

No Child Left Behind Application

Baseline Data and Performance Targets

English Language Proficiency

Highly Qualified Teachers

Professional Development

Title I Paraprofessionals

Persistently Dangerous Schools

High School Graduation

Dropouts



**Illinois State Board of Education
100 North First Street
Springfield, Illinois 62777**

September 2, 2003

Instructions for Completing the Consolidated State Application

As described in the May 7, 2002, *Consolidated State Application Package*, States' submissions of their consolidated applications have been divided into multiple submissions and information requests. The information States are to provide in their September 1, 2003 document is listed below (*to be sent by September 2, 2003*).

Summary of Information Required for September 2003 Submission

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for ESEA GOALS AND ESEA INDICATORS

Performance Goal 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

- 2.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.

Performance Goal 3: By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

- 3.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of classes being taught by highly qualified teachers, in the aggregate and in high-poverty schools.
- 3.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development.
- 3.3 Performance indicator: The percentage of paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

Performance Goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.

- 4.1 Performance indicator: The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State.

Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.

- 5.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma.
- 5.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of students who drop out of school.

ESEA GOALS and ESEA INDICATORS

Performance Indicator 2.1: The percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.

For this *Consolidated State Application* document, states must report information related to their standards and assessments for English language proficiency (ELP) and baseline data and performance targets for ESEA Performance Indicator 2.1.

A. ELP Standards and Assessments

Please describe the status of the State's efforts to establish ELP standards that relate to the development and attainment of English proficiency by limited English proficient students. Specifically, describe how the State's ELP standards:

- **Address grades K through 12**
- **Address the four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing**
- **Are linked to the academic content and achievement standards in reading/language arts and mathematics, and in science (by 2005-2006).**

STATE RESPONSE

Illinois has not yet created ELP Standards. Although there is a comprehensive set of *Illinois Learning Standards* in place since 1997, the standards incorporate English/Language Arts, Science, Mathematics, Social Science, Physical Development and Health, Fine Arts, and Foreign Language (in an advisory capacity). Staff of the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) have begun the process of reviewing the available information and tapping into the new consortia of states working on this area. These consortia have been established as a result of special *No Child Left Behind* Act of 2001 (NCLB) grants provided by the United States Department of Education (USDE) for the specific development of enhanced assessments for students with limited English proficiency (LEP). Although Illinois is not currently a consortium member, this option is being explored.

Illinois has sampled data from districts and their use of the four allowed language proficiency tests. Districts were asked to submit data on the number of LEP students scoring in the various performance levels, based on the language proficiency test used. Data were not analyzed because ELP standards are not in place and Illinois has therefore not updated the definition of the term "proficient" based on ELP standards. The Illinois Measure of Academic Growth in English (IMAGE) state assessment addresses academic content and achievement standards in reading, writing and mathematics at this time, and tests in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11.

Section 1111 (b) (7) states:

(7) ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY- Each State plan shall demonstrate that local educational agencies in the State will, beginning not later than school year 2002-2003, provide for an annual assessment of English proficiency (measuring students' oral language, reading, and writing skills in English) of all students with limited English proficiency in the schools served by the State educational agency, except that the Secretary may provide the State 1 additional year if the State demonstrates that exceptional or uncontrollable circumstances, such as a natural disaster or a precipitous and unforeseen decline in the financial resources of the State, prevented full implementation of this paragraph by that deadline and that the State will complete implementation within the additional 1-year period. [emphasis added]

As a result of a significant State budget deficit, \$5 billion in FY03 leading into FY04, the agency experienced an unforeseen decline in financial resources. There was also a substantial loss of qualified staff through the state's Early Retirement Incentive of 2002-03, another cost-savings measure which worked for the State but created a significant drain on the agency.

Due to this unforeseen budget decline **and** lack of appropriate personnel, Illinois requests an extension of time until September 2, 2004. At this time, Illinois is not ready for all of the tasks outlined by *NCLB* in the arena of assessing LEP students, such as the ELP standards and a single language proficiency exam.

- ❑ The agency restructured the work and staff of the former Bilingual Section in March 2002. An interim administrator was put into place. Ongoing duties of state and federal programs such as the state Transitional Bilingual Education Program, Title I, Migrant Education Program, the Refugee Children School Assistance grant, and the Transition to Teaching grant were performed, to the extent possible, but with a small number of staff. Those roles, given the reduced number of staff, were the focus rather than the future planning and policy issues of *NCLB*.
- ❑ The agency experienced a substantial loss of qualified staff through the state's Early Retirement Incentive in 2002-03. Staff left between September 2002 and February 2003. There was a substantial loss of positions across the agency, many of which were crucial to the implementation of activities required for the completion of necessary tasks under *NCLB*. The Division of English Language Learning had five (5) professional staff retire, from a total of thirteen (13), as of February 28, 2003. Three of the division's clerical staff were placed elsewhere by ISBE and the remaining clerical staff person retired.
- ❑ Similarly, related supportive divisions such as Student Assessment, School Accountability, Data Analysis and Reporting, and Curriculum and Instruction were severely impacted by the Early Retirement Incentive such that no additional staff could be borrowed to address the losses in English Language Learning.

- ❑ There had been an acting administrator from March 2002 through February 2003, and another one from March 2003 through June 2003. Despite funding shortages, an experienced permanent administrator was employed by ISBE for the Division of English Language Learning as of July 1, 2003.
- ❑ Even though there was a reduction in agency funds and layoffs of staff agency-wide in June 2003 and again in August 2003, two professional staff were transferred into the division from elsewhere in ISBE. These staff are experienced agency employees but not in this arena. They are bilingual but have limited program knowledge at this time.
- ❑ Additionally, an individual qualified but not experienced in this area "bumped" into a position in the division in mid-August, replacing a less senior experienced staff member.
- ❑ The Division of English Language Learning administers various programs funded by the state and by several federal grants. These now include Transitional Bilingual Education (state funded – 275 districts, including Chicago Public Schools; operating 388 programs for LEP students); Migrant Education (federal – 14 summer programs at 20 sites); Title III (federal - 172 language instruction programs and 109 immigrant education programs); Refugee Children School Assistance Grant (federal – Chicago Public Schools and 12 different agencies that work with refugees); and, finally, the Transition to Teaching (federal) project. The administration of all these programs and all the activities each entails has placed a heavy demand on the Division of English Language Learning, which has been operating since the winter with a staff reduction of 50% and a concomitant 150% increase in programs, thus causing significant delays in the accomplishment of all required program activities.
- ❑ These recent staff additions (management and staff) will begin to alleviate the pressure in the Division of English Language Learning **after** a suitable transition period and learning time. It is anticipated that ISBE will catch up with these *NCLB*-required tasks by the beginning of 2004-05, and be on target thereafter. As allowed for unusual circumstances, an extension of time for one year is requested.

B. Baseline Data for Performance Indicator 2.1

In the following table, please provide ELP baseline data from the 2002-2003 school year test administration. ELP baseline data should include all students in the State who were identified as limited English proficient by State-selected ELP assessments, regardless of student participation in Title III-supported programs.

1. The ELP baseline data should include the following:
 - Total number of students identified as LEP by each State-selected ELP assessment(s);

- Total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of ELP as defined by State ELP standards and ELP assessments; and
- A list of each of the ELP assessment(s) used to determine level of English language proficiency.

2. The baseline data should:

- Indicate all levels of ELP; and
- Be aggregated at the State level.

If a State is reporting data using an ELP composite score (e.g., a total score that consists of a sum or average of scores in the domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension), the State must:

- Describe how the composite score was derived;
- Describe how all five domains of ELP were incorporated into the composite score; and
- Describe how the domains were weighted to develop the composite score.

Please provide the following additional information:

1. ELP assessment(s) used, including the grades and domains addressed by each assessment (e.g., IDEA Language Proficiency Test (IPT I), grades K-6, listening and speaking).

In Illinois, four language proficiency assessments are used by local school districts to assess ELEP, and one is used statewide. Following is a list of LEP assessment(s) (both state and state-approved assessments) used to determine level of English proficiency:

- IMAGE
- Language Assessment Scale (LAS)
- Language Proficiency Test Series (LPTS)
- IDEA Proficiency Test (IPT)
- Maculaitis (MACII)

The four local tests are:

- LAS -- Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing
- LPTS -- Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing
- IPT -- Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing
- MACII -- Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing

All of these tests measure the domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The sections of the tests that measure oral language contain activities which measure listening comprehension. All of the assessments include sections which address reading comprehension.

Due to the circumstances described under **Item A** on pages 3-5, Illinois is asking that the data provided not be used as the baseline. It is here as illustrative of current Illinois information, but should not be considered as a baseline.

- Total number of students assessed for English language proficiency on state-selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students referred for assessment and evaluated using state-selected ELP assessments).

**Table 1. Number of Students Assessed and Identified as LEP
by State-selected ELP Assessments**

Type of Assessment Instrument	Numbers Assessed ►	Number Identified as LEP	Percent of Students Identified as LEP via Assessment
State Approved Tests			
<i>IPT</i>	16,200	12,980	80.1%
<i>LAS</i>	29,267	20,869	71.3%
<i>LPTS</i>	170,667	69,709	40.8%
<i>MACII</i>	11,450	8,493	74.2%
Non-State Approved Tests			
<i>Woodcock-Munoz</i>	1,869	1,500	80.3%
<i>Language Assessment Battery</i>	206	96	46.6%
<i>Other</i>	3,304	1,700	51.5%
TOTAL	232,963	115,347	49.5%

► The numbers shown are **new students** who were screened or assessed at the beginning of the 2002-03 school year for eligibility to receive bilingual education program services. The numbers **do not** include the students who entered the program within the school year. The numbers were aggregated from reports of 239 school districts out of 308 school districts.

- Total number of students identified as LEP on state-selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students determined to be LEP on state-selected ELP assessment(s)).

The data were taken from state-required or state-approved local tests which were administered at the end of the school year – normally in April or May 2003. Since the assessments for screening and assessments for achievement or proficiency are not administered at the same time – there is no one-to-one correspondence between screening data and levels of proficiency data. Therefore, the data on English proficiency levels that appears on the next page do not include the number of students assessed and the number of students identified as LEP. The proficiency levels data are limited to the list of assessment instruments listed above. Moreover, only IMAGE is aligned to the state learning standards; the state-selected local assessments are not. Illinois has yet to establish its English learning standards for LEP students. The state-selected test results were extracted from a sample of 169 school districts, i.e., the numbers reported do not represent a total census.

Commonly used ELP assessments in Illinois, including the grades and domains assessed by each assessment, are as follows:

- State -- IMAGE Grades 3 -- 11 Reading and Writing

► **State-approved local tests**

- IPT1 Grades K -- 6 Oral Language, Reading and Writing
- IPT2 Grades 7 -- 12 Oral Language, Reading and Writing
- Pre-LAS 4 -- 6 years old Oral Language
- Pre-LAS 5 -- 6 years old Pre-Literacy Component
- LAS Grades 1 -- 12 Oral Language, Reading and Writing
- LPTS Grades K -- 12 Listening/Speaking, Reading and Writing
- Maculaitis Grades K -- 12 Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing

Table 2. Levels of ELP Aggregated at the State Level

⊕ **IMAGE**

Note: Students are considered “proficient” at the “expanding” level.

Grade Level	Proficiency Levels in Reading							
	Beginning		Strengthening		Expanding		Transitioning	
	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct
Grade 3	3,638	24.5	5,100	34.4	3,685	24.8	2,424	16.3
Grade 4	1,774	39.3	1,610	35.7	770	17.1	357	7.9
Grade 5	1,239	35.9	1,072	31.1	645	18.7	496	14.4
Grade 6	1,435	46.5	1,051	34.1	542	17.6	56	1.8
Grade 7	1,229	41.2	978	32.8	679	22.8	98	3.3
Grade 8	1,142	39.1	865	29.6	778	26.6	136	4.7
Grade 9	1,988	58.5	1,183	34.8	208	6.1	18	0.5
Grade 10	1,651	53.5	1,163	37.7	257	8.3	18	0.6
Grade 11	1,050	47.4	957	43.2	191	8.6	19	0.9

Grade Level	Proficiency Levels in Writing							
	Beginning		Strengthening		Expanding		Transitioning	
	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct
Grade 3	758	5.4	1,770	12.6	6,756	47.9	4,825	34.2
Grade 4	1,071	25.3	1,474	34.8	1,440	34.0	251	5.9
Grade 5	642	19.8	909	28.1	1,369	42.3	317	9.8
Grade 6	1,183	40.1	987	33.4	707	24.0	75	2.5
Grade 7	1,031	36.2	916	32.2	812	28.5	86	3.0
Grade 8	854	30.9	816	29.6	920	33.3	171	6.2
Grade 9	1,988	62.1	828	25.8	367	11.5	21	0.7
Grade 10	1,635	55.2	846	28.6	456	15.4	26	0.9
Grade 11	1,051	48.8	705	32.8	382	17.7	15	0.7

State-Approved Local Tests

IDEA PROFICIENCY TEST (IPT)

Oral Language (IPT)

Grade Cohorts	No English		Limited English		Fluent English		TOTAL
	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	
K	278	28.3	472	48.1	231	23.5	981
1	146	17.6	470	56.6	214	25.8	830
2-6	191	5.6	792	23.3	2,417	71.1	3,400
7-12	407	25.5	416	26.1	773	48.4	1,596
TOTAL	1,022	19.6	2,150	41.3	3,635	69.8	5,211

Reading (IPT)

Grade Cohorts	No English		Limited English		Competent English		TOTAL
	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	
K-1	471	20.2	1,124	48.2	736	31.6	2,331
2-3	951	32.9	900	31.2	1,037	35.9	2,888
4-6	645	27.3	953	40.3	766	32.4	2,364
7-12	766	23.0	1,755	52.7	807	24.2	3,328
TOTAL	2,833	26.0	4,732	43.4	3,346	30.7	10,911

Writing (IPT)

Grade Cohorts	No English		Limited English		Competent English		TOTAL
	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	
K-1	298	13.6	1,587	72.5	303	13.8	2,188
2-3	303	12.3	2,162	87.7	0	0.0	2,465
4-6	187	7.6	1,775	71.9	505	20.5	2,467
7-12	186	5.8	2,458	76.8	556	17.4	3,200
TOTAL	974	9.4	7,982	77.3	1,364	13.2	10,320

LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT SCALE (LAS) (Pre-LAS assessments in the K-1 cohort)

Oral Language (LAS)

Cohort	No English		Limited English		Fluent English		TOTAL
	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	
K-1	3,468	57.4	1,392	23.0	1,180	19.5	6,040
2-6	1,636	27.0	1,312	21.7	3,107	51.3	6,055
7-12	819	47.3	520	30.0	394	22.7	1,733
TOTAL	5,923	42.8	3,224	23.3	4,681	33.9	13,828

Reading (LAS)

Cohort	Non-Reader		Limited Reader		Competent Reader		TOTAL
	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	
K-1	1,939	38.5	1,723	34.2	1,377	27.3	5,039
2-6	2,779	24.6	3,749	33.2	4,760	42.2	11,288
7-12	674	26.4	1,186	46.4	697	27.3	2,557
TOTAL	5,392	28.6	6,658	35.3	6,834	36.2	18,884

Writing (LAS)

Cohort	Non-Writer		Limited Writer		Competent Writer		TOTAL
	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	
K-1	1,745	41.1	1,452	34.2	1,051	24.7	4,248
2-6	3,695	33.7	5,337	48.6	1,948	17.7	10,980
7-12	681	27.7	1,403	57.1	372	15.1	2,456
TOTAL	6,121	34.6	8,192	46.3	3,371	19.1	17,684

LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY TEST SERIES (LPTS)**Oral Language (LPTS)**

Grade Cohorts	Not Proficient		Proficient		TOTAL
	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	
K-2	2,680	67.8	1,271	32.2	3,951
3-5	1,294	41.4	1,832	58.6	3,126
6-8	710	52.2	651	47.8	1,361
9-12	550	44.9	676	55.1	1,226
Total	5,234	54.2	4,430	45.8	9,664

Reading (LPTS)

Grade Cohorts	No English		Limited-Intermediate English		Nearly Reading to Exit Program		General Education/Transitioned		TOTAL
	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	
K-2	2,210	50.3	879	20.0	700	15.9	606	13.8	4,395
3-5	1,340	43.4	825	26.7	320	10.4	600	19.4	3,085
6-8	651	49.5	398	30.2	147	11.2	120	9.1	1,316
9-12	567	46.1	360	29.3	232	18.9	70	5.7	1,229
Total	4,768	47.6	2,462	24.6	1,399	14.0	1,396	13.9	10,025

Writing (LPTS)

Grade Cohorts	No English		Limited-Intermediate English		Nearly Writing to Exit Program		General Education/Transitioned		TOTAL
	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	
K-2	2,207	49.7	331	7.5	695	15.7	1,207	27.2	4,440
3-5	513	17.2	552	18.5	1,215	40.8	701	23.5	2,981
6-8	545	43.7	386	30.9	222	17.8	95	7.6	1,248
9-12	545	44.3	353	28.7	247	20.1	84	6.8	1,229
Total	3,810	38.5	1,622	16.4	2,379	24.0	2,087	21.1	9,898

Composite Scores* (LPTS)

Grade Cohorts	No English		Limited-Intermediate English		Nearly Reading to Exit Program		General Education/Transitioned		TOTAL
	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	
K-2	8,359	31.5	9,861	37.2	5,843	22.0	2,441	9.2	26,504
3-5	2,141	10.8	2,023	10.2	6,839	34.6	8,735	44.3	19,738
6-8	1,539	16.1	1,669	17.5	2,303	24.1	4,053	42.4	9,564
9-12	454	11.3	650	16.2	1,445	36.0	1,467	36.5	4,016
Total	12,493	20.9	14,203	23.7	16,430	27.5	16,696	27.9	59,822

* These composite scores were reported by Chicago Public School District 299. No explanations were offered on how these scores were derived.

MACULAITIS (MACII)

Listening (MACII)

Grade Cohorts	Basic Beginner		Beginner		Low Intermediate		High Intermediate		Advanced		TOTAL
	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	
K-1	152	8.3	237	13.0	270	14.8	556	30.5	606	33.3	1,821
2-3	6	0.3	37	2.2	243	14.1	511	29.7	922	53.6	1,719
4-5	6	0.5	84	7.3	145	12.7	391	34.2	518	45.3	1,144
6-8	27	2.8	89	9.3	220	23.1	361	37.9	256	26.9	953
9-12	10	0.9	73	6.2	251	21.5	400	34.2	436	37.3	1,170
TOTAL	201	3.0	520	7.6	1,129	16.6	2,219	32.6	2,738	40.2	6,807

Speaking (MACII)

Grade Cohorts	Basic Beginner		Beginner		Low Intermediate		High Intermediate		Advanced		TOTAL
	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	
K-1	266	15.8	345	20.5	418	24.9	457	27.2	196	11.7	1,682
2-3	77	4.5	140	8.2	299	17.4	571	33.3	629	36.7	1,716
4-5	32	2.9	45	4.0	178	15.9	358	32.1	503	45.1	1,116
6-8	109	11.9	85	9.2	148	16.1	284	30.9	293	31.9	919
9-12	65	7.2	90	10.0	185	20.6	310	34.5	248	27.6	898
TOTAL	549	8.7	705	11.1	1,228	19.4	1,980	31.3	1,869	29.5	6,331

Reading (MACII)

Grade Cohorts	Basic Beginner		Beginner		Low Intermediate		High Intermediate		Advanced		TOTAL
	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	
K-1	220	15.1	335	23.0	563	38.7	228	15.7	108	7.4	1,454
2-3	11	0.6	141	7.9	628	35.0	597	33.3	415	23.2	1,792
4-5	10	0.9	398	34.1	411	35.2	294	25.2	55	4.7	1,168
6-8	14	1.5	274	28.8	312	32.8	273	28.7	77	8.1	950
9-12	10	0.9	196	16.7	426	36.3	385	32.8	158	13.4	1,175
TOTAL	265	4.1	1,344	20.6	2,340	35.8	1,777	27.2	813	12.4	6,539

Writing (MACII)

Grade Cohorts	Basic Beginner		Beginner		Low Intermediate		High Intermediate		Advanced		TOTAL
	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	
K-1	95	10.5	221	24.4	413	45.6	126	13.9	50	5.5	905
2-3	43	2.4	434	24.5	531	30.0	539	30.4	224	12.6	1,771
4-5	61	5.2	212	18.2	423	36.3	396	34.0	72	6.2	1,164
6-8	61	6.4	208	21.9	268	28.2	317	33.4	95	10.0	949
9-12	79	7.1	254	22.9	367	33.1	345	31.1	63	5.7	1,108
TOTAL	339	5.7	1,329	22.5	2,002	33.9	1,723	29.2	504	8.5	5,897

C. Performance Targets (Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives) for ELP

Section 3122(a) (3) requires that States’ annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for English language proficiency include annual increases in the number or percentage of children attaining English proficiency. Please provide the State’s definition of “proficient” in English as defined by the State’s English language proficiency standards. Please include in your response:

- **The test score range or cut scores for each of the State’s ELP assessments;**
- **A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State’s definition of “proficient” in English.**

STATE RESPONSE

As previously explained on pages 3-5, due to unforeseen circumstances resulting from a sudden decline in financial resources, ISBE has been unable to proceed with its plans to:

- develop ELP standards;
- collect and analyze student ELP data on a timely basis;
- define what constitutes “proficient” in terms of meeting ELP standards;
- augment the IMAGE test to address the domains of listening and speaking and also to include grades K, 1, and 12; and
- develop AMAOs.

In the absence of these essential elements, the development of AMAOs will proceed once the other areas are addressed.

Section 3122 (a) (3) requires that States’ annual measurable achievement objectives for English language proficiency include annual increases in the number or percentage of children making progress in learning English. Please provide the State’s definition of “making progress” in learning English as defined by the State’s English language proficiency standards and assessments. Please include in your response:

- **A description of the English language proficiency levels and any sub-levels as defined by the State’s English language proficiency standards and assessments**
- **A description of the criteria students must meet to progress from one proficiency level to the next (e.g., narrative descriptions, cut scores, formula, data from multiple sources)**
- **A description of the language domains in which students must make progress in moving from one English language proficiency level to the next.**

STATE RESPONSE

At the present time, the State’s definition of “proficient” is based on the regulations, which specify attainment of at least the 50th percentile on a standardized, nationally-normed ELP test. Districts currently can select from four such state-approved local measures in Illinois (see page 6). At this time, there is no single or standard definition of what constitutes “making progress” in language proficiency. Districts rely on the criteria established by the publishers of the respective tests. These commercially available tests assess all domains of ELP at grades K-12 (see page 6). Table 2 delineates local progress in ELP with those assessments.

The law requires districts to account for *two* AMAOs:

1. The annual expected student progress in attaining ELP, which takes into consideration the students’ proficiencies in reading and writing through 2004-05. During this period the expected annual growth on the IMAGE reading test will be a gain of 25 scale points and for writing it will be 2.5 rubric-based points. A student who makes the expected gain in reading or writing will be included in the group having made adequate progress in English proficiency.
2. Illinois will factor in all other language proficiency domains beginning with the 2005-06 school year. This does not mean that districts in Illinois are not measuring progress in the domains of listening and speaking. Indeed, districts are using one of the four nationally-normed state-approved instruments. However, since the scores derived from these four different instruments are not comparable and are not aligned with the *Illinois Learning Standards* for Language Arts, they are not included in determining student progress in attaining English proficiency.

Should Illinois be granted the requested extension as outlined on pages 3-5, ISBE would use Spring 2004 data as the baseline.

Illinois will establish ELP standards and review the existing ELP instruments to establish a common range of scores that would fall within a predetermined set of proficiency levels to determine student progress. This would be an interim approach while the standards are developed and assessments are upgraded for implementation in 2006. The state will be modifying and adding to the current assessment instruments by which the *Illinois Learning Standards* are measured, and has issued a Request for Sealed Proposals for that purpose.

Please provide the State's definition of cohort(s). Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

STATE RESPONSE

Unit of Analysis/Cohort. The current grade level spans are grades 3-5, grades 6-8, and grades 9-11. Scores are reported based on these grade level spans. Students will also demonstrate proficiency for three consecutive years before taking the ISAT. These new developments in state law will help determine a description of "cohort".

Illinois proposes defining cohorts first by years of participation in the program and then by grade level spans: year 1: Grades K -- 2, 3 -- 4 -- 5, 6 -- 7 -- 8, 9 -- 12; and years 2 -- 4: same.

Mathematics is assessed in grades 3, 5, 8, and 11 only. Scores are reported for the individual grade levels rather than as a grade level span. Information tracking individual student growth from year to year has not been available due to state regulations, which mandated LEP students to take the general state assessment, the Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT), after completing three years of service in either bilingual or English as a Second Language (ESL) programs.

Typically, a third grade student who began to receive services in either kindergarten or first grade would only take the IMAGE test once, then take the ISAT the following time it is offered. State law changed in August 2003, consistent with Illinois' federally-approved *Accountability Plan*, to allow LEP students, on a case-by-case basis and at the discretion of the district, to take the IMAGE test for an additional two years.

Students will also demonstrate proficiency for three consecutive years before taking the ISAT. These new developments in state law will help determine a description of "cohort". Illinois proposes defining cohorts first by years of participation in the program and then by grade level spans: year 1: Grades K -- 2, 3 -- 4 -- 5, 6 -- 7 -- 8, 9 -- 12; and years 2 -- 4: same.

Granted an extension of time as requested on pages 3-5, Illinois will define and describe cohorts as part of the complete system of accountability for LEP students.

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.1: The percentage of classes being taught by highly qualified teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in high-poverty schools (as the term is defined in Section 1111(h) (1) (C) (viii) of the ESEA).

NCLB places a major emphasis upon teacher quality as a factor in improving student achievement. The new Title II programs focus on preparing, training, and recruiting high-quality teachers and principals and require States to develop plans with annual measurable objectives that will ensure that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects are highly qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

The requirement that teachers be highly qualified, as defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA, applies to public elementary and secondary school teachers teaching in core academic subjects.

A. In the following chart, provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of classes in the core academic subjects being taught by highly qualified teachers in the aggregate and in high-poverty schools. Section 1111(h) (1) (C) (viii) defines high-poverty schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.

For baseline data, indicate the percentage of classes in core academic subjects taught by highly qualified teachers both in the aggregate and for high-poverty schools in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of classes in core academic subjects that will be taught by highly qualified teachers by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

Table 3a. Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Highly Qualified Teachers

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers State Aggregate	Percentage of Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers in High-Poverty Schools
2002-2003 Baseline	▶	▶
2003-2004 Target	▶	▶
2004-2005 Target	▶	▶
2005-2006 Target	▶	▶

▶ This information was not collected for 2002-03 in any fashion. It will be collected in future years, beginning with local consolidated applications for 2004-05.

Table 3b. Illinois Information about Highly Qualified Teachers from the 2001-02 school year as reflected on the 2002 *Public School Report Card*

Grade Levels	% of Teachers with Emergency or Provisional Credentials	% of Classes Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
Elementary	2.4%	2.3%
Middle	2.4%	2.3%
High School	2.4%	2.3%

▶ This information will be available for 2002-03 by November 2003.

In terms of data Illinois does have available, Table 4 reflects information on a regional and statewide basis. By region, it shows the total number of teachers in the current records system, total number of teachers in core academic areas, those determined to be highly qualified, those determined to not be highly qualified at this time, and the overall percent of teachers determined to be highly qualified. Looking at Region 1 of the state (Adams-Pike Counties, in West Central Illinois), there are 69% of the teachers who are determined by the state criteria (see Attachment A) to be highly qualified. The statewide average is 76%.

Table 4. Available Information on Highly Qualified Teachers, September 2003

Regional Office of Education	Total Teachers in 2003 Teacher Service Record System	Total Teachers in NCLB Core Academic Areas	Total Teachers Programmatically Determined to be NCLB Highly Qualified	Total Teachers Programmatically Determined to not be NCLB Highly Qualified	% of Teachers Programmatically Determined to be NCLB Highly Qualified
01	1,074	628	436	192	69%
02	921	502	368	134	73%
03	905	580	420	160	72%
04	4,123	2,271	1,786	485	79%
08	1,240	757	567	190	75%
09	2,334	1,337	1,008	329	75%
10	934	516	354	162	69%
11	2,204	1,237	898	339	73%
12	1,148	650	451	199	69%
13	1,288	782	540	242	69%
14	30,928	17,213	13,077	4,136	76%
15	28,912	20,144	15,742	4,402	78%
16	1,319	706	560	146	79%
17	2,972	1,694	1,345	349	79%
19	12,435	7,207	5,656	1,551	78%
20	1,324	769	536	233	70%
21	1,231	720	514	206	71%
22	611	360	272	88	76%
24	1,753	1,012	766	246	76%
25	708	370	274	96	74%
26	800	423	327	96	77%
27	526	335	234	101	70%
28	1,392	867	634	233	73%
30	940	526	376	150	71%
31	7,506	4,181	3,331	850	80%
32	1,974	1,123	826	297	74%
33	753	442	320	122	72%
34	10,678	5,921	4,618	1,303	78%
35	1,483	850	660	190	78%
38	839	516	376	140	73%
39	1,623	946	686	260	73%
40	1,223	744	524	220	70%
41	3,153	1,767	1,401	366	79%
43	884	515	376	139	73%
44	3,623	2,075	1,707	368	82%
45	763	439	311	128	71%
46	890	497	362	135	73%
47	1,304	783	589	194	75%
48	2,484	1,389	1,009	380	73%
49	1,902	1,058	829	229	78%
50	3,236	1,890	1,391	499	74%
51	2,428	1,358	1,010	348	74%
53	1,559	923	678	245	73%

54	1,192	688	472	216	69%
55	867	526	400	126	76%
56	6,298	3,702	2,944	758	80%
60	369	252	32	220	13%
65	344	164	64	100	39%
State	159,397	94,355	72,057	22,298	76%

- 1) Data based upon 2003 Teacher Service Record (TSR) data and Teacher Certification Information System (TCIS) data.
- 2) Data is presented for Elementary, Middle/Junior High, High School, and Special Education Teaching positions only, with teaching assignments in core academic areas.
- 3) Special Education assignments were not included as NCLB Core Academic Areas. TSR currently collects data on the 21,857 special education teachers were not included in these statistics.
- 4) Bilingual Education assignments were not included as NCLB Core Academic Areas. TSR currently collects data on the primary language in the classroom, not the academic subject being taught. 1,774 bilingual teachers were not included in these statistics.

B. Provide the State's definition of a highly qualified teacher.

Attachment A is the policy adopted by the Illinois State Board of Education on June 17, 2003 concerning highly qualified teachers.

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.2: The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development (as the term, "professional development" is defined in Section 9101 (34).)

Provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development. The term high-quality professional development means professional development that meets the criteria outlined in the definition of professional development in Title IX, Section 9101(34) of ESEA.

For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of teachers who received high-quality professional development in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of teachers who will receive high-quality professional development through the 2005-2006 school year.

Table 5. Baseline Data and Targets Concerning Teachers Receiving High Quality Professional Development

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Teachers Receiving High-Quality Professional Development
2002-2003 Baseline	▶
2003-2004 Target	▶
2004-2005 Target	▶
2005-2006 Target	▶

▶ Illinois does have a process for certificate renewal which has been in place for several years.

The Certificate Renewal Plan Manual notes the details of that process (see <http://www.isbe.net/recertification/CRManual%20PDFs/Section%20I.pdf>) but in essence

every teacher with a standard teaching certificate must have a certain amount of Continuing Professional Development Units or Continuing Education Units over a period of five years (and again for the next set of five years and so on), in accord with an individual development plan. Some areas of study are required (e.g., reading, special education) and others must tie in with local school improvement plans.

Numbers collected to date have been on a voluntary basis. There is an electronic database for teachers to use to document their local plans and their claims for credits, but it is not universally used. Others by choice maintain a paper record. The database is called CeRTS (online Certificate Renewal Tracking System) (see <https://isbes2.isbe.net/Certs/Default.asp>.) Using the system, data for teachers are as follows:

- Over 22, 275 teachers have registered on CeRTS.
- Over 12,000 plans have been submitted on CeRTS.
- Over 2,500 teachers have submitted claim for credits on CeRTS.
- Over 10,900 plans have been reviewed and approved on CeRTS.
- Over 2,100 claims for credits have been reviewed and approved on CeRTS.
- At least 600 teachers have completed their certificate renewal requirements on CeRTS

The Illinois target is "*100% of all teachers receiving quality professional development by 2005-06*" as stated in the *Consolidated State Application* of June 2002.

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.3: The percentage of paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

NCLB defines a qualified paraprofessional as an employee who provides instructional support in a program supported by Title I, Part A funds who has (1) completed two years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; *or* (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness).

Provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals who were qualified, as defined above, in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals who will be qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

Table 6. Baseline Data and Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2002-2003 Baseline	▶
2003-2004 Target	▶
2004-2005 Target	▶
2005-2006 Target	▶

▶ This information was not collected for 2002-03 in any fashion. It will be collected in future years, beginning with local consolidated applications for 2004-05.

By board policy, ISBE has approved two tests as state-approved tests for Title I paraprofessionals. Both the ETS ParaPro and the ACT WorkKeys are approved for use in the state. State cut-off scores have been established. Test sites are available.

The Illinois target is "100% of all paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants are qualified...annually achieve 25% of the different between 100% and the actual starting point [to be determined]" as stated in the *Consolidated State Application* of June 2002.

Baseline data and performance targets for Goal 4, Performance Indicator 4.1: The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State.

Illinois will collect and reflect data on Goal 4, Performance Indicator 4.1 based on the *Consolidated State Application* of June 2002. In that application Illinois said a new law would be sought by ISBE to incorporate the board policy of June 2002 into state law. That bill was introduced and has made it through one of the two chambers of the Illinois General Assembly (see Attachment B, Senate Bill 814 of 2003).

The policy adopted by ISBE follows:

Figure 1. Policy on Persistently Dangerous Schools

<p>Under Section 9532 of <i>NCLB</i>, the State Board of Education hereby adopts the following to define the Unsafe School Choice Option.</p> <p>Attending a Persistently Dangerous School (Group Option)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A persistently dangerous school must meet all of the following criteria for two consecutive years: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Have violence-related expulsions greater than 3% of the student enrollment; and</i> ▪ <i>Have one or more students expelled for bringing a gun or weapon to school as defined in 18 USC 921; and</i> ▪ <i>Have 3% or more of the student enrollment exercising the individual option outlined below.</i> <p>Becoming a Victim of a Violent Criminal Offense (Individual Option) -- Any individual student who becomes a victim of a violent criminal offense* as defined by Illinois law</p>
--

(725 ILCS 120/3) must be eligible to exercise the unsafe school choice option and be allowed to transfer immediately to a different school within the district, based on verification to the school authorities pursuant to board policy. *[This means a victim within the school or on the school grounds of the school the student attends during regular school hours or during school-sponsored events.]*

Crime Victim Definition: A crime victim means:

- a person physically injured in Illinois as a result of a violent crime perpetrated or attempted against that person *or*
- a person who suffers injury to or loss of property as a result of a violent crime perpetrated or attempted against that person *or*
- a single representative who may be the spouse, parent, child or sibling of a person killed as a result of a violent crime perpetrated against the person killed or the spouse, parent, child or sibling or any person granted right under this Act who is physically or mentally incapable of exercising such rights, except where the spouse, parent, child or sibling is also the defendant or prisoner *or*
- any person against whom a violent crime has been committed.

Violent Crime Definition -- A violent crime means any felony in which force or threat of force was used against the victim, of any offense involving sexual exploitation, sexual conduct or sexual penetration, domestic battery, violation of an order of protection, stalking or any misdemeanor which results in death or great bodily harm to the victim or any violation or any violation of Section 9-3 of the Criminal Code of 1961, or Section 11-501 of the Illinois Vehicle Code, or a similar provision of a local ordinance, if the violation resulted in personal injury, and includes any action committed by a juvenile that would be a violent crime if committed by an adult. For the purposes of this paragraph, "personal injury" shall include any Type A injury as indicated on the traffic accident report completed by a law enforcement officer that requires immediate professional attention in either a doctor's office or medical facility. A Type A injury shall include severely bleeding wounds, distorted extremities, and injuries that require the injured party to be carried from the scene.

Illinois, like other states, has reported quarterly during 2002-03 regarding the status of unsafe school choice/persistently dangerous schools. Figure 2 is an example of such a report (the December 2002 report).

Figure 2. Sample Report to USDE on Persistently Dangerous Schools

Policy: The Illinois State Board of Education adopted an Unsafe School Choice Option policy last summer and gave responsibility to implement the policy to the State Coordinator for Safe and Drug-Free Schools.

Representative Sample: A representative sample of LEAs has been involved from the beginning of setting this policy.

Objective Criteria: The objective criteria used in the Unsafe School Choice Policy

[see Figure 1] indicates the definitions applied for both the group and individual options under the Act.

Data Collection Process: The data collection process is in place and data will be collected from three sources and programmed to be included in a single report. The program to accomplish this has been written and is in place. The data will be collected from the Illinois End of Year Report (*due in Fall annually*) and the Gun Free School Report. Data (*due in December annually*) relating to violent activities within the school has been added to gather this data.

Identification of Persistently Dangerous Schools: Data collection process now in place will identify any school that is persistently dangerous.

Unforeseen circumstances: No unforeseen circumstances have arisen as of this date.

Concerns: At this time [December 2002] the state has no concerns about meeting the expected 03-04 start date.

The policy is in place, as required by the start of the 2003-04 school year. It will continue to be in place for future school years.

For performance targets, please provide the number of schools that will be identified as persistently dangerous through the 2013-2014 school year.

Table 7. Baseline Data and Persistently Dangerous Schools

Baseline Data and Targets	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools ►
2003-2004 <i>Baseline</i>	-0-
2004-2005 Target	-0-
2005-2006 Target	-0-
2006-2007 Target	-0-
2007-2008 Target	-0-
2008-2009 Target	-0-
2009-2010 Target	-0-
2010-2011 Target	-0-
2011-2012 Target	-0-
2012-2013 Target	-0-
2013-2014 Target	-0-

► Under the definition contained in the June 2002 *Consolidated State Application*, there is a two consecutive year requirement. The policy is cited above. There are no schools at this time identified as needing to provide unsafe school choice. No school in Illinois is at that status at this time.

Illinois is collecting the necessary information on an annual basis. Attachment E to the 2003-04 local consolidated application for Titles I, II, IV and V funds collected data on gun-free schools (see <http://www.isbe.state.il.us/title-grants/pdf/04Assurances.pdf>). It asked one main question and then four related questions. The numbers following each question relate to the data aggregated to date.

- Main Question: Were any students expelled during 2002-03 for bringing firearms to school? If yes, answer the questions below. [yes in 14 districts, with 47 expulsions listed by the districts]
 1. How many of the expulsions violating the Gun-Free Schools Act resulted in a referral to an alternative school or program? [8]
 2. How many of the expulsions were shortened to less than a full year under the case-by-case modification provisions? [2]
 3. How many of the modifications reported were for students not under IDEA? [5]
 4. Number of students who exercised the individual unsafe school choice option during the 2002-03 school year because they were the victim of a violent criminal offense. It [0]

Given that the criteria for being selected as a persistently dangerous school (see Figure 1) has three parts and that no school has listed 3% or more of their student enrollment as exercising the individual option, no school is listed in Illinois for 2003-04 as such a school.

Attachment C is a schematic of the various elements of the database which are and will be used to determine schools in this status.

The Illinois target is "*No schools having more than 3% of its enrollment expelled due to violence-related expulsions, one or more expulsions for bringing a gun or other weapon to school, or having 3% or more of the student enrollment exercising the unsafe school choice option by 2013-14*" as stated in the *Consolidated State Application* of June 2002.

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 5, Performance Indicator 5.1: The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

In the 2002 *Consolidated State Application*, indicator 5.1 read: "*The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma – disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged—calculated in the same manner as used in National Center for Education Statistics reports on Common Core of Data.*" However, Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under *NCLB* on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:

- The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of the school year, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a

GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,

- Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
- Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.

The Secretary approved each State's definition of the graduation rate, consistent with Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State's accountability plan. To reduce burden, provide flexibility, and promote more consistent data collection by the Department, USDE asks that the information submitted in this document reflect this Title I definition rather than the definition used in the NCES Common Core of Data.

Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as federally-approved *Accountability Workbook*, in the following charts please provide baseline data and performance targets for the graduation rate. For baseline data, please provide the graduation rate for the 2001-2002 school year. For performance targets, please indicate what the Illinois graduation rate will be through the 2013-2014 school year.

Baseline Data: GRADUATION RATE

Illinois' definition of graduation rate is as follows, as used in the *NCLB Accountability Workbook* of June 2003, is: **Graduation rate** is the number of current year graduates divided by the number of freshman class four years ago, less students who transferred out, plus students who transferred in, multiplied by 100. It is essentially a cohort rate.

Thus, graduation rate = $(B / (A - C + D)) * 100$

A. Freshman Class, i.e., the number of students enrolled for the first time in the 9th grade four years ago, (e.g., freshman class enrollment in the fall of 1998).

B. Graduates, i.e., the number of students who graduated in the current school year (e.g., July 2001 through June 2002). Graduates include only students who were awarded regular diplomas; students with GEDs and other non-regular completion certificates are not included.

C. Transferred Out, i.e., the number of students from the freshman class (**A**) who transferred to another school, or died, prior to graduation.

D. Transferred in, i.e., the number of graduates from among all the graduates (**B**) who were not members of the original freshman class (**A**). Included are students, who transferred in from other schools in the last four years, and also students who graduated in fewer or more than four years. Since these students are counted in the numerator, they are also counted in denominator to ensure that the graduation rate does not exceed 100%.

NOTE: Students from A who drop out, are expelled, or do not have enough credits to graduate, are not included in B, C or D above.

The Graduation Rate is a Valid Indicator

- As defined, it is a cohort rate, following a group of students from the time they first enter 9th grade till they graduate.
- Students who drop out, are expelled, or who do not have enough credits to graduate, are not counted as transfer students.
- School districts that submit their raw data on time are asked to verify their graduation rates when they are computed.
- Edit checks are built into the process to ensure accuracy, e.g. schools submitting data that result in graduation rates outside of an acceptable range (40%-100%) are contacted for verification.

The Graduation Rate is a Reliable Indicator

- The same data collection process and formula have been used since 1995. (Data collection was expanded in 2001-02 in order to report graduation rates disaggregated for the various student groups.)
- Results of the computation have been consistent through time; the statewide rate has been relatively stable over the years, ranging from a low of 80.5% in 1996 and to a high of 85.2% in 2002.

Table 8. High School Graduation Rate by Student Groupings▶

High School Graduate Student Group	High School Graduation Rate▶	High School Graduation Rate
	2001-02 Baseline	2002-03 Information
All Students	85.2%	65%
African American/Black	74.5%	65%
American Indian/Native Alaskan	73.9%	65%
Asian/Pacific Islander	91.7%	65%
Hispanic	74.7%	65%
White	89.2%	65%
Other		65%
Students with Disabilities	69.1%	65%
Students without Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient	69.9%	65%
Economically Disadvantaged	80.2%	65%
Non-Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant	31.1%	
Male	82.5%	65%
Female	87.9%	65%

► Shaded subgroup areas indicate that data are not collected. Data are not available from the End of the Year Report for 2002-03 yet. The report forms are due this fall. Data will be reviewed and available as of November 2003.

Table 9. High School Graduation Rates Targets by Group by Year►

High School Graduates	02-03 School Year	03-04 School Year	04-05 School Year	05-06 School Year	06-07 School Year	07-08 School Year	08-09 School Year	09-10 School Year	10-11 School Year	11-12 School Year	12-13 School Year	13-14 School Year
Student Group												
All Students	65%	65%	66%	67%	69%	72%	75%	78%	80%	82%	84%	85%
African American/Black	65%	65%	66%	67%	69%	72%	75%	78%	80%	82%	84%	85%
American Indian/Native Alaskan	65%	65%	66%	67%	69%	72%	75%	78%	80%	82%	84%	85%
Asian/Pacific Islander	65%	65%	66%	67%	69%	72%	75%	78%	80%	82%	84%	85%
Hispanic	65%	65%	66%	67%	69%	72%	75%	78%	80%	82%	84%	85%
White	65%	65%	66%	67%	69%	72%	75%	78%	80%	82%	84%	85%
Other												
Students with Disabilities	65%	65%	66%	67%	69%	72%	75%	78%	80%	82%	84%	85%
Students without Disabilities												
Limited English Proficient	65%	65%	66%	67%	69%	72%	75%	78%	80%	82%	84%	85%
Economically Disadvantaged	65%	65%	66%	67%	69%	72%	75%	78%	80%	82%	84%	85%
Non-Economically Disadvantaged												
Migrant												
Male	65%	65%	66%	67%	69%	72%	75%	78%	80%	82%	84%	85%
Female	65%	65%	66%	67%	69%	72%	75%	78%	80%	82%	84%	85%

► Shaded areas indicate that data are not collected. These figures are consistent with the federally-approved *Accountability Workbook* of June 2003 (see *Figure 7. Proposed Annual Targets for Graduation Rate*).

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 5, Performance Indicator 5.2: The percentage of students who drop out of school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

For purposes of calculating and reporting a dropout rate for this performance indicator, States should use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data.

Consistent with this requirement, States must use NCES' definition of high school dropout, "*An individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a state- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.*"

Please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged. For baseline data, indicate the State high school dropout rate for the 2001-2002 school year. For targets, please indicate the State high school dropout rate through the 2013-2014 school year.

Table 10. Student Dropout Data

Student Dropouts	Student Dropout Information, not Rate
Student Group	2001-02 Baseline ►
All Students	35,384
African American/Black	10,125
American Indian/Native Alaskan	70
Asian/Pacific Islander	573
Hispanic	7,742
White	13,874
Other	
Students with Disabilities	
Students without Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	21,381
Female	15,003

► Data are available for 2001-2002 in terms of numbers but not percentages. The End of the Year Report for 2001-02 is the source of data. Shaded areas indicate that data are not collected.

Table 11. Dropout Student Data by Year of Graduation

Student Dropouts	02-03 School Year	03-04 School Year	04-05 School Year	05-06 School Year	06-07 School Year	07-08 School Year	08-09 School Year	09-10 School Year	10-11 School Year	11-12 School Year	12-13 School Year	13-14 School Year
Student Group												
All Students	▶											
African American/Black	▶											
American Indian/Native Alaskan	▶											
Asian/Pacific Islander	▶											
Hispanic	▶											
White	▶											
Other	▶											
Students with Disabilities	▶											
Students without Disabilities												
Limited English Proficient	▶											
Economically Disadvantaged	▶											
Non-Economically Disadvantaged												
Migrant	▶											
Male	▶											
Female	▶											

▶ Data are not available from the End of the Year Report for 2002-03 yet. The report forms are due this fall. Data will be reviewed and available as of November 2003. Shaded areas indicate that data are not collected.

The Illinois target is "0% of all students (in aggregate and by subgroup) dropping out in grades 7-12 by 2013-14; and annually achieve 1/12 of the difference between 0% and the actual starting point [to be determined]" as stated in the Consolidated State Application of June 2002.

Attachment A

State Policy on Highly Qualified Teachers

Adopted June 17, 2003

Illinois Criteria for Meeting the *NCLB* Requirements for Highly Qualified Teachers

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) requires that, by the end of the 2005-2006 school year, all teachers in *core academic subjects* must be “highly qualified” in the areas of teaching assignment. All teachers in programs supported with Title I funds who were or are newly hired after the first day of the 2002-2003 school year are required to be “highly qualified” at the time of employment.

According to the definition set forth in *NCLB*, teachers are considered “highly qualified” if they: (1) have a bachelor’s degree; (2) have full State certification; and (3) have demonstrated subject matter competence in the area(s) taught.

The following criteria define the specific requirements that Illinois teachers must meet to be considered highly qualified for *NCLB* purposes. The criteria define “full certification” and the options available for “demonstrating subject matter competence” for two groups: *current* teachers and teachers who are *new to the profession*.

This document is designed to serve as a resource that can be used by teachers, administrators and others to identify the options for being considered “highly qualified” at a given grade level, for a specific student population, and for special circumstances.

These criteria do not replace state requirements for teaching assignments; all such rules remain in place and must be observed by local districts in placing teachers into the classroom. The criteria for being considered “highly qualified” represent baseline qualifications necessary to meet the *NCLB* requirements.

Terms used in these criteria are defined as follows.

Academic Major - Federal requirements allow states to define an academic “major” for use in determining whether a teacher can be considered “highly qualified.” Illinois defines an academic major as 32 semester hours or as otherwise indicated by the institution on the individual’s official transcript.

Arts - *NCLB* allows states to define the core academic area of the “Arts.” The Illinois criteria for “highly qualified” teachers are based on a definition of the “Arts” as music and art.

Content Area Test – A test that assesses subject matter knowledge specific to each certificate or endorsement; this excludes the Test of Basic Skills and the Assessment of Professional Teaching (APT). The Elementary/Middle Grades Test, the Mathematics Test, the French Test and the LBS I Test are examples of Content Area Tests.

Core Academic Subjects – *NCLB* defines the “core academic subjects” as including English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and

government, economics, arts, history and geography. Note: *NCLB* has identified several specific subject areas under the general areas of the sciences and social sciences. The Illinois criteria treat these subject areas consistent with the new state certification structure and the standards for these academic areas. This includes an expectation for core competencies and specific designations related to subject areas.

“Current” Teachers – Teachers who received their first certificate in Illinois on or before June 30, 2002 are considered “current” teachers for *NCLB* purposes.

Elementary/Middle Grades Test – This is a new name for the Illinois Certification System Elementary Test. The name change is designed to more accurately reflect the content of the test and the range of grades covered; there has been no change in the content of the test.

Full Certification – Certificates, including alternative certificates, issued by the State of Illinois consistent with the law are considered “full” certificates. This excludes certificates issued to individuals when certification or licensure requirements have been waived, such as provisional vocational certificates and full-time substitute certificates. It includes provisional certificates issued to teachers coming into Illinois from another state and the Short-Term Emergency Certificate in Special Education.

“New” Teachers – Teachers who received their first certificate in Illinois on or after July 1, 2002 are considered “new” teachers for *NCLB* purposes.

Primary Responsibility - The requirements for consideration as “highly qualified” are linked to the teacher’s assignment and whether he or she has “primary responsibility” for providing content instruction. For the purposes of determining “highly qualified” status, “primary responsibility” is defined as being the sole teacher or the instructor of record. In team teaching situations, the district will identify the teacher or teachers with primary responsibility, except that teachers must be highly qualified for the subjects for which they have full teaching responsibility.

The term “highly qualified” indicates that a teacher has the certification and subject matter competence required to teach a particular subject area, grade level and/or group of students. It is linked directly to the teacher’s specific teaching assignment, so a teacher may be “highly qualified” for one assignment and not for another. Use of the term “highly qualified” should not be construed as an evaluation of the professional teaching abilities of the teacher.

Additional information about Illinois certification requirements, the *No Child Left Behind Act* and highly qualified teachers may be found on the State Board of Education website at www@isbe.net.

Illinois Criteria for Meeting the *NCLB* Requirements for “Highly Qualified” Teachers

Part I

Criteria for Current Teachers to be Considered “Highly Qualified”

All Illinois teachers must meet requirements of the *Illinois Administrative Code* for their specific teaching assignment.

To meet *NCLB* requirements, teachers who were first certified to teach in Illinois on or before June 30, 2002 and who retain a valid certificate are considered “highly qualified” in the area of teaching responsibility if they meet the following requirements. These requirements represent the Illinois “High Objective Uniform State Standard of Evaluation” or “HOUSSE” as authorized by *NCLB*.

“Current” teachers must hold a valid Illinois teaching certificate that is appropriate to the grade level and meet one of the following options.

1. Pass the Elementary/Middle Grades Test or the Content-Area Test for the area of teaching responsibility.
2. Have a major or coursework equivalent to a major in the area of teaching responsibility.
3. Have a master’s degree or other advanced degree/credential in the area of teaching responsibility.
4. Be certified by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards in the area of teaching responsibility.
5. Have an endorsement or its coursework equivalent that is sufficient to meet the Illinois minimum requirements for the area of teaching responsibility, have teaching experience in the area of teaching responsibility, and have engaged in continuing professional development in the area of teaching responsibility.

Part II

Criteria for New Teachers to be Considered “Highly Qualified”

All Illinois teachers must meet requirements of the *Illinois Administrative Code* for their specific teaching assignment.

To meet *NCLB* requirements, teachers who were certified in Illinois on or after July 1, 2002 are considered “highly qualified” in the area of teaching responsibility if they meet the following requirements.

Elementary Grades (K-4)

Teaching assignment: Primary responsibility for teaching content in the core academic subjects in a self-contained classroom.

Options to be considered “Highly Qualified”

1. Hold Elementary Certificate (Type 03) that is endorsed for self-contained general education and pass the Elementary/Middle Grades Test
2. Hold Elementary Certificate (Type 03) that is endorsed for self-contained general education and hold a National Board Certificate as a Middle Childhood Generalist (ages 7-12) (applicable only through grade 6)
3. Hold Early Childhood Certificate (Type 04) and pass the Early Childhood Test (option is applicable only through 3rd grade)
4. Hold Early Childhood Certificate (Type 04) and hold a National Board Certificate as an Early Childhood Generalist (ages 3-8) (option applicable only through 3rd grade)
5. Hold a Provisional Early Childhood or Elementary Certificate that is based on certification in another state or nation and pass the Early Childhood Test or the Elementary/Middle Grades Test within nine months of certification
6. Hold a Special K-12 Certificate (Type 10) and pass the Content-Area Test (option applicable only for the subject for which the certificate is endorsed -- e.g., art or music)

Middle Grades (5-8)

Teaching assignment: Primary responsibility for teaching content in the core academic subjects in a middle grades setting, whether self-contained or departmentalized.

Options to be considered “Highly Qualified”

1. Hold Elementary Certificate (Type 03) and pass the Elementary/Middle Grades Test
2. Hold Elementary Certificate (03) and a middle grades endorsement or the coursework equivalent, and pass the Elementary/Middle Grade test.
3. Hold a Secondary Certificate (Type 09) and meet one of the following options:
 - Pass the Content-Area Test for each area of teaching responsibility (applicable only for grades 6-8)
 - Have a major or coursework equivalent to a major
 - Have a graduate degree or advanced certification (e.g., NBPTS) in each area of teaching responsibility (applicable only for grades 6-8)
 - Pass the elementary/middle grade test.
4. Hold a Special K-12 Certificate (Type 10) endorsed in the area of teaching responsibility and pass the Content-Area Test
5. Hold a Provisional Elementary, Secondary or Special K-12 Certificate (as listed above) based on certification in another state or nation and pass the Elementary/Middle Grades Test or the Content-Area Test for each area of teaching responsibility within nine months of certification.

Secondary Grades (9-12)

Teaching assignment: Primary responsibility for teaching content in the core academic subjects in a secondary setting.

Options to be considered “Highly Qualified”

1. Hold a Secondary Certificate (Type 09) and meet one of the following options:
 - Pass the Content-Area Test for each area of teaching responsibility
 - Have a major or coursework equivalent to a major in each area of teaching responsibility
 - Have a graduate degree or advanced certification (e.g., NBPTS) in each area of teaching responsibility
2. Hold an Elementary Certificate (Type 03) and meet one of the following options:
 - Pass the Elementary/Middle Grades Test and the Content-Area Test in the area of teaching responsibility (applicable only for 9th grade)
 - Pass the Elementary/Middle Grades Test and have a major or coursework equivalent to a major (applicable only for 9th grade)
 - Have a graduate degree or advanced certification (e.g., NBPTS) in each area of teaching responsibility (applicable only to grade 9)
3. Hold a Provisional Elementary (applicable only to grade 9), Secondary or Special K-12 Certificate (as listed above) based on certification in another state or nation; and pass the required tests for each area of teaching responsibility (see above) within nine months of certification

Special Education

The criteria for determining whether a special education teacher is “highly qualified” for his or her assignment will be defined when additional guidance is provided by the federal government (e.g., through the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Until that time, special education teachers will not be included in school, district or state data regarding highly qualified teachers.

Bilingual Education and English-as-a-Second Language Education

Teaching Assignment -- Primary responsibility for teaching content to students with Limited English Proficiency in a Bilingual or English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) program.

Options to be considered “Highly Qualified”

- Hold an Early Childhood, Elementary, Secondary, Special K-12 or Special Preschool-Age 21 Certificate appropriate for the grade level of the teaching assignment and hold the Bilingual or ESL credential (Approval or Endorsement) appropriate to the certificate and meet one of the following options:
 - Pass the Content-Area Test for each area of teaching responsibility

- Hold a major or coursework equivalent to a major in each area of teaching responsibility
- Hold a graduate degree or advanced certification (e.g., NBPTS) in each area of teaching responsibility

Special Circumstances

Charter school teachers – No certification is required but to be highly qualified, the teacher must hold a bachelor's degree and demonstrate competence in the area of teaching responsibility by passing the content test(s).

Alternative Certificate Holders – Hold an Illinois Alternative Certificate through an Illinois approved alternative program and demonstrate competence by passing the appropriate content test(s).

Resident Teacher Certificate Holders – Hold Resident Teacher Certificate through an Illinois approved resident teacher program and demonstrate competence by passing the appropriate content test(s).

International Visiting Teacher Certificate Holders– Hold a valid International Visiting Teacher Certificate.

Vocational Certificate Holders – Only vocational teachers who teach core academic courses are required to meet the federal definition of highly qualified.

Transitional Bilingual Certificate Holders – Must meet all three of the following:

1. Hold a Type 29 Certificate and demonstrate subject area competence through one of the following options:
 - Have a major or coursework equivalent to major in the content area; or
 - Within nine months of Type 29 certification, pass the Content-Area Test for the area of teaching responsibility (would include, as appropriate, the Elementary/Middle Grades test); and
2. Participate in an induction/mentoring/professional development program; and
3. Be continuously enrolled in a program to fulfill state requirements for certification at the early childhood, elementary, secondary or K-12 level.

Attachment B

Senate Bill 814 of 2003

Persistently Dangerous Schools

1 AN ACT concerning schools.

2 Be it enacted by the People of the State of Illinois,
3 represented in the General Assembly:

4 Section 5. The School Code is amended by changing
5 Sections 10-21.3a and 34-18.24 and adding Section 2-3.131 as
6 follows:

7 (105 ILCS 5/2-3.131 new)
8 Sec. 2-3.131. Persistently dangerous schools. The State
9 Board of Education shall maintain data and publish a list of
10 persistently dangerous schools on an annual basis.

11 (105 ILCS 5/10-21.3a)
12 Sec. 10-21.3a. Transfer of students.
13 (a) Each school board shall establish and implement a
14 policy governing the transfer of a student from one
15 attendance center to another within the school district upon
16 the request of the student's parent or guardian. Any request
17 by a parent or guardian to transfer his or her child from one
18 attendance center to another within the school district
19 pursuant to Section 1116 of the federal Elementary and
20 Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. Sec. 6317) must be
21 made no later than 30 days after the parent or guardian
22 receives notice of the right to transfer pursuant to that
23 law. A student may not transfer to any of the following
24 attendance centers, except by change in residence if the
25 policy authorizes enrollment based on residence in an
26 attendance area or unless approved by the board on an
27 individual basis:

28 (1) An attendance center that exceeds or as a
29 result of the transfer would exceed its attendance
30 capacity.

1 (2) An attendance center for which the board has
2 established academic criteria for enrollment if the
3 student does not meet the criteria, provided that the
4 transfer must be permitted if the attendance center is
5 the only attendance center serving the student's grade
6 that has not been identified for school improvement,
7 corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of
8 the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act of
9 1965 (20 U.S.C. Sec. 6317).

10 (3) Any attendance center if the transfer would
11 prevent the school district from meeting its obligations
12 under a State or federal law, court order, or consent
13 decree applicable to the school district.

14 (b) Each school board shall establish and implement a
15 policy governing the transfer of students within a school
16 district from a persistently dangerous school to another
17 public school in that district that is not deemed to be
18 persistently dangerous. In order to be considered a
19 persistently dangerous school, the school must meet all of
20 the following criteria for 2 consecutive years:

21 (1) Have greater than 3% of the students enrolled
22 in the school expelled for violence-related conduct.

23 (2) Have one or more students expelled for bringing
24 a firearm to school as defined in 18 U.S.C. 921.

25 (3) Have at least 3% of the students enrolled in
26 the school exercise the individual option to transfer
27 schools pursuant to subsection (c) of this Section.

28 (c) A student may transfer from one public school to
29 another public school in that district if the student is a
30 victim of a violent crime as defined in Section 3 of the
31 Rights of Crime Victims and Witnesses Act. The violent crime
32 must have occurred on school grounds during regular school
33 hours or during a school-sponsored event.

34 (d) Transfers made pursuant to subsections (b) and (c)

1 of this Section shall be made in compliance with the federal
2 No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (Public Law 107-110).

3 (Source: P.A. 92-604, eff. 7-1-02.)

4 (105 ILCS 5/34-18.24)

5 Sec. ~~34-18.24~~ ~~34-18.23~~. Transfer of students.

6 (a) The board shall establish and implement a policy
7 governing the transfer of a student from one attendance
8 center to another within the school district upon the request
9 of the student's parent or guardian. Any request by a parent
10 or guardian to transfer his or her child from one attendance
11 center to another within the school district pursuant to
12 Section 1116 of the federal Elementary and Secondary
13 Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. Sec. 6317) must be made no
14 later than 30 days after the parent or guardian receives
15 notice of the right to transfer pursuant to that law. A
16 student may not transfer to any of the following attendance
17 centers, except by change in residence if the policy
18 authorizes enrollment based on residence in an attendance
19 area or unless approved by the board on an individual basis:

20 (1) An attendance center that exceeds or as a
21 result of the transfer would exceed its attendance
22 capacity.

23 (2) An attendance center for which the board has
24 established academic criteria for enrollment if the
25 student does not meet the criteria, provided that the
26 transfer must be permitted if the attendance center is
27 the only attendance center serving the student's grade
28 that has not been identified for school improvement,
29 corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of
30 the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act of
31 1965 (20 U.S.C. Sec. 6317).

32 (3) Any attendance center if the transfer would
33 prevent the school district from meeting its obligations

1 under a State or federal law, court order, or consent
2 decree applicable to the school district.

3 (b) The board shall establish and implement a policy
4 governing the transfer of students within the school district
5 from a persistently dangerous attendance center to another
6 attendance center in that district that is not deemed to be
7 persistently dangerous. In order to be considered a
8 persistently dangerous attendance center, the attendance
9 center must meet all of the following criteria for 2

10 consecutive years:

11 (1) Have greater than 3% of the students enrolled
12 in the attendance center expelled for violence-related
13 conduct.

14 (2) Have one or more students expelled for bringing
15 a firearm to school as defined in 18 U.S.C. 921.

16 (3) Have at least 3% of the students enrolled in
17 the attendance center exercise the individual option to
18 transfer attendance centers pursuant to subsection (c) of
19 this Section.

20 (c) A student may transfer from one attendance center to
21 another attendance center within the district if the student
22 is a victim of a violent crime as defined in Section 3 of the
23 Rights of Crime Victims and Witnesses Act. The violent crime
24 must have occurred on school grounds during regular school
25 hours or during a school-sponsored event.

26 (d) Transfers made pursuant to subsections (b) and (c)
27 of this Section shall be made in compliance with the federal
28 No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (Public Law 107-110).

29 (Source: P.A. 92-604, eff. 7-1-02; revised 9-3-02.)

30 Section 90. The State Mandates Act is amended by adding
31 Section 8.27 as follows:

32 (30 ILCS 805/8.27 new)

1 Sec. 8.27. Exempt mandate. Notwithstanding Sections 6
2 and 8 of this Act, no reimbursement by the State is required
3 for the implementation of any mandate created by this
4 amendatory Act of the 93rd General Assembly.

5 Section 99. Effective date. This Act takes effect upon
6 becoming law.

Attachment C

Schematic for Persistently Dangerous Schools

Information Base



