ILLINOIS LEARNING STANDARDS IMPLEMENTATION SURVEY

Illinois State Board of Education Research and Policy Division

January 1999

Table of Contents

HIGHLIGHTS	1
PURPOSE OF THE SURVEY	3
METHODOLOGY	4
SURVEY LIMITATIONS	4
FINDINGS	5
Awareness	5
Professional Development	7
Curriculum & Instruction	8
Assessment	11
General Questions	12
SUMMARY AND ACTION PLANS	13
APPENDIX A: Survey Instrument	15
APPENDIX B: Survey Results	18

ILLINOIS LEARNING STANDARDS IMPLEMENTATION SURVEY

Highlights

Of the 1,508 educators that responded to the survey...

- Over 99% have "heard of" and "have read some of" the Standards.
- About 80% feel they know what is expected of students.
- To enhance awareness of the Standards, schools employed various measures, including: class discussions by teachers; newsletters and bulletins to parents and the community; and reports to local school boards.
- Nearly two-thirds (65%) indicated they were well prepared to help students meet the standards and 62% felt that educators in their schools were well prepared also.
- "Aligning standards, curriculum and assessment" was the most often cited professional development need for both teachers (76%) and administrators (66%).
 For school board members it was "Identification of barriers to attaining the Standards" (63%).
- Most schools' curricula are "generally" or "closely" aligned with the Standards.
 Among those whose curricula were not aligned, about two-thirds said they were rewriting parts of their curricula.
- To help more students attain the Standards, various changes were made to teaching methods, including: more hands-on approaches, engaged learning and more writing.
- School have made (or are making) a variety of organizational changes in order to help more students meet the Standards. The most frequently mentioned changes were increased classroom access to technology (91%) and an increase in the amount of professional development (73%).
- Schools reported using multiple methods to document student achievement of the standards. As expected, most rely on the state assessment (81%) and commercial standardized tests (76%). A more surprising finding is that a good number of schools are also using performance assessments (68%) and portfolios (41%).
- Schools and districts noted a number of barriers keeping them from effectively implementing the Standards. Barriers most frequently mentioned were: organization structure (time, scheduling, etc.) (47%); lack of resources (46%); staff resistance to changes (46%); and conflicting state mandates (32%).

• The assistance most needed by schools/district were: "Workshops for teachers on effective strategies to help students meet the standards" (72%); "additional funding" (68%), and "sample assessments (67%).

The survey also allowed a number of opportunities for respondents to provide additional comments. The three most common, and emphatic, themes derived from a content analysis were:

- Perception in the field that the State is constantly changing its direction and lacks commitment to its initiatives. Both administrators and teachers indicated anger and frustration with the lack of "staying power" of school improvement and accountability approaches and fear that the Standards will change before they have had sufficient time to implement them.
- Lack of time, personnel and fiscal resources to plan, align, re-write curriculums, select materials and train teachers.
- The need for more timely information on assessment of the Standards in general, sample ISAT tests, and examples of local assessments.

PURPOSE OF THE SURVEY

In July 1997, the State Board of Education approved the Illinois Learning Standards. The State Board also called for an evaluation of the implementation of the Standards during each of the ensuing five years. This survey was conducted to examine the first year's implementation of the Standards in Illinois public schools.

A more in-depth follow-up study will be conducted by the University of Illinois over the next four years. Researchers there will be responsible for a survey of practitioners to determine the nature and extent of Standards implementation as well as a qualitative study to determine which implementation strategies work best to increase student achievement.

Following are the research questions which were formulated by the State Board's Assessment and Accountability Team:

AWARENESS

How familiar are teachers and administrators with the Illinois Learning Standards? What activities are schools undertaking to help students, school boards, parents and others become aware of the Standards?

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

How well are teachers and administrators currently prepared to help students reach the Illinois Learning Standards?

What areas are most important for teacher and administrator training?

What areas are most important for school board information and training?

CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

How closely are schools' curricula aligned with the Illinois Learning Standards?

What changes are being made in curriculum?

What changes are teachers making in their teaching methods to help as many students as possible reach the Standards?

Are schools considering changes in how their schools are organized (time, courses, etc.) to help more students meet the Standards?

ASSESSMENT

How are schools documenting students' achievement of the Standards in classrooms and in schools?

How do educators and others understand the relationship between state and local assessments of the Standards?

GENERAL QUESTIONS

What barriers exist to using the Standards effectively?

What information and assistance do schools/districts need?

(This question was formulated by collapsing the following three questions:

- 1. What information would be most helpful to share among schools and districts?
- 2. What assistance do schools need from Regional Offices of Education?
- 3. What assistance do schools need from the State Board of Education?)

METHODOLOGY

Based on the research questions provided by the State Board of Education, Research and Policy staff constructed a survey instrument (see Appendix A). Copies of the survey were mailed to 2,000 teachers, 1,750 principals and all (895) public school district superintendents in Illinois. The teachers and principals were randomly selected.

A total of 1,508 completed surveys were received resulting in a return rate of 33%. An additional 35 surveys were returned but they yielded no data because they were either returned undelivered, damaged by the post office, or were received too late for data entry. Most of the 1,508 survey respondents were principals and superintendents. Since teacher responses accounted for only about 13% of the returned surveys, the findings in this report should be considered primarily the views of school administrators.

SURVEY LIMITATIONS

First, the response rate from teachers as a group was low (13%), therefore it was not possible to analyze the results of this survey by type of profession of the respondents. Future surveys calling for teacher participation would do well to include aggressive follow-up strategies to ensure greater representation of teacher views.

Second, many respondents indicated in their various responses that they had not had sufficient time to fully implement the Standards since they were just adopted in July, 1997. Surveys to be conducted in the future (when schools would have had more time for implementation) should provide a more complete picture.

FINDINGS

AWARENESS

How familiar are teachers and administrators with the Illinois Learning Standards?

[See Appendix B, Questions 1-7]

Virtually every respondent indicated some degree of familiarity with the Illinois Learning Standards. Over 99% have heard of or read some of the Standards. Nearly three-quarters (73%) indicated having read the Standards in all the learning areas. Ninety-six percent were involved in efforts to implement the Standards in their schools/districts and 97% indicated they were familiar with the term "benchmark level."

Nearly 90% of the respondents educated themselves about the Standards by reading a copy of the Illinois Learning Standards. Reading bulletins and newsletters (83%) was another common way to gain knowledge of the Standards. Other sources of information about the Standards included workshops/meetings conducted by the ROE/ESC/ISC (58%), school/district (46%) and ISBE (38%).

What activities are schools undertaking to help students, school boards, parents and others become aware of the Standards?

Respondents were asked to write down the most successful activities their schools or districts had undertaken to help various groups (students, parents, school board members and general community) become aware of the Illinois Learning Standards. Following is a summary of the results.

Students:

The most common activity to enhance student awareness of the Standards was having teachers discuss or address the Standards with students in class. Other common activities included announcements by administrators about Standards during assemblies, newsletters, posting standards in classrooms, alignment of curriculum to Standards, and focusing lesson plans on the Standards.

While a few respondents indicated that nothing had been done to inform students of the Standards, others wrote about considerable efforts to increase student awareness. One school invited students to participate in curriculum committees to implement the Standards. Another worked with the student council. Yet another conducted focus groups after school. One teacher tells students what the Standards are before each lesson. One administrator talked to every class about Standards and testing.

Parents:

The two most common activities to inform parents of the Standards were sending newsletters/pamphlets to parents explaining the Standards and conducting discussions/presentations on Standards at PTO meetings. Other common activities included newspaper articles, information on Standards included with school report cards, giving copies of the Standards to parents, and publishing Standards in handbooks or calendars.

Parents in a few schools were more directly involved in the Standards implementation. They participated on the school improvement teams or curriculum re-aligning committees. One school reported that "two-week goals (standards) are sent home every two weeks." One district made the Standards and benchmarks available on the district web page.

School Board Members:

A sizable majority of the districts made presentations on Standards to their school board members at their regular/monthly meetings. These presentations were made by superintendents, principals, curriculum directors or teachers. Typically, school board members were informed of the Standards and given reports of the districts' implementation progress at these meetings. Many districts also indicated that the board members were given regular updates over time. Some districts mentioned using ISBE's video in their presentations.

Districts used a wide range of activities to inform their board members. Some reported merely giving copies of the Standards to their board members. On the other hand, other districts had their board members more involved in the Standards implementation process, such as having members participating in focus groups, district training on Standards and school improvement planning.

General Community:

District newsletters/bulletins to the community and local newspapers were the most often-mentioned channels to enhance community awareness of the Standards. A few districts also mentioned the use of other media such as radio and television.

Other outreach activities mentioned included presentations on Standards made by school district personnel to community/service organizations such as Citizens' Advisory Councils, Chamber of Commerce, and the Rotary Club. One district reported having made approximately 50 presentations to community organizations.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

How well are teachers and administrators currently prepared to help students reach the Illinois Learning Standards?

[See Appendix B, Questions 9-11]

Illinois educators generally have the preparation needed to help students reach the Standards.

- Eighty percent of those responding to this question felt they had knowledge of what students were expected to know relative to the Illinois Learning Standards.
- Sixty-five percent felt that they were well prepared to help students meet the Standards.
- Sixty-two percent were of the opinion that educators in their schools were generally well prepared to help students meet the Standards.

What areas are most important for teacher and administrator training? What areas are most important for school board information and training?

[See Appendix B, Question 12]

The results below represent the views of survey respondents relative to the areas of training/professional development needed for the following three groups: teachers, administrators, and school board members.

Most needed professional development areas for teachers

•	Aligning standards, curriculum and assessment	(76%)
•	Student assessment	(58%)
•	Standards implementation	(53%)
•	Instructional methods	(51%)

Most needed professional development areas for <u>administrators</u>

•	Aligning standards, curriculum and assessment	(66%)
•	Evaluation of the school's attainment of standards	(63%)
•	Data analysis and interpretation	(58%)
•	Standards implementation and assessment	(49%)

Most needed professional development areas for school board members

•	Identification of barriers to attaining the Standards	(63%)
•	Understanding the Illinois Learning Standards	(62%)
•	Resources and conditions needed to assure the Standards can be met	(61%)
•	Evaluation of the school's attainment of Standards	(52%)

CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

How closely are schools' curricula aligned with the Illinois Learning Standards? [See Appendix B, Question 14]

Respondents indicated that their schools' curricula were aligned with the Illinois Learning Standards. Following are results of the survey in terms of the percent of respondents indicating their perceptions of how aligned (reported as "closely" and "generally" aligned in the survey) their curricula were for the six learning areas:

•	English language arts	(94%)
•	Mathematics	(96%)
•	Science	(92%)
•	Social Science	(89%)
•	Physical Development/Health	(83%)
•	Fine Arts	(75%).

What changes are being made in curriculum?

[See Appendix B, Question 15]

Across the six learning areas . . .

- About two-thirds (63%-67%) of the respondents indicated that they were rewriting those parts of their curricula that were not aligned with the Standards.
- Between 8% to 17% indicated that curricular changes were not needed or none were made/considered.
- Between 6% to 10% indicated that their curricula were completely re-written.

What changes are teachers making in their teaching methods to help as many students as possible reach the Standards?

Respondents were asked to list the changes that teachers made to their instructional methods to help students meet the Standards for each of the six learning areas. Following is a summary of the results.

English language arts:

Common response(s):

More reading; greater emphasis on writing; integration of writing throughout the curriculum; use of IGAP writing rubric; more hands-on problem-based approaches; increased use of technology; and engaged learning.

Unique response(s):

 "Change from teacher-centered to student-centered activities. Computer assisted instruction; individually paced lessons. More writing opportunities. Use of portfolios for assessment. Some cross-curricular projects with Social Studies."

Mathematics:

Common response(s):

More hands-on and problem-solving techniques; more use of manipulatives; new text book series; greater use of technology; and more test preparation.

Unique response(s):

- "More emphasis placed on the basics (i.e. add/subtract, etc.)"
- "More use of calculators and short answers."
- "More emphasis on concepts."

Science:

Common response(s):

More hands-on science activities; increased laboratory work: use of new science series; greater use of technology; and more integrated curriculum.

Unique response(s):

- "Remediation in all areas."
- "Expansion of the Science Fair to elementary fifth and sixth grades with plans to include one additional grade level a year;" "Lab science for 6th-8th grades."
- "Hands-on learning with experimentation and problem-solving skills."

Social Science:

Common response(s):

More engaged learning; student-focused interaction activities; new textbook series; greater use of technology; cross curricular instruction; higher-order thinking skills; and working on projects.

Unique response(s):

- "Stressing geography skills daily; using current events to develop higher order thinking skills."
- "Relating concepts to real world."
- "More outside materials being used i.e. less book work."
- "Thematic approach, cooperative learning."

Physical Development and Health:

Common response(s):

Broadening the scope to include more health classes; more hands-on activities; incorporation of more dance classes; cooperative learning; and fitness orientation. [The response rate for this learning area was low compared to other learning areas.]

Unique response(s):

- "More 'wholesome living,' stress reduction, proper diet, athletics."
- "Doing more physical fitness programs for each child."
- "Dance elements being defined."
- "More life long health habits than just skill of a particular sort."

Fine arts:

Common response(s):

Broadening of the scope of offerings to include drama, music, and other visual arts. [Lack of funds may be one reason why districts have not done much in this area. One respondent wrote that "we do very little in this area because of money." As in the case of Physical Development and Health above, the response rate was relative low.]

Unique response(s):

- "Teachers are incorporating drama in class subjects."
- "Art outreach curriculum that teaches art appreciation. Teachers are also connecting dance, drama, music and visual arts to other learning areas by using a common theme."

Are schools considering changes in how their schools are organized (time, courses, etc.) to help more students meet the Standards?

[See Appendix B, Question 13]

Respondents were asked to provide their answers by checking from a list of organizational changes provided in the survey. The most frequently mentioned organizational changes made (or in the process of being made) were:

•	Increased classroom access to technology	(91%)
•	Increase in the amount of professional development	(73%)
•	Providing time for teachers to meet and collaborate	(64%)
•	Increase in remediation opportunities	(53%)

ASSESSMENT

How are schools documenting students' achievement of the Standards in classrooms and in schools?

[See Appendix B, Question 17]

A variety of methods were used to document students' achievement of the Standards. The more frequently used methods were:

•	Analyzing and using state assessment results	(81%)
•	Commercial standardized tests	(76%)
•	Teacher observations of coursework	(71%)
•	Performance assessments	(68%)
•	Comparing local results to state assessment results	(67%)
•	Student grades	(64%)
•	Monitoring local assessment trends	(62%)
•	Monitoring state assessment trends	(55%)
•	Portfolios	(41%)

How do educators and others understand the relationship between state and local assessments of the Standards?

Respondents were asked to write what they thought the relationship between state and local assessments of the Standards should be. While one group thought that local and state assessments should complement each other, another group thought that local and state assessments should be one and the same. Yet another group mentioned that there should be a close correlation between local and state assessments.

<u>Complement one another</u>: A number of respondents felt that local and state assessments should complement each other. As one respondent wrote, "Local assessment should measure the mastery of local outcomes. State assessment should measure the mastery of state standards. They should be aligned and linked to be meaningful." Some also pointed out that local assessments should be used in instances where state testing was not administered, such as some of the grades or subjects not tested by IGAP. As one respondent wrote, "We should assess locally what the state test can not."

One and the same: Another group felt that local and state assessments should measure the same goals and standards. As such, some felt that there was no need for two different assessments. As one respondent wrote, "they should be one and the same so that one battery of tests would suffice for both state and local assessments. As it is now, our students are 'tested to death."

<u>Close correlation</u>: A third group stressed that local and state assessments should be closely correlated. As one respondent put it, "If our assessments are aligned with standards, they should be similar. There should be a high correlation." One respondent

felt that the two assessments should be used to validate one another. Another respondent wrote, "Each should serve to help us understand how well students are learning."

GENERAL QUESTIONS

What barriers exist to implementing the Standards effectively?

[See Appendix B, Question 19]

The barriers most frequently mentioned were:

Organization structure (47%)
Lack of resources (46%)
Staff resistance to change (40%)
Conflicting state mandates (32%)

What information and assistance do schools/districts need?

[See Appendix B, Question 20]

The information and assistance most needed by schools and districts were:

•	Workshops for teachers on effective strategies to help	
	students meet the Standards	(72%)
•	Additional funding	(68%)
•	Sample assessments	(67%)
•	Performance standards and student work samples	(56%)
•	Workshops for school-level administrators on	
	effective strategies to raise student achievement	(55%)
•	How to align standards, curriculum and local assessment	(54%)

Emerging Issues: Information from questions (e.g. Questions 19 and 20) containing an "other" option

The survey contained several opportunities for respondents to provide additional narrative comments. A content analysis of the comments revealed several issues from which emerged three themes with policy implications.

1) <u>Constant State of Change</u>: Respondent written comments indicate that constant change in expectations at the state level has created a barrier to the effective implementation of the Illinois Learning Standards. Respondents seem to be asking for leadership from the state in terms of a clear direction and commitment to remain with the same focus on standards for a sufficient period of time so that schools and districts can implement the changes required to align current practice with the Standards.

Specific Examples of Comments:

- "With all the changes over the past years, it is hard to convince teachers the present standards are here to stay."
- "Teacher reluctance due to [the] state changing expectations every 4-5 years."
- "Disillusion with changes from one state superintendent/board to the next."
- "Teaching staff is tired of change and question the 'staying power' of school improvement/accountability approaches."
- 2) <u>Lack of Time and Resources</u>: Personnel, time, and a lack of fiscal resources were also identified as barriers to implementing the Illinois Learning Standards.

Specific Examples of Comments:

- "Time to align the standards with curriculum and time to rewrite the curriculum, select materials and train teachers."
- "Lack of money."
- "Time to plan! Not enough time to teach everything."
- "Funding for teacher inservice to constantly update instructional strategies."
- 3) <u>Need for Assessment Information</u>: Respondents expressed a need for more information on the state assessment, as well as how to develop and align local assessments.

Specific Examples of Comments:

- "Need adequate IGAP analysis to pinpoint deficiencies."
- "Need examples and sample questions from state on time."
- "Lack of information on appropriate assessment measures."
- "Lack of state readiness to implement in a timely manner. Sample assessments are not ready."

Note: Due to its excessive volume, the listing of all written responses to open-ended questions is not provided in this report. However, it is available upon request from the Research and Policy Division.

SUMMARY AND ACTION PLANS

Although the return rate of the survey was disappointing, particularly that of teachers, the results can still be used as baseline information by the external contractor (University of Illinois) in future evaluation efforts. The results can also be used by the Illinois State Board of Education as it considers future policies and actions related to standards and assessment efforts.

Even though the Standards have only been in existence since 1997, it is evident from the survey results that widespread efforts are underway to align curriculum to the Standards. The results also identify certain areas in which teachers, administrators and

school board members could benefit from additional training as they strive toward higher standards for their students.

There is now an awareness of the types of barriers that schools and districts encounter as they attempt to implement the Standards. The emerging issues also provide insights into why the barriers exist. For example, the mention of staff resistance to change was often accompanied by narrative comments regarding the constant state of change in expectations at the state level. Talk of the lack of resources was accompanied by a request for targeted funding and technical assistance.

Based on the findings of this survey, staff plan to take the following actions:

- Maintain the focus on implementing the Illinois Learning Standards and emphasize the State Board's commitment to continuity of direction.
- Include Standards and Assessments as priorities for continuing professional development of teachers as a condition for certification renewal.
- Put forth a concerted effort to ensure that districts have the time, financial, and other resources needed to implement the Standards.
- Increase professional development and assistance to schools through workshops and literature on aligning Standards, curriculum, and assessment.
- Develop and implement a public relations plan to provide regular updates on the Standards and assessment initiatives.
- Identify state mandates that conflict with the ability of schools and districts to
 effectively implement the Standards, and where appropriate, seek legislation to
 eliminate those conflicting mandates.
- Work with local educators to determine specific barriers (other than mandates) that limit their ability to effectively implement the Standards and identify ways the State Board of Education can assist in their implementation.
- Give additional emphasis to meeting timelines.

Appendix A

Survey Instrument

Click here for a copy of the Survey Instrument in PDF format.

Appendix B Survey Results

PART I- AWARENESS

	YES	NO
Have you heard of the Illinois Learning Standards?	99.7%	.3%
	[1500]	[4]
2. Have you read some of the Illinois Learning Standards?	99%	1%
	[1488]	[13]
3. Have you read the standards for all seven learning areas?	73%	27%
	[1087]	[410]
4. Did you participate in any of the committees that developed the	10%	90%
standards?	[144]	[1352]
5. Are you currently involved in efforts to implement the standards in your	96%	4%
school or district?	[1424]	[67]
6. Are you familiar with the term "Benchmark Level"?	97%	3%
	[1447]	[41]

No
Response
[4]
[7]
[11]
[12]
[17]
[20]

7. How did you gain knowledge of the Illinois Learning Standards?

1	I have no knowledge of the Illinois Learning Standards	.9%
		[13]
2	Reading a copy of the Illinois Learning Standards	89%
		[1340]
3	Reading various bulletins and newsletters	83%
		[1254]
4	The mass media	20%
		[298]
5	Other	9%
		[136]
A WOR	KSHOP OR MEETING GIVEN BY:	
6	School/district	46%
		[700]
7	Professional Organization	30%
		[452]
8	ROE/ESC/ISC	58%
		[873]
9	State Board	38%
		[574]

8. [OPEN-ENDED RESPONSE]

PART II- PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
9. I know what students are expected to know and be	2%	5%	12%	64%	16%
able to do relative to the Illinois Learning Standards	[26]	[78]	[182]	[948]	[241]
10.I am well prepared to help students meet the Illinois	2%	10%	23%	52%	13%
Learning Standards	[32]	[145]	[343]	[762]	[189]
11. Overall, educators in my school(s) are well prepared	2%	12%	24%	51%	11%
to help students meet the Illinois Learning Standards	[35]	[177]	[350]	[750]	[154]

12. Which of the following professional development areas do each of these groups need most to help students meet the Illinois Learning Standards?

	ERS [No Response= 32]	
1	Instructional methods	51%
		[770]
2	Standards implementation	53%
	<u> </u>	[806]
3	Aligning standards, curriculum and assessment	76%
		[1150]
4	Selection of instructional materials	33%
		[503]
5	Student assessment	58%
		[874]
6	Data analysis and interpretation	50%
		[746]
7	Subject area content	22%
•		[335]
8	OTHER	5%
	OTTLEN	[73]
	ADMINISTRATORS [No Response= 55]	
1	Instructional methods	26%
		[392]
2	Standards implementation and assessment	49%
		[731]
3	Aligning standards, curriculum and assessment	66%
	7 mg/m/g startatios, ournouldin and assessment	[997]
4	Selection of instructional materials	26%
-	ocicetion of instructional materials	[398]
5	Student assessment	42%
	otadon assossment	[640]
6	Data analysis and interpretation	58%
	Data analysis and interpretation	[878]
7	Evaluation of the school's attainment of standards	63%
'	Evaluation of the school's attainment of standards	[948]
8	OTHER: [n=55]	4%
	OTTIER. [II-00]	[55]

	SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS [No Response= 97]	
1	Understanding the Illinois Learning Standards	62% [928]
2	Resources & conditions needed to assure the standards can be met	61% [921]
3	Student assessment	25% [380]
4	Data analysis and interpretation	38% [565]
5	Evaluation of the school's attainment of standards	52% [781]
6	Identification of barriers to attaining the Illinois Learning Standards	63% [943]
7	OTHER: [n=53]	4% [53]

PART III- CURRICULUM & INSTRUCTION

to help m	d below are some organizational changes that schools could make nore students meet the Illinois Learning Standards. Have you made, u considering making any of the following changes?	[1] Not Considering	[2] Considering	[3] Currently Making	[4] Already Made
1	Increased classroom access to technology	1%	7%	57%	34%
		[19]	[107]	[851]	[512]
2	Reduction in class size	42%	18%	18%	23%
		[614]	[254]	[255]	[331]
3	Providing time for teachers to meet and collaborate	11%	25%	33%	31%
		[166]	[372]	[486]	[453]
4	Lengthening the school day	78%	12%	2%	7%
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	[1144]	[176]	[35]	[107]
5	Lengthening the school year	86%	11%	2%	2%
		[1250]	[161]	[22]	[28]
6	Year-round schooling	89%	9%	1%	1%
		[1305]	[126]	[11]	[17]
7	Block scheduling	50%	23%	9%	18%
		[732]	[338]	[124]	[262]
8	Re-design of courses	26%	37%	29%	9%
		[297]	[408]	[311]	[86]
9	Addition of courses	41%	29%	18%	11%
		[596]	[424]	[265]	[161]
10	Increase in remediation opportunities	12%	36%	33%	20%
		[172]	[518]	[480]	[285]
11	Increase in graduation requirements	54%	15%	10%	21%
		[739]	[209]	[143]	[283]
12	Increase in the amount of professional development	8%	19%	42%	31%
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	[120]	[275]	[609]	[450]
13	OTHER: [n=46]	13%	17%	33%	37%
		[6]	[8]	[15]	[17]

14. How aligned is your curriculum to the standards?	[1] Closely Aligned	[2] Generally Aligned	[3] Far from Aligned
English Language Arts	40%	54%	6%
	[570]	[773]	[78]
Mathematics	40%	56%	5%
	[560]	[786]	[68]
Science	30%	62%	9%
	[415]	[862]	[121]
Social Science	26%	63%	11%
	[359]	[871]	[157]
PD/Health	23%	61%	16%
	[316]	[843]	[222]
Fine Arts	19%	56%	25%
	[259]	[769]	[336]

No
Response
[87]
[94]
[110]
[121]
[127]
[144]

15. What curriculum changes are being made or considered?	1 No changes are needed	2 No changes are being made or considered	3 Rewriting parts of the curriculum that are not aligned	4 Completely rewriting the curriculum	5 Selecting a commercially produced curric.
English Language	15%	8%	65%	7 %	4%
Arts	[202]	[106]	[865]	[97]	[56]
Mathematics	17%	10%	63%	6%	4%
	[214]	[126]	[624]	[57]	[43]
Science	12% [116]	11% [105]	66% [645]	7 %	4% [38]
Social Science	12%	11%	66%	8%	4%
	[112]	[104]	[640]	[75]	[37]
PD/Health	12%	11%	67%	8%	2%
	[110]	[105]	[631]	[79]	[22]
Fine Arts	11%	12%	66%	10%	2%
	[104]	[107]	[615]	[89]	[17]

No Response
[182]
[209]
[224]
[228]
[258]
[274]

16. [OPEN-ENDED RESPONSE]

PART IV- ASSESSMENT

17. Student achievement of the Illinois Learning Standards is documented in your school/district by which of the following?

1	Teacher observations of coursework	71 % [1072]
2	Student grades	64% [962]
3	Performance assessments	68% [1031]
4	Portfolios	41% [612]
5	Commercial standardized test(s)	76% [1138]
6	Analyzing and using State Assessment results	81% [1214]
7	National results (NAEP; TIMSS, etc.)	8% [115]
8	Comparing local results to State Assessment results	67% [1011]
9	Monitoring local assessment trends	62% [931]
10	Monitoring state assessment trends	55% [834]
11	Other (please specify):	3% [46]
12	None of the above	>1% [8]

PART V- GENERAL QUESTIONS

18. [OPEN-ENDED RESPONSE]

19. What barriers, if any, are keeping your school/district from effectively implementing the Illinois Learning Standards?

1 Lack of knowledge of the IL Learning Standards 14% [212] 2 Lack of local leadership 7% [104] 3 Lack of state leadership 14% [204] 4 Lack of resources 46% [690] 5 Lack of instructional materials 16% [238] 6 Turnover of school personnel 14% [210] 7 Turnover of district personnel 8% [125] 8 Conflicting state mandates 32% [484] 9 Organization structure 47% [709] 10 Program funding not aligned with the IL Learning Standards [377] 25% [337] 11 Professional development opportunities not aligned to ILS [25% [334] 22% [334] 12 Staff resistance to change [596] 40% [596] 13 Administration resistance to change [91] 3% [52] 15 Other (please specify): [239] 16% [95] 16 None of the above [95] 6% [95]			
2 Lack of local leadership 7% [104] 3 Lack of state leadership 14% [204] 4 Lack of resources 46% [690] 5 Lack of instructional materials 16% [238] 6 Turnover of school personnel 14% [210] 7 Turnover of district personnel 8% [125] 8 Conflicting state mandates 32% [484] 9 Organization structure 47% [709] 10 Program funding not aligned with the IL Learning Standards 25% [337] 11 Professional development opportunities not aligned to ILS 22% [334] 12 Staff resistance to change 40% [596] 13 Administration resistance to change 6% [91] 14 School board resistance to change 3% [52] 15 Other (please specify): 16% [239] 16 None of the above 6%	1	Lack of knowledge of the IL Learning Standards	14%
104 3			[212]
104	2	Lack of local leadership	7%
204 4		·	[104]
204 4	3	Lack of state leadership	14%
[690] 5 Lack of instructional materials 16% [238] 6 Turnover of school personnel 14% [210] 7 Turnover of district personnel 8% [125] 8 Conflicting state mandates 32% [484] 9 Organization structure 47% [709] 10 Program funding not aligned with the IL Learning Standards [377] 11 Professional development opportunities not aligned to ILS 22% [334] 12 Staff resistance to change 40% [596] 13 Administration resistance to change 6% [91] 14 School board resistance to change 3% [52] 15 Other (please specify): 16% [239] 16 None of the above 6%			[204]
[690] 5 Lack of instructional materials 16% [238] 6 Turnover of school personnel 14% [210] 7 Turnover of district personnel 8% [125] 8 Conflicting state mandates 32% [484] 9 Organization structure 47% [709] 10 Program funding not aligned with the IL Learning Standards 25% [377] 11 Professional development opportunities not aligned to ILS 22% [334] 12 Staff resistance to change 40% [596] 13 Administration resistance to change 6% [91] 14 School board resistance to change 3% [52] 15 Other (please specify): 16% [239] 16 None of the above 6%	4	Lack of resources	46%
238 6 Turnover of school personnel 14% [210] 7 Turnover of district personnel 8% [125] 8 Conflicting state mandates 32% [484] 9 Organization structure 47% [709] 10 Program funding not aligned with the IL Learning Standards [377] 11 Professional development opportunities not aligned to ILS 22% [334] 12 Staff resistance to change 40% [596] 13 Administration resistance to change 6% [91] 14 School board resistance to change 3% [52] 15 Other (please specify): 16% [239] 16 None of the above 6%			[690]
[238] 14% 14% [210] 7 Turnover of district personnel 8% [125] 8 Conflicting state mandates 32% [484] 9 Organization structure 47% [709] 10 Program funding not aligned with the IL Learning Standards 25% [377] 11 Professional development opportunities not aligned to ILS 22% [334] 12 Staff resistance to change 40% [596] 13 Administration resistance to change 6% [91] 14 School board resistance to change 3% [52] 15 Other (please specify): 16% [239] 16 None of the above 6%	5	Lack of instructional materials	16%
210		Laon of mondonal materials	[238]
[210] 7 Turnover of district personnel 8% [125] 8 Conflicting state mandates 32% [484] 9 Organization structure 47% [709] 10 Program funding not aligned with the IL Learning Standards 25% [377] 11 Professional development opportunities not aligned to ILS 22% [334] 12 Staff resistance to change 40% [596] 13 Administration resistance to change 6% [91] 14 School board resistance to change 3% [52] 15 Other (please specify): 16% [239] 16 None of the above 6%	6	Turnover of school personnel	14%
125 8 Conflicting state mandates 32% [484] 9 Organization structure 47% [709] 10 Program funding not aligned with the IL Learning Standards 25% [377] 11 Professional development opportunities not aligned to ILS 22% [334] 12 Staff resistance to change 40% [596] 13 Administration resistance to change 6% [91] 14 School board resistance to change 3% [52] 15 Other (please specify): 16% [239] 16 None of the above 6%		Talliovol of collect percollinor	[210]
125 8 Conflicting state mandates 32% [484] 9 Organization structure 47% [709] 10 Program funding not aligned with the IL Learning Standards 25% [377] 11 Professional development opportunities not aligned to ILS 22% [334] 12 Staff resistance to change 40% [596] 13 Administration resistance to change 6% [91] 14 School board resistance to change 3% [52] 15 Other (please specify): 16% [239] 16 None of the above 6%	7	Turnover of district personnel	8%
8 Conflicting state mandates 32% [484] 9 Organization structure 47% [709] 10 Program funding not aligned with the IL Learning Standards 25% [377] 11 Professional development opportunities not aligned to ILS 22% [334] 12 Staff resistance to change 40% [596] 13 Administration resistance to change 6% [91] 14 School board resistance to change 3% [52] 15 Other (please specify): 16% [239] 16 None of the above 6%	,	Turnover of district personner	
9 Organization structure 47% [709] 10 Program funding not aligned with the IL Learning Standards 25% [377] 11 Professional development opportunities not aligned to ILS 22% [334] 12 Staff resistance to change 40% [596] 13 Administration resistance to change 6% [91] 14 School board resistance to change 3% [52] 15 Other (please specify): 16% [239] 16 None of the above 6%	8	Conflicting state mandates	32%
10 Program funding not aligned with the IL Learning Standards 25% [377] 11 Professional development opportunities not aligned to ILS 22% [334] 12 Staff resistance to change 40% [596] 13 Administration resistance to change 6% [91] 14 School board resistance to change 3% [52] 15 Other (please specify): 16% [239] 16 None of the above 6%		Confidency state mandates	
10 Program funding not aligned with the IL Learning Standards 25% [377] 11 Professional development opportunities not aligned to ILS 22% [334] 12 Staff resistance to change 40% [596] 13 Administration resistance to change 6% [91] 14 School board resistance to change 3% [52] 15 Other (please specify): 16% [239] 16 None of the above 6%	9	Organization structure	47%
11 Professional development opportunities not aligned to ILS 22% [334] 12 Staff resistance to change 40% [596] 13 Administration resistance to change 6% [91] 14 School board resistance to change 15 Other (please specify): 16% [239] 16 None of the above			[709]
11 Professional development opportunities not aligned to ILS 22% [334] 12 Staff resistance to change 40% [596] 13 Administration resistance to change 6% [91] 14 School board resistance to change 3% [52] 15 Other (please specify): 16% [239] 16 None of the above 6% 6%	10	Program funding not aligned with the IL Learning Standards	25%
12 Staff resistance to change 40% [596] 13 Administration resistance to change 6% [91] 14 School board resistance to change 3% [52] 15 Other (please specify): 16% [239] 16 None of the above 6%			[377]
[334] 12 Staff resistance to change 40% [596] 13 Administration resistance to change 6% [91] 14 School board resistance to change 3% [52] 15 Other (please specify): 16% [239] 16 None of the above 6%	11	Professional development opportunities not aligned to ILS	22%
13 Administration resistance to change 6% [91]			[334]
13 Administration resistance to change 6% [91]	12	Staff resistance to change	40%
14 School board resistance to change [91]		oran roomanoo to orange	[596]
14	13	Administration resistance to change	6%
15 Other (please specify): 16% [239] 16 None of the above 6%			[91]
[52] 15 Other (please specify): 16% [239] 16 None of the above 6%	14	School board resistance to change	3%
16 None of the above [239]			[52]
16 None of the above [239]	15	Other (please specify):	16%
10 11010 01 110 00000		Carior (product opposity).	[239]
10 11010 01 110 00000	16	None of the above	6%
			[95]

20. What information and assistance do schools/districts need?

1	Printed copies of the Illinois Learning Standards	21%
		[321]
2	Performance standards & student work samples	56%
		[844]
3	Sample assessments	67%
	•	[1003]
4	How to align standards, curriculum & local assessment	54%
		[814]
5	Clarification of the school's and district's responsibilities regarding the	35%
	Illinois Learning Standards	[525]
6	Workshops for teachers on effective strategies to help students meet	72%
	the Illinois Learning Standards	[1079]
7	Workshops for school-level administrators on effective strategies to	55%
	raise student achievement	[832]
8	Workshops for district-level administrators on effective strategies to	33%
	raise student achievement	[501]
9	Additional funding	68%
	3	[1018]
10	Curriculum frameworks or sample curricula	49%
		[734]
11	Workshops for school board members	21%
		[320]
12	Other (please specify):	7%
'-	Carron (process opposity).	[101]
		[]