquisition of Subsequent Teaching Certificates (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.40</td>
<td>Requirements for the Special Certificate (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.43</td>
<td>Standards for Certification of Special Education Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.45</td>
<td>Standards for the Initial Special Preschool-Age 12 Certificate – Speech and Language Impaired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.46</td>
<td>Special Provisions for the Learning Behavior Specialist I Endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.47</td>
<td>Special Provisions for the Learning Behavior Specialist I Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.48</td>
<td>Short-Term Emergency Certification in Special Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.50</td>
<td>General Certificate (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.60</td>
<td>State Special Certificate, Grades 11-12, For Teaching Elective Subjects (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.65</td>
<td>Alternative Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.67</td>
<td>Alternative Route to Teacher Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.70</td>
<td>Provisional Vocational Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.72</td>
<td>Temporary Provisional Vocational Certificate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25.75</td>
<td>Part-time Provisional Certificates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.80</td>
<td>Requirements for the Early Childhood Certificate (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.85</td>
<td>Special Provisions for Endorsement in Foreign Language for Individuals Currently Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.86</td>
<td>Special Provisions for Endorsement in Foreign Language for Individuals Prepared as Teachers But Not Currently Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.90</td>
<td>Transitional Bilingual Certificate and Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.92</td>
<td>Visiting International Teacher Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.95</td>
<td>Majors, Minors, and Separate Fields for the Illinois High School Certificate (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.97</td>
<td>Endorsement for Elementary Education (Grades 1 through 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.99</td>
<td>Endorsement for the Middle Grades (Grades 5 through 8) Endorsing Teaching Certificates (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.100</td>
<td>Endorsing Teaching Certificates (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.105</td>
<td>Temporary Substitute Teaching Permit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBPART C: APPROVING PROGRAMS THAT PREPARE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATORS IN THE STATE OF ILLINOIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25.110</td>
<td>System of Approval: Levels of Approval (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.115</td>
<td>Recognition of Institutions and Educational Units, and Approval of Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.120</td>
<td>Standards and Criteria for Institutional Recognition and Program Approval (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.125</td>
<td>Accreditation Review of the Educational Unit (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.127</td>
<td>Review of Individual Programs (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.130</td>
<td>Interventions by the State Board of Education and State Educator Preparation and Licensure Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.135</td>
<td>Interim Provisions for Continuing Accreditation and Approval – July 1, 2000, through Fall Visits of 2001 (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.137</td>
<td>Interim Provisions for Continuing Accreditation and Approval – July 1, 1999, through June 30, 2000 (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.140</td>
<td>Requirements for the Institution’s Educational Unit Assessment Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.142</td>
<td>Assessment Requirements for Individual Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.145</td>
<td>Approval of New Programs Within Recognized Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.147</td>
<td>Approval of Programs for Foreign Language Beginning July 1, 2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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25.150 The Periodic Review Process (Repealed)
25.155 Procedures for the Initial Recognition of an Institution as an Educator Preparation Institution and Its Educational Unit
25.160 Notification of Recommendations; Decisions by State Board of Education
25.165 Discontinuation of Programs

SUBPART D: SCHOOL SERVICE PERSONNEL

Section
25.200 Relationship Among Credentials in Subpart D
25.210 Requirements for the Certification of School Social Workers (Repealed)
25.220 Requirements for the Certification of Guidance Personnel (Repealed)
25.230 Requirements for the Certification of School Psychologists (Repealed)
25.240 Standard for School Nurse Endorsement (Repealed)
25.245 Certification of School Nurses (2004)
25.250 Standards for Non-Teaching Speech-Language Pathologists
25.252 Certification of Non-Teaching Speech-Language Pathologists
25.255 Interim Certification of Speech-Language Pathologist Interns
25.275 Renewal of the School Service Personnel Certificate

SUBPART E: REQUIREMENTS FOR THE CERTIFICATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPERVISORY STAFF

Section
25.300 Relationship Among Credentials in Subpart E
25.310 Definitions (Repealed)
25.311 Administrative Certificate (Repealed)
25.313 Alternative Route to Administrative Certification (Through August 31, 2013)
25.314 Alternative Route to Administrative Certification for Teacher Leaders
25.315 Renewal of Administrative Certificate
25.320 Application for Approval of Program (Repealed)
25.322 General Supervisory Endorsement (Repealed)
25.330 Standards and Guide for Approved Programs (Repealed)
25.333 General Administrative Endorsement (Repealed)
25.335 General Administrative Endorsement (Through June 30, 2014)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25.337</td>
<td>Principal Endorsement (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.338</td>
<td>Designation as Master Principal (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.344</td>
<td>Chief School Business Official Endorsement (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.355</td>
<td>Superintendent Endorsement (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.365</td>
<td>Director of Special Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUBPART F: GENERAL PROVISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25.400</td>
<td>Registration of Certificates; Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.405</td>
<td>Military Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.410</td>
<td>Revoked Certificates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.415</td>
<td>Credit in Junior College (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.420</td>
<td>Psychology Accepted as Professional Education (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.425</td>
<td>Individuals Prepared in Out-of-State Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.427</td>
<td>One-Year Limitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.430</td>
<td>Institutional Approval (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.437</td>
<td>Equivalency of General Education Requirements (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.440</td>
<td>Master of Arts NCATE (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.442</td>
<td>Illinois Teacher Corps Programs (Through August 31, 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.444</td>
<td>Illinois Teaching Excellence Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.445</td>
<td>College Credit for High School Mathematics and Language Courses (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.450</td>
<td>Lapsed Certificates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.455</td>
<td>Substitute Certificates (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.460</td>
<td>Provisional Special and Provisional High School Certificates (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.464</td>
<td>Short-Term Authorization for Positions Otherwise Unfilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.465</td>
<td>Credit (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.470</td>
<td>Meaning of Experience on Administrative Certificates (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.475</td>
<td>Renewal Requirements for Holders of Multiple Types of Certificates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.480</td>
<td>Credit for Certification Purposes (Repealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.485</td>
<td>Certification of Persons with Certificates Previously Denied, Suspended, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rovked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.486</td>
<td>Certification of Persons Who Are Delinquent in the Payment of Child Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.487</td>
<td>Certification of Persons with Illinois Tax Noncompliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.488</td>
<td>Certification of Persons Named in Reports of Child Abuse or Neglect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.489</td>
<td>Certification of Persons Who Are in Default on Student Loans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.490</td>
<td>Certification of Persons Who Have Been Convicted of a Crime</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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25.493  Part-Time Teaching Interns (Repealed)
25.495  Approval of Out-of-State Institutions and Programs (Repealed)
25.497  Supervisory Endorsements

SUBPART G: PARAPROFESSIONALS AND OTHER NONCERTIFICATED PERSONNEL

Section
25.510  Paraprofessionals; Teacher Aides
25.520  Other Noncertificated Personnel (Repealed)
25.530  Specialized Instruction by Noncertificated Personnel (Repealed)
25.540  Approved Teacher Aide Programs (Repealed)
25.550  Approval of Educational Interpreters

SUBPART H: CLINICAL EXPERIENCES

Section
25.610  Definitions
25.620  Student Teaching
25.630  Pay for Student Teaching (Repealed)

SUBPART I: ILLINOIS CERTIFICATION TESTING SYSTEM

Section
25.705  Purpose – Severability
25.710  Definitions
25.715  Test Validation
25.717  Test Equivalence
25.720  Applicability of Testing Requirement and Scores
25.725  Applicability of Scores (Repealed)
25.728  Use of Test Results by Institutions of Higher Education
25.730  Registration – Paper-and-Pencil Testing
25.731  Registration – Computer-Based Testing
25.732  Late Registration
25.733  Emergency Registration
25.735  Frequency and Location of Examination
25.740  Accommodation of Persons with Special Needs
25.745  Special Test Dates
25.750  Conditions of Testing
25.755  Cancellation of Scores; Voiding of Scores
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25.760 Passing Score
25.765 Individual Test Score Reports
25.770 Re-scoring
25.775 Institution Test Score Reports
25.780 Fees

SUBPART J: RENEWAL OF STANDARD AND MASTER TEACHING CERTIFICATES

Section
25.800 Professional Development Required
25.805 Continuing Professional Development Options
25.807 Additional Specifications Related to Professional Development Activities of Special Education Teachers
25.810 State Priorities
25.815 Submission and Review of the Plan (Repealed)
25.820 Review of Approved Plan (Repealed)
25.825 Progress Toward Completion (Repealed)
25.830 Application for Renewal of Certificate(s)
25.832 Validity and Renewal of Master Certificates
25.835 Review of and Recommendation Regarding Application for Renewal
25.840 Action by State Educator Preparation and Licensure Board; Appeals
25.845 Responsibilities of School Districts
25.848 General Responsibilities of LPDCs
25.850 General Responsibilities of Regional Superintendents
25.855 Approval of Illinois Providers
25.860 Out-of-State Providers
25.865 Awarding of Credit for Activities with Providers
25.870 Continuing Education Units (CEUs) (Repealed)
25.872 Special Provisions for Interactive, Electronically Delivered Continuing Professional Development
25.875 Continuing Professional Development Units (CPDUs)
25.880 “Valid and Exempt” Certificates; Proportionate Reduction; Part-Time Teaching
25.885 Funding; Expenses (Repealed)

SUBPART K: REQUIREMENTS FOR RECEIPT OF THE STANDARD TEACHING CERTIFICATE

Section
25.900 Applicability of Requirements in this Subpart
25.905 Choices Available to Holders of Initial Certificates
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

NOTICE OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

25.910 Requirements for Induction and Mentoring
25.915 Requirements for Coursework on the Assessment of One’s Own Performance
25.920 Requirements for Coursework Related to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS)
25.925 Requirements Related to Advanced Degrees and Related Coursework
25.930 Requirements for Continuing Professional Development Units (CPDUs)
25.935 Additional Activities for Which CPDUs May Be Earned
25.940 Examination
25.942 Requirements for Additional Options
25.945 Procedural Requirements

25.APPENDIX A Statistical Test Equating – Certification Testing System
25.APPENDIX B Certificates Available Effective February 15, 2000
25.APPENDIX C Exchange of Certificates
25.APPENDIX D Criteria for Identification of Teachers as “Highly Qualified” in Various Circumstances
25.APPENDIX E Endorsement Structure Beginning July 1, 2004

AUTHORITY: Implementing Articles 21 and 21B and Section 14C-8 and authorized by Section 2-3.6 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/Art. 21, Art. 21B, 14C-8, and 2-3.6].


SUBPART B: CERTIFICATES

Section 25.97 Endorsement for Elementary Education (Grades 1 through 6)

The requirements of 23 Ill. Adm. Code 1.710 (Requirements for Elementary Teachers) shall apply to the preparation of any candidate who completes a program approved in accordance to those provisions and has the elementary endorsement issued on or before February 1, 2017. For candidates prepared in a program approved using the standards set forth at 23 Ill. Adm. Code 20 (Standards for Endorsements in Elementary Education), as well as those completing programs on or after February 1, 2017, the requirements of this Section shall apply.
a) The endorsement for self-contained general education in grades 1 through 6 shall be affixed to the professional educator license.

b) Each candidate for an endorsement in elementary education shall complete a 32-semester hour major in elementary education offered by an Illinois program approved for the preparation of elementary education teachers pursuant to Subpart C of this Part. The program shall include:

1) coursework that addresses at least four areas of the sciences (i.e., physical, life, earth and space, and engineering, technology and applications of science);

2) coursework that address at least four areas of the social sciences (i.e., history, geography, civics and government, and economics of Illinois, the United States and the world); and

3) a student teaching experience that meets the requirements of Section 25.620 of this Part for those candidates who will be receiving the professional educator license for the first time.

c) Each candidate shall be required to pass the applicable tests, as required by Section 21B-30 of the School Code, subject to the provisions of Section 25.720 of this Part.

d) Additional elementary endorsements (e.g., elementary mathematics, elementary reading) may be added to the professional educator license endorsed for self-contained elementary education in accordance with the provisions of Section 25.37 of this Part.

(Source: Added at 37 Ill. Reg. ______, effective _____________)

Section 25.99 Endorsement for the Middle Grades (Grades 5 through 8) Endorsing Teaching Certificates (Repealed)

The requirements of 23 Ill. Adm. Code 1.720 (Requirements for Teachers of Middle Grades) shall apply to the preparation of any candidate who completes the requirements set forth in Section 1.720 and has the endorsement issued on or before January 31, 2018. For candidates prepared in a program approved using the standards set forth at 23 Ill. Adm. Code 21 (Standards for Endorsements in the Middle Grades), as well as those completing programs on or after February 1, 2018, the requirements of this Section shall apply.
a) The endorsement for the middle grades of 5 through 8 shall be affixed to the professional educator license.

b) General Requirements

1) Each candidate for an endorsement for the middle grades shall complete a 32-semester hour major in middle grades education offered by an Illinois program approved for the preparation of teachers in the middle grades pursuant to Subpart C of this Part.

2) As applicable to the specific middle-grades content area of the endorsement, the course of study required under subsection (b)(1) of this Section shall include the following:

A) for a middle-grades math endorsement, 24 hours of math content, which shall include three hours of content-specific methods focused on the middle grades; or

B) for a middle-grades literacy endorsement, 24 hours of literacy content, which shall include three hours of content-specific methods focused on the middle grades; or

C) for a middle-grades science endorsement, 24 hours of science content (including three hours of content-specific methods focused on the middle grades) to include coursework in each of the following areas:

   i) physical sciences;

   ii) life sciences;

   iii) earth and space sciences; and

   iv) engineering, technology and applications of science; or

D) for a middle-grades social science endorsement, 24 hours of social science content (including three hours of content-specific methods focused on the middle grades) to include coursework in each of the
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following areas, in relation to Illinois, the United States and the world:

i) history,

ii) geography,

iii) civics and government, and

iv) economics; or

E) for content areas other those specified in this subsection (b), 24 hours of content specific to the endorsement sought, which shall include three hours of content-specific methods focused on the middle grades.

3) Each candidate who will be receiving the professional educator license for the first time shall complete a student teaching experience that meets the requirements of Section 25.620 of this Part specific to his or her content area of endorsement.

e) Each candidate shall be required to pass the applicable tests, as required by Section 21B-30 of the School Code, subject to the provisions of Section 25.720 of this Part.

d) Additional content-area endorsements (e.g., health, physical education, family and consumer sciences) may be added to the professional educator license endorsed for the middle grades in accordance with the provisions of Section 25.37 of this Part.

(Source: Old Section repealed at 29 Ill. Reg. 15831, effective October 3, 2005; new Section added at 37 Ill. Reg. _____, effective ____________)

Section 25.100 Endorsing Teaching Certificates (2004)

Beginning July 1, 2004, the structure of endorsements available on Illinois certificates was changed. Appendix E to this Part provides a list of the available endorsements and shows for each new endorsement the related endorsements that were previously issued and were discontinued or replaced. Any semester hours of credit presented toward fulfillment of the requirements of this Section shall be posted on the candidate’s official transcript and may be
taken in on-line or electronically-mediated courses, provided that college credit is provided for
the coursework by a regionally accredited institution of higher education. All professional
education and content-area coursework that forms part of an application for certification,
endorsement, or approval that is received on or after February 1, 2012, must have been passed
with a grade no lower than “C” or equivalent in order to be counted towards fulfillment of the
applicable requirements.

a) Subject-area “designations” shall be required in conjunction with some
endorsements, as shown in Appendix E to this Part. Except in the case of foreign
language, a certificate-holder shall be authorized to teach all the subjects
encompassed by a particular endorsement, regardless of the designation or
designations received in conjunction with that endorsement. However, a
certificate-holder may not teach honors courses, as these are defined by the
employing district, or Advanced Placement courses in a subject for which he or
she does not hold the specific designation, unless he or she holds an applicable
master certificate. For example, a secondary science teacher with a biology
designation may not teach honors physics or chemistry unless he or she holds a
master certificate endorsed for sciences.

b) Endorsements at Time of Issuance

Pursuant to Section 21-1b of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/21-1b], all certificates
initially issued under this Article…shall be specifically endorsed by the State
Board of Education for each subject the holder of the certificate is legally
qualified to teach.

1) For each application for certification received on or before September 30,
2004, the certificate issued shall be endorsed in keeping with the program
completed and the related test passed by the candidate, as well as for any
additional subject in which the candidate completed the required
coursework.

2) For each application received on or after October 1, 2004, but no later than
January 31, 2012, the certificate issued shall be endorsed in keeping with the
program completed and the related content-area test or test of subject
matter knowledge passed by the candidate and, except as provided in
subsections (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), and (m) of this Section:

A) any additional area in which the individual has completed a major
area of concentration, totaling 32 semester hours or as otherwise
Identified by a regionally accredited institution on the individual’s official transcript; and

B) any additional area in which the individual presents evidence of having accumulated 24 semester hours of college credit demonstrably related to the subject area, either as a subset of an approved program at an Illinois institution or from one or more regionally accredited institutions of higher education, and has passed the applicable content-area test (or test of subject matter knowledge); and

C) any additional area for which the individual has met the applicable requirements of subsection (e) of this Section.

3) For each application received on or after February 1, 2012, the certificate issued shall be endorsed in keeping with the program completed and the related content-area test or test of subject matter knowledge passed by the candidate and for any other subject in which the individual:

A) meets the requirements of subsection (e), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (m), or (n) of this Section; or

B) has accumulated 24 semester hours of college credit demonstrably related to the subject area, either as a subset of an approved program at an Illinois institution or from one or more regionally accredited institutions of higher education, with at least 12 semester hours at the upper-division or graduate level, as defined by the institution offering the coursework, and has passed the applicable content-area test.

c) Pursuant to Section 21-4 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/21-4], an individual who is eligible to receive a special certificate may elect to receive both an elementary and a secondary certificate, each endorsed as the special or special preschool–age 21 certificate would have been endorsed. An individual who elects to hold a special certificate may add endorsements to it by submitting an application pursuant to Section 21B-40 of the School Code and demonstrating that he or she has met the applicable requirements of subsection (f)(3) of this Section.

d) Endorsements issued under the system used prior to July 1, 2004, shall continue to be valid only for the specific subjects covered. An individual who wishes to teach
other subjects in the same field shall be required to apply for the relevant new endorsement in keeping with Section 21B-40 of the School Code and meet the applicable requirements of this Section.

e) Certain endorsements or designations listed in Appendix E to this Part have no corresponding content-area test (see Section 25.710 of this Part). The provisions of this subsection (e) shall apply to the issuance of these endorsements and designations.

1) For an applicant who is receiving an Illinois teaching certificate, the institution that offered the approved program completed by the applicant shall indicate that the applicant has met the standards applicable to the endorsement or the particular designation, except that the requirements of subsection (n) of this Section shall apply to the issuance of endorsements in safety and driver education beginning with applications received on or after February 1, 2012.

2) An applicant prepared out of state, or an applicant who is already certified in Illinois and is seeking to add a new endorsement or designation in one of these subjects, other than an endorsement in safety and driver education, shall:

   A) present verification from an institution with an approved teacher preparation program that he or she is prepared in the area covered by the endorsement or designation sought; or

   B) present evidence of completion of nine semester hours of coursework in the area covered by the endorsement or designation sought; or

   C) present evidence of at least one year’s teaching experience on a valid certificate in the area covered by the endorsement or designation sought.

3) An applicant prepared out of state or an applicant who is already certified in Illinois and is seeking to add a new endorsement in safety and driver education shall be subject to the requirements set forth at 23 Ill. Adm. Code 1.730(q) through January 31, 2012. Beginning with applications received on or after February 1, 2012, the requirements stated in subsection (n) of this Section shall apply.
f) Addition of Endorsements to Previously Issued Certificates

Individuals seeking to endorse previously issued certificates shall apply for such endorsements, using a format specified by the State Superintendent of Education, in accordance with the provisions of Section 21B-40 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/21B-40].

1) When an applicant qualifies for an endorsement, its issuance shall be reflected on the electronic certification system that is maintained by the State Superintendent of Education for use by applicants, school districts, and regional superintendents of schools.

2) Except as provided in subsections (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), and (m) of this Section, for applications received on or after July 1, 2005, but no later than January 31, 2012, an endorsement will be issued to each applicant who:

   A) has completed a major area of concentration, totaling 32 semester hours or as otherwise identified by a regionally accredited institution on the individual’s official transcript; or

   B) presents evidence of having accumulated 24 semester hours of college credit demonstrably related to the subject area, either as a subset of an approved program at an Illinois institution or from one or more regionally accredited institutions of higher education, and has passed the applicable content-area test (or test of subject matter knowledge); or

   C) has met the applicable requirements of subsection (e) of this Section.

3) For applications received on or after February 1, 2012, an endorsement will be issued for any subject in which the individual:

   A) meets the requirements of subsection (e), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (m), or (n) of this Section; or

   B) has accumulated 24 semester hours of college credit demonstrably related to the subject area, either as a subset of an approved program at an Illinois institution or from one or more regionally accredited institutions of higher education.
accredited institutions of higher education, (with at least 12 semester hours at the upper-division or graduate level, as defined by the institution offering the coursework, for secondary endorsements) and has passed the applicable content-area test; any coursework to be considered (whether undergraduate or graduate level) shall be posted on the individual’s official transcript.

g) Special provisions shall apply to the addition of endorsements in self-contained general education. An individual who holds a secondary, special K-12, or special preschool–age 21 certificate, or an individual who holds an elementary certificate endorsed in some other field by virtue of having “split” a special or special preschool–age 21 certificate, may qualify for the endorsement in self-contained general education on that certificate only by completing an approved program for the elementary certificate in accordance with Section 25.37 of this Part and passing the elementary/middle grades test. Fulfillment of these requirements qualifies the individual for an elementary certificate with this endorsement. However, an individual with an early childhood or a secondary certificate may choose whether to receive the elementary certificate or to add the endorsement to his or her existing certificate, thereby restricting his or her capacity for assignment to the grade levels encompassed by that certificate. An individual who elects to receive a separate certificate pursuant to this subsection (g) shall be required to pass the test of basic skills and/or the applicable assessment of professional teaching if passage of one or both of these tests would be required for receipt of a subsequent certificate as explained in Section 25.720 of this Part.

h) Special provisions shall apply to the issuance of endorsements in the sciences and social sciences. The requirements of subsections (h)(1) through (h)(4) of this Section relate to endorsements and designations based on the standards found at 23 Ill. Adm. Code 27.140 through 27.260.

1) An individual seeking to add an endorsement and a designation in either of these fields who does not already hold that endorsement with one of its other available designations shall be required to pass the content-area test for the designation sought and either:

A) be recommended for the endorsement and the designation by an institution with an approved program in the subject area based on having completed coursework sufficient to address the applicable content-area standards; or
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B) present evidence of having accumulated 32 semester hours of college coursework in the field, from one or more regionally accredited institutions, that meets the following requirements:

i) at least 12 semester hours of credit must have been earned in the subject area of the designation sought; and

ii) some portion of the coursework completed must have addressed at least two additional designations within the field; and

iii) in the case of the sciences, the coursework completed must have included both biological and physical science.

2) The requirement stated in subsection (h)(1) of this Section shall apply whenever an individual seeks to add his or her first endorsement in one of these fields.

3) An individual may receive a subsequent designation in the same field if he or she has:

A) passed the applicable content-area test and, effective with applications received on or after February 1, 2012, completed 12 semester hours of coursework in the subject area of the designation; or

B) completed a major in the content area of the designation.

4) An individual who holds an endorsement in the sciences or social sciences under the structure that was in effect prior to July 1, 2004, may receive an endorsement and a designation in that field under the new structure by passing the content-area test for the designation sought and, effective with applications received on or after February 1, 2012, completing 12 semester hours of coursework in the subject area of the designation. He or she may then qualify for additional designations in the field pursuant to subsection (h)(3) of this Section.

i) Special provisions shall apply to the issuance of endorsements for reading teachers and reading specialists. A reading teacher is one whose assignment involves teaching reading to students, while a reading specialist is one whose
assignment involves the provision of technical assistance and/or professional development to other teachers and may also include teaching reading to students.

1) Reading Teacher

This endorsement shall not be issued alone as an individual’s first teaching credential. An individual who holds an Illinois early childhood, elementary, secondary, or special certificate, or who receives one of these certificates endorsed for some field other than reading, shall be eligible to receive this additional endorsement on that certificate (and on any other certificate held or subsequently earned) when he or she presents evidence of:

A) having passed the applicable content-area test (or test of subject matter knowledge) and having been recommended for the endorsement by virtue of completing an approved reading teacher’s preparation program based on the standards set forth at 23 Ill. Adm. Code 27.110 that requires at least 24 semester hours of graduate or undergraduate coursework in reading (as posted on the individual’s official transcript), including a practicum involving clinical experience with two or more students and at two or more grade levels, at an institution that is recognized to offer teacher preparation programs in Illinois; or

B) having passed the applicable content-area test (or test of subject matter knowledge) and having completed 24 semester hours of graduate or undergraduate coursework in reading (as posted on the individual’s official transcript), including a practicum, at one or more regionally accredited institutions of higher education, provided that all the following areas were addressed:

i) foundations of reading;

ii) content-area reading;

iii) assessment and diagnosis of reading problems;

iv) developmental and remedial reading instruction and support;
v) developmental and remedial materials and resources; and

vi) literature appropriate to students across all grade ranges; or

C) having completed, on or before June 30, 2006, the 18 semester hours of college coursework in reading described at 23 Ill. Adm. Code 1.740(a), in which case the individual shall apply for the endorsement no later than March 31, 2010, and passage of the content-area test or test of subject matter knowledge shall not be required.

2) Reading Specialist

A) Each candidate for the reading specialist’s endorsement shall hold an Illinois early childhood, elementary, secondary, or special certificate and have at least two years of teaching experience on one or more of those certificates in an Illinois school. Each candidate shall be eligible to receive this endorsement on that certificate or on a separate special K-12 certificate when he or she presents evidence of having completed the required teaching experience.

B) Each candidate shall hold a master’s degree or higher degree awarded by a regionally accredited institution of higher education.

C) Each candidate shall have completed a K-12 reading specialist’s program approved pursuant to Subpart C of this Part that includes clinical experiences with five or more students at both the elementary (i.e., kindergarten through grade 8) and secondary levels and leads to the issuance of a master’s or higher degree, provided that a person who holds one master’s degree shall not be required to obtain a second one. For purposes of the clinical experiences, a candidate shall work with at least one student enrolled in elementary grades and at least one student enrolled in secondary grades and may work with students one on one or in a group. Each candidate shall have been recommended for the endorsement by the institution offering the program.

D) Each candidate shall be required to pass the content-area test for reading specialist.
3) An individual who qualifies for the reading specialist’s endorsement may receive the endorsement on his or her early childhood, elementary, secondary, or special certificate or may elect to receive a separate special K-12 certificate. In the latter instance, the individual shall be required to pass the test of basic skills and/or the applicable assessment of professional teaching if passage of one or both of these tests would be required for receipt of a subsequent certificate as explained in Section 25.720 of this Part.

j) Special provisions shall apply to the addition of endorsements and designations in foreign languages.

1) An endorsement and a designation for a foreign language may be added to an existing certificate when an individual has completed a major area of concentration in the language, totaling 32 semester hours or as otherwise identified by a regionally accredited institution on the individual’s official transcript.

2) An endorsement and a designation for a foreign language may be added to an existing certificate when an individual presents evidence of having accumulated 20 semester hours of college credit in the language, either as a subset of an approved program at an Illinois institution or from one or more regionally accredited institutions of higher education, and has passed the applicable content-area test (or test of subject matter knowledge). The 20 semester hours may be calculated by including semester hours of study that were waived by the institution offering the coursework based on the individual’s prior learning, provided that the individual presents verification issued by the institution to this effect (i.e., a statement on the official transcript or a letter signed by the certification officer identifying the number of hours involved).

3) Each additional designation for a foreign language shall be subject to the requirements of this subsection (j).

4) Sections 25.85 and 25.86 of this Part set forth additional provisions for certification in foreign languages under specified circumstances.

k) Requirements for Elementary, Middle Grades and Bilingual Education
NOTICE OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

1) The requirements of Section 25.97 of this Part, rather than the requirements of this Section, shall apply to credentials and assignments in the elementary grades.

2) The requirements of Section 25.99 of this Part 1.720 (Requirements for Teachers of Middle Grades), rather than the requirements of this Section, shall apply to credentials and assignments in the middle grades, except that Section 1.720 shall be read in conjunction with this Section with respect to reading and library information specialist assignments in the middle grades.

3) The requirements of 23 Ill. Adm. Code 1.780, 1.781, and 1.782, rather than the requirements of this Section, shall apply to credentials and assignments in the areas of bilingual education and English as a Second (New) Language.

l) Each individual who is first assigned to teach a particular subject on or after July 1, 2004, based on completion of the minimum requirements for college coursework in that subject that are set forth at 23 Ill. Adm. Code 1.737(b), 1.745(b)(3), or 1.755(c), as applicable, but who has not met the requirements of this Section for an endorsement in that subject area shall have three years after the date of first assignment to meet those requirements and receive the relevant endorsement. An individual who does not do so shall become ineligible to teach the subject in question in any subsequent semester, unless he or she later receives the endorsement.

m) An additional endorsement for “technology specialist” shall be issued only upon presentation of evidence that the applicant has completed at least 24 semester hours of college coursework demonstrably related to the subject area at one or more regionally accredited institutions of higher education and has passed the relevant content-area test.

n) Beginning with applications received on or after February 1, 2012, an endorsement in safety and driver education shall be issued when the applicant provides evidence of having completed 24 semester hours of college credit in the field, with at least 12 semester hours at the upper-division or graduate level (as posted on the individual’s official transcript), as defined by the institution offering the coursework, distributed as follows:

1) 3 semester hours in injury prevention or safety;
2) 12 semester hours in driver education that include:

A) driving task analysis (introduction to driver education);

B) teaching driver education in the classroom;

C) teaching the laboratory portion of the driver education course, including:
   i) on-street teaching under the supervision of a qualified driver education teacher;
   ii) the equivalent of at least one semester hour’s preparation in and use of driving simulation;
   iii) the equivalent of at least one semester hour’s preparation in and use of multiple-car programs; and

D) advanced driver education and emergency evasive driving;

3) 3 semester hours in first aid and cardiopulmonary resuscitation; and

4) 6 semester hours chosen in any combination from:

A) the use of technology in instruction;

B) safety issues related to alcohol and other drugs;

C) driver education for students with disabilities; and

D) any other safety-related area.

o) Special provisions shall apply to the issuance of endorsements for gifted education teachers and gifted education specialists. A gifted education teacher is one whose assignment involves teaching gifted students, while a gifted education specialist is one whose assignment involves the provision of technical assistance and/or professional development to other teachers and may also include teaching gifted students.
1) Gifted Education Teacher

This endorsement shall not be issued alone as an individual’s first teaching credential. An individual who holds a professional educator license endorsed at any of the grade levels of early childhood, elementary, middle, or secondary, or for special, or who receives an endorsement for some field other than gifted, shall be eligible to receive this additional endorsement on that license when he or she presents evidence of:

A) having passed the applicable content-area test and having been entitled for the endorsement by virtue of completing an approved gifted education teacher’s preparation program that aligns to the standards set forth at 23 Ill. Adm. Code 27.490 (Gifted Education Teacher) that requires at least 24 semester hours of graduate coursework in gifted education at an institution that is approved to offer teacher preparation programs in Illinois pursuant to Subpart C of this Part; or

B) having passed the applicable content-area test and having documented completion of a gifted education seminar offered by the State Board of Education in conjunction with the Illinois Association for Gifted Children or received recognition as an State Board-approved gifted education seminar trainer and has four years of teaching experience in a public or nonpublic school recognized pursuant to 23 Ill. Adm. Code 425 (Voluntary Registration and Recognition of Nonpublic Schools). The requirements of this subsection (o)(1)(B) shall apply to applications received on or before February 1, 2015. Applications submitted on or after February 1, 2015, shall be subject to each of the requirements set forth in subsection (o)(1)(A) of this section.

2) Gifted Education Specialist

Each candidate for the gifted education specialist’s endorsement shall hold a professional educator license endorsed at any of the grade levels of early childhood, elementary, middle, or secondary, or for special, and have at least two years of teaching experience on that license involving the education of gifted students. Each candidate shall be eligible to receive this endorsement on the professional educator license when he or she presents evidence of having completed the required teaching experience.
A) Each candidate shall hold a master’s degree or higher degree awarded by a regionally accredited institution of higher education.

B) Each candidate shall have completed a gifted education specialist’s program for prekindergarten through grade 12 approved pursuant to Subpart C of this Part that aligns to the standards set forth at 23 Ill. Adm. Code 27.495 (Gifted Education Specialist). The program shall include clinical experiences with five or more students in both prekindergarten through grade 8 and grades 9 through 12 and lead to the issuance of a master’s or higher degree, provided that a person who holds one master’s degree shall not be required to obtain a second one. For purposes of the clinical experiences, a candidate shall work with at least one student enrolled in prekindergarten through grade 8 and at least one student enrolled in grades 9 through 12 and may work with a student one on one or in a group. The clinical experience shall also include coaching or mentoring one or more teachers on the topic of gifted education. Each candidate shall have been entitled for the endorsement by the institution offering the program.

C) Each candidate shall be required to pass the content-area test for gifted education specialist.

D) An individual who qualifies for the gifted education specialist’s endorsement may receive the endorsement on his or her professional educator license for assignment in any of prekindergarten through grade 12.

E) An individual may receive the gifted education specialist endorsement without passing the test required under subsection (o)(2)(C) of the Section if he or she has met the requirements set forth in subsections (o)(2)(A), (B), and (D); has completed a gifted education seminar offered by the State Board of Education in conjunction with the Illinois Association for Gifted Children or received recognition as an ISBE-approved gifted education seminar trainer and has four years of teaching experience in a public or nonpublic school recognized pursuant to 23 Ill. Adm. Code 425 (Voluntary Registration and Recognition of Nonpublic Schools), provided that he or she submits an application for the gifted
specialist’s endorsement no later than February 1, 2015. Individuals otherwise meeting the requirements of this subsection (o)(2)(E) whose applications are received on or after February 1, 2015, will be subject to each of the requirements of subsection (o)(2) of this Section.

(Source: Amended at 37 Ill. Reg. _____, effective ____________)

SUBPART C: APPROVING PROGRAMS THAT PREPARE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATORS IN THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Section 25.115 Recognition of Institutions and Educational Units, and Approval of Programs

As used in this Subpart C, “institution” shall be defined as an Illinois institution of higher education, an out-of-state college or university granted authorization to operate by the Illinois Board of Higher Education as an out-of-state institution, an out-of-state college or university granted authorization to operate by the state in which it is located, or a not-for-profit educational entity subject to the General Not For Profit Corporation Act of 1986 [805 ILCS 105] or incorporated as a not-for-profit entity in another state but registered to do business in the State of Illinois pursuant to the Business Corporation Act of 1983 [805 ILCS 5].

a) In order for an institution to offer one or more programs that prepare professional educators, that institution must be recognized, and the educational unit responsible for the programs must be recognized, by the State Board of Education in consultation with the State Educator Preparation and Licensure Board. “Educational unit” means the institution or college, school, department, or other administrative body within the institution that is primarily responsible for the initial and continuing preparation of teachers and other education professionals. Each program that is offered by a recognized institution must also be individually approved by the State Board of Education in consultation with the State Educator Preparation and Licensure Board. “Program” or “preparation program” means a program that leads to certification. Electronic transmission of written materials pursuant to this Subpart C is required.

b) In order to be considered for recognition under Section 25.155 of this Part, a degree-granting institution of higher education shall:

1) be regionally accredited;
be approved by the Illinois Board of Higher Education to operate as a postsecondary degree-granting institution under the provisions of the Private College Act [110 ILCS 1005] and the Academic Degree Act [110 ILCS 1010] or, if the out-of-state institution is not required to seek authorization to operate from the Illinois Board of Higher Education, be approved to offer educator preparation programs by the state that granted it operating authority; and

3) sponsor a course of study leading to a certificate issued under Article 21 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/Art. 21] and this Part.

c) In order to be considered for recognition under Section 25.155 of this Part, an eligible not-for-profit educational entity shall conduct or propose to conduct at least one approved program that will prepare professional educators and leads to a certificate issued pursuant to Article 21 of the School Code and this Part.

d) In order to be considered for recognition under Section 25.155 of this Part, an educational unit shall meet the standards enumerated in “Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Preparation Institutions” (2008), published by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), 2010 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20036-1023 (no later amendments to or editions of these standards are incorporated by this Section).

e) In order to be considered for approval under Section 25.145 of this Part, a recognized institution shall propose a preparation program that:

1) meets the national content standards accepted by the State Board of Education and listed on the State Board of Education’s website at www.isbe.net or, if no national content standards are specified, then the applicable content standards set forth at 23 Ill. Adm. 20, 21, 23, 26, 27, or 29;

2) meets the standards set forth at 23 Ill. Adm. Code 24 (Standards for All Illinois Teachers) or the Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008, adopted by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration and posted at http://www.npbea.org/projects.php (no later additions to or editions of these standards are incorporated by this Part), as applicable;
3) will produce candidates for certification in areas defined as “shortage areas” by the State Superintendent of Education (e.g., the number of individuals holding a particular certificate and the number of positions that are currently vacant or predicted to be available in the next five years; the number of approved programs in Illinois and their capacity). Evidence of need shall be presented in the application submitted under Section 25.145 of this Part; and

4) beginning July 1, 2014, meets the State Board of Education’s Social and Emotional Learning Standards set forth at 23 Ill. Adm. Code 555.Appendix A.

f) In the case of a not-for-profit entity, all advertising materials, candidate handbooks, catalogues, and candidate contracts shall display prominently the fact that the entity does not offer higher education credit and that there is no guarantee that the Illinois certificate or endorsement earned by the candidate will be honored or accepted for exchange in another state.

g) The recognition of an educational unit shall be subject to review every four years beginning in 2012. This cycle shall begin in accordance with a timeline established by the State Superintendent of Education or designee. The approval of the educational unit’s programs shall be subject to review in each year after the unit receives initial State recognition.

h) Each recognized educational unit shall submit a separate annual program report for each approved program to the State Superintendent of Education, in a format defined by the State Superintendent, no sooner than October 1 and no later than November 30. Subject-area designations (see Section 25.100(a) of this Part) shall be considered separate programs for reporting purposes. The annual program report shall:

1) update any information previously provided;

2) summarize data about the program’s overall structure, faculty, and candidates, and the results of various assessments, including the effectiveness of the completers of the program from the performance evaluations conducted under Article 24A of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/Art. 24A] (to be provided for principals beginning in 2014 and for teachers beginning in 2018):
A) If at least 80 percent of an institution’s teacher preparation program completers have passed the content area test and applicable form of the assessment of professional teaching (APT) in each of the preceding three years, the institution shall be deemed to be adequately addressing the Standards for All Illinois Teachers set forth at 23 Ill. Adm. Code 24;

B) If at least 80 percent of an institution’s administrative certification program completers have passed the applicable content-area examinations for administrative certification in each of the preceding three years, the institution shall be deemed to be adequately addressing the standards set forth in subsection (e)(2) of this Section; and

3) as relevant to the institution, report on all programs provided by the institution that have been approved as an alternative route to certification under Sections 25.65 and 25.67 of this Part.

i) In conjunction with the review set forth in subsection (g) of this Section, each educational unit shall submit a unit report to the State Superintendent, in a format specified by the State Superintendent, no sooner than October 1 and no later than November 30 of the academic year (i.e., September 1 through August 31) in which the review is scheduled. The report shall include:

1) a description of how the unit has addressed any concerns about applicable standards identified in any of the program reports produced pursuant to subsection (h) of this Section submitted in each of the last four years preceding the review;

2) any changes in the institution or in the educational unit that affects the operation of the unit;

3) any new programs approved in the last four years;

4) the percentage of individuals in the last four years who completed the program and received a certificate or endorsement who were hired into a related school position in the field for which the certificate or endorsement was issued; and
5) Data regarding the effectiveness of the completers of the program from the performance evaluations conducted under Article 24A of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/Art. 24A] (to be provided for principals beginning in 2014 and for teachers beginning in 2018).

j) No later than April 7 of each year, each institution shall report to the State Board of Education, using a form supplied by the Board, on its program completers’ pass rates on the examinations required for initial certification pursuant to this Part and other information required by Title II of the Higher Education Act (20 USCA 1027). Further, each institution shall make this information readily available to the public on an annual basis and shall include it in or with publications routinely sent to potential applicants, school counselors, and prospective employers of the institution’s program completers.

k) State Board of Education staff may visit a recognized institution at any time with one day’s advance notice and may ask to speak with faculty, candidates, or administrators. All records shall be made available to State Board of Education staff upon request.

(Source: Amended at 37 Ill. Reg. _____, effective ____________)
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TITLE 23: EDUCATION AND CULTURAL RESOURCES
SUBTITLE A: EDUCATION
CHAPTER I: STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
SUBCHAPTER b: PERSONNEL

PART 26
STANDARDS FOR ENDORSEMENTS CERTIFICATION IN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION AND IN ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

SUBPART A: STANDARDS FOR ENDORSEMENTS CERTIFICATION IN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Section
26.100 Purpose and Effective Dates of Standards in Subpart A
26.110 Curriculum: General
26.120 Curriculum: English Language Arts
26.130 Curriculum: Mathematics
26.140 Curriculum: Science
26.150 Curriculum: Social Science
26.160 Curriculum: Physical Development and Health
26.170 Curriculum: Fine Arts
26.180 Human Development and Learning
26.190 Diversity
26.200 Planning for Instruction
26.210 Learning Environment
26.220 Instructional Delivery
26.230 Communication
26.240 Assessment
26.250 Collaborative Relationships
26.260 Reflection and Professional Growth
26.270 Professional Conduct and Leadership

SUBPART B: STANDARDS FOR ENDORSEMENTS CERTIFICATION IN ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

Section
26.300 Purpose and Effective Dates of Standards in Subpart B
26.310 Curriculum
26.320 Curriculum: English Language Arts
26.330 Curriculum: Mathematics
26.340 Curriculum: Science
26.350 Curriculum: Social Science
26.360 Curriculum: Physical Development and Health
26.370 Curriculum: Fine Arts
26.380 Human Development and Learning
26.390 Diversity
26.400 Planning for Instruction
26.410 Learning Environment
26.420 Instructional Delivery
26.430 Communication
26.440 Assessment
26.450 Collaborative Relationships
26.460 Reflection and Professional Growth
26.470 Professional Conduct and Leadership

AUTHORITY: Implementing Article 21 and authorized by Section 2-3.6 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/Art. 21 and 2-3.6].

SOURCE: Adopted at 26 Ill. Reg. 6263, effective April 22, 2002; amended at 37 Ill. Reg. _____, effective ____________.

SUBPART A: STANDARDS FOR ENDORSEMENTS CERTIFICATION IN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Section 26.100 Purpose and Effective Dates of Standards in Subpart A

This Subpart A establishes the standards that, together with the standards set forth in Standards for All Illinois Teachers (see 23 Ill. Adm. Code 24), shall apply to the issuance of endorsements teaching certificates in early childhood education on professional educator licenses pursuant to Article 21B of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/Art. 21B]. The standards set forth in this Subpart A shall apply both to candidates for an endorsement certification in early childhood education and to the programs that prepare them. That is:

a) beginning July 1, 2003, approval of any teacher preparation program or course of study in early childhood education pursuant to the State Board’s rules for Educator Licensure Certification (23 Ill. Adm. Code 25, Subpart C) shall be based on the congruence of that program’s or course’s content with the standards identified in this Subpart A; and
b) beginning July 1, 2004, the examination(s) required for issuance of an endorsement certificate in early childhood education shall be based on the standards identified in this Subpart A.

(Source: Amended at 37 Ill. Reg. _____, effective ____________)

SUBPART B: STANDARDS FOR ENDORSEMENTS CERTIFICATION IN ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

Section 26.300 Purpose and Effective Dates of Standards in Subpart B

Beginning February 1, 2017, the provisions of this Subpart B are replaced by 23 Ill. Adm. Code 20 (Standards for Endorsements in Elementary Education) as establishes the standards that, together with the standards set forth in Standards for All Illinois Teachers (see 23 Ill. Adm. Code 24), shall apply to the issuance of an endorsement in teaching certificates in elementary education on a professional educator license endorsed pursuant to Article 21B of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/Art. 21B 21]. The standards set forth in this Subpart B shall apply both to candidates for an endorsement certification in elementary education and to the programs that prepare them. That is:

a) Approval beginning July 1, 2003, approval of any teacher preparation program or course of study in elementary education pursuant to the State Board’s rules for Educator Licensure Certification (23 Ill. Adm. Code 25, Subpart C) shall be based on the congruence of that program’s or course’s content with the standards identified in this Subpart B; and

b) The examination(s) beginning July 1, 2004, the examination(s) required for issuance of an elementary endorsement certificate shall be based on the standards identified in this Subpart B.

c) No candidate shall be admitted to a program approved under the provisions of this Subpart B after February 1, 2014. Any candidate who is enrolled in an elementary program approved under this Part shall complete the program and have the elementary endorsement issued no later than January 31, 2017.

(Source: Amended at 37 Ill. Reg. _____, effective ____________)
# NOTICE OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

**TITLE 23: EDUCATION AND CULTURAL RESOURCES**

**SUBTITLE A: EDUCATION**

**CHAPTER I: STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

**SUBCHAPTER b: PERSONNEL**

## PART 27

**STANDARDS FOR ENDORSEMENTS CERTIFICATION IN SPECIFIC TEACHING FIELDS**

### SUBPART A: GENERAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.10</td>
<td>Purpose and Effective Dates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUBPART B: FUNDAMENTAL LEARNING AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.100</td>
<td>English Language Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.110</td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.120</td>
<td>Reading Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.130</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.140</td>
<td>Science - A Common Core of Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.150</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.160</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.170</td>
<td>Earth and Space Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.180</td>
<td>Environmental Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.190</td>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.200</td>
<td>Social Science – A Common Core of Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.210</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.220</td>
<td>Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.230</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.240</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.250</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.260</td>
<td>Sociology and Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.270</td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.280</td>
<td>Health Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.300</td>
<td>Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.310</td>
<td>Drama/Theatre Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.320</td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.330</td>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.340</td>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SUBPART C: ADDITIONAL TEACHING FIELDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.400</td>
<td>Agricultural Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.410</td>
<td>Business, Marketing, and Computer Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.420</td>
<td>English as a New Language (ENL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.430</td>
<td>Family and Consumer Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.440</td>
<td>Health Careers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.450</td>
<td>Library Information Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.460</td>
<td>Technology Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.470</td>
<td>Technology Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.480</td>
<td>Work-Based Learning Teacher/Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.490</td>
<td>Gifted Education Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.495</td>
<td>Gifted Education Specialist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AUTHORITY:** Implementing Article 21 and authorized by Section 2-3.6 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/Art. 21 and 2-3.6].

**SOURCE:** Adopted at 26 Ill. Reg. 6293, effective April 22, 2002; amended at 27 Ill. Reg. 18586, effective December 1, 2003; amended at 28 Ill. Reg. 4553, effective February 24, 2004; amended at 28 Ill. Reg. 7002, effective April 29, 2004; amended at 37 Ill. Reg. ______, effective ____________.

### SUBPART A: GENERAL

#### Section 27.10 Purpose and Effective Dates

This Part establishes the standards that, together with the standards set forth in Standards for All Illinois Teachers (see 23 Ill. Adm. Code 24), shall apply to the issuance of endorsements in specific teaching fields on a professional educator license pursuant to Article 21B 21B of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/Art. 21B 21B]. The standards set forth in this Part shall apply both to candidates for the respective endorsements and to the programs that prepare them. That is:

**a)** Except as provided in Section 27.350 of this Part, beginning July 1, 2003, approval of any teacher preparation program or course of study in any field covered by this Part pursuant to the State Board’s rules for Educator Licensure (23 Ill. Adm. Code 25, Subpart C) shall be based on the congruence of that program’s or course’s content with the standards identified in this Part, and
b) Except as provided in Section 27.350 of this Part, beginning on July 1, 2004, the examinations required for issuance of an endorsement in any field covered by this Part shall be based on the relevant standards set forth in this Part.

c) On or before February 1, 2018, the standards set forth in Sections 27.100 and 27.130 will be replaced by the standards set forth in Part 21 (Standards for Endorsements in the Middle Grades) both for the approval of any teacher preparation program or course of study in the middle grades and the basis of the examinations required for issuance of an endorsement for teaching literacy (e.g., English language arts) or mathematics in the middle grades.

(Source: Amended at 37 Ill. Reg. _______, effective ____________)

SUBPART C: ADDITIONAL TEACHING FIELDS

Section 27.490 Gifted Education Teacher

a) The competent gifted education teacher, recognizing the learning and developmental differences of gifted and talented students, promotes ongoing self-understanding, awareness of his or her students’ needs, and cognitive and affective growth of these students in school, home and community settings to ensure specific student outcomes. The competent gifted education teacher:

1) collects and develops tools and techniques to engage the full range of profiles of gifted and talented students, including students with special needs (e.g., students with disabilities (twice exceptional), English language learners, creatively gifted, visual-spatial learners, profoundly gifted) in identifying their interests, strengths and gifts;

2) assists gifted and talented students in developing pride in their gifts and growing their passion for their areas of interest;

3) develops activities that can be tailored easily to match each student’s developmental level and culture-based learning needs or to compensate for areas of deficit;

4) provides a variety of research-based grouping practices for use with gifted and talented students that allow them to interact with individuals of various gifts, talents, abilities and strengths;
models respect for individuals with diverse abilities, strengths and goals, including those students with atypical gifted profiles;

provides role models (e.g., through mentors, bibliotherapy) for gifted and talented students that match their abilities and interests (i.e., students with special needs);

identifies extracurricular learning opportunities that match students’ abilities and interests, and works to remove barriers to their taking advantage of these opportunities;

collaborates with families in accessing resources to develop their child’s gifts and talents;

provides interventions for students to develop cognitive and affective growth that is based on research of effective practices;

develops specialized intervention services for underachieving gifted and talented students to accommodate their deficits, remediate their barriers to achievement, leverage their gifts and build their community with other gifted students;

enables students to identify their preferred approaches to learning, accommodates the students’ preferences and expands them;

provides students with college and career guidance that is consistent with their strengths; and

implements a scope and sequence of the curriculum that contains person and social awareness and adjustment, academic planning, and vocational and career awareness.

The competent gifted education teacher has a deep understanding of assessment and its ability to provide information about identification, learning progress and outcomes, and evaluation of programming for gifted and talented students in all domains. The competent gifted education teacher:

identifies gifted and talented students, including those students with special needs who may be underserved:
develops environments and instructional activities that accommodate the full range of learning and performing among gifted populations, and encourage students to express diverse characteristics and behaviors that are associated with giftedness;

possesses current knowledge of student exceptionalities and collects assessment data while adjusting curriculum and instruction to address each student’s developmental level and aptitude for learning;

provides parents and guardians with information in their native language regarding diverse behaviors and characteristics that are associated with giftedness, including unique characteristics that are associated with gifted students with special needs;

provides parents and guardians with information in their native language that explains the nature and purpose of gifted programming options;

uses current, research-based assessment strategies that accurately measure the progress of all gifted and talented students, including students with special needs;

uses differentiated pre- and post-performance-based assessments to measure the progress of gifted and talented students;

uses differentiated product-based assessments to measure the progress of students with gifts and talents;

uses and interprets qualitative and quantitative assessment information to develop a profile of the strengths and weaknesses of each student to plan appropriate intervention;

communicates and interprets assessment information to students and their parents or guardians;

possesses an understanding of the emotional and attitudinal profiles of gifted and talented students and identifies when a child is in crisis and in need of additional supports; and

possesses an understanding of the difference between high-achieving students and gifted and talented students, and is able to address the needs of both within a single, unified program.
The competent gifted education teacher applies the theory and research-based models of curriculum and instruction for gifted and talented students and responds to the needs of his or her students by planning, selecting, adapting and creating culturally relevant curriculum and by using a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies to ensure specific student outcomes. The competent gifted education teacher:

1) uses local, state and national standards to align and expand curriculum and instructional plans;

2) adapts, modifies or replaces the core or standard curriculum to meet the needs of gifted and talented students, including those students with special needs;

3) designs differentiated curricula that incorporates advanced, conceptually challenging, in-depth, distinctive and complex content that can be modified to meet the needs of all gifted and talented students, including those students with special needs;

4) uses a balanced assessment system, including pre-assessment and formative assessment, to identify students’ needs, develop differentiated education plan and adjust plans based on continual progress monitoring;

5) ensures that assessment measures are sensitive to the needs of students with special needs;

6) uses pre-assessments and paces and differentiates instruction based on the learning rates and needs of each gifted and talented student, including those with special needs, accelerating and compacting learning, as appropriate;

7) uses information and technologies, including assistive technologies, to individualize instruction for gifted and talented students, including those who are twice exceptional;

8) collaborates with school support personnel and special educators to design and deliver curricula in cognitive, affective, aesthetic, social and leadership domains that are challenging and effective for gifted and talented students, including those students with special needs;
9) uses meta-cognitive models to meet the needs of gifted and talented students;

10) selects, adapts and uses a repertoire of instructional strategies and materials that differentiate instruction for gifted and talented students and respond to diversity;

11) uses school and community resources that support differentiation;

12) provides opportunities for gifted and talented students to explore, develop or research their areas of interest and/or talent;

13) uses critical-thinking strategies to meet the needs of gifted and talented students;

14) uses open-ended creative-thinking strategies to meet the needs of gifted and talented students;

15) uses problem-solving model strategies to meet the needs of gifted and talented students;

16) uses inquiry models to meet the needs of gifted and talented students;

17) develops and uses challenging, culturally responsive curriculum to engage all gifted and talented students;

18) integrates career exploration experiences into learning opportunities for gifted and talented students (e.g., biography study, speakers);

19) uses curriculum for deep explorations of cultures, languages and social issues related to diversity; and

20) demonstrates the ability to identify and leverage sources for high-quality resources and materials that are appropriate for gifted and talented students.

d) The competent gifted education teacher creates learning environments that foster personal and social responsibility, multicultural competence, and interpersonal and technical communication skills for leadership in the 21st century to ensure specific student outcomes. The competent gifted education teacher:
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
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1) maintains high expectations for all gifted and talented students as evidenced by meaningful cognitively and creatively challenging activities;

2) recognizes, accommodates and helps to remediate the limitations of gifted students with special needs in meeting production demands;

3) provides opportunities for self-exploration, development and pursuit of interests, and development of identities supportive of achievement (e.g., through mentors and role models);

4) creates environments that support trust among diverse learners;

5) provides feedback that focuses on effort, evidence of potential to meet high standards and mistakes as learning opportunities;

6) provides examples of positive coping skills and opportunities to apply them;

7) understands the needs of gifted and talented students for both solitude and social interaction;

8) provides opportunities for gifted and talented students to interact with intellectual and artistic and creative peers, as well as with chronological-age peers;

9) provides students with special needs with opportunities to interact with both intellectual and emotional-age peers and with other gifted and talented students with special needs;

10) assesses and provides instruction on social skills needed for school, community and the world of work;

11) establishes a safe and welcoming climate for addressing social issues and developing personal responsibility;

12) provides environments for developing many forms of leadership and leadership skills;

13) promotes opportunities for leadership in community settings to effect positive change;
14) models appreciation for and sensitivity to students’ diverse backgrounds and languages;

15) censures discriminatory language and behavior and models appropriate strategies;

16) provides structured opportunities to collaborate with diverse peers on a common goal;

17) provides opportunities for advanced development and maintenance of first and second languages;

18) provides resources to enhance oral, written and artistic forms of communication, recognizing students’ cultural context; and

19) ensures access to advanced communication tools, including assistive technologies, and use of these tools for expressing higher-level thinking and creative productivity.

e) The competent gifted education teacher is aware of empirical evidence regarding the cognitive, creative and affective development of gifted and talented students, and programming that meets their concomitant needs. Competent teachers use this expertise systematically and collaboratively to develop, implement and effectively manage comprehensive services for students with a variety of gifts and talents to ensure specific student outcomes. The competent gifted education teacher:

1) regularly uses multiple alternative approaches to accelerate learning;

2) regularly uses enrichment options to extend and deepen learning opportunities within and outside of the school setting;

3) regularly uses multiple forms of grouping, including clusters, resource rooms, special classes or special schools;

4) regularly uses individualized learning options, such as mentorships, internships, online courses and independent study;

5) regularly uses current technologies, including online learning options and assistive technologies, to enhance access to high-level programming;
collaborates with educators in gifted, general and special education programs, as well as those in specialized areas, to collaboratively plan, develop and implement services for gifted and talented students;

7) regularly engages families and community members for purposes of planning, programming, evaluating and advocating;

8) provides professional guidance and counseling for individual student's strengths, interests and values; and

9) facilitates mentorships, internships and vocational programming experiences that match student interests and aptitudes.

f) The competent gifted education teacher formally assesses professional development needs related to standards, develops and monitors development plans, systematically engages in training to meet identified needs, and demonstrates mastery of standards through the assessment of relevant student outcomes. The competent gifted education teacher:

1) participates in ongoing, research-supported professional development that addresses the foundations of gifted education, education of gifted students with special needs, characteristics of students with gifts and talents, assessment, curriculum planning and instruction, learning environments and programming;

2) stays current regarding key issues affecting gifted and talented students, such as anti-intellectualism, and trends in gifted education, such as equity and access;

3) expands the support system for gifted and talented students and their families by connecting them to organizations and publications relevant to gifted education;

4) participates in ongoing professional development to support the social and emotional needs of gifted and talented students, and shares resources and perspective with students and their families;

5) assesses his or her instructional practices on an ongoing basis and, based on these assessments, continues his or her professional development related to gifted education through the school district's staff development, professional organizations and higher education settings;
6) assesses evidence of the impact of new instructional approaches both on teacher practice and student learning;

7) leverages multiple modes of delivering professional development, including online courses, online gifted-related communities, workshops, professional learning communities and book "talks";

8) identifies and addresses areas in his or her professional development plans for personal growth in the teaching of gifted and talented students;

9) responds to cultural and personal frames of reference when teaching gifted and talented students; and

10) complies with rules, policies and standards of ethical practice.

(Source: Added at 37 Ill. Reg. ______, effective ____________)

Section 27.495 Gifted Education Specialist

a) The competent gifted education specialist, recognizing the learning and developmental differences of students with gifts and talents, promotes ongoing self-understanding, awareness of their needs, and cognitive and affective growth of these students in school, home and community settings to ensure specific student outcomes. The competent gifted education specialist:

1) collects and develops tools and techniques to engage the full range of profiles of gifted and talented students, including students with special needs (e.g., students with disabilities (twice exceptional), English language learners, creatively gifted, visual-spatial learners, profoundly gifted), in identifying their interests, strengths and gifts;

2) assists gifted and talented students in developing their pride in their gifts and talents and encouraging their passion in their areas of interest;

3) develops activities that can be easily tailored to match each student's developmental needs and culture-based learning needs or to compensate for areas of deficit, to include students with special needs;
provides a variety of research-based grouping practices for use with gifted and talented students that allow them to interact with individuals of various gifts, talents, abilities and strengths;

5) models respect for individuals with diverse abilities, strengths and goals, including those with atypical gifted profiles (i.e., students with special needs);

6) provides role models (e.g., through mentors, bibliotherapy) for gifted and talented students that match their abilities and interests.

7) identifies extracurricular learning opportunities that match students’ abilities and interests, and works to remove barriers to their taking advantage of these opportunities;

8) collaborates with families in accessing resources to develop their child’s talents;

9) designs interventions for students to develop cognitive and affective growth that is based on research of effective practices;

10) develops specialized intervention services for underachieving gifted and talented students to accommodate their deficits, remediate barriers to achievement, leverage their gifts and build their community with other gifted and talented students;

11) enables students to identify their preferred approaches to learning, accommodates the students’ preferences and expands them;

12) provides students with college and career guidance that is consistent with their strengths;

13) implements a scope and sequence of the curriculum that contains person and social awareness and adjustment, academic planning and vocational and career awareness.

b) The competent gifted education specialist has a deep understanding of assessment and its ability to provide information about identification, learning progress and outcomes, and evaluation of programming for students with gifts and talents in all domains. The competent gifted education specialist:
IDENTIFIES GIFTED AND TALENTED STUDENTS, INCLUDING THOSE STUDENTS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS WHO MAY BE UNDERSERVED;

2) DEVELOPS ENVIRONMENTS AND INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES THAT ACCOMMODATE THE FULL RANGE OF LEARNING AND PERFORMING FOUND AMONG GIFTED POPULATIONS, AND ENCOURAGE STUDENTS TO EXPRESS DIVERSE CHARACTERISTICS AND BEHAVIORS THAT ARE ASSOCIATED WITH GIFTEDNESS;

3) USES CURRENT, RESEARCH-BASED ASSESSMENT STRATEGIES APPROPRIATE FOR ACCURATELY MEASURING THE PROGRESS OF ALL GIFTED AND TALENTED STUDENTS, INCLUDING STUDENTS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS;

4) ESTABLISHES COMPREHENSIVE, COHESIVE AND ONGOING PROCEDURES FOR IDENTIFYING AND SERVING GIFTED AND TALENTED STUDENTS; THESE PROVISIONS INCLUDE INFORMED CONSENT, COMMITTEE REVIEW, STUDENT RETENTION, STUDENT REASSESSMENT, STUDENT EXITING, AND APPEALS PROCEDURES FOR BOTH ENTRY AND EXIT FROM GIFTED PROGRAM SERVICES;

5) SELECTS AND USES MULTIPLE ASSESSMENTS THAT MEASURE DIVERSE ABILITIES, TALENTS AND STRENGTHS THAT ARE BASED ON CURRENT THEORIES, MODELS AND RESEARCH;

6) SELECTS ASSESSMENTS THAT PROVIDE QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE INFORMATION FROM A VARIETY OF SOURCES, INCLUDING "OFF-LEVEL" TESTING (I.E., NOT DESIGNED FOR THE GRADE LEVEL OF THE STUDENT), AND ARE NONBIASED AND EQUITABLE, AND TECHNICALLY ADEQUATE FOR THE PURPOSE;

7) POSSESSES KNOWLEDGE OF STUDENT EXCEPTIONALITIES AND COLLECTS ASSESSMENT DATA WHILE ADJUSTING CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION TO LEARN ABOUT EACH STUDENT’S DEVELOPMENTAL LEVEL AND APITUDE FOR LEARNING;

8) INTERPRETS MULTIPLE ASSESSMENTS IN DIFFERENT DOMAINS AND UNDERSTANDS THE USES AND LIMITATIONS OF THE ASSESSMENTS IN IDENTIFYING THE NEEDS OF GIFTED AND TALENTED STUDENTS, INCLUDING THOSE STUDENTS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS;

9) INFORMS ALL PARENTS AND GUARDIANS ABOUT THE IDENTIFICATION PROCESS, OBTAINS PARENTAL OR GUARDIAN PERMISSION FOR ASSESSMENTS, USES CULTURALLY SENSITIVE CHECKLISTS, AND ELICITS EVIDENCE REGARDING THE CHILD’S INTERESTS AND POTENTIAL OUTSIDE OF THE CLASSROOM SETTING;
selects and uses non-biased and equitable approaches for identifying gifted and talented students, which may include using locally developed norms or assessment tools in the child’s native language or in nonverbal formats;

understands and implements district and state policies designed to foster equity in gifted programming and services;

provides parents and guardians with information in their native language regarding diverse behaviors and characteristics that are associated with giftedness, including unique characteristics associated with gifted students with special needs;

Provides parents and guardians with information in their native language that explains the nature and purpose of gifted programming options;

uses differentiated pre- and post-performance-based assessments to measure the progress of gifted and talented students;

uses differentiated product-based assessments to measure the progress of gifted and talented students;

uses off-level standardized assessments to measure the progress of gifted and talented students;

uses and interprets qualitative and quantitative assessment information to develop a profile of the strengths and weaknesses of each gifted and talented student to plan appropriate intervention;

communicates and interprets assessment information to gifted and talented students and their parents or guardians;

ensures that the assessments used in the identification and evaluation processes are reliable, are sensitive to the needs of special populations, are valid for each instrument’s purpose, allow for above grade-level performance and allow for diverse perspectives;

ensures that the assessment of the progress of gifted and talented students uses multiple indicators that measure mastery of content, higher-level thinking skills, achievement in specific program areas and affective growth;
21) assesses the quantity, quality and appropriateness of the programming and services provided for gifted and talented students by disaggregating assessment data and yearly progress data and making the results public;

22) provides the necessary time and resources to implement an annual evaluation plan developed by personnel with expertise in program evaluation and gifted education;

23) ensures that the evaluation plan is purposeful and evaluates how student-level outcomes are influenced by one or more of the following components of gifted education programming: identification, curriculum, instructional programming and services, ongoing assessment of student learning, counseling and guidance programs, teacher qualifications and professional development, parent and guardian and community involvement, programming resources, and programming design, management, and delivery; and

24) disseminates results of the program evaluation, orally and in written form, and explains how results will be used.

c) The competent gifted education specialist applies the theory and research-based models of curriculum and instruction for gifted and talented students and respond to his or her students' needs by planning, selecting, adapting and creating culturally relevant curriculum and by using a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies to ensure specific student outcomes. The competent gifted education specialist:

1) uses local, state and national standards to align and expand curriculum and instructional plans;

2) designs and uses a comprehensive and continuous scope and sequence to develop differentiated plans for gifted and talented students in prekindergarten through grade 12;

3) adapts, modifies or replaces the core or standard curriculum to meet the needs of gifted and talented students and those with special needs;

4) Designs differentiated curricula that incorporates advanced, conceptually challenging, in-depth, distinctive and complex content that can be modified to meet the needs of all gifted and talented students, including students with special needs;
5) uses a balanced assessment system, including pre-assessment and formative assessment, to identify students’ needs, develop differentiated education plans and adjust plans based on continual progress monitoring;

6) uses pre-assessments and paces and differentiates instruction based on the learning rates and needs of each gifted and talented student, accelerating and compacting learning as appropriate;

7) uses information and technologies, including assistive technologies, to individualize instruction for gifted and talented students, including those who are twice-exceptional;

8) collaborates with school service personnel and special educators to design and deliver curricula in cognitive, affective, aesthetic, social and leadership domains that are challenging and effective for gifted and talented students, including students with special needs;

9) uses meta-cognitive models to meet the needs of gifted and talented students;

10) selects, adapts and uses a repertoire of instructional strategies and materials that differentiate instruction for gifted and talented students and respond to diversity;

11) uses school and community resources that support differentiation;

12) provides opportunities for gifted and talented students to explore, develop or research their areas of interest and/or talent;

13) uses critical-thinking strategies to meet the needs of gifted and talented students;

14) uses creative-thinking strategies to meet the needs of gifted and talented students;

15) Uses problem-solving model strategies to meet the needs of gifted and talented students;

16) uses open-ended inquiry models to meet the needs of gifted and talented students;
develops and uses challenging, culturally responsive curriculum to engage all gifted and talented students;

integrates career exploration experiences into learning opportunities for gifted and talented students (e.g., biography study, speakers);

uses curriculum for deep explorations of cultures, languages and social issues related to diversity; and

demonstrates the ability to identify and leverage sources for high-quality resources and materials that are appropriate for gifted and talented students

d) The competent gifted education specialist creates learning environments that foster personal and social responsibility, multicultural competence, and interpersonal and technical communication skills for leadership in the 21st century to ensure specific student outcomes. The competent gifted education specialist:

maintains high expectations for all gifted and talented students, as evidenced in meaningful cognitively and creatively challenging activities;

recognizes, accommodates and helps to remediate the limitations of gifted students with special needs in meeting production demands;

provides opportunities for self-exploration, development and pursuit of interests and development of identities supportive of achievement (e.g., through mentors and role models);

creates environments that support trust among diverse learners;

provides feedback that focuses on effort, evidence of potential to meet high standards and mistakes as learning opportunities;

provides examples of positive coping skills and opportunities to apply them;

understands the needs of gifted and talented students for both solitude and social interaction;
8) provides opportunities for gifted and talented students to interact with intellectual and artistic and creative peers, as well as with chronological-age peers;

9) provides students with special needs with opportunities to interact with both intellectual and emotional-age peers and with other gifted and talented students with special needs;

10) assesses and provides instruction on social skills needed for school, community and the world of work;

11) establishes a safe and welcoming climate for addressing social issues and developing personal responsibility;

12) provides environments for developing many forms of leadership and leadership skills;

13) promotes opportunities for leadership in community settings to effect positive change;

14) models appreciation for and sensitivity to students’ diverse backgrounds and languages;

15) censures discriminatory language and behavior, and models appropriate strategies;

16) provides structured opportunities to collaborate with diverse peers on a common goal;

17) provides opportunities for advanced development and maintenance of first and second languages;

18) provides resources to enhance oral, written and artistic forms of communication, recognizing students’ cultural context; and

19) ensures access to advanced communication tools, including assistive technologies, and use of these tools for expressing higher-level thinking and creative productivity.

e) The competent gifted education specialist is aware of empirical evidence regarding the cognitive, creative and affective development of gifted and talented
students, and programming that meets their concomitant needs. Competent teachers use this expertise systematically and collaboratively to develop, implement and effectively manage comprehensive services for students with a variety of gifts and talents to ensure specific student outcomes. The competent gifted education specialist:

1) regularly uses multiple alternative approaches to accelerate learning;

2) regularly uses enrichment options to extend and deepen learning opportunities within and outside of the school setting;

3) regularly uses multiple forms of grouping, including clusters, resource rooms, special classes or special schools;

4) regularly uses individualized learning options, such as mentorships, internships, online courses and independent study;

5) regularly uses current technologies, including online learning options and assistive technologies, to enhance access to high-level programming;

6) demonstrates support for gifted programs through equitable allocation of resources and demonstrated willingness to ensure that gifted and talented students receive appropriate educational services;

7) collaborates with educators in gifted, general and special education programs, as well as those in specialized areas, to collaboratively plan, develop and implement services for gifted and talented students;

8) regularly engages families and community members for the purposes of planning, programming, evaluating and advocating;

9) tracks expenditures at the school level to verify appropriate and sufficient funding for gifted programming and services;

10) develops thoughtful, multi-year program plans in talent areas relative to students in prekindergarten through grade 12;

11) creates policies and procedures to guide and sustain all components of the program, including assessment, identification, acceleration practices and grouping practices, that are built on an evidence-based foundation in gifted education;
12) provides professional guidance and counseling for individual student strengths, interests and values; and

13) facilitates mentorships, internships and vocational programming experiences that match student interests and aptitudes.

f) The competent gifted education specialist formally assesses professional development needs related to standards, develops and monitors development plans, systematically engages in training to meet identified needs and demonstrates mastery of standards through the assessment of relevant student outcomes. The competent gifted education specialist:

1) participates in ongoing, research-supported professional development that addresses the foundations of gifted education, education of gifted students with special needs, characteristics of students with gifts and talents, assessment, curriculum planning and instruction, learning environments and programming;

2) provides professional development for teachers that models how to develop environments and instructional activities that encourage students to express diverse characteristics and behaviors that are associated with giftedness;

3) stays current regarding key issues affecting gifted students, such as anti-intellectualism, and trends in gifted education, such as equity and access;

4) provides human and material resources needed for professional development in gifted education (e.g., release time, funding for continuing education, substitute support, webinars, mentors);

5) expands the support system for gifted and talented students and their families by connecting them to organizations and publications relevant to gifted education;

6) assesses his or her instructional practices on an ongoing basis and, based on these assessments, continues his or her professional development related to gifted education through the school district's staff development, professional organizations and higher education settings;
7) assesses evidence of the impact of new instructional approaches both on teacher practice and student learning;

8) leverages multiple modes of delivering professional development, including online courses, online gifted-related communities, workshops, professional learning communities and book "talks";

9) identifies and addresses areas in his or her professional development plans for personal growth in the teaching of gifted and talented students;

10) responds to cultural and personal frames of reference when teaching gifted and talented students; and

11) complies with rules, policies and standards of ethical practice.

(Source: Added at 37 Ill. Reg. _____, effective _____________)
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
Susie Morrison, Deputy Superintendent and Chief Education Officer
Nicki Bazer, General Counsel

Agenda Topic: Action Item: Proposed Amendments for Initial Review: Part 226 (Special Education)

Materials: Recommended Amendments

Staff Contact(s): Beth Hanselman, Assistant Superintendent

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

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
The proposed changes address Strategic Goals 1 and 2, in that they help ensure that medical reviews conducted to evaluate or re-evaluate students for the provision of special education services are conducted appropriately and by qualified individuals.

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

Background Information
Since the 1980s, agency rules have required that medical reviews, a component of the evaluation process used to assess students’ eligibility for special education services, be conducted only by certified school nurses or physicians licensed to practice medicine in all of its branches. In 2010, the State Board promulgated changes to these rules in order to expand the list of practitioners who were deemed qualified to conduct medical reviews. At the time, agency staff had received a number of requests from the field asking that other qualified individuals, in addition to certified school nurses (CSNs) and physicians, be allowed to conduct medical reviews. As a result, the agency amended the rules to authorize both registered professional nurses (RNs) and advanced practice nurses (APNs) to conduct medical reviews.

Last year, agency staff reopened the rules after receiving several inquiries from the certified school nurse community, indicating that they were unaware of the 2010 change described above and requesting that the rule be restored to its original form. The agency agreed to conduct the rulemaking, and received a record number of public comments, most of which were in support of limiting qualified individuals for medical reviews to CSNs and physicians. The Board supported a compromise, however, adopting a rule that continues to allow RNS with bachelor's degrees, APNs and physicians to conduct most portions of the medical review, but limits to CSNs the authority to make recommendations concerning any educational accommodations, modifications or interventions that the student may need. The rule, which
became effective July 18, 2012, also contained a delayed effective date of one year to give school districts and special education cooperatives an opportunity to find qualified staff.

The rule continued to be controversial, however. School districts and cooperatives have expressed concerns to agency staff about the lack of CSNs to fill positions now held by RNs and APNs, while RNs and APNs have said that one year was not sufficient time for them to complete the coursework necessary to become certified or for RNs to complete requirements for receipt of a bachelor's degree. For these reasons, staff are proposing that the rules' implementation be delayed until July 1, 2015, and that opportunities other than certification (i.e., training, testing) be provided for currently employed staff to become qualified to conduct all components of the medical review, including making recommendations concerning educational accommodations, modifications and interventions.

Additionally, the term "medical review" is being defined in new Section 226.160(a). Neither state nor federal law prescribes the components of the medical review, and it was clear from the public comment received last year that a medical review is not conducted in the same manner among the school districts and cooperatives in the state. As a result, the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules asked that the agency add a definition of "medical review" in Part 226 as part of a future rulemaking.

Agency staff convened a meeting with representatives from school districts, special education cooperatives, certified school nurse association, teachers unions and representatives of higher education institutions offering school nurse certification programs to discuss various alternatives to the rules' taking effect on July 1. On March 4, 2013, the initial draft of the proposed amendments was shared with representatives of these organizations, some of whom submitted modifications. Those discussions and modifications are further illuminated below.

Analysis and Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action and Communications
Policy Implications: Under Section 10-22.23 of the School Code, a school district must use a CSN whenever instructional judgment or the educational evaluation of students is required. School districts may employ RNs to perform "professional nursing services". It is this distinction that led staff last year to propose to the Board that it adopt a compromise that would continue to allow RNs with bachelor's degrees, APNs and physicians to conduct those portions of the medical review that are medical in nature and restrict to CSNs the recommendation of educational accommodations, modifications or interventions that may be necessary to ensure a student with disabilities is able to progress and meet the goals of his or her Individualized Education Program (IEP).

School districts and special education cooperatives since 2010 have been allowed to use RNs and APNs to conduct the full medical review, and as a result, many of them either no longer employ CSNs or employ an insufficient number of CSNs for the number of reviews that must be conducted. Organizations representing school districts and special education cooperatives indicated that many of their member districts, particularly those with small enrollments and located in rural areas, currently do not have CSNs on staff, and they have found it difficult to recruit certified school nurses. Many expressed concerns that they would be unable to have staff employed by the July 1, 2013, effective date of the new rule who would be fully qualified to make recommendations for any accommodations, modifications or interventions in response to educationally relevant medical findings identified as part of the medical review process.

As a result of the discussions with the stakeholder groups, staff determined that delaying the implementation of the new rule by two years will allow sufficient time for a training program to be
developed and implemented that would address special education law and regulations for students with disabilities, an understanding of which certified school nurse representatives indicated that medical personnel may lack. Further, the groups suggested that an option for testing (i.e., the content-area test for school nurse) also be provided to allow RNs, APNs or physicians hired before July 1, 2015, to show competency in these areas. Successful completion of the training or passage of the content-area test, therefore, would authorize these individuals to provide the recommendations for accommodations, modifications or interventions that can be part of the medical review. (See Section 226.160(c)(1).) In order to maintain the authorizations, anyone completing the training or passing the test would still need to complete any professional development required of certified school nurses under agency rules governing Certification (23 Ill. Code 25.275).

Further concerns about the availability of CSNs also resulted in these two alternative ways of showing competency being extended beyond July 1, 2015, in circumstances when school districts and cooperatives that are unable to find CSNs to conduct the complete medical review. Section 226.160(c)(2) addresses this exception.

The comments submitted in response to the initial draft resulted in a substantial revision of the rule as originally proposed. In particular, the qualifications required of individuals conducting medical reviews have been moved to Section 226.160(b). Additionally, clarification has been made that the bachelor's degree required of an RN after July 1, 2015, must be in nursing, education or a related field. Specific requirements pertaining to a district's or cooperative's documentation of inability to recruit a CSN also has been added.

It is important to note that this delay in implementing the rule regarding the medical review does not reduce or eliminate the requirement to employ a CSN. That is, the proposed rule would not in any way eliminate the educator licensure required of school nurses who teach, exercise instructional judgment or conduct educational evaluations nor would it remove the requirement that appropriately qualified personnel be available to perform nursing and other medical services (e.g., medications, feeding tubes, glucose levels). These concerns were voiced during the 2012 rulemaking, and it seems prudent to reiterate that the proposed change would only address the conduct of the medical review and not other services that CSNs and RNs provide.

**Medical Review Definition.** When considering a student's eligibility for special education services, federal regulations implementing the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) require that the student be assessed in all areas related to the suspected disability, including, if appropriate, health, vision, hearing, social and emotional status, communicative status and motor abilities. Currently, the way in which a medical review is performed and the data collected varies across the state. According to the public comment received last year, some medical reviews are solely medical in nature, while others contain specific plans for the educational supports that must be provided for the student in the classroom. For this reason, a consistent definition of the minimum components that a medical review must contain will assist school districts and special education cooperatives in providing appropriate assessments of their students’ needs and determining the services that should be provided based on those needs.

The definition proposed in new Section 226.160(a) was based on a guidance document about the medical review process that the agency provided to the field in December 2012. The guidance, which is not binding, was reviewed in advance of its posting by the Illinois Association for School Administrators, Illinois Principals Association and the Illinois Association of School Nurses and was shared with the Illinois Association of Administrators of Special Education.
during its December board meeting. Only minor, technical changes to the document were requested at that time.

Budget Implications. None.
Legislative Action. None.
Communication. Please see “Next Steps” below.

**Pros and Cons of Various Actions**
The delay in the effective date of the 2012 rulemaking will allow individuals who are qualified under the current rule to continue to conduct the full medical review until July 1, 2015, at which time they will need to complete either the necessary training or pass the content-area test for the school nurse endorsement to remain qualified. The delay also provides State Board staff and representatives of school districts, special education cooperatives, certified school nurses, teacher unions and institutions of higher education time to explore alternatives to certification and develop and implement training options for currently employed RNs with bachelor's degrees, APNs and physician.

Individual certified school nurses may oppose the delay (or its length) and the expectation that noncertified school nurses would be authorized to conduct all portions of the medical reviews if they complete a training program or pass a test rather than to obtain the appropriate educator license.

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

> The State Board of Education hereby authorizes 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 the proposed amendments to the Administrative Code Division for publication in the Illinois Register to elicit public comment. Additional means, such as the Superintendent’s Weekly Message and the agency’s website, will be used to inform interested parties of the opportunity to comment on this rulemaking.
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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 Medical Review 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
226.240 Determination of Placement
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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
226.360 Placement by School Districts in Remote Educational Programs

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

### 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>
<tr>
<td>226.780</td>
<td>Procedures for Withdrawal Hearings before the Regional Board of School Trustees</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>
</tbody>
</table>
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226.830 List of Independent Evaluators
226.840 Qualifications of Evaluators
226.850 List of Qualified Workers
226.860 List of Noncertified Employees

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


Section 226.160 Medical Review Determination of Eligibility (Repealed)
a) In accordance with 34 CFR 300.34(c)(4), any student who is being evaluated or re-evaluated for special education services shall be assessed in all areas related to the suspected disability, including, if appropriate, health, vision, hearing, social and emotional status, communicative status and motor abilities. The results of the medical review shall be used by the IEP team to address any educationally relevant medical findings or other health concerns that may affect the provision of FAPE to students with disabilities. The medical review shall consist of the following components.

1) Subjective information, if relevant, which may include:
   
   A) a description of the perceptions that the parents and student, as applicable, have regarding the student's health;
   
   B) a health history of the student from the parents; and
   
   C) a description of perceptions of the student's teachers relative to how the student's health may be affecting his or her academic performance or access to the curriculum.

2) Objective information, if relevant, which shall include:

   A) a summary of information contained in the student's health record and the record of other health-related information, as defined at 23 Ill. Adm. Code 375.10 (Definitions), about his or her prior and current health conditions; and

   B) a summary of any relevant health-related information obtained from records provided by or requested from the student's parent, health care provider or health facility where the student has received services, which may address prenatal and birth history; early growth and development; medical issues the child has experienced; hospitalizations and significant injuries; medical diagnosis, if any; and medications or treatments the child currently receives.

3) Nursing services, if relevant, which shall include the identification of the school health services or school nurse services necessary to enable a student with a disability to receive FAPE as described in his or her IEP. (34 CFR 300.34(b)(13))
4) Educationally relevant medical findings, which shall include the identification of the medical conditions and other health-related issues that are likely to adversely affect a child's educational performance.

5) Recommendations, which shall include an analysis of the information gathered for the purpose of:

A) determining the medical, school health and/or school nurse services that should be provided during the school day; and

B) developing a proposed plan that provides for specific accommodations, modifications or interventions to be implemented when educationally relevant medical, school health and/or school nurse findings are made, which shall include annual goals, short-term objectives and ongoing evaluation.

b) Qualifications of Personnel

1) Until June 30, 2015, the practitioners who are qualified to conduct a medical review that addresses each of the components listed in subsection (a) of this Section shall be limited to:

A) An individual who holds a professional educator license endorsed for school support personnel in school nursing, pursuant to 23 Ill. Adm. Code 25.245 (Endorsement for School Nurses); or

B) An individual licensed to practice medicine in all of its branches pursuant to the Medical Practice Act of 1987 [225 ILCS 60]; or

C) An individual licensed as a registered professional nurse pursuant to Article 60 of the Nurse Practice Act [225 ILCS 65/Art. 60]; or

D) An individual licensed as an advanced practice nurse pursuant to Article 65 of the Nurse Practice Act [225 ILCS 65/Art. 65].

2) Beginning July 1, 2015, the practitioners who are qualified to conduct certain components of the medical review, as identified in this subsection (b)(2), shall be limited to:
An individual who holds a professional educator license endorsed for school support personnel in school nursing, pursuant to 23 Ill. Adm. Code 25.245 (Endorsement for School Nurses), who may conduct any of the components listed in subsections (a)(1) through (5) of this Section; or

An individual licensed to practice medicine in all of its branches pursuant the Medical Practice Act of 1987 [225 ILCS 60], who may conduct any of those components listed in subsections (a)(1) through (4) of this Section; or

An individual licensed as a registered professional nurse pursuant to Article 60 of the Nurse Practice Act [225 ILCS 65/Art. 60] and who also holds a bachelor's degree in nursing, education or a related field, who may conduct any of those components listed in subsections (a)(1) through (4) of this Section; or

An individual licensed as an advanced practice nurse pursuant to Article 65 of the Nurse Practice Act [225 ILCS 65/Art. 65], who may conduct any of those components listed in subsections (a)(1) through (4) of this Section.

c) Certain exceptions shall apply to the personnel qualifications set forth in subsection (b) of this Section.

1) After July 1, 2015, an individual meeting the qualifications set forth in subsection (b)(1)(B), (b)(1)(C) or (b)(1)(D) of this Section who is currently employed by a school district or special education cooperative also may continue to conduct activities described in subsection (a)(5) of this Section, provided he or she:

A) successfully completes a training course specific to special education laws and regulations and students with disabilities that is approved by the State Board of Education; or

B) passes the content-area test for the school nurse endorsement authorized under 105 ILCS 5/21B-30 and subject to the limitations regarding testing attempts set forth in 23 Ill. Adm. Code 25.720(i) (Applicability of Testing Requirement and Scores).
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C) Any practitioner receiving authorization under subsection (c)(1) of this Section to conduct activities set forth in subsection (a)(5) of this Section retains that authorization provided he or she completes the professional development required at 23 Ill. Adm. Code 25.275 (Renewal of the Professional Educator License for School Support Personnel).

2) Beginning on July 1, 2015, a school district or special education cooperative may first employ a practitioner to conduct the activities described in subsection (a)(5) of this Section who is not fully qualified, provided that each of the conditions listed in this subsection (c)(2) are met.

A) A school district or special education cooperative has not been able to recruit an individual meeting the qualifications set forth in subsection (b)(1)(A) of this Section due to a shortage of these individuals.

B) The school district or special education cooperative must be actively engaged in the recruitment process, as evidenced by written documentation such as notices on the agency's website, postings with professional organizations, or personnel notices placed in newspapers, either online or in print. The school district or special education cooperative shall retain this documentation, which must include the date of publication or notice, for the duration of the employment of the practitioner recruited under the provisions of subsection (c)(2) of this Section, and make it available upon request to the State Board of Education or its designee.

C) Any individual hired pursuant to this subsection (c)(2) shall meet the qualifications of subsection (b)(2)(B), (b)(2)(C) or (b)(2)(D) of this Section and meet either of the requirements stated in subsection (c)(1) of this Section as soon as is practicable, but in no case longer than 12 months from the date of hire.

D) Any practitioner receiving authorization under this subsection (c)(2) to conduct activities set forth in subsection (a)(5) of this Section retains that authorization provided he or she completes the professional development required at 23 Ill. Adm. Code 25.275
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(Renewal of the Professional Educator License for School Support Personnel).

(Source: Old Section repealed at 31 Ill. Reg. 9915, effective June 28, 2007; new Section added at 37 Ill. Reg. ______, effective ____________)

Section 226.840 Qualifications of Evaluators

The following list identifies the credentials required to administer certain types of evaluations. Where no requirements are established, an evaluation may be performed by an individual who is qualified to administer it according to the technical specifications of the publisher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>REQUIRED QUALIFICATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Performance</td>
<td>Teaching certificate/approval appropriate for the age or disability of the child, or School Service Personnel Certificate endorsed for school psychology or guidance. (See Article 21 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/Art.21] and the State Board’s rules at 23 Ill. Adm. Code 1 and 23 Ill. Adm. Code 25.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapted Physical Education</td>
<td>Special Certificate endorsed for physical education with approval in adapted physical education (23 Ill. Adm. Code 25.43).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistive Technology</td>
<td>To the extent that a test is used in performing this assessment, qualification for administering the test according to the instructions provided by the test’s publisher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiological</td>
<td>License to practice as an Audiologist issued by the Department of Financial and Professional Regulation pursuant to the Illinois Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology Practice Act [225 ILCS 110].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Psychological</td>
<td>License issued pursuant to the Clinical Psychologist Licensing Act [225 ILCS 15].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Background Assessment</td>
<td>School Service Personnel Certificate endorsed for school psychology, school social work, or school counseling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE</td>
<td>REQUIRED QUALIFICATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Screening</td>
<td>License to practice as an Audiologist issued by the Department of Financial and Professional Regulation pursuant to the Illinois Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology Practice Act [225 ILCS 110], Special Certificate endorsed for speech and language impairment (23 Ill. Adm. Code 25.45), or certificate of training issued by the Department of Public Health (77 Ill. Adm. Code 675).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Review</td>
<td>Meet the requirements set forth in Section 226.160 of this Part, as applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Until June 30, 2013, a School Service Personnel Certificate endorsed for school nursing (23 Ill. Adm. Code 25.245), or a license to practice medicine in all of its branches, or under Section 60 or 65 of the Nurse Practice Act [225 ILCS 65].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beginning July 1, 2013, a School Service Personnel Certificate endorsed for school nursing (23 Ill. Adm. Code 25.245); or a license to practice medicine in all of its branches; or a bachelor’s degree or higher and a license issued under Article 60 or Article 65 of the Nurse Practice Act [225 ILCS 65/Art. 60 or Art. 65], provided that only a person holding a School Service Personnel Certificate endorsed for school nursing shall make recommendations regarding educational interventions, accommodations or modifications based on the findings of the student’s medical review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurological Evaluation</td>
<td>Licensure/registration issued by the Department of Financial and Professional Regulation pursuant to the Medical Practice Act of 1987 [225 ILCS 60].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE</td>
<td>REQUIRED QUALIFICATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Therapy Evaluation</td>
<td>Certificate/Registration issued by the Department of Financial and Professional Regulation pursuant to the Illinois Occupational Therapy Practice Act [225 ILCS 75].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation/Mobility</td>
<td>Certification for orientation/mobility instruction and evaluation (Certification for Orientation and Mobility, Orientation and Mobility Division, Association for Education and Rehabilitation of the Blind and Visually Impaired, 4600 Duke Street, #430, P.O. Box 22397, Alexandria, Virginia 22304; 1984; no later amendments or editions are included).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Therapy Evaluation</td>
<td>Certificate/registration issued by the Department of Financial and Professional Regulation pursuant to the Illinois Physical Therapy Act [225 ILCS 90].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric Evaluation</td>
<td>Licensure/registration issued by the Department of Financial and Professional Regulation pursuant to the Medical Practice Act of 1987.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(Source: Amended at 37 Ill. Reg. _______, effective ____________)
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
Robert Wolfe, Chief Financial Officer
Nicki Bazer, General Counsel

Agenda Topic: Action Item: Proposed Amendments for Adoption – Part 252 (Driver Education)

Materials: Recommended Rules

Staff Contacts: Tim Imler, Division Administrator

Purpose of Agenda Item
The purpose of this agenda item is to present the proposed amendments for adoption.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
This agenda item primarily links to Strategic Goals 1 and 2 (student achievement and highly prepared and effective teachers), in that the proposed changes will enable school districts to implement driver education programs in a more timely and effective manner.

Expected Outcome of Agenda Item
The Board will be asked to adopt amendments to Part 252.

Background Information
This set of amendments responds to several pieces of recent legislation, each of which is explained below.

P.A. 96-1374, effective July 29, 2010, established the Instructional Mandates Task Force, which was charged with reviewing instructional mandates currently placed on school districts and making recommendations regarding the relaxation or elimination of those mandates. The task force issued its report in June 2011, and of particular interest to the group were mandates concerning driver education. Specifically, the task force suggested increasing flexibility of school districts to offer behind-the-wheel instruction before and after school, in the evening or on weekends without the need to also offer it during the regular school day. (See Section 252.20(b).) This proposed change will assist school districts that are no longer allowed to use simulators, range driving and the like to meet the behind-the-wheel requirement, as those options were eliminated from the law and rules in 2009.

P.A. 97-1025, effective January 1, 2013, made several changes that affect Part 252. First, the public act amended Section 2-3.25g of the School Code relative to requirements for school districts that, through a waiver of agency rules, enter into a contract to provide driver’s education through a commercial driving school. New Section 252.20(e)(2) reminds school districts of their obligation to post the contract with the commercial driver school on its internet website or to make it available upon request, notify the State Board of any personnel changes, and maintain records of all materials related to the waiver application for the term of the waiver’s approval.
Additionally, P.A. 97-1025 amended Section 27-24.4 of the School Code, regarding reimbursement for students completing driver’s education. The law clarifies the responsibility that certain parties (i.e., school district of residence of a nonpublic school student, the school district where the student enrolls in driver’s education, or the student’s parents) have for the cost (as defined in the law) of the driver’s education course. The law provides that the parents of the nonpublic school student are responsible for reimbursing the nonresident district the amount that exceeds the cost of providing the course by the resident district. Should the nonpublic student choose to take the course in another district (i.e., not his or her resident district nor the one where the nonpublic school is located), then his or her parents would pay the full cost of the course. The nonpublic school student can continue to take the course at his or her resident district on the same basis as other students who are enrolled in the district. A cross-reference to this statutory provision is proposed in Section 252.30(a)(2).

Finally, P.A. 97-1025 added Section 27-24.9 of the School Code, which requires the State Board of Education, in consultation with the Secretary of State (SOS), to adopt course content standards for driver education. SOS drafted proposed standards, which address operation and equipment of motor vehicles and were reviewed by the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules earlier this month. A cross-reference to SOS’ standards is proposed in the State Board’s rules at Section 252.20(c)(1).

P.A. 97-607, effective August 26, 2011, has resulted in minor changes being proposed in Section 252.40 regarding the issuance of “licenses” rather “certificates”. This law created the educator licensure system, which will take effect July 1, 2013, necessitating the change in terminology used in this Part.

Other technical changes also are proposed to clarify certain of the rules’ requirements, in particular Section 252.20(c)(3), which acknowledges that the requirement for a student driver to have observers in the car during behind-the-wheel instruction would not apply if a student’s Individualized Education Program stipulates otherwise.

The proposed rules were published in the Illinois Register December 28, 2012, to elicit public comment; one was received. A summary and analysis of the public comment, and any recommendations for changes as a result, is attached.

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

Policy Implications: Please see “Background” above.

Budget Implications: None.

Legislative Action: None.

Communication: Please see “Next Steps” below.

**Pros and Cons of Various Actions**

Moving forward with the recommendations of the Instructional Mandates Task Force provides much needed flexibility for school districts to implement programs that better meet local needs. Further, it is advisable to have a single set of standards for training drivers under age 18, so it would be appropriate for the agency to adopt the standards developed by SOS. Other changes are necessitated by recent statutory changes, and acknowledgement of these changes in the rules updates and clarifies the rules for those regulated by them.

Not proceeding with the changes will mean that certain school districts will continue to struggle with difficulties associated with providing all eligible students with behind-the-wheel instruction in
a timely manner. Additionally, failure to align the rules with current law is likely to cause confusion for school districts as they implement driver education programs.

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

The State Board of Education hereby adopts the proposed rulemaking for:

Driver Education (23 Illinois Administrative Code 252),

Further, the Board authorizes the State Superintendent of Education to make such technical and nonsubstantive changes as the State Superintendent may deem necessary in response to suggestions or objections of the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules.

**Next Steps**
Notice of the adopted rules will be submitted to the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules to initiate JCAR’s review. When that process is complete, the rules will be filed with the Secretary of State and disseminated as appropriate.
Summary and Analysis of Public Comment
23 Ill. Adm. Code 252 (Driver Education)

Comment

The Illinois High School and College Driver Education Association, Inc., (IHSCDEA) submitted the only comment received on this rulemaking. The group objected to the standards for driver education content that are being placed in the rules by cross-reference to standards that the Secretary of State’s office (SOS) currently is promulgating for drivers under age 18 (see Section 252.20(c)(1)). These standards will apply equally to commercial driving schools and, under the agency's proposed rules, to students who take driver education in programs approved by the State Board.

In particular, the group argues that either the standards developed by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration or curriculum materials that the association developed in 1972 would be more appropriate than the standards being promulgated by SOS. It claims that the proposed SOS standards have "little or no educational value beyond a rudimentary outline of an extremely complicated driving task". The association also contends that the SOS standards will have the effect of "lower course standards and learner outcomes" than school districts may currently be using. The adoption of SOS standards by the agency "will have a direct negative impact on the safety and well-being of Illinois teen drivers", as well as drivers in the state, the association concluded.

Further, the association argues that the State Board failed to "meet the intent or spirit" of Section 27-24.9 of the School Code, which requires that the agency work in consultation with SOS to "adopt" standards. Instead of simply adopting the SOS standards, the association stated that State Board staff should have used a process, to develop driver education content standards, that was similar to the one used to develop other subject area standards, such as those for science, math and foreign languages.

Analysis

SOS staff reported that they reviewed the driver education standards used in several states as a guide in drafting the standards that eventually were proposed at 92 Illinois Administrative Code 1060.181. Those proposed standards were initially shared with commercial driving schools that offer teen driving programs and further revisions were made. In late summer, SOS’s proposed standards were provided to several education-related organizations for their review. These included the IHSCDEA, Illinois Association of School Boards, and Illinois Education Association, as well as City of Chicago School District 299 and the Illinois State Police.

At the time of the review, only the IHSCDEA raised any concerns, asking that the State Board adopt the classroom standards that the association had developed rather than incorporating those proposed by SOS. In response to this suggestion, agency staff compared the association’s driver education standards with the ones proposed by SOS and concluded that while the association provided greater detail in its document concerning specific curriculum and lesson plans, its learning objectives aligned to SOS’s proposed standards.

It is also important to understand that standards, by their very nature, are general statements of the knowledge and skills that students should acquire as a result of their schooling. In this vein, the additional information and guidance contained both in the IHSCDEA and the National
Highway Traffic Safety Administration documents address the content of curriculum rather than the standards to which students should be held based on completion of that curriculum. Further, the national association's assumptions about driver education differ in several significant ways, in particular by advocating for 45 hours of classroom theory (opposed to Illinois' 30) and 10 hours of behind-the-wheel instruction (rather than six hours). While the State Board has standards in the fundamental areas of schooling, as required to be offered under the School Code, it does not require the use of certain lessons plans and curricular materials nor does it dictate course content for these critical subject areas. IHSCDEA may share its and the national association's documents with driver education instructors to encourage their incorporation, as applicable. As with other curricular standards, a district determines locally the methods to be used to ensure students are able to meet those standards upon course completion, and its students' pass rates on driver education exams will be a strong barometer of the rigor of both the standards and the district's curriculum.

As for the process that was used for standards' development, staff support the use of the SOS as the lead agency in developing standards for several reasons. First, the standards will apply to any course designed for drivers under age 18, whether offered by public schools or commercial driver training schools; therefore, it is preferable for Illinois to have a single set of standards that apply to all programs rather than two separate, yet highly similar sets of standards.

Second, SOS is the state agency that is charged with licensing individuals to operate vehicles and for ensuring the safety of both drivers and others when vehicles are operated. SOS, rather than the State Board, determines the knowledge and skills, as assessed through both written and driving tests, that a student must possess in order to receive an Illinois driver's license. As such, it seems counterintuitive for the State Board not to rely on SOS staff's expertise when adopting standards to be used to train students in the programs that the State Board approves. The fact that SOS would take the lead in writing the standards also was made clear during meetings last year with the sponsor of P.A. 97-1025 and other stakeholder groups.

Finally, the agency has been not employed a driver education expert since the early 2000s due to downsizing and budget constraints. Although staff believe they have a productive working relationship with IHSCDEA, they nonetheless believe that the state agency responsible for issuing driver's licenses is capable of determining the standards that should apply to licensing.

**Recommendation**

No changes are recommended in response to these comments.

**Comment**

The IHSCDEA also objected to the proposed change in Section 252.20(b)(1) that allows school districts to determine locally the times in which behind-the-wheel instruction (BTW) should be provided. The group indicated that allowing districts to offer BTW only before or after school or on the weekends (rather than also during the regular school day) creates a "disjointed learning environment" that would lead to extended "time gaps" between the time in which students complete the classroom portion of the course and when they are practicing in a vehicle what they have learned in the classroom. Eliminating the requirement that BTW must be offered during the school day would result in school districts "not (being) required to offer the behind-the-wheel phase until the following summer, 9 months later", the association contended.
While the association also acknowledged that some school districts currently do not offer BTW during the regular school day due to approved waiver requests, it suggests that those districts have provided to the State Board an explanation of how the alternate schedule is "in the best interests of students" and that this explanation is required under the waiver process. Additionally, the association correctly states that the waiver process, which requires a public hearing be held about any request, provides an opportunity for the district to receive input from parents and students about the proposed change.

The association also asked for a fuller explanation of why the change (i.e., not requiring that some BTW be offered during the regular school day) was being proposed at all.

**Analysis**

The proposed change is not intended to delay any student's participation in BTW, particularly until the following summer. In fact, the proposed change must be read in conjunction with the rule at Section 252.20(c)(2), which states (emphasis added):

> The classroom and the behind-the-wheel instruction each must be scheduled regularly throughout a period of not less than six complete weeks.

Taken together, the rules would prohibit a school district from placing a student in the 30-hour classroom portion of the approved driver education course, say, at the beginning of the year, and then not offering the six-hour BTW until the following summer since both portions of the instruction must be scheduled at regular intervals. The instruction also must occur in not less than six weeks. Unless a school district was offering only minutes of driver education instruction each week, it would be difficult for it to extend "regularly" scheduled driver education class periods for a full school year given the requirements that a typical school year includes potentially consists of 880 clock-hours of instruction versus the minimum of 36 clock-hours required for a driver education course.

Additionally, the waiver process does not require that school districts provide information relative to how offering BTW outside of the regular school day "is in the best interest of students". Since these requests are waivers of agency rules, the district could provide a rationale that addresses student performance but may also use a rationale based on economics, effectiveness or efficiency. Of the half of dozen or so such waivers that are currently approved, all of them used cost-savings as a primary rationale for offering BTW outside of the school day or during the summer. Also, while it is true under certain approved waivers some school districts offer BTW only during the summer months, the rule, as modified, neither encourages nor requires that districts do so. The rule, however, could be clarified to direct school districts to the companion requirement in Section 252.20(c)(1). Under this proposed modification, school districts would still be required to submit a waiver request if they want to offer BTW only during the summer months.

As to why the rule is being modified, P.A. 96-1374, effective July 29, 2010, established the Instructional Mandates Task Force, which suggested that the agency increase the flexibility of school districts to offer behind-the-wheel instruction before and after school, in the evening or on weekends without the need to also offer it during the regular school day. Under the current rules, school districts are only obligated to offer one section of BTW during the school day, allowing many school districts to provide most of their BTW outside of the regular school day. For those districts that do offer the majority of BTW outside the regular school day, the effect of the rule change would be minimal. The proposed amendments, if promulgated, would enable
those school districts that are contemplating offering BTW only outside of the school day to do so without having to go through the cumbersome waiver process and incur additional expenses associated with that process.

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that Section 252.20(b) be modified as follows.

b) When to Offer the Course - The classroom portion of the course shall be during the school day and may be offered at other times (i.e., before or after school, in the evenings or on weekends). The school district shall determine when to offer the behind-the-wheel portion of the course during the regular school year, which may be during the school day, at times other than during the school day, or through a combination of both options; however, this subsection (b) shall not authorize a school district to offer behind-the-wheel instruction only during the summer. (Also see Section 252.20(c)(1).)

**Comment**

The association asks that a "traffic safety committee" be "re-established" in the spring.

**Analysis**

Neither agency staff who handle driver education reimbursement nor SOS staff are familiar with a "traffic safety committee" that may have existed in the past (although Secretary of State Jesse White chaired a Graduated Driver License Task Force in 2007). Nor does it appear that any such committee was required to be established by the State Board of Education under now repealed Section 27-23 of the School Code, which governed the provision of school districts' driver education under the Motor Vehicle Code. From the association's comment, it appears as though the group is working with the legislature and other advocates to establish this committee.

**Recommendation**

No change is recommended in response to this comment.
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TITLE 23: EDUCATION AND CULTURAL RESOURCES
SUBTITLE A: EDUCATION
CHAPTER I: STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
SUBCHAPTER g: SPECIAL COURSES OF STUDY

PART 252
DRIVER EDUCATION

Section 252.20 Administration and Procedures

a) Availability of the Course - Any public school district maintaining grades 9 through 12 must provide the driver education course for any legal resident of the district between the ages of 15 and 21 years who requests the course, provided the resident is eligible as set forth in Section 27-24.2 of the School Code. All eligible students who reside in a school district must be provided an equal opportunity to enroll in driver education, and school districts are obligated to
make the driver education course available within a reasonable length of time after each individual’s declaration of intent is made. A "reasonable length of time" shall be determined based on the student's individual needs and the school district's ability to meet those needs, provided that the course must be offered within 12 months after the declaration of intent.

1) Public school districts that include high schools must provide the driver education course for all eligible students of the district who attend a nonpublic school that does not offer the course.

2) Nonpublic schools may offer a driver education course at their own expense.

3) Public school districts that include high schools must provide the driver education course for all eligible Illinois students, regardless of the district of their residence, who attend a nonpublic school located within that school district's boundaries when application is made by the administrators of the nonpublic school. The application shall constitute a declaration of intent by the affected student or students. By April 1, the nonpublic school shall notify the district offering the course of the names and district numbers of the nonresident students desiring to take such a course the next school year. The district offering the course shall notify the district of residence of those students affected by April 15. [105 ILCS 5/27-24.4]

4) An eligible student may elect to enroll in a driver education course at a commercial driver training school at his or her expense.

b) When to Offer the Course - Any school district that includes one or more high schools offering a driver education course and must offer the classroom portion of the course shall be during the school day and may be offered at other times (i.e., before or after school, in the evenings or on weekends). The school district shall determine when to offer the behind-the-wheel portion of the course during the regular school year, which may be during the school day, at times other than during the school day, or through a combination of both options; however, this subsection (b) shall not authorize a school district to offer behind-the-wheel instruction only during the summer. (Also see Section 252.20(c)(1).)
Enrollment in a driver education course must be closed at the inception of the course, except as provided in subsection (b)(2) of this Section. Another course may be started when enrollment warrants.

2) A student who transfers to a new school after the inception of the driver education course at that school may be allowed to enroll in the course under the following conditions.

A) The driver education course in which the student was enrolled at the previous school offered 30 clock hours of classroom instruction and 6 clock hours of behind-the-wheel instruction.

B) The length of time the student previously participated in the driver education course (prior to his or her transfer) is sufficient to allow the student to complete the course at the new school within the time during which it is offered.

C) The new school has received verification, either by mail or in an electronic format, of the student's previous participation in the driver education course (i.e., length of time in the course, grades received). The verification shall be placed in the student's temporary school record as defined in 23 Ill. Adm. Code 375.10.

3) A high school student may be allowed to commence the classroom instruction part of the driver education course prior to reaching age 15 if the student will be eligible to complete the entire course within 12 months after being allowed to commence classroom instruction. (See Section 27-24.2 of the School Code.)

c) Course Organization - Driver education courses must be organized according to the standards established in the Driver Education Act [105 ILCS 5/27-24 through 27-24.10 27-24.8] and this Part.

1) The classroom and the behind-the-wheel instruction shall be aligned to the course content standards set forth at 92 Ill. Adm. Code 1060.181 (Teen Accreditation Classroom and Behind-the-Wheel Requirements).

2) The classroom and the behind-the-wheel instruction each must be scheduled regularly throughout a period of not less than six complete
weeks (four weeks allowable in summer courses and for schools using block scheduling).

3) Behind-the-wheel instruction shall not begin until the student has started classroom instruction; however, a student may be enrolled in both portions of the course on a concurrent basis.

4) At least one but not more than three student observers must be in the car during behind-the-wheel instruction. At least one hour of observation time is required for each hour of behind-the-wheel instruction. This subsection (c)(4) does not apply when a student’s Individualized Education Program stipulates that the student receive behind-the-wheel instruction separately.

d) Dual-Control Cars - The instructor shall occupy the front passenger seat. The driver education car is to be used for instructional purposes. A school district may not use the driver education car for purposes other than those designated by agreement or contract.

e) Contracting - In fulfilling the requirements of the Driver Education Act, a public school district must either offer the course in its own school or must provide the course for its students, and any other legal residents of the school district who request the course, through a joint agreement with another public school district or through the provisions of cooperative school district programs. Schools offering a driver education course shall not contract for the course from any individual or commercial driver training school, except as provided in subsection (e)(1(f) of this Section or through a waiver approved pursuant to Section 2-3.25g of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/2-3.25g].

1) A public school district may contract for the provision of the behind-the-wheel portion of the course for students who have physical limitations that would require the use of a specially equipped car or for students who require other specialized instruction (e.g., vision or hearing impairments, cognitive disabilities) provided that:

   A) the facility is approved by the Illinois Secretary of State (SOS) as meeting all of the requirements of Chapter 6, Article IV of the Illinois Vehicle Code [625 ILCS 5/Ch. 6 Art. IV 5/Art. IV] and of rules promulgated by SOS (see 92 Ill. Adm. Code 1030 (Issuance of Licenses));
B) each instructor providing instruction to the public school district's students is certified as a Driver Rehabilitation Specialist by the ADED - the Association for Driver Rehabilitation Specialists (see http://www.driver-ed.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=1), 2425 N. Center Street, #369, Hickory, North Carolina 28601; and

C) the facility conducts an evaluation of the student's physical and cognitive abilities to determine the individualized course of instruction.

2) Subject to the limitations set forth in Section 2-3.25g(d) of the School Code, a district that provides driver education through a contract with a commercial driver training school pursuant to an approved waiver shall:

A) post the contract with the commercial driver training school on its website or, if it does not maintain a website, make the contract available upon request;

B) notify the State Board of Education within 15 calendar days of an instructor leaving the program or a new instructor being assigned. The notice shall include the instructor's name, birth date and driver's license number, and the personal identification number assigned by the State Board; and

C) maintain a record, for the term of the waiver's approval, of all materials related to the application for the waiver, which shall be made available to parents and guardians upon request.

(Source: Amended at 37 Ill. Reg. ______, effective ____________)

Section 252.30 The Terms of Reimbursement for Public School Participation in the Course

a) Claims for Reimbursement - These shall be made under oath or affirmation of the chief school administrator for the district employed by the school board or authorized driver education personnel employed by the school board [105 ILCS 5/27-24.6].

1) Reimbursement shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of Sections 27-24.4 and 27-24.5 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/27-24.4 and 27-24.5].
2) The school district that is the residence of an eligible pupil who attends a nonpublic school in another district that has furnished the driver education course shall reimburse the district offering the course the difference between the actual per capita cost of giving the course the previous school year and the amount reimbursed by the State (Section 27-24.4 of the School Code), subject to the limitations regarding the reimbursement amount that are set forth in Section 27-24.2 of the School Code. This arrangement shall also apply in the case of tuition students who receive driver education from the districts where they are enrolled rather than from their respective districts of residence.

3) The district may charge a reasonable fee not to exceed the amount specified in Section 27-24.2 of the School Code to students who participate in a driver education course approved in accordance with this Part. No other fee or portion thereof shall be charged to students and attributed to the driver education course. As used in this Part, "reasonable fee" means a fee calculated by dividing the sum of documented annual district costs for items such as instructional materials (if not included in the district's textbook rental fee), the cost of driver education cars, car maintenance costs, fuel, and insurance by the number of students enrolled or participating in the driver education course. The district's costs used in this calculation shall not include any portion of the salaries or benefits of school district personnel. For purposes of this calculation, the cost of driver education cars that are purchased by the district shall be amortized over a five-year period, and the cost of leasing cars shall be included in the fee calculation in the year the costs are incurred.

4) The driver education fee shall be waived with respect to any student who applies pursuant to this subsection and who is eligible for free lunches or breakfasts pursuant to the School Breakfast and Lunch Program Act [105 ILCS 125] and 23 Ill. Adm. Code 305 (School Food Service), and with respect to other students in accordance with the district's policy adopted in accordance with Section 1.245 (Waiver of School Fees) of the rules of the State Board of Education (see 23 Ill. Adm. Code 1, (Public Schools Evaluation, Recognition and Supervision)).

b) Transfer Student – For any transfer student as defined in Section 252.20(b)(2) of this Part, reimbursement shall be claimed only by the school district to which the student has transferred.
c) Cooperative School Programs - In fulfilling the requirements for reimbursement, a school district must provide a driver education course or participate in a special education cooperative or be part of an approved joint school agreement with another public school district.

d) Contracting - School districts providing the driver education course through a contract as provided under Section 252.20(e)(1) 252.20(f) of this Part or under a waiver granted pursuant to Section 2-3.25g of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/2-3.25g (see 23 Ill. Adm. Code 1.100)] shall make a claim for reimbursement by submitting, in a format specified by the State Superintendent of Education, the names of the students successfully completing the course and the date of course completion for each.

e) Records - Daily attendance records shall be kept by the teachers in the manner prescribed in Section 27-24.6 of the School Code and are to be used to certify claims made under the Act.

1) Records in either paper or electronic format must be maintained by the school to substantiate daily lessons, time behind the wheel, observation time, and periodic as well as final evaluation of each student. Also recorded shall be the beginning and ending dates of classroom and behind-the-wheel instruction. Students are to be identified by their instructional permit number, name, address and other personal information.

2) The Such records are to be on file in the office of the driver education supervisor, principal, or other manager at the time reimbursement and/or certification is requested.

3) Driver education participation records are to be kept and be readily available for a period of not less than three years.

4) All records are subject to yearly audit by State auditors.

(Source: Amended at 37 Ill. Reg. _____, effective ____________)

Section 252.40 Driver Education Personnel Requirements

a) Qualifications of Teachers - All persons who teach a driver education course must meet the applicable standards of this subsection (a).
1) A driver education instructor who teaches in a public school district shall hold a professional educator license endorsed for the secondary grades teaching certificate and either have an endorsement for safety and driver education or meet the requirements of 23 Ill. Adm. Code 1.730(q) through January 31, 2012. Each individual first assigned to teach safety and driver education on or after February 1, 2012 shall be required to hold a professional educator license endorsed certificate valid for both the secondary grades and safety and driver education an endorsement received pursuant to 23 Ill. Adm. Code 25.100(m) 25.100(n).

2) A driver education instructor who teaches in a nonpublic school is not required to be certified but must hold a baccalaureate degree, or equivalent as determined by the employing school, and meet the requirements of 23 Ill. Adm. Code 1.730(q) through January 31, 2012. Each individual first assigned to teach safety and driver education on or after February 1, 2012 shall meet the course requirements of 23 Ill. Adm. Code 25.100(k) 25.100(n).

3) A driver education instructor who teaches in either a public school district or in a nonpublic school must:

   A) possess good physical health as determined in accordance with Section 24-5 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/24-5]; and

   B) hold a valid driver’s license in good standing that has been issued by the state in which he or she resides. For the purposes of this subsection (a)(3)(B), a driver’s license issued in Illinois shall not be considered valid and in good standing if it is revoked, suspended, expired or cancelled as described in Sections 6-201 through 6-209 of the Illinois Driver Licensing Law [625 ILCS 5/6-201 through 6-209] or if restrictions have been placed on driving privileges through either a restricted driving permit under Section 6-205(c)(1) or monitoring device driving judicial driving permit under Section 6-206.1.

4) Additional requirements will not be retroactive as pertaining to those qualified under standards applicable prior to September 1, 1962, so long as they continue to teach driver education in the same district, except in the event the method of instruction has been changed to include simulation.
and/or multiple-car laboratory instruction. (See 23 Ill. Adm. Code 1.730(q).) The prescribed additional requirements effective July 1, 1969, must be met.

5) When schools have a department chairman or a person designated to supervise the driver education program, this person must be qualified as described in this Section.

b) Invalid Driver's License - The State Board of Education, using information provided by the Secretary of State, shall on a regular basis provide to school districts and nonpublic schools employing driver education instructors who possess Illinois driver's licenses a list of driver education instructors who are in possession of an invalid driver's license as described in subsection (a)(3)(B) of this Section. It shall be the responsibility of the school district or nonpublic school employing an instructor who holds an out-of-state license to ensure that that license is valid and in good standing (e.g., has not been revoked, suspended, expired, or cancelled or is restricted by the state issuing the license).

1) After receiving the list, or confirmation that an out-of-state license is invalid, the school district or nonpublic school shall inform each of the instructors in writing of the determination that he or she is in possession of an invalid license and that he or she has no more than five school days to provide evidence to the school district or nonpublic school disputing the determination.

2) If the initial determination is found to be correct (i.e., the instructor's license is not valid), then the driver education instructor shall be removed from the driver education program immediately.

3) A driver education instructor who is removed from his or her teaching position due to an invalid license shall not be allowed to teach a driver education course for three years following the reinstatement of a valid driver's license.

4) For the purposes of this subsection (b), a driver education instructor shall not be subject to the three-year suspension described in subsection (b)(3) of this Section if:

A) the invalid license is restored to good standing, and
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B) the reason that the license was invalidated is due to a non-serious violation not related to driving ability or performance (e.g., failure to renew a license, failure to pay traffic fines, not possessing a mandatory insurance card).

c) Administrators and teachers of State-approved high school driver education courses shall not acquire an interest in, teach in, or solicit for a commercial driver training school.

(Source: Amended at 37 Ill. Reg. _____, effective ____________)
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
Robert Wolfe, Chief Financial Officer

Agenda Topic: Approval of Intergovernmental Agreement Exceeding $1 Million with E. St. Louis School District 189 - $9 Million for Ordinary and Contingent Expenses

Materials: N/A

Staff Contact(s): Deb Vespa

Purpose of Agenda Item
In accordance with PA 98-0001, to obtain approval to execute an intergovernmental agreement to award E. St. Louis School District 189 $9,000,000 for ordinary and contingent expenses. This supplemental appropriation was effective February 7, 2013.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
This agenda item has a direct correlation with all goals in the Board’s Strategic Plan. Without sufficient funding, the District will not be able to continue to operate to achieve any of the three goals.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
This agenda item will be discussed as part of the consent agenda and then be called for a vote by the Board. It is expected that staff will receive the Board’s authorization to enter into the Intergovernmental Agreement.

Background Information
E. St. Louis School District 189 is a unit district in St. Clair County. It has an enrollment of approximately 6,300 students and fourteen facilities.

Financial Oversight:
In May 2011, ISBE and E. St. Louis School District entered into an intergovernmental agreement for a voluntary partnership between the two parties for additional oversight by ISBE. This agreement was in place until May 2012 at which time the State Board approved a Financial Oversight Panel for the District.

Many budgetary reductions have already been made. Below is a summary of the budget reductions and financial outlook for the District:

Staff Reductions:
There has been a significant reduction in force since ISBE’s interaction with the District. Current staffing level is at 734 positions:

- Teachers 374
- Administrators 67
- Certified Support 63
Instructional Aides 101
Other Non-Certified 129

Below is a summary of the District's staffing levels over the past few fiscal years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Staff Level</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010</td>
<td>1,288</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011</td>
<td>1,167 (decrease of 121 positions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012</td>
<td>864 (decrease of 303 positions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013</td>
<td>734 (decrease of 130 positions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total decrease in staff: 554 positions or 43% since FY 2010.

Facility Closures
In addition to the reduction in staff, two elementary schools were closed in June 2011 and five elementary schools were closed in June 2012.

All of the projections are based upon unaudited 2012 financial data as the beginning point. The District's AFR is not yet completed due to complications with the Special Education Cooperative and the Vocational Cooperative. Many of the revenues and expenditures of the two cooperatives have been combined within the District's books instead of being maintained separate and distinct from District records.

Financial Outlook
Even with the budget reductions, expenditures continue to outpace revenues. For FY 2012, it is projected they will realize a deficit of $3.2 million. The deficit is expected to increase to $6.9 million for FY 2013 and $19.7 million for FY 2014.

The decline in revenue over the last few years has also contributed to the financial decline. The District is heavy reliant upon State funding which is approximately 70% of their total revenue. General State Aid funding comprises 54.5% of the State funding. Federal funding comprises 23% of the total revenue while local funding only comprises 7% of the total funding.

The District has an extremely low EAV per student of $17,010. The statewide average is $289,272 EAV per student. Because of the low EAV, the total tax rate is $10.0665 and the operating tax rate is $8.0142. The District's EAV per student and the operating tax rate would generate an estimated $1,363 per student or 5.88% of what the statewide EAV would generate at the same operating tax rate ($17,010 times $8.0142 per $100 EAV). The statewide EAV would generate an estimated $23,183 per student at the same tax rate ($289,272 times $8.0142 per $100 EAV).
Due to declining enrollment and proration of General State Aid appropriation, E. St. Louis’ General State Aid has decreased a total of $13.9 million over the past two years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Total General State Aid Prior to Proration (Gross Entitlement)</th>
<th>Total General State Aid After Proration</th>
<th>Decrease From Prior Year’s Gross Entitlement</th>
<th>Decrease Due to Enrollment Decline</th>
<th>Decrease Due to Statewide Proration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$60.8</td>
<td>$60.8</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$57.6</td>
<td>$54.7</td>
<td>$6.1</td>
<td>$3.2</td>
<td>$2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$55.9</td>
<td>$49.8</td>
<td>$7.8</td>
<td>$1.7</td>
<td>$6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$174.3</td>
<td>$165.3</td>
<td>$13.9</td>
<td>$4.9</td>
<td>$9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If General State Aid is prorated at 82.1145% for FY 2014, it is estimated that the District will lose another $10 million.

What is currently being reviewed for the financial plan?

- The wall-to-wall labor contract is currently being negotiated for FY 2014.
- Five additional facilities may be closed:
  - 1 elementary facility
  - 3 middle schools
  - 1 alternative high school
- Further staff reductions
- Possibly eliminating music, band, art and athletics
- Reviews are being conducted to reduce overall expenditures another $10 million
- Inquiring into borrowing $12 million in General State Aid Alternate Revenue notes for a short-term period. However, this borrowing would need to be paid back over a thirteen month period and deflect approximately $1.2 million each month in General State Aid proceeds from operation funds to make debt payments.

Cash Flow Projections:

- Even with the budget reductions that have already been realized, the District is projected to realize a cash shortage in June 2013.
- With the infusion of the $9 million State grant, it is estimated that the cash flow can be sustained through September 2013.
- If the $9 million State grant and $10 million in additional budget reductions are realized, it is estimated that the cash flow can be sustained through February 2014.
- If the $9 million State grant and $10 million in additional budget reductions are realized, and the short-term borrowing is obtained, it is estimated that the cash flow can be sustained through May 2014.

Financial

The contract will be awarded for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the East St. Louis School District through June 30, 2013. Funding in the amount of $9,000,000 is provided by General Revenue Funds.
Shown below is a summary for the funding for the proposed contract:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Contract State Funding</th>
<th>Current Contract Federal Funding</th>
<th>Requested Additional State Funding</th>
<th>Requested Additional Federal Funding</th>
<th>Total Contract per Fiscal Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 9,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 9,000,000</td>
<td>$ 9,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effectiveness**

It is projected that the $9 million grant will sustain district operations through September 2013. In the duration, the District Board and Financial Oversight Panel are jointly meeting to identify an additional $10 million in budgetary reductions and attempting to obtain short-term borrowing of $12 million. The grant, $10 budget reductions, and short-term loan are projected to sustain the district through May 2014. Further budget reductions will be necessary to sustain the cash flow beyond May 2014. Estimated cash flow needs for June 2014 are projected to be $400,000.

Once the FY 2014 Financial Plan is finalized, the Financial Oversight Panel and the District Board will be able to engage in discussions and finalize a three year financial plan.

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

**Policy Implications:** Because of the economic impacts and reduced local, State and federal funding, many school districts are beginning to realize financial hardships. If General State Aid continues to be prorated, several districts may require supplemental appropriations in the future.

**Budget Implications:** The budget implications for E. St. Louis will be dire if they do not receive these funds. It is estimated that they will not be able to sustain their cash flow beyond May 2013.

**Legislative Action:** No further legislative action required

**Communication:** Communicate to School District 189 administration the approval of the funds.

**Pros and Cons of Various Actions**

**Pros:** E. St. Louis will be able to realize positive cash balances a little longer, giving them time to develop a plan to further reduce their expenditures, obtain their FY 2012 Annual Financial Report, and continue to review options to obtain short-term borrowing. This will enable them to continue to provide an education to their students.

**Cons:** As mentioned above, many districts are beginning to realize financial constraints due to decreasing revenues and economic impacts. Many may feel these funds would be better spent by appropriating them through the General State Aid formula.

**Superintendent’s Recommendation**

I recommend that the State Board approved the $9 million grant to be awarded to E. St. Louis School District 189
I recommend that the following motion be adopted:

In accordance with PA 98-001, the State Board of Education approves entering into an Intergovernmental Agreement with East St. Louis School District 189 in the amount of $9,000,000 through June 30, 2013.

**Next Steps**
Upon Board authorization, Agency staff will enter into an Intergovernmental Agreement with E. St. Louis School District 189.
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
      Peter Godard, Chief Performance Officer

Agenda Topic: Request for RFSP – Survey of Learning Conditions

Staff Contact(s): Christi Chadwick, Director of Performance Management

Purpose of Agenda Item
The Center for Performance seeks a contractor to develop and administer a statewide survey of
learning conditions as required by Section 2-3.153 of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/2-3.153].
Pursuant to Section 24A-20 (a) (6) of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/24A-20 (a) (6)], one or more
instruments must be developed and administered to provide feedback to principals on the
instructional environment within a school.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
The following action will support Goal 1 & 2 in the Board’s Strategic Plan. (GOAL 1: Every
student will demonstrate academic achievement and be prepared for success after high school;
GOAL 2: Every student will be supported by highly prepared and effective teachers and school
leaders.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
It is expected that the Board will authorize the State Superintendent to execute such RFSP
subject to staff recommendations.

Background Information
Background
Surveys on school climate and learning conditions are designed to measure intangible, yet
essential, aspects of a school’s learning and teaching environment. They address these factors
by asking specific stakeholders about their perceptions of issues such as trust between students
and teachers; school-parent communication; the physical and emotional safety of the facility; the
level of support that teachers feel is available and present in the working environment; and how
instructional staff is included in learning and decision-making processes.

Because information regarding school climate and learning conditions can be so powerful for
educators, parents, and legislators, twenty-five states currently include information on school
safety in their state school report cards, and six include extensive learning environment
information. In Illinois, the following were impetuses for adopting instruments and systems to
measure climate/conditions:

A. Public Act 96-0861. Referred to as the Performance Evaluation Reform Act (PERA) of 2010,
the Act requires ISBE to develop and implement “[o]ne or more instruments to provide feedback
to principals on the instructional environment within a school” [105 ILCS 5/24A-20 (a) (6)]. The
survey developed and administered through this contract will be used to fulfill that statutory
requirement.
B. **Public Act 97-008.** Often referred to under its pre-passage name, Senate Bill 7, this Act was passed in 2011 and transforms the way teacher evaluations will be used in the State. Illinois has been hailed as a national leader for the collaborative nature of the stakeholder negotiations around the bill. Part of the Act also requires ISBE to “select for statewide administration an instrument to provide feedback from, at a minimum, students in grades 6 through 12 and teachers on the instructional environment within a school after giving consideration to the recommendations of the Performance Evaluation Advisory Council” [105 ILCS 5/2-3.153]. The survey developed and administered through this contract is expected to fulfill the requirements cited in this legislation.

C. **P-20 Council.** The State’s P-20 Education Council’s Data and Accountability Subcommittee convened a Report Card Working Group to make recommendations to the legislature for updating and improving the State’s school report card. Some of these recommendations were reflected in Public Act 97-0671, which revised the statutory requirements for school and district report cards. In addition to several other factors, report cards must also include “2 or more indicators from any school climate survey developed by the State” [105 ILCS 5/10-17a (2) (E)]. The climate survey developed and administered through this contract will make that data collection and reporting possible.

In 2012, the Illinois State Board of Education selected a vendor for its first survey of learning conditions through competitive bid. Currently, the University of Chicago is conducting the Illinois 5Essentials survey under the contract that resulted from that procurement. Early implementation measures suggest that this implementation has been very successful with more than 80% of school districts surveying teachers and 50% of school districts surveying students only half-way through the survey administration window.

Through this first year of implementation, staff have learned that substantial technical support for the field is required in order to ensure successful implementation. As a result, staff believe the contract needs to be rebid with a wider scope of services than that allowed under the 2011 procurement. Among the requirements of the new RFSP will be comparability of data with that currently being collected.

**Financial Background**

The contract will be awarded to extend from July 1, 2013, or upon execution whichever is later, until June 30, 2014. There will be four possible one-year renewals contingent upon a sufficient appropriation for the program and the satisfactory performance of the contractor in the preceding contract year. The total contract will not exceed $1,806,552. This contract will be partially funded by the Race to the Top grant.

Shown below is a summary for the funding for the proposed contract:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Contract State Funding</th>
<th>Current Contract Federal Funding</th>
<th>Requested Additional State Funding</th>
<th>Requested Additional Federal Funding</th>
<th>Total Contract per Fiscal Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 400,000</td>
<td>$ 106,552</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 506,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 322,181</td>
<td>$ 77,819</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Effectiveness
Targets have been set for the initial contract, but as the survey window is still open, we have yet to determine whether our targets have been met. We will continue to set targets for both survey completion, as well as how districts are improving on the responses to the survey.

Analysis and Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action and Communications
A. Public Act 96-0861. Referred to as the Performance Evaluation Reform Act (PERA) of 2010, the Act requires ISBE to develop and implement “[o]ne or more instruments to provide feedback to principals on the instructional environment within a school” [105 ILCS 5/24A-20 (a) (6)]. The survey developed and administered through this contract will be used to fulfill that statutory requirement.

B. Public Act 97-008. Often referred to under its pre-passage name, Senate Bill 7, this Act was passed in 2011 and transforms the way teacher evaluations will be used in the State. Illinois has been hailed as a national leader for the collaborative nature of the stakeholder negotiations around the bill. Part of the Act also requires ISBE to “select for statewide administration an instrument to provide feedback from, at a minimum, students in grades 6 through 12 and teachers on the instructional environment within a school after giving consideration to the recommendations of the Performance Evaluation Advisory Council” [105 ILCS 5/2-3.153]. The survey developed and administered through this contract is expected to fulfill the requirements cited in this legislation.

C. P-20 Council. The State’s P-20 Education Council’s Data and Accountability Subcommittee convened a Report Card Working Group to make recommendations to the legislature for updating and improving the State’s school report card. Some of these recommendations were reflected in Public Act 97-0671, which revised the statutory requirements for school and district report cards. In addition to several other factors, report cards must also include "2 or more indicators from any school climate survey developed by the State" [105 ILCS 5/10-17a (2) (E)]. The climate survey developed and administered through this contract will make that data collection and reporting possible.

Superintendent’s Recommendation
I recommend that the following motion be adopted:

The State Board hereby authorizes agency staff to release an RSFP for the purpose of entering into a contract for a statewide Survey of Learning Conditions. The contract will extend from July 1, 2013, or upon execution, whichever is later, until June 30, 2014 with four possible one-year renewals. That total contract will not exceed $1,806,552.

Next Steps
Agency staff will commence the process of the RFSP in accordance with the approved motion and award a contract. Agency staff will then bring the recommended awardee(s) to the Board for approval prior to the issuance of any award(s).
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
       Susan Morrison, Deputy Superintendent/Chief Education Officer

Agenda Topic: Approval of Request for Sealed Proposals for Lead Partners to Support District and School Improvement Efforts for the 1003(g) School Improvement Grant for FY 2014 Exceeding $1 Million.

Staff Contact(s): Linda Shay, Acting Division Administrator System of Support and District Intervention

Purpose of Agenda Item
The Division of System of Support and District Intervention requests the Board to authorize the release of a request for sealed proposal (RFSP) for lead partners to support district and school improvement efforts for the 1003(g) School Improvement Grant. Qualified entities can apply to serve as ISBE-approved Lead Partners that will offer services and programs designed to assist school districts (Local Education Agencies (LEA’s) with school improvement efforts in Illinois’ persistently lowest performing schools in the Fiscal Year 2014.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
The School Improvement Grant 1003(g) contract will support the following Board goals.

   GOAL 1: Every student will demonstrate academic achievement and be prepared for success after high school.

   GOAL 2: Every student will be supported by highly prepared and effective teachers and school leaders.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
It is expected that the Board will authorize the State Superintendent to execute a release for sealed proposals for lead partners to support district and school improvement efforts for the 1003(g) School Improvement Grant for Fiscal Year 2014.

Background Information
The purpose of this request for sealed proposal is to secure additional Lead Partners to assist in the execution of the School Improvement Grant 1003(g) program. The School Improvement Grant (SIG) program is authorized by Section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 (ESEA). These funds are made available from the United States Department of Education (ED) to state education agencies (SEAs) to provide subgrants to local education agencies (LEAs) for use in Title I and Title I eligible schools for the purpose of providing assistance for school improvement, consistent with section 1116 of the ESEA. In awarding such subgrants, the SEA must give priority to those LEAs with the lowest-achieving schools (Tier I and Tier II) that demonstrate: (A) the greatest need for these funds; and (B) the strongest commitment to ensuring that such funds are used to provide adequate resources to enable the lowest-achieving schools to meet the goals under school and district improvement, corrective action, and restructuring plans.
under section 1116. These requirements were further defined by the interim final requirements published in the Federal Register on October 28, 2010. As a result of the specific, intensive, reform efforts, including the full implementation of one of the ED intervention models, it is expected that these schools will make adequate yearly progress (AYP) and exit improvement status.

Under the final SIG 1003(g) requirements, the LEA must implement one of the four ED-approved school intervention models which include: Turnaround, Restart, School Closure, or Transformation. The specifications for these intervention models are detailed in the Guidance on School Improvement Grants under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 issued by ED (see http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/sigguidance05242010.pdf).

In Illinois, LEAs that are awarded SIG 1003(g) funds through a competitive process are required to work with an approved Lead Partner to implement the selected intervention model. Lead Partners are entities external to the LEA and the participating schools with proven expertise in school reform as well as demonstrated success in turning around persistently low-performing schools.

FY 2011/FY 2012 Lead Partner's Include:

- Academy for Urban School Leadership (AUSL)
- America’s Choice in Partnership with ACT, Inc.
- Atlantic Research Partners, Inc.
- Cambridge Education LLC
- Consortium for Educational Change (CEC)
- EdisonLearning, Inc.
- Evans Newton, Inc.
- Illinois Association of Regional Superintendents of Schools (IARSS)
- Johns Hopkins University — Diploma’s Now
- John Hopkins University — Talent Development Secondary
- Learning Point Associates
- Office of School Turnaround, Board of Education, City of Chicago
- Office of Transformation Support, Board of Education, City of Chicago
- Scholastic Inc.
- School of Social Service Administration – University of Chicago
- Success for All Foundation, Inc.

Financial Background
Funding for Lead Partners under this RFSP will be provided by LEAs which have been awarded School Improvement Grants under the SIG 1003 (g) RFP to be released in 2013, making funds available for the fiscal year FY 2014 implementation phase to be conducted during the 2013-2014 school year. The total amount of federal funding available to LEAs for the overall implementation of the grants is up to $32 million under the U.S. Department of Education’s (ED) School Improvement Grants (SIG) program.

Effectiveness
The impact of the all of the grant programs is determined by examining performance objectives which include:

A. Number of minutes within the school year;
B. Student participation rate on ISAT or PSAE in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup;
C. Dropout rate;
D. Student attendance rate;
E. Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes;
F. Discipline incidents;
G. Truants;
H. Distribution of teachers by performance level on the LEA’s teacher evaluation system;
I. Teacher attendance rate;
J. School climate and culture; and
K. Teacher and principal effectiveness.

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

**Policy Implications:** None

**Budget Implications:** The proposed activities will be funded by Legislative Action: None

Communication: None

**Superintendent’s Recommendation**

I recommend that the following motion be adopted:

The Board hereby authorizes the State Superintendent to release a request for sealed proposals for lead partners to support district and school improvement efforts for the 1003(g) School Improvement Grant for Fiscal Years 2014-2016. The total amount of federal funding available to LEAs for the overall implementation of the grants is up to $32 million under the U.S. Department of Education’s (ED) School Improvement Grants (SIG) program.

**Next Steps**

Upon Board authorization, Agency staff will execute the release of the request for sealed proposals from ISBE-approved Lead Partners to offer services and programs designed to assist school districts [local educational agencies (LEAs)] with school improvement efforts in Illinois’ persistently lowest performing schools.
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TO: Illinois State Board of Education
FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
       Susan Morrison, Deputy Superintendent/Chief Education Officer

Agenda Topic: Request for RFSP– Local Assessment Support Management Entity

Staff Contact(s): Vicki Phillips, Division Administrator, Educator Preparation and Evaluation
                  Mary O’Brien, Director of Assessment
                  Christi Chadwick, Race to the Top

Purpose of Agenda Item
The Division of Preparation and Evaluation requests the Board to authorize the State
Superintendent to release Request for Sealed Proposal (RFSP) in fiscal year (FY) 2013 for a
Local Assessment Support Management Entity.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
The following action will support Goal 1 & 2 in the Board’s Strategic Plan.

GOAL 1: Every student will demonstrate academic achievement and be prepared for success after high school;
GOAL 2: Every student will be supported by highly prepared and effective teachers and school leaders.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
It is expected that the Board will authorize the State Superintendent to execute such RFSP
subject to staff recommendations.

Background Information
The Illinois federal Race to the Top Phase 3 (“RTTT3”) application supports the establishment
of local assessment systems aligned to State standards, as revised to incorporate the Common
Core State Standards (“CCSS”), and appropriate for measuring student growth for performance
evaluations performed in accordance with the Performance Evaluation Reform Act, Public Act
96-0861 (“PERA”). Each of the 35 Illinois school district participating in RTTT3 is required to:

- Develop an assessment system that includes the following types of assessments in a
  coherent framework to both support standards-aligned instruction and, where
  appropriate, measure student growth:

  a) Through-course assessments designed to assist teachers and administrators
     to follow students’ progress toward meeting learning outcomes in order to
     provide appropriate instructional interventions and supports;

  b) Formative assessments designed to inform instruction in real time, such as
     teacher-created assessments that are used throughout the year; and


c) Summative assessments designed to measure changes in students’ knowledge and skills through an entire course, such as district- or network-wide end-of-term/course assessments.

- Integrate CCSS assessment items in subjects other than Mathematics and English/language arts;
- Participate in the development of a framework and assessment items that can be used on a district-wide basis by all teachers in a given grade or non-tested subject area;

ISBE will assist participating LEAs in developing new locally developed instructional and assessment capacities and that will support an aggressive timeline effective measure of student growth across the curriculum. These local assessment systems will support the development and implementation of improved teacher evaluation systems, which will include student growth as a significant factor in evaluations as required by PERA.

The selected contractor will do the following:
- Provide a framework and guidance for evaluating assessments for reliability, validity, and fairness
- Provide professional development to working groups (as discussed below) on assessment literacy and the development of assessments, rubrics, assessment items, frameworks, etc.
- Establish, and administer working groups to develop non-commercial, open-source assessment resources (including fully developed assessments, assessment frameworks and individual assessment items) appropriate for measuring student growth in areas other than those tested by the State. All assessments and assessment resources procured and developed pursuant to the RFSP must be valid and reliable measures of student growth that can be used to inform teacher and principal evaluations.
- Determine how to best make assessments available through a shared resource bank.

Upon approval from the Board, the Division will release a Request for Proposals (RFSP) for a Local Assessment Support Entity in March 2013. Proposals will be read and scored by internal and external reviewers. All scoring sheets and readers’ comments will remain on file in the Division.

Financial Background
The contract will be awarded for two fiscal years to extend from July 1, 2013, or upon execution whichever is later, until June 30, 2015. There will be three possible one-year renewals after 2015 contingent upon a sufficient appropriation for the program and the satisfactory performance of the contractor in the preceding contract year. The total contract will not exceed $2,483,967. This contract will be funded by the Race to the Top grant for the initial contract period.
Shown below is a summary for the funding for the proposed contract:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Contract State Funding</th>
<th>Current Contract Federal Funding</th>
<th>Requested Additional State Funding</th>
<th>Requested Additional Federal Funding</th>
<th>Total Contract per Fiscal Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 995,900</td>
<td>$ 995,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 372,667</td>
<td>$ 372,667</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16</td>
<td>$ 371,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 371,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>$ 371,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 371,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18</td>
<td>$ 371,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 371,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 2,483,967</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effectiveness**
This is a new contract, therefore no previous effectiveness measure exists, however the agency will establish performance measures for the Local Assessment Support Management Entity and for Participating LEAs engaging in the development of local assessment capacities.

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

Policy Implications: The Local Assessment Supports (referred to as “Assessments for Learning”) was part the Illinois RTTT3 application.

Budget Implications: Funds will be paid from Race to the Top.

Legislative Action: None

Communication: Please see next steps.

**Superintendent’s Recommendation**
I recommend that the following motion be adopted:

The State Board hereby authorizes agency staff to release a RSFP for the purpose of entering into a contract for a Local Assessment Support Management Entity. The contract will extend from July 1, 2013, or upon execution, whichever is later, until June 30, 2015 with three possible one-year renewals. The contract will not exceed $2,483,967.

**Next Steps**
Agency staff will commence the process of the RFSP in accordance with the approved motion and award a contract. Agency staff will then bring the recommended awardee(s) to the Board for approval prior to the issuance of any award(s).
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
      Susan Morrison, Deputy Superintendent/Chief Education Officer


Materials: Revised Scope of Services

Staff Contact(s): Linda Shay, Division Administrator, Division of System of Support and District Intervention

Purpose of Agenda Item
The Division of System of Support and District Intervention requests the Board to authorize the State Superintendent to amend and renew the Intergovernmental Agreement (IA) with Northern Illinois University (NIU) for the continued hosting, development, maintenance, and support of the Illinois Interactive Report Card (IIRC).

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
The IIRC will support the following Board goal:

GOAL 1: Every student will demonstrate academic achievement and be prepared for success after high school.

Goal 2: Every student will be supported by highly prepared and effective teachers and school leaders.

Goal 3: Every school will offer a safe and healthy learning environment for all students.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
This agenda item will be discussed in the Finance and Audit Committee and then called for a vote during the April Plenary Session. The Board is expected to authorize the State Superintendent to amend and renew the Intergovernmental Agreement with NIU.

Background Information
NIU, in partnership with the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE), designed and implemented an innovative website that provides the public with an array of informational tools to support district and school improvement in Illinois. The IIRC provides several important functions. These include:

- Providing publicly accessible Interactive School and District Report Cards;
- Providing Individual Student Data Reports;
- Hosting the Continuous Improvement Platform Rising Star, the State’s official system of record for District and School Continuous Improvement Planning; and
• Through Rising Star, provides the State’s compliance and submission portal for Title I, Title III, Special Education Needs Assistance and Focused Monitoring, and Race To The Top.
• Hosting the 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) benchmarking tool.

In January 2013 a cross-division work group collaboratively reviewed and added to the FY13 Scope of Services for the FY14 Intergovernmental Agreement renewal. Major components of the Scope of Services include:

• Increased support for system maintenance and technical assistance due to a rapid and considerable growth in the number Districts and School using the Rising Star platform;
• Improvement to the accessibility and development of the content of the Interactive School and District Report Cards;
• Improvement to the accessibility and development of the content of the Individual Student Data Reports;
• Additional development tasks to improve the functionality of the continuous improvement planning platform Rising Star;
• Increased development activities to expand and improve upon the compliance and submission portal for programmatic accountability. (Title I, Title III, Special Education Needs Assistance and Focused Monitoring, Race To The Top, and 5 Essentials Survey.)
• Continued hosting, maintenance, and support for the 21st CCLC benchmarking tool.

Financial Background
On June 29, 2012, the Illinois State Board of Education entered into an intergovernmental agreement with Northern Illinois University (NIU) to provide interactive school and district report cards; individual student data reports and school and district ePlans.

The contract was amended on February 4, 2013 to add an addition $14,999 to the agreement for the refinement and maintenance of the IIRC and to include the support of the benchmarking tool used by the 21st CCLC grantees.

This request is for an amendment to extend the end date of the contract through June 30, 2014, and to request an additional amount of funding for Fiscal Year 2014 of $1,465,819. This amendment would bring the total amount of funding to $2,660,818. The funding will come from a combination of the following funding sources: State General Revenue, Federal Special Education IDEA, Federal Title I Administrative, and Federal 21st CCLC.

The financial background of this contract is illustrated in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Contract State Funding</th>
<th>Current Contract Federal Funding</th>
<th>Requested Additional State Funding</th>
<th>Requested Additional Federal Funding</th>
<th>Total Contract per Fiscal Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>$810,191</td>
<td>$384,808</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,194,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td></td>
<td>$810,191</td>
<td>$655,628</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,465,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,660,818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Effectiveness**

Last Evaluation of the program: The last Post Performance Review for NIU indicated Good to Excellent contractor performance on individual indicators and recommends continued contracting with NIU.

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

Policy Implications: None

Budget Implications: The amount of $1,465,819 is funded through State General Revenue ($810,191), Federal Special Education IDEA ($184,904), Federal Title I Administrative ($455,725) and Federal 21st CCLC ($14,999).

Legislative Action: None

Communication: None

**Pros and Cons of Various Actions**

Renewal of the Intergovernmental Agreement will ensure that federal and state accountability compliance and reporting submission for Illinois district and school continuous improvement planners will continue without any interruption of services.

**Superintendent’s Recommendation**

I recommend that the following motion be adopted:

The State Board hereby authorizes the State Superintendent to amend and renew the agreement with NIU through June 30, 2014, and to increase the contract’s amount by $1,465,819 such that the total amount of the contract will be $2,660,818; for hosting the Illinois Interactive Report Card, Rising Star and the 21st CCLC Benchmarking Tool; for providing increased maintenance and support for the growth in system users; and for additional development of the system and compliance and submission functionality.

**Next Steps**

Upon Board authorization, Agency staff will amend and renew the Intergovernmental Agreement with NIU.
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
Melissa S. Oller, Chief Internal Auditor

Agenda Topic: Presentation of FY 2012 Financial Audit Report


Staff Contact: Melissa Oller, Chief Internal Auditor

Purpose of Agenda Item
To provide the Board with the results of the FY 2012 Financial Audit, reported finding, and Agency’s response to the finding.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
The Board will be informed of the issues identified by the Office of the Auditor General in the FY 2012 Financial Audit report, and accept the audit.

Background Information
The Auditor General is responsible for conducting a Financial Audit of the Agency. The objectives of this audit are to determine if financial statements are fairly presented.

Analysis and Implications for Legislative Action and Communications

Legislative: This audit will be reviewed by the Legislative Audit Commission.

Communications: The audit is issued by the Auditor General and is available to the public.

Superintendent’s Recommendation
I recommend that the State Board adopt the following motion:


Next Steps
No further actions necessary.
TO: Illinois State Board of Education
FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
Robert Wolfe, Chief Financial Officer

Agenda Topic: Review of Annual Financial Profile

Materials: Under Separate Cover
- 2013 Financial Profile Report

Staff Contact(s): Deb Vespa

Purpose of Agenda Item
To provide the Board information regarding the financial condition of the school districts based upon the 2013 School District Financial Profile designations from fiscal year 2012 data and to have the Board review and approve the Financial Watch List.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
The Financial Profile assists in assessing the financial position of the school districts. Districts in sound financial standing are better able to accomplish strategic goals as resources can be allocated towards such purposes.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
The expected outcome is for the Board to approve the 2013 School District Financial Profile designation scores and financial watch list.

Background Information
Section 1A-8 of the Illinois School Code states, “To promote the financial integrity of school district, the State Board of Education shall be provided the necessary powers to promote sound financial management and continue operation of the public schools.” The Financial Profile assists State Board staff, district administrators, and school boards in promoting sound financial management. The School District Financial Profile was designed to review the status of the school districts using categories to designate the financial position of all districts. The designation categories are: Financial Recognition, Financial Review, Financial Early Warning, and Financial Watch with Financial Recognition being the highest ranking.

This is the eleventh year that the Financial Profile has been used to evaluate districts. For the 2004 Financial Profile through the 2009 Financial Profile, the number of districts in Financial Recognition status increased each year. In 2010, the number of districts in Financial Recognition decreased to 578 from the previous year’s 626. For the 2011 and 2012 Financial Profiles, the number of districts in Financial Recognition increased again to 604 and 670, respectively.

The 2013 Financial Profile is reflecting the difficult economic times every district in the state is realizing. The number of districts in Financial Recognition decreased to 562 districts (65.0% of 865 districts), resulting in 108 fewer districts in the highest category of Financial Recognition.
Beginning with the 2009 Financial Profile, adjustments were made to the calculations to adjust for delayed State mandated categorical payments.

Section 1A-8 of The School Code [105 ILCS 1A-8] mandates that the Financial Profile calculations shall incorporate delayed State Payments for General State Aid and Mandated Categorical. Because of this, the Financial Profile was calculated in two ways: (1) utilizing the standard calculation methodology and (2) revising the calculation by incorporating delayed payments to the districts’ fund balances, revenue, and cash balances, thus removing the effect of the delayed state payments. For cash basis school districts, the second calculation adjusted the Revenue to Fund Balance Ratio, Expenditure to Revenue Ratio, and Days Cash on Hand indicators. The adjustment for accrual basis districts depended upon the amount of delay payments that were recognized in the AFR. For districts that included all delayed payments through December 31, 2012, only the Days Cash on Hand Ratio was revised. For districts that included delayed payments through August 31, 2012, Days Cash on Hand was adjusted for the total amount of the delayed payments. The Revenue to Fund Balance Ratio and Expenditure to Revenue Ratio was adjusted for the payments received after August 31, 2012.

Difficulties in compiling the 2013 Financial Profile:

- For districts that report on a modified accrual basis, there was an inconsistency in the AFRs. Some auditors recognized delayed State payments through the customary sixty day period, August 31, 2012. Other auditors recognized the delayed State payments through December 31, 2012. To make the required adjustments to the Profile indicators, staff was required to review the notes to the AFR and contact the auditors. Last year ISBE staff conducted four auditing workshops throughout the state. The accounting of the delayed payments was discussed in these workshops. To further assist with the inconsistency, a schedule was added to the Annual Financial Report so auditors could denote the date the accrual adjustments were made through.

- Four school districts did not submit their Annual Financial Reports:
  - Bellwood School District 88
  - E. St. Louis School District 189
  - Maywood-Melrose Park-Broadview 89
  - Webber Township High School District 204

  This is the third year that Bellwood School District 88 has been delinquent and the second year that Maywood-Melrose Park-Broadview 89 has been delinquent. East St. Louis’ Annual Financial Report has been delayed due to expenditures and receipts of the vocational and special education cooperatives included within the district’s records. Since the cooperatives are separate and distinct entities, the expenditures and receipts are required to be maintained accordingly. ISBE staff has been and will continue to work with each of the districts and respective auditing firms to obtain the Annual Financial Reports.
Besides differences in the Financial Watch (the lowest category), there were differences in other categories. Both scores and designations are reflected in the Financial Profile report.

Results of the Financial Profile:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 12 Financial Profile Based on FY 11 Revised Data</th>
<th>FY 13 Financial Profile Based on FY 12 Revised Data</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Recognition</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Review</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Early Warning</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Watch</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General State Aid Proration</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The calculations have been adjusted for delayed State payments.

Of the 562 districts realizing Financial Recognition, 143 received a perfect 4.0 score.

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

Policy Implications: By the Board’s approval of the Financial Profile, they are also approving the districts categorized within the Financial Watch List. These districts will be designated as the districts ISBE will be monitoring closely for the next year.

Budget Implications: The Financial Profile supports the need for State funding. There appears to be a direct correlation between the decreasing State funding and the declining number of districts in Financial Recognition and the increasing number of districts in Financial Watch. As State revenue and federal revenue continue to decrease, it is troublesome that this trend will most likely continue.

Legislative Action: No legislative action is required at this time.

Communication: Each district’s Financial Profile designation will be posted on the ISBE website

**Pros and Cons of Various Actions**

Con: The Financial Profile is a snapshot in time and reflective of the district’s financial condition on June 30 of a specific fiscal year. To assess a district’s true financial condition, the Financial Profile must be reviewed along with other reviews of the district’s finances to assess the district’s financial status.
Pro: By approving the Financial Watch List as designated by the Financial Profile, ISBE staff can begin to utilize the Financial Profile tool along with other reviews of a district’s finances to assess the district’s financial status.

**Superintendent’s Recommendation**

I recommend that the following motion be adopted:

> The Illinois State Board of Education hereby approves the financial designations of school districts as set forth in the Fiscal Year 2013 Financial Profile Scores, which have been calculated using the revised methodology with data from the districts’ Fiscal Year 2012 Annual Financial Reports and, furthermore, recognizes that the districts designated on the Financial Watch List are those so identified from the Fiscal Year 2013 Financial Profile calculations.

**Next Steps**

Continue to review and monitor school districts on the Financial Watch List and to recommend potential certification of districts to the Board.
Illinois State Board of Education
Fiscal Year 2013 School District Financial Profile Scores
Based on Fiscal Year 2012 Annual Financial Reports

Enclosed is the Fiscal Year 2013 School District Financial Profile Scores based on the Fiscal Year 2012 Annual Financial Reports. Financial profile calculations for school districts are determined using four key indicators: Fund Balance to Revenue Ratio, Expenditure to Revenue Ratio, Days Cash on Hand, and Percentage of Remaining Short-Term Borrowing Ability.

A detailed explanation of these indicators and the Financial Profile calculation formulae are shown in Appendix A to the report. They are also available on the ISBE website at http://www.isbe.net/sfms/afr/profile.pdf

Background Information
Section 1A-8 of the Illinois School Code states, “To promote the financial integrity of school districts, the State Board of Education shall be provided the necessary powers to promote sound financial management and continue operation of the public schools.”

The School District Financial Profile was designed to better illustrate information on school district finances and to establish financial designation lists for all districts. The designation categories in descending order are: Financial Recognition, Financial Review, Financial Early Warning, and Financial Watch with Financial Recognition being the highest category.

This is the eleventh year that the Financial Profile has been used to evaluate districts. Beginning with the 2004 Financial Profile through the 2009 Financial Profile, the number of districts in Financial Recognition status has increased each year. In 2010 the number of districts in Financial Recognition decreased to 578 from the previous year’s 626. Beginning with the 2011 Financial Profile, the number of districts in Financial Recognition began increasing again with 604 districts in 2011 and 670 districts in 2012.

The difficult economic times the districts are facing are apparent with the 2013 Financial Profile. The number of districts realizing Financial Recognition for 2013 Profile decreased to 562 districts (65.0% of 865 districts.) This is a decrease of 108 districts from last year. The number of districts realizing Financial Watch increased to 45 (5.2% of 865 districts) from 17 last year. For each year from the 2009 Financial Profile forward, the scores have been adjusted for delayed State mandated categorical payments.

School finance is a complicated topic. Given this complexity and the financial and accounting differences among the 865 Illinois school districts, there will likely always be issues with how the school district finances are characterized. The issues most often identified include:

- Weighting a deficit more than short term borrowing (incentive to borrow without really improving the financial condition)
- Timing of revenues (e.g. early receipt of local taxes or late state payments)

As the Financial Profile is a “snap shot” in time of a district’s finances, the data alone cannot give a holistic view of the districts’ financial picture.
**Payment Delays**
Many school districts have inquired about their rankings in the Financial Profile due to delays in the receipt of the mandated categorical payments. Although the State Board vouchered these payments, the Comptroller made two payments after June 30th. Since 691 school districts are on the cash basis of accounting, these payments were not recognized until the next fiscal year, 2012.

Section 1A-8 of the Illinois School Code [105 ILCS 1A-8] mandates that the Financial Profile calculations shall incorporate delayed State Payments for General State Aid and Mandated Categorical. Because of this, the Financial Profile was calculated in two ways: (1) utilizing the standard calculation methodology and (2) revising the calculation by incorporating late payments to the districts' fund balances, revenue, and cash balances, thus removing the effect of the delayed state payments. For cash basis school districts, the second calculation adjusted the Revenue to Fund Balance Ratio, Expenditure to Revenue Ratio, and Days Cash on Hand indicators. The adjustment for accrual basis districts depended upon the amount of delay payments that were recognized in the AFR. For districts that included all delayed payment through December 31, 2012, only the Days Cash on Hand Ratio was revised. For districts that included delayed payments through August 31, 2012, Days Cash on Hand was adjusted for the total amount of the delayed payments. Then the Revenue to Fund Balance Ratio and Expenditure to Revenue Ratio was adjusted for the payments received after August 31, 2012.

**Summary of Watch List Districts**
Of the 17 districts that were on the Watch List last year:
- One improved to Recognition
- Two improved to Review
- Two improved to Early Warning
- Eleven remained as Watch
- One reorganized

The primary reasons for improvement are:
- Districts submitted their Annual Financial Reports on time
- Districts decreased their expenditures
- Districts issued debt to increase their cash and fund balances

There are thirty-four new districts on the Watch category this year:
- Five decreased from Recognition
- Sixteen decreased from Review
- Thirteen decreased from Early Warning
### Results of the Financial Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY08 Financial Profile Based on FY07 data</th>
<th>FY09 Financial Profile Based on FY08 data Adjusted</th>
<th>FY10 Financial Profile Based on FY09 data Adjusted</th>
<th>FY11 Financial Profile Based on FY10 data Adjusted</th>
<th>FY12 Financial Profile Based on FY11 data Adjusted</th>
<th>FY13 Financial Profile Based on FY12 data Adjusted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Recognition</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Review</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Early Warning</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Watch</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>865</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar chart showing the financial profile results for each year from FY08 to FY13.](chart.png)
A summary of the location of the 45 districts in the Financial Watch category follows:

- Seven in St. Clair County
- Three in Cook and Madison Counties
- Two in Bureau, Crawford, Jefferson, Lake, and Will Counties
- One in Clinton, Cumberland, Grundy, Hamilton, Hancock, Jackson, Johnson, Kankakee, LaSalle, Lawrence, Lee, Macon, Macoupin, McLean, Menard, Pike, Randolph, Stephenson, Vermilion, Washington, White, and Williamson Counties.
Financial Watch and Early Warning Designations

From 2004 through 2009 the number of school districts in the financial watch category has declined each year until 2010. This was the first year there has been an increase in the number of districts in this category. For the 2011 Financial Profile, the number of districts in Financial Watch decreased again and continued to decrease for the 2012 Financial Profile.

The 2013 Financial Profile is reflecting the difficult economic times every district in the state is realizing. The number of districts in the lowest category, Financial Watch increased to 45 districts from 17 districts last year. Beginning with the 2009 Financial Profile, adjustments were made to the calculations to account for delayed State mandated categorical payments.

- For the 2013 Financial Profile compared to the 2012 Financial Profile, the number of districts in the lowest designation category, Financial Watch, increased by 28 districts or 165% (currently 45 school districts compared to 17 school districts last year).
  - For the 2012 Financial Profile compared to the 2011 Financial Profile, the number of districts in the lowest designation category decreased by 7 school districts or 29% (17 compared to 24).
  - For the 2011 Financial Profile compared to the 2010 Financial Profile, the number of districts in the lowest designation category decreased by 5 school districts or 17% (24 compared to 29).
- 12.9% of the school districts are in the lowest two designation categories compared with 6.2% last year.

Four districts, Bellwood School District 88, E. St. Louis School District 189, Maywood-Melrose Park-Broadview 89, and Webber Township High School District 204 failed to submit audited financial information. They were given a score of zero in all categories and reflected as Financial Watch.

School District Budget Analysis -- Deficit Spending

The table below depicts historical trends in school districts’ deficit spending. The deficit is calculated by examining the four operational funds: Educational Fund, Operation and Maintenance Fund, Pupil Transportation, and Working Cash.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of School Districts</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Deficit Spending School Districts</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Deficit Spending School Districts</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given economic conditions, school districts anticipate that their financial position will worsen in the coming year. Information submitted by school districts for FY 2013 projects that the number of districts with deficits will increase to 573 or 66.7% of the total districts compared to the FY 2012 which reflected...
415 or 48.2%. One reason districts reflect improvement for FY 2011 over the prior years is due to cash basis of accounting and districts receiving five mandated categorical payments in FY 2011.

School districts submit a deficit reduction plan if their budgets are not balanced and they do not have an adequate fund balance to sustain the deficit. An adequate fund balance is defined as an ending fund balance that is three times the deficit amount. For example, if a district incurred a deficit of $100,000, it would be required to submit a deficit reduction plan if the ending fund balance was less than $300,000.

Of the 573 districts that project that they will incur deficits in Fiscal Year 2013, 87 school districts were required to submit a deficit reduction plan. Last year 39 districts were required to submit a deficit reduction plan. ISBE staff will continue to monitor these school districts. Staff is reviewing to ensure that all school districts required to submit a deficit reduction plan have done so. After a thorough review, staff will report districts that meet the criteria for certification in financial difficulty.

Summary
School district administrators facing difficult economic times continue to make hard choices. They have chosen to reduce expenditures via reductions in force, to forgo supplies, delay facility repairs/maintenance and to outsource operations. They have also increased cash balances by issuing debt or restructuring debt payments. Financial performance in the school districts has been impacted by the unavailability of debt, reduced State funding appropriations, and delays in receipt of state funding and local revenues. Dependent upon funding appropriations for fiscal year 2014, districts could be further impacted financially. The 2014 federal revenue is anticipated to decrease approximately 6% due to sequestration. Thus, continued monitoring and consulting support will be required to assure that school districts will be able to realize strong financial results without impacting educational services.

In comparing FY 2002 data to that in FY 2012, it is clear that districts continue to make difficult financial decisions to improve their financial status. It is apparent that to balance their budgets many districts have reduced expenditures and incurred additional long-term debt. Districts are now at a point where additional budget reductions are going to be very difficult to realize without impacting the education of students.
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
       Robert Wolfe, Chief Financial Officer

Agenda Topic: Report of School District Special Education Expenditures and Receipts
              [105 ILCS 203.145]

Materials: Annual Report (alphabetical and descending order)

Staff Contact(s): Deb Vespa

Purpose of Agenda Item
Section 2-3.145 [105 ILCS 5/2-3.145] mandates that the State Board of Education issue an
annual report to the General Assembly and Governor identifying each school district’s special
education expenditures, receipts, and net special education expenditures over receipts. This
report is due May 1st of each year.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
This is a required mandate for the Illinois State Board of Education

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
Approval of the report to be sent to the General Assembly and Governor

Background Information
Section 2-3.145 [105 ILCS 2-3.145] mandates that the Illinois State Board of Education
submit to the General Assembly and Governor an annual report that designates school
districts’ special education expenditures, receipts, and net special education expenditures over receipts. The receipts are to be specified as local, state, and federal. The calculations utilize limited data the Agency receives on districts’ Annual Financial Reports (AFR), Pupil Transportation Claims, Fall Housing Reports/Student Information System (SIS), and the Funding and Child Tracking System (FACTS) and is not a reflection of school districts’ total special education expenditures and receipts.

With implementation of this legislation in FY 2008, there was considerable discussion of
the limitations of presenting these calculations and other information.

The following limitations were discussed:

- The exact amount of time devoted to special education programs is not available. While the FACTS Report collects each identified special education student’s enrollment in special education, the Educational Environment (EE) for each student defines a range of time the student is receiving regular services. For example, a student with an EE code of 02 is defined as “40% - 79% inside the
regular classroom.” For such students, ISBE worked with external education entity stakeholders and determined that they would be counted as sixty percent (60%) special education.

- For Attendance and Social Work Services, Psychological Services and Other Support Services – Pupil, the percentage of time dedicated to special education would be difficult to determine. Therefore, it was agreed that expenditures would be allocated to special education as follows:
  - Attendance and Social Work Services—90%
  - Psychological Services—90%, and
  - Other Support Services—5%

- Chicago receives a predetermined amount of special education funding within their block grant that incorporates special education funding as well as other State funding. Each year, the block grant revenue is reviewed and the percentage dedicated to special education is determined and utilized within their calculations. It is important to note, however, that PA 97-0238 went into effect July 1, 2011 and requires that ISBE collect data on grant and MCAT programs in the block grants in the same manner as other districts. The Public Act does not change the current block percentages or the amounts that are due to District 299 in FY 11 or in FY 12.

These assumptions have been used consistently in each year’s report. This is the sixth year for this report.

The table below designates the highest ten schools. As conveyed in the report, Chicago School District 299 has the highest amount of special education expenditures in excess of receipts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Ten:</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>$ (in the Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Chicago School District 299</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>$39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Prairie Comm. Unit School District 204</td>
<td>DuPage</td>
<td>$27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley View Comm. Unit School District 365U</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>$24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaumburg Comm. Cons. School District 54</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>$20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township High School District 211(Palatine)</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>$19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township High School District 214 (Arlington Heights)</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>$18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plainfield School District 202</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>$18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naperville Comm. Unit School District 203</td>
<td>DuPage</td>
<td>$17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Unit School District 300 (Carpentersville)</td>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>$15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield School District 186</td>
<td>Sangamon</td>
<td>$15.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ten lowest school districts are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lowest Ten:</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>$ (in the Thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teutopolis Community Unit School District 50</td>
<td>Effingham</td>
<td>$10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartelso School District 57</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>$9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geff Community Consolidated School District 14</td>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>$5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossville-Alvin Community Unit School District 7</td>
<td>Vermilion</td>
<td>$5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris Community Unit School District 4</td>
<td>Edgar</td>
<td>$5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford Community Unit School District 1</td>
<td>Stark</td>
<td>$4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montmorency Community Consolidated Sch Dist 145</td>
<td>Whiteside</td>
<td>$3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rooks Creek Community Consolidated Sch Dist 425</td>
<td>Livingston</td>
<td>$3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas Comm. Unit School District 3</td>
<td>Edgar</td>
<td>$2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester Non High School District 122</td>
<td>Randolph</td>
<td>$1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were 22 school districts that realized more special education revenue than incurred expenditures. This could be due to the timing of expenditures and receipts, the number of students served from one year to the next, or the accounting of expenditures and receipts within the Annual Financial Report.

Excluding the City of Chicago School District 299, the average amount by which the expenditures exceed receipts is $1.6 million.

The following table reflects the total amount calculated for the estimated, net special education expenditures after deduction of a proportionate share of local funds received and specific state and federal funds received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Estimated Special Education Expenditures (A)</th>
<th>Proportionate Share of Local Funds (B)</th>
<th>State Funding (C)</th>
<th>Federal Funding (D)</th>
<th>Net Special Education Expenditures (A − B − C − D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$4.0</td>
<td>$0.9</td>
<td>$1.4</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
<td>$1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$3.8</td>
<td>$0.9</td>
<td>$1.4</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
<td>$1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$4.4</td>
<td>$0.9</td>
<td>$1.5</td>
<td>$0.7</td>
<td>$1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$4.5</td>
<td>$0.9</td>
<td>$1.6</td>
<td>$0.7</td>
<td>$1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$4.6</td>
<td>$0.9</td>
<td>$1.7</td>
<td>$0.6</td>
<td>$1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis and Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action and Communications

Policy Implications: As reported last year, this report is based upon limited data received by ISBE.

Budget Implications: Legislation has been previously introduced which would allow school districts to levy a tax when special education expenditures are greater than the revenue received. Data from this report could be used as a tool by people advocating for this legislation.

Legislative Action: None needed at this time

Communication: The report will be submitted to the General Assembly and Governor by May 1, 2013. It will be posted on the Illinois State Board of Education website.

Pros and Cons of Various Actions
This report demonstrates the high costs that school districts incur to provide necessary special education services to their students. However, as stated above, the calculations are limited to the data collected by the Agency. They should not be perceived as reflecting the exact amount of “unreimbursed” special education costs incurred by each school district.

Superintendent’s Recommendation
I recommend that the following motion be adopted:
   The Board hereby approves the 2013 Annual Report of Special Education Expenditures and Receipts and directs the State Superintendent to forward the report to the General Assembly and Governor by May 1, 2013.

Next Steps
The report will be forwarded to the General Assembly and Governor and placed on the Illinois State Board of Education website.

Section 2-3.145 mandates that the Illinois State Board of Education submit to the General Assembly and Governor an annual report that designates school districts’ special education expenditures, receipts, and net special education expenditures over receipts. The receipts are to be specified as local, state, and federal. The calculations utilize limited data the Agency receives on districts’ Annual Financial Reports (AFR), Fall Housing Reports/Student Information System (SIS), Pupil Transportation Claims, and the Funding and Child Tracking System (FACTS) and is not a reflection of school districts’ total special education expenditures and receipts.

With the implementation of this legislation in FY 2008, there was considerable discussion of the limitations of presenting these calculations and other information. Limitations that were discussed were:

- The exact amount of time devoted to special education programs is not available. While the FACTS Report collects each identified special education student’s enrollment in special education, the Educational Environment (EE) for each student defines a range of time the student is receiving regular services. For example a student with an EE code of 02 is defined as “40% - 79% inside the regular classroom.” For such students, it was determined by external education entities that they would be counted as sixty percent (60%) special education.

- For Attendance and Social Work Services, Psychological Services and Other Support Services – Pupil, the percentage of time dedicated to special education would be difficult to determine. Therefore, it was agreed that expenditures would be allocated to special education as follows:
  - Attendance and social work services—90%
  - Psychological Services—90%, and
  - Other Support Services—5%

- Chicago receives a predetermined amount of special education funding within their block grant that incorporates special education funding as well as other State funding. Each year, the block grant revenue is reviewed and the percentage dedicated to special education is determined and utilized within their calculations. It is important to note, however, that PA 97-
0238 went into effect July 1, 2011 and requires that ISBE collect data on grant and MCAT programs in the block grants in the same manner as other districts. The Public Act does not change the current block percentages or the amounts that are due to District 299 in FY 11 or in FY 12. As of this date, ISBE has not received this claim data.

- The expenditures for district superintendents, building principals, etc. were allocated based upon the percentage of full-time equivalent count of special education students compared to the total child headcount of the district.

- Some receipts such as special education state or federal reimbursements are easily identifiable as 100% related to special education. Other receipts such as General State Aid and local taxes relate to services provided to all students in the district. These receipts were allocated based upon the percentage of full-time equivalent count of special education students to the total student headcount of the district.

The limitation of these calculations were thoroughly discussed and agreed upon with the sponsor of the bill and several special education entities. It is understood that this report previously stated limitations prevent a representation of the total cost districts incur to educate their special needs students and should not be construed as such.

The table below designates the highest ten schools districts. As conveyed in the report, the City of Chicago School District 299 has the highest amount of special education expenditures over receipts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Ten:</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>$ (in the Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Chicago School District 299</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>$39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Prairie Comm. Unit School District 204</td>
<td>DuPage</td>
<td>$27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley View Comm. Unit School District 365U</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>$24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaumburg Comm. Cons. School District 54</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>$20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township High School District 211(Palatine)</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>$19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township High School District 214 (Arlington Heights)</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>$18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plainfield School District 202</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>$18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naperville Comm. Unit School District 203</td>
<td>DuPage</td>
<td>$17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Unit School District 300 (Carpentersville)</td>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>$15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield School District 186</td>
<td>Sangamon</td>
<td>$15.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ten lowest school districts are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lowest Ten:</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>$ (in the Thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teutopolis Community Unit School District 50</td>
<td>Effingham</td>
<td>$10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartelso School District 57</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>$9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geff Community Consolidated School District 14</td>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>$5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossville-Alvin Community Unit School District 7</td>
<td>Vermilion</td>
<td>$5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris Community Unit School District 4</td>
<td>Edgar</td>
<td>$5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford Community Unit School District 1</td>
<td>Stark</td>
<td>$4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montmorency Community Consolidated Sch Dist 145</td>
<td>Whiteside</td>
<td>$3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rooks Creek Community Consolidated Sch Dist 425</td>
<td>Livingston</td>
<td>$3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas Comm. Unit School District 3</td>
<td>Edgar</td>
<td>$2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester Non High School District 122</td>
<td>Randolph</td>
<td>$1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were 22 school districts that realized more special education revenue than incurred expenditures. This could be due to the timing of expenditures and receipts, the number of students served from one year to the next, or the accounting of expenditures and receipts within the Annual Financial Report.

Excluding the City of Chicago School District 299, the average amount by which the expenditures exceed receipts is $1.6 million.
TO: Illinois State Board of Education
FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
       Nicki Bazer, General Counsel

Agenda Topic: State Charter School Commission Appointment

Materials: Resume (separate cover)

Staff Contact(s): Jennifer Saba, Assistant General Counsel, ISBE General Counsel's Office

Purpose of Agenda Item
To review and act upon the Superintendent’s recommendation to fill a vacancy on the State Charter School Commission (hereinafter also referred to as the “Commission”).

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
The Commission is responsible for authorizing high-quality charter schools throughout Illinois, particularly schools designed to expand opportunities for at-risk students. The Commission is empowered to consider the appeals of charter agreements and proposals that have been denied, revoked, or not renewed by a local school board, approve quality charter school applications and deny weak or inadequate applications, monitor the performance and legal compliance of charter schools authorized by the Commission, and determine whether each charter school authorized by the Commission merits renewal, nonrenewal, or revocation.

The performance of these responsibilities directly relates to all three goals of the State Board’s Strategic Plan, including ensuring that: (1) “every student will demonstrate academic achievement and be prepared for success after high school; (2) “every student will be supported by highly prepared and effective teachers and school leaders; and (3) “every school will offer a safe and healthy learning environment for all students.”

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
The anticipated outcome of this agenda item is the appointment of a new member to the Commission to fill a vacancy left by the February 22, 2013 resignation of a Commissioner, for the remainder of that former Commissioner’s 2 year term.

Background Information
Section 27A-7.5 of the School Code requires that the State Board of Education appoint nine (9) members to the State Charter School Commission. To establish staggered terms of office, the terms of office are set as follows: (i) the initial term of office for 3 Commission members shall be 4 years and thereafter shall be 4 years; (ii) the initial term of office for another 3 members shall be 3 years and thereafter shall be 4 years; and (iii) the initial term of office for the remaining 3 members shall be 2 years and thereafter shall be 4 years.

Commission members are to collectively possess strong experience and expertise in public and nonprofit governance, management and finance, public school leadership, higher education, assessments, curriculum and instruction, and public education law. In addition, all members of the Commission must have demonstrated an understanding of and a commitment to public education, including without limitation charter schooling. At least 3 members must have past experience with urban charter schools.
The State Board of Education acted in September 2011 to approve the initial appointments of members to the Commission. Each Commission member's term of service commenced on November 1, 2011. Former Commission member Patricia Van Pelt Watkins resigned from the Commission on February 22, 2013, effective immediately, creating a vacancy. The process for filling a vacancy on the State Charter Commission is set forth in Article 27A-7.5(f). Specifically, whenever a vacancy on the Commission exists, the State Board must appoint a member for the remaining portion of the term. Patricia Van Pelt Watkins was appointed for a 2 year term, commencing on November 1, 2011 and ending on October 31, 2013. By operation of the State Board’s vote, a new Commissioner will be appointed for the remaining portion of Patricia Van Pelt Watkins’ term.

The Chair of the Commission has recommended that DeRonda Williams (Long Grove) be appointed to fill the remainder of the term vacated by Patricia Van Pelt Watkins (Chicago).

Analysis and Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action and Communications
Policy Implication: Approval of the new member to fill the vacancy left by Patricia Van Pelt Watkins will ensure compliance with the requirements of the Charter Law for composition of the Commission.

Superintendent's Recommendation

The State Board of Education hereby approves the appointment of DeRonda Williams to the State Charter School Commission to fill the reminder of a 2-year term expiring in October 2013.

Next Steps
Ms. DeRonda Williams will be notified about the action taken by the State Board of Education. In addition, the State Board of Education website, and the page dedicated to the State Charter School Commission, will be appropriately updated.
EXECUTIVE PROFILE
Leader with a demonstrated track record in the for-profit and not-for-profit sectors. Strong understanding of key business drivers and analyzing the impact of strategic plans and operating decisions on financial results. Exceptional communication, project management and leadership skills; wide ranging financial skills with particular focus on budgeting, modeling, analytics, cost reduction, strategic planning, and process improvement.

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Principal, DW Inc., Chicago, IL 2012 to present
Independent consultant serving charter school operators, public school districts, investors and other organizations supporting education reform. Provide financial, operational and strategic advisory services, lead executive searches to identity high-caliber and diverse talent, and plan, coordinate, and implement special projects.

KIPP FOUNDATION, Chicago, IL 2007 to 2012
A national network of 100+ free open-enrollment, college-preparatory public schools dedicated to preparing over 30K students in underserved communities for success in college and in life.

Network Finance Director
Served as the primary liaison to KIPP finance leaders (109 schools governed by 31 separate local boards). Developed a comprehensive framework, analytical reports and capacity building tools that helped leaders assess and impact the financial health and sustainability of KIPP charter schools across 20 states and the District of Columbia.

Participated in a number of KIPP initiatives to support the rapid scaling and regionalization of the KIPP network including processes to review the strength of finance and operations in KIPP organizations planning network expansion, as well as School Quality Reviews that use a set of criteria and indicators to assess strengths and opportunities for improving performance. Developed and delivered charter school finance training to new Principals across the national network of KIPP schools. Led a national compensation study of 60 charter management organizations, co-sponsored by the KIPP Foundation and Charter School Growth Fund.

Principal, DW Inc., Chicago, IL 2000 to 2007
Financial & Strategic Planning Consultant
Launched a consulting practice to provide financial and operational expertise to start-up ventures and traditional corporations. Provided financial and operational expertise to enhance the financial position of a healthcare organization; moved billing in-house, which led to a 25% revenue increase; established policies and procedures to improve efficiencies, and recommended staffing changes. Co-led the negotiation of a physician clinic buyout by a large area hospital. Worked with a start-up retail business targeting to “fast track” franchising as a growth strategy. Co-authored business plan and developed a
financial model for major franchising company. Developed budgets and assisted in a merger of traditional and web-based businesses for a major publishing company.

WEBKICK.COM, INC., Andover, MA 1999 to 2000
Start-up Internet company specializing in “edutainment” for children

Virtual Chief Financial Officer / Vice President of Finance
Joined forces with a former Pearson colleague to provide business strategy, operational and financial expertise to build a business model and financial projections based on target markets, competitors and product offerings. Co-authored the business plan, developed financial projections and valuations used in investor presentations to attract venture capital needed for full-scale business launch. Made strategic outsourcing decisions and established relationships with banks, legal, and accounting/audit firms.

PEARSON EDUCATION, Multiple locations 1988 to 1999
$2.5 billion publishing company with over 10 US divisions/subsidiary operations

Vice President, Director of Finance – Scott Foresman, Chicago, IL (1997 to 1999)
Vice President, Director of Financial Planning – Higher Education Group, Boston, MA (1994 to 1997)

Member of the senior financial team of a large, diversified corporation that grew through acquisition. Served as financial advisor on strategic, financial and operational issues for several key divisions in various phases of rapid growth, maturity and turnaround.

Business Growth & Turnaround Strategies: Supported 125% revenue growth of a $30 million operation over a three-year period through implementation of new systems and procedures to improve organizational efficiency. Restructured organization in response to slow-growth and declining business operations of a $300 million division, reducing operating expenses and headcount 10%.

Process & Performance Improvements: Streamlined and automated work and sales forecasting processes to gain tighter control over inventory management. Cut inventory on hand, increased inventory turnover and lowered obsolescence. Developed management, sales and employee incentive/rewards programs.

Corporate Transactions: Served on a management team that led $4 billion acquisition of Simon & Schuster’s education business and reverse-merged Pearson’s operations into Simon & Schuster’s existing structure to consolidate divisions and exploit synergies. Played a key role in structuring a $100 million acquisition that doubled revenues and enhanced market position. Led detailed merger integration to achieve efficiencies and economies of scale.

EDUCATION & PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

MBA – Finance, University of Chicago Booth School of Business Chicago, IL
BS – Industrial Engineering, Northwestern University Evanston, IL

Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) – A non-profit focused on advocating for abused and neglected children. Volunteer, past President, past Vice President & current Board Member, 2001-present; Jack & Jill North Shore Chapter member 2001-Present – past Treasurer; Primo Center for Women and Children – A non-profit providing transitional housing to women and children. Red Hot Board 2011-Present
TO: Illinois State Board of Education
FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
        Susan Morrison, Deputy Superintendent/Chief Education Officer
Agenda Topic: Grant Exceeding $1 Million: Request to Release Request for Proposals for School Improvement Grants

Staff Contact(s): Linda Shay, Division Administrator for Innovation and Improvement

Purpose of Agenda Item
The Division of Innovation & Improvement requests the Board to authorize the State Superintendent to release a Request for Proposals (RFP) whereby one or more eligible entities are expected to receive a competitive School Improvement Grant which exceeds $1 million over the term of the grant.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
The School Improvement Grants will support the following Board goal.

        GOAL 1: Every student will demonstrate academic achievement and be prepared for success after high school.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
It is expected that the Board will authorize the State Superintendent to execute such RFP subject to staff recommendations.

Background Information
School Improvement Grants, as authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) and under section 1003(g) of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA), are made available from the U.S. Department of Education (ED) to state education agencies (SEAs) to provide subgrants to local education agencies (LEAs) for use in Title I schools and Title I eligible secondary schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring or are otherwise designated as a priority school in accordance with federal guidelines.

The purpose of the grant program is to assist the state’s lowest performing schools that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to use the funds to provide adequate resources in order to raise substantially the achievement of their students so as to enable the schools to make adequate yearly progress and exit improvement status. For each eligible school approved to receive funds under this grant, the LEA must implement one of four school intervention models approved by ED.

Proposals will be reviewed and evaluated according to the criteria established in the RFP. Agency staff anticipates announcing grant awards in June 2013.
Financial Background
The initial term of these grants will begin no sooner than July 1, 2013 and will extend from the execution date of the grant agreement to June 30, 2014 (FY 2014). During the term of the grant, it is anticipated that funds will be available for a one year initial grant period and two additional one-year continuation periods, except in cases of school closure.

Funding in the two continuation periods will be contingent upon a sufficient appropriation for the program and satisfactory progress by the grantee in the preceding grant period. Annual grant awards can range from not less than $50,000 to $2 million per participating school per year, subject to available funds. Actual allocations, however, will be based on the intervention model selected at the local level and program guidelines.

Effectiveness
The four school intervention models endorsed by ED are supported by research for effectively improving student achievement. 29 High Schools in 9 districts across the state have been awarded $150 million in federal School Improvement Grant funds in Fiscal Year 2011, 2012 and 2013. The grants, awarded through a competitive application and review process, aim to help improve student achievement at some of the lowest performing schools in the state.

Analysis and Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action and Communications
Policy Implications: None

Budget Implications: The SIG program is funded entirely by federal Title I funds and funds received under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA).

Legislative Action: None

Communication: None

Superintendent’s Recommendation
I recommend that the following motion be adopted:

The Board hereby authorizes the State Superintendent to release an RFP whereby one or more eligible entities are expected to receive a competitive School Improvement Grant which exceeds $1 million over the term of the three year grant program (i.e., FY 2014 – 2016).

Next Steps
Upon Board authorization, Agency staff will release the RFP for the School Improvement Grant competition. Agency staff will then bring the recommended awardee(s) to the Board for approval prior to the issuance of any award(s).
TO: Illinois State Board of Education

FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
Robert Wolfe, Chief Financial Officer

Agenda Topic: Budget Update

Materials: Comparative Schedule of the Fiscal Year 2014 Board Recommended Budget to the Governor’s Budget

Staff Contact(s): Robert Wolfe

Purpose of Agenda Item
The purpose of the agenda item is to provide the Board with the comparison of the Board’s Fiscal Year 2014 recommended budget to the Governor’s recommended budget.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
Many issues discussed below relate to the successful implementation of the Board’s Strategic Plan.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
The Board will be provided with information regarding the variances in the two budgets and the potential challenges that will need to be addressed.

Background Information
The Governor submitted the Fiscal Year 2014 budget to the members of the General Assembly on March 6, 2013 in accordance with 15 ILCS 20/50-5. The Governor’s Fiscal Year General Revenue Funds budget for P-12 Education is $6.241 Billion. This budget level is $308.6 million less than the Fiscal Year 2013 Appropriation Levels and $1.174 Billion less than the budget adopted by the Board in January 2013.

The reductions, when compared to Fiscal Year 2013 appropriation amounts, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General State Aid</td>
<td>$(150.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation - Regular/ Vocational</td>
<td>$(145.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East St. Louis District 189 Supplemental Appropriation</td>
<td>$(9.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Delivery System (funded via the Personal Property Replacement Tax Fund)</td>
<td>$(2.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights</td>
<td>$(1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Free Lunch/Breakfast</td>
<td>$(5.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Mandated Categorical Increases Recommended by the Board</td>
<td>$4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Increase Recommended by the Board</td>
<td>$0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Decrease</td>
<td>$(308.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The line items in the Governor’s Budget that were not reduced were funded at the same level in Fiscal Year 2014 as the appropriation amount for Fiscal Year 2013. The major differences between the Governor’s Budget and the Budget Recommended by the Board are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General State Aid</td>
<td>$ (895.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation - Regular/ Vocational</td>
<td>$ (145.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>$ (40.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Security Grant Program</td>
<td>$ (20.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District Emergency Financial Assistance Fund Deposit</td>
<td>$ (13.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>$ (11.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments &amp; Growth Model</td>
<td>$ (10.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator Quality and Support Line Items</td>
<td>$ (6.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Free Lunch/Breakfast</td>
<td>$ (5.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Education</td>
<td>$ (3.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Learning/Regional Safe Schools</td>
<td>$ (2.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Consolidation Cost</td>
<td>$ (1.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the appropriations, as presented in the Governor’s Budget, are enacted, the proration amounts for Fiscal Year 2014 are projected to be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General State Aid</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation - Regular/ Vocational</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>71.9% (est.)</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the increased proration amounts listed above, the Governor’s Budget did not include increases in the amounts needed to administer Common Core and Writing Assessments in Fiscal Year 2014. Another area of concern is that the amount budgeted for District Consolidation Costs will only cover the payments required by statute for the district reorganizations that have already occurred. If referendums are passed in April, the appropriation for this line item will be insufficient.

**Superintendent’s Recommendation**
This item is for discussion purposes only.

**Next Steps**
Agency Staff will continue to communicate and advocate the Board Recommended Budget to the Office of Governor and General Assembly.
# ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

## FY2014 Budget Request

Comparison to FY2014 Governor's Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$000s</th>
<th>FY13 Board Recommendation</th>
<th>FY13 ISBE Appropriation</th>
<th>FY14 ISBE Board Recommendation</th>
<th>FY14 Governor's Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td>Percent Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td>Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td>Percent Increase (Decrease)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL FUNDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General State Aid</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Foundation Level</td>
<td>$6,119</td>
<td>$6,119</td>
<td>$6,119</td>
<td>$6,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-rated 96%</td>
<td>Pro-rated 89%</td>
<td>Pro-rated 100%</td>
<td>Pro-rated 82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSA Formula Grant</td>
<td>2,886,773.8</td>
<td>2,684,807.0</td>
<td>3,072,235.9</td>
<td>2,522,752.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td>(549,483.9)</td>
<td>-17.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>(162,055.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSA Poverty Grant</td>
<td>1,737,617.0</td>
<td>1,581,627.7</td>
<td>1,934,613.6</td>
<td>1,588,598.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td>(346,014.8)</td>
<td>-17.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,971.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Adjustments</td>
<td>25,000.0</td>
<td>20,317.8</td>
<td>25,000.0</td>
<td>25,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, General State Aid</strong></td>
<td>4,649,390.8</td>
<td>4,286,752.5</td>
<td>5,031,849.5</td>
<td>4,136,350.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td>(895,498.7)</td>
<td>-17.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>(150,401.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mandated Categoricals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp Ed - Personnel Reimbursement</td>
<td>440,200.0</td>
<td>440,200.0</td>
<td>440,500.0</td>
<td>440,500.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp Ed - Funding for Children Requiring Sp Ed Services</td>
<td>314,196.1</td>
<td>314,196.1</td>
<td>303,091.7</td>
<td>303,091.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>(11,104.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp Ed - Orphanage Tuition</td>
<td>111,000.0</td>
<td>111,000.0</td>
<td>105,000.0</td>
<td>105,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>(6,000.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp Ed - Private Tuition</td>
<td>213,800.0</td>
<td>206,843.3</td>
<td>219,119.0</td>
<td>219,119.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,275.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp Ed - Summer School</td>
<td>10,100.0</td>
<td>10,100.0</td>
<td>10,500.0</td>
<td>10,500.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>400.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp Ed - Transportation</td>
<td>440,500.0</td>
<td>440,500.0</td>
<td>450,300.0</td>
<td>450,300.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,800.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Special Ed Categoricals</strong></td>
<td>1,529,796.1</td>
<td>1,522,839.4</td>
<td>1,528,510.7</td>
<td>1,528,510.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,671.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Free Lunch/Breakfast</td>
<td>37,200.0</td>
<td>14,300.0</td>
<td>14,300.0</td>
<td>9,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td>(5,300.0)</td>
<td>-37.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5,300.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orphanage Tuition</td>
<td>13,000.0</td>
<td>13,000.0</td>
<td>12,000.0</td>
<td>12,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,000.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation - Regular/Vocational</td>
<td>205,808.9</td>
<td>205,808.9</td>
<td>205,808.9</td>
<td>60,179.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td>(145,629.5)</td>
<td>-70.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>(145,629.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-70.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Mandated Categoricals</strong></td>
<td>1,785,805.0</td>
<td>1,755,948.3</td>
<td>1,760,619.6</td>
<td>1,609,690.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td>(150,929.5)</td>
<td>-8.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>(146,258.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standards and Assessments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments</td>
<td>27,400.0</td>
<td>27,400.0</td>
<td>35,500.0</td>
<td>27,400.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td>(8,100.0)</td>
<td>-28.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Model</td>
<td>2,400.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>(2,400.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td>(2,400.0)</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Stds &amp; Assessments/Stdls Materials &amp; Training</td>
<td>2,000.0</td>
<td>2,000.0</td>
<td>2,000.0</td>
<td>2,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Standards, Assessments and Accountability</strong></td>
<td>31,800.0</td>
<td>29,400.0</td>
<td>39,900.0</td>
<td>29,400.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td>(10,500.0)</td>
<td>-34.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Improvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>345,000.0</td>
<td>300,192.4</td>
<td>340,192.4</td>
<td>300,192.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td>(40,000.0)</td>
<td>-12.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Foreign Language</td>
<td>1,000.0</td>
<td>500.0</td>
<td>500.0</td>
<td>500.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>70,381.2</td>
<td>63,381.2</td>
<td>74,381.2</td>
<td>63,381.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td>(11,000.0)</td>
<td>-14.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$000s</td>
<td>FY13 Board Recommendation</td>
<td>FY13 ISBE Appropriation</td>
<td>FY14 Board Recommendation</td>
<td>FY14 Governor's Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College and Career Readiness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance Placement Classes</td>
<td>527.0</td>
<td>527.0</td>
<td>750.0</td>
<td>527.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Education</td>
<td>1,800.0</td>
<td>1,800.0</td>
<td>1,800.0</td>
<td>1,800.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career and Technical Education Programs</td>
<td>38,562.1</td>
<td>38,062.1</td>
<td>38,062.1</td>
<td>38,062.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Career and College Readiness</td>
<td>40,889.1</td>
<td>40,389.1</td>
<td>40,612.1</td>
<td>40,389.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Reform and Accountability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest Performing Schools</td>
<td>3,000.0</td>
<td>1,002.8</td>
<td>5,000.0</td>
<td>1,002.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>statewide System of Support</td>
<td>2,000.0</td>
<td>300.0</td>
<td>300.0</td>
<td>300.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and District Technology Support</td>
<td>3,000.0</td>
<td>3,000.0</td>
<td>3,000.0</td>
<td>3,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, School Reform and Accountability</td>
<td>8,000.0</td>
<td>4,302.8</td>
<td>8,300.0</td>
<td>4,302.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Delivery System</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Offices of Education - Bus Driver Training</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Offices of Education - Salaries</td>
<td>9,800.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10,100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Offices of Education - School Services</td>
<td>4,950.0</td>
<td>2,225.1</td>
<td>6,500.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Regional Offices of Education</td>
<td>14,820.0</td>
<td>2,295.1</td>
<td>16,670.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind and Dyslexic</td>
<td>894.0</td>
<td>816.6</td>
<td>816.6</td>
<td>816.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Residential Services Authority</td>
<td>627.0</td>
<td>592.3</td>
<td>592.3</td>
<td>592.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Center for the Visually Impaired</td>
<td>1,421.1</td>
<td>1,421.1</td>
<td>1,421.1</td>
<td>1,421.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip J. Rock Center and School</td>
<td>3,577.8</td>
<td>3,577.8</td>
<td>3,577.8</td>
<td>3,577.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Special Education</td>
<td>6,619.9</td>
<td>6,507.8</td>
<td>6,657.8</td>
<td>6,507.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educator Quality and Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Board Certification</td>
<td>1,000.0</td>
<td>1,000.0</td>
<td>1,000.0</td>
<td>1,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach for America</td>
<td>1,975.0</td>
<td>1,225.0</td>
<td>1,975.0</td>
<td>1,225.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Evaluations</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Mentoring Program</td>
<td>900.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>900.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher and Administrator Mentoring Program</td>
<td>3,157.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5,000.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Educator Quality and Support</td>
<td>7,232.6</td>
<td>2,225.0</td>
<td>9,075.0</td>
<td>2,225.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Statewide District Categorical Assistance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Consolidation Costs</td>
<td>4,600.0</td>
<td>2,805.0</td>
<td>3,950.0</td>
<td>2,805.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Oversight/School Management Assistance</td>
<td>150.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East St. Louis District 189</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9,000.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District Emergency Financial Assistance Fund Deposit</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13,640.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13,640.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Other Statewide District Categorical Assistance</td>
<td>4,750.0</td>
<td>11,805.0</td>
<td>17,590.0</td>
<td>2,805.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Health and Safety Initiatives</td>
<td>FY13 Board Recommendation</td>
<td>FY13 ISBE Appropriation</td>
<td>FY14 Board Recommendation</td>
<td>FY14 Governor's Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Learning/Regional Safe Schools</td>
<td>9,341.9</td>
<td>6,539.3</td>
<td>9,341.9</td>
<td>6,539.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Education</td>
<td>1,000.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3,000.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truant Alternative and Optional Education</td>
<td>14,059.0</td>
<td>12,000.0</td>
<td>12,000.0</td>
<td>12,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Security Grant Program</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20,000.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Health &amp; Safety Initiatives before lump sums</strong></td>
<td>24,400.9</td>
<td>18,539.3</td>
<td>44,341.9</td>
<td>18,539.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator Investigations/Hearings--Lump Sum</td>
<td>375.0</td>
<td>184.0</td>
<td>184.0</td>
<td>184.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Student Health and Safety Initiatives</strong></td>
<td>24,775.9</td>
<td>18,723.3</td>
<td>44,525.9</td>
<td>18,723.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After School Matters</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2,500.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2,500.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Equivalent Grants</td>
<td>222.6</td>
<td>222.6</td>
<td>222.6</td>
<td>222.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1,000.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Miscellaneous</strong></td>
<td>222.6</td>
<td>3,722.6</td>
<td>222.6</td>
<td>2,722.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Grants without GSA/MCATS</strong></td>
<td>555,491.3</td>
<td>483,444.3</td>
<td>598,627.0</td>
<td>471,219.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL - GRANTS</strong></td>
<td>6,990,687.1</td>
<td>6,526,145.1</td>
<td>7,391,096.1</td>
<td>6,217,260.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADMINISTRATION --GENERAL FUNDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>16,629.6</td>
<td>16,036.3</td>
<td>16,036.3</td>
<td>16,036.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Pick-Up</td>
<td>198.9</td>
<td>191.8</td>
<td>191.8</td>
<td>191.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security/Medicare</td>
<td>536.8</td>
<td>517.6</td>
<td>517.6</td>
<td>517.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total Personal Services and Benefits</strong></td>
<td>17,565.3</td>
<td>16,745.7</td>
<td>16,945.7</td>
<td>16,945.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual</td>
<td>6,000.0</td>
<td>6,000.0</td>
<td>6,000.0</td>
<td>6,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>300.0</td>
<td>166.3</td>
<td>300.0</td>
<td>166.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodities</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>132.2</td>
<td>132.2</td>
<td>132.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications</td>
<td>450.0</td>
<td>450.0</td>
<td>450.0</td>
<td>450.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Operations</strong></td>
<td>24,727.3</td>
<td>23,654.0</td>
<td>23,987.7</td>
<td>23,854.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Lump Sums</strong></td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL - ADMINISTRATION AND LUMP SUMS</strong></td>
<td>24,927.3</td>
<td>23,654.0</td>
<td>23,987.7</td>
<td>23,854.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Funds Total</strong></td>
<td>7,015,614.4</td>
<td>6,549,799.0</td>
<td>7,415,083.8</td>
<td>6,241,114.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$000s</td>
<td>FY13 Board Recommendation</td>
<td>FY13 ISBE Appropriation</td>
<td>FY14 Board Recommendation</td>
<td>FY14 Governor's Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATION--OTHER STATE FUNDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinary &amp; Contingent Expenses - Indirect Cost Recovery</td>
<td>7,015.2</td>
<td>7,015.2</td>
<td>7,015.2</td>
<td>7,015.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinary &amp; Contingent Expenses - Chicago Teacher Cert. Fees</td>
<td>2,208.9</td>
<td>2,208.9</td>
<td>2,208.9</td>
<td>2,208.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinary &amp; Contingent Expenses - Teacher Certificate Fees</td>
<td>5,000.0</td>
<td>5,000.0</td>
<td>5,000.0</td>
<td>5,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinary &amp; Contingent Expenses - School Infrastructure Fund</td>
<td>600.0</td>
<td>600.0</td>
<td>600.0</td>
<td>600.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Lump Sums</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,824.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,824.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,824.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,824.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL - ADMINISTRATION</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,824.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,824.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,824.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,824.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRANTS--OTHER STATE FUNDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After School Rescue Fund</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter Schools Revolving Loan Fund</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers Education Fund</td>
<td>17,500.0</td>
<td>17,500.0</td>
<td>15,000.0</td>
<td>15,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Property Replacement Tax Fund - ROE Salaries</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12,025.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12,025.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Property Replacement Tax Fund - ROE Services</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2,225.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District Emergency Financial Assistance Fund</td>
<td>1,000.0</td>
<td>1,000.0</td>
<td>14,640.0</td>
<td>1,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Technology Revolving Loan Fund</td>
<td>5,000.0</td>
<td>5,000.0</td>
<td>5,000.0</td>
<td>5,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Board of Education Special Purpose Trust Fund</td>
<td>8,484.8</td>
<td>8,484.8</td>
<td>8,484.8</td>
<td>8,484.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Relocation Expenses Revolving Grant Fund</td>
<td>1,400.0</td>
<td>1,400.0</td>
<td>1,400.0</td>
<td>1,400.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Charter School Commission Fund</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>600.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Grants</strong></td>
<td><strong>33,604.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>46,229.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>45,344.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>45,954.8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL - GRANTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>33,604.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>46,229.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>45,344.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>45,954.8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL--OTHER STATE FUNDS - ISBE</td>
<td><strong>48,428.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>61,053.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>60,168.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>60,778.9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY13 Board Recommendation</td>
<td>FY13 ISBE Appropriation</td>
<td>FY14 Board Recommendation</td>
<td>FY14 Governor's Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDERAL FUNDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADMINISTRATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>17,375.7</td>
<td>17,375.7</td>
<td>17,897.0</td>
<td>17,897.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Pick-Up</td>
<td>109.4</td>
<td>109.4</td>
<td>114.9</td>
<td>114.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>7,507.5</td>
<td>7,507.5</td>
<td>7,732.7</td>
<td>7,732.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security/Medicare</td>
<td>1,222.6</td>
<td>1,222.6</td>
<td>1,259.3</td>
<td>1,259.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Insurance</td>
<td>5,052.2</td>
<td>5,052.2</td>
<td>5,203.8</td>
<td>5,203.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total Personal Services and Benefits</strong></td>
<td><strong>31,267.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>31,267.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>32,207.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>32,207.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual</td>
<td>25,525.5</td>
<td>25,525.5</td>
<td>26,525.5</td>
<td>26,525.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>2,030.0</td>
<td>2,030.0</td>
<td>2,030.0</td>
<td>2,030.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodities</td>
<td>410.0</td>
<td>410.0</td>
<td>410.0</td>
<td>410.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>498.0</td>
<td>498.0</td>
<td>498.0</td>
<td>498.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>677.6</td>
<td>1,000.0</td>
<td>1,000.0</td>
<td>1,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications</td>
<td>459.0</td>
<td>459.0</td>
<td>459.0</td>
<td>459.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Operations</strong></td>
<td><strong>60,867.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>61,189.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>63,130.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>63,130.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL-- ADMINISTRATION</strong></td>
<td><strong>60,867.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>61,189.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>63,130.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>63,130.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRANTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career and Technical Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career and Technical Education - Basic</td>
<td>55,000.0</td>
<td>55,000.0</td>
<td>55,000.0</td>
<td>55,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career and Technical Education - Tech Prep</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Career and Technical Education</strong></td>
<td><strong>55,100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>55,100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>55,000.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>55,000.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Nutrition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Nutrition Programs</td>
<td>725,000.0</td>
<td>725,000.0</td>
<td>725,000.0</td>
<td>725,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Child Nutrition</strong></td>
<td><strong>725,000.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>725,000.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>725,000.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>725,000.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individuals with Disabilities Act</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals with Disabilities Education Act</td>
<td>700,000.0</td>
<td>700,000.0</td>
<td>700,000.0</td>
<td>700,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals with Disabilities Education Act - Deaf and Blind</td>
<td>500.0</td>
<td>500.0</td>
<td>500.0</td>
<td>500.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals with Disabilities Education Act - Preschool</td>
<td>25,000.0</td>
<td>25,000.0</td>
<td>25,000.0</td>
<td>25,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals with Disabilities Education Act - State Improvement</td>
<td>4,000.0</td>
<td>4,000.0</td>
<td>4,350.0</td>
<td>4,350.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellfaire JCB</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Individuals with Disabilities Act</strong></td>
<td><strong>729,500.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>729,500.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>729,850.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>729,850.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>FY13 Board Recommendation</th>
<th>FY13 ISBE Appropriation</th>
<th>FY14 Board Recommendation</th>
<th>FY14 Governor's Budget</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease)</th>
<th>Percent Increase (Decrease)</th>
<th>FY14 Board Recommended</th>
<th>FY13 Appropriation</th>
<th>Percent Increase (Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NCLB (excluding Assessments)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCLB - Title I - Advanced Placement Program</td>
<td>3,000.0</td>
<td>3,000.0</td>
<td>3,000.0</td>
<td>3,000.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCLB - Title I</td>
<td>825,000.0</td>
<td>825,000.0</td>
<td>930,000.0</td>
<td>930,000.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCLB - Title I - ARRA</td>
<td>150,000.0</td>
<td>150,000.0</td>
<td>73,400.0</td>
<td>73,400.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-51.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCLB - Title I - Striving Readers</td>
<td>500.0</td>
<td>500.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCLB - Title II - Enhancing Education Through Technology</td>
<td>5,000.0</td>
<td>5,000.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCLB - Title II - Enhancing Education Through Technology - ARRA</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCLB - Title II - Math/Science Partnerships</td>
<td>14,000.0</td>
<td>14,000.0</td>
<td>14,000.0</td>
<td>14,000.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCLB - Title II - Teacher/Principal Training</td>
<td>157,000.0</td>
<td>157,000.0</td>
<td>157,000.0</td>
<td>157,000.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCLB - Title III - Language Acquisition</td>
<td>45,000.0</td>
<td>45,000.0</td>
<td>45,200.0</td>
<td>45,200.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCLB - Title IV - 21st Century/Community Service Programs</td>
<td>65,000.0</td>
<td>65,000.0</td>
<td>74,000.0</td>
<td>74,000.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCLB - Title IV - Safe and Drug Free Schools</td>
<td>500.0</td>
<td>500.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCLB - Title V - Charter Schools</td>
<td>9,000.0</td>
<td>9,000.0</td>
<td>9,000.0</td>
<td>9,000.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCLB - Title VI - Rural and Low Income Schools</td>
<td>2,000.0</td>
<td>2,000.0</td>
<td>2,000.0</td>
<td>2,000.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCLB - Title X - Homeless Education</td>
<td>5,000.0</td>
<td>5,000.0</td>
<td>5,000.0</td>
<td>5,000.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, NCLB (excluding Assessments)</strong></td>
<td>1,281,100.0</td>
<td>1,281,100.0</td>
<td>1,312,650.0</td>
<td>1,312,650.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments</td>
<td>23,780.3</td>
<td>23,780.3</td>
<td>23,780.3</td>
<td>23,780.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONPAR</td>
<td>2,000.0</td>
<td>2,000.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,000.0) -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Assessments</strong></td>
<td>25,780.3</td>
<td>25,780.3</td>
<td>23,780.3</td>
<td>23,780.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,000.0) -7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Grants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressional Special Projects</td>
<td>5,000.0</td>
<td>5,000.0</td>
<td>5,000.0</td>
<td>5,000.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn and Serve America</td>
<td>500.0</td>
<td>500.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(500.0) -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal Data System</td>
<td>5,200.0</td>
<td>5,200.0</td>
<td>5,200.0</td>
<td>5,200.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal Data System - ARRA</td>
<td>10,000.0</td>
<td>10,000.0</td>
<td>10,000.0</td>
<td>10,000.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Learning Challenge</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>35,000.0</td>
<td>35,000.0</td>
<td>35,000.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race to the Top</td>
<td>42,800.0</td>
<td>42,800.0</td>
<td>42,800.0</td>
<td>42,800.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Other Grants</strong></td>
<td>63,500.0</td>
<td>98,500.0</td>
<td>98,000.0</td>
<td>98,000.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(500.0) -0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL - GRANTS</strong></td>
<td>2,879,980.3</td>
<td>2,914,980.3</td>
<td>2,944,280.3</td>
<td>2,944,280.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL - FEDERAL FUNDS</strong></td>
<td>2,940,847.8</td>
<td>2,976,170.2</td>
<td>3,007,410.5</td>
<td>3,007,410.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>10,004,891.1</td>
<td>9,587,023.1</td>
<td>10,482,663.2</td>
<td>9,309,303.5</td>
<td>(1,173,359.7)</td>
<td>-11.2%</td>
<td>(277,719.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Agenda Topic: Synopsis of Tracked Legislation

Staff Contact(s): Nicole Wills, Governmental Relations
                  Amanda Elliott, Governmental Relations

Purpose of Agenda Item
The purpose of the agenda item is to provide a legislative update of matters before the General Assembly.

Overview of Pending Legislation
In addition to legislation included on the Synopsis List, the following bills are highlighted as bills of particular interest:

Compulsory School Age (SB 1307 (Lightford), HB 2762 (Scherer) and HB 2405 (Welch)): SB 1307 and HB 2762 lower the compulsory school age from 7 to 5 and 6, respectively. HB 2405 requires districts to offer full day kindergarten. SB 1307 passed the Senate Education Committee. HB 2762 and HB 2405 are both assigned to the House Elementary and Secondary Education Committees. ISBE is neutral on all three of these measures.

Boards (HB 2766 (Kifowit)): HB 2766 amends the State Finance Act to disallow part-time State board and commission members from receiving a per diem. Board members may still be reimbursed for travel and other expenses authorized by law. If this were to become law, members of the State Board of Education would no longer receive a $50 per diem.

Certified School Nurses (HB 1373 (Chapa LaVia)): HB 1373 codifies the ISBE rule set to go into effect July 1, 2013 that would require a CSN to make the educational accommodation recommendation based on a student's medical condition to the IEP team.

School Vouchers (HB 76 (Ford) and SB 1248 (Murphy)): HB 76 creates the School Choice Program which provides vouchers for eligible students to attend non-public schools. Eligible students include those students that are residents of 1 of the 20 zip codes that generated the greatest amount of lottery sales in 2012 (18 out of 20 are located in the City of Chicago). SB 1248 creates the School Choice Program, a 10-year pilot program which will provide vouchers for students to attend non-public schools in the City of Chicago. Agency staff intend to oppose both measures. HB 76 (Murphy) failed in the Senate Education Committee.

Pensions: Various pension reform proposals have been introduced in both the House and Senate. Agency staff will continue to monitor pension reform.

PTELL (HB 89 (Franks,) and HB 95 (McSweeney)) HB 89 is similar to HB 3793 and HB 4608 from the 97th General Assembly. This bill provides that if the total EAV in a school district is less
than the previous year, the district’s extension limitation is either 0% or the rate of increase approved by the voters. The bill will keep extensions – the money raised by property tax collections – from increasing when EAV amounts are declining. The result would be decreased funds raised locally, which would impact a school districts local revenue. This would also increase the cost of funding the foundation level for the State, or increase the proration if appropriation levels hold steady. HB 95 is somewhat similar to HB 89, except that it provides that no matter if EAVs are falling or not, a PTELL district’s extension limitation will be 0% or the rate of increase approved by the voters. There would be a similar impact to HB 89, although the cost for the state could be slightly higher. Agency staff plans to oppose both proposals.

**Funding (HB 2 (Bellock) and HB 1273 (Beiser)):** HB 2 amends the Grant Funds Recovery Act to require more detailed reporting of persons and organizations that apply for grant funds. Agency staff has multiple concerns regarding this proposal that would add additional reporting requirements to our grant recipients: early childhood providers, school districts, etc. As filed, agency staff plans to oppose the measure and is working with the sponsor for a positive resolution. HB 1273 repeals the Chicago Block Grant effective FY 2014. Agency staff will monitor this proposal.

**Overview of Board Legislative Initiatives**

Over the past several months, the Agency’s Governmental Relations staff has been working with Agency divisions to develop legislative proposals for the spring 2013 legislative session. Governmental Relations is continuing to develop substantive language and identify sponsors for any legislation supported by the Board.

**Classrooms First Commission:** SB 1877 (Manar) and HB 2267 (Gordon-Booth) include three recommendations of the Classrooms First Commission. The three recommendations include:

- Recommendation 3: Allow non-contiguous but compact school districts to reorganize if contiguous school districts reject reorganization.
- Recommendation 4: Permit districts under 750 student enrollment to dissolve with or without a referendum.
- Recommendation 8: Allow for a delayed reorganization effective date.

The final report can be found at: [Classrooms First Commission Final Report](#).

**District Interventions:** ISBE has utilized its statutory authority to intervene using FOPs, both those formed under Article 1B and 1H of the School Code, in a number of districts, including four active FOPs in Cairo Unit School District 1, Proviso Township High School District, East St. Louis District 189 and North Chicago CUSD 187.

While FOPs (and other limited interventions) can be successful in certain districts that need targeted assistance, the staff of the State Board of Education believes that for districts in more comprehensive failure often these limited interventions do not go far enough to solve the problems in the district or only solve the problems for a limited time.

SB 2340 (Steans) amends Section 3.25(f) of the School Code to clarify ISBE’s authority to intervene in these failing school districts.

**Multiple Measures Index:** While engaged in the ESEA Flexibility Waiver application process it became clear that the current accountability system in Illinois did not consider all the factors that contribute to school and district success. Illinois needs a system that provides stakeholders with the necessary information, tools, and measures to properly address the appropriate
interventions, supports, and rewards given the diverse needs of our students. Based on the feedback gathered from stakeholders, implementation of multiple measures provides a more holistic and comprehensive differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system to better serve the school districts, schools, students, and parents of Illinois.

**North Chicago Charter:** SB 2377 would set aside 1/3 of charter enrollment at LEARN Charter in North Chicago for students with parents assigned to the federal military base.

**Data Streamlining:** SB 2385 amends the School Code to streamline data collection required of school districts.

**Obsolete/Duplicative Bill:** This initiative would be a continuation of ISBE’s efforts to streamline the School Code provisions and amend or repeal outdated or otherwise problematic provisions of the School Code. ISBE has introduced similar pieces of legislation over the last several years.

**FY 14 Budget:** Governmental Relations staff will work with the Budget staff to advocate for the Board's FY 14 budget recommendation as well as any other related legislation.

**Next Steps**
Governmental Relations will continue to update the Board with respect to the Spring legislative session.