



Illinois State Board of Education

Jesse Ruiz, Board Chair
Dr. Christopher Koch, State Superintendent

Illinois State Board of Education*

100 North First Street
4th Floor Board Room
Springfield, Illinois 62777
217/782-2221
217/785-3972 (fax)

SCHEDULE AND AGENDA OF MEETINGS

Tuesday, March 23

- Education Policy and Planning Committee Meeting at 12:00 p.m.

Wednesday, March 24

- Finance & Audit Committee Meeting at 4:00 p.m. <

Thursday, March 25

- Board Meeting at 9:00 a.m.

Conference Call Access Number for all meetings:
1-866-297-6391

(A live audio stream, via the Internet, will be available during the meeting on Thursday.)

View on Screen Board Meeting Information Document
Download for Printing Board Meeting Information Document

TUESDAY, March 23, 2004

12:00 p.m.

Education Policy and Planning Committee Meeting

Via Conference Call--Access Number: 1-866-297-6391

- Additional Supplemental Educational Service (SES) Providers
- Appeals Advisory Committee Recommendations
 - Iroquois West #10
 - East Alton-Wood River Community HS District #14
 - Chicago Public Schools #299
- Student Racial/Ethnic Categories for State Testing and AYP Calculations
- AYP Alternate Calculation Status
- 2005 Test Dates
- Update on Student Identification System and E-Grant Management System
- Academic Early Warning and Watch Lists
- Rules for Adoption:
 - Part 27: Standards for Certification in Specific Teaching Fields
 - Part 29: Standards for Administrative Certification
 - Part 350: Secular Textbook Loan

WEDNESDAY, March 24, 2004

4:00 p.m.

Finance & Audit Committee Meeting

Via Conference Call--Access Number: 1-866-297-6391

- 2004 School District Financial Profile
- East St. Louis District #189 Petition for Dissolution of FOP
- Fiscal Year 2005 Proposed Budget
- Assessment Contract Update
- ISBE Monthly Reports
- Superintendent's Quarterly Travel Analysis (Nov. 2003-Feb. 2004)

THURSDAY, March 25, 2004

9:00 a.m.

A. Call Meeting to Order/Roll Call

4th Floor Board Room

B. Items for Discussion

- Additional Supplemental Educational Service (SES) Providers (*pp. 1-6*)
- Appeals Advisory Recommendations (*pp. 7-12*)
 - Iroquois West #10
 - East Alton-Wood River Community HS District #14
 - Chicago Public Schools #299
- Student Racial/Ethnic Categories for State Testing and AYP Calculations (*pp. 13-15*)
- AYP Alternate Calculations (*pp. 16-18*)
- 2005 Test Dates (*pp. 19-26*)
- Update on Student Identification System and E-Grant Management System (*pp. 27-28*)
- Academic Early Warning and Watch List (*pp. 29-30*)
- Rules for Adoption:
 - Part 27: Standards for Certification in Specific Teaching Fields (*pp. 31-80*)
 - Part 29: Standards for Administrative Certification (*pp. 81-110*)
 - Part 350: Secular Textbook Loan (*pp. 111-117*)
- 2004 School District Financial Profile (*pp. 118-122*)
- East St. Louis District #189 Petition for Dissolution of FOP (*pp. 123-128*)
- Fiscal Year 2005 Proposed Budget (*pp. 129-132*)
- Assessment Contract Update (*pp. 133-134*)
- ISBE Monthly Reports (*pp. 135-150*)
- Superintendent's Quarterly Travel Analysis (Nov. 2003-Feb. 2004)

12:00 p.m.

Lunch/Executive Session (as needed)

1:15 p.m.

C. Public Participation

D. Approval of Minutes

- February 18, 2004 (*pp. 151-167*)

E. Action Items

- Approval of Additional Supplemental Educational Service (SES) Providers (*pp. 1-6*)
- Appeals Advisory Recommendations (*pp. 7-12*)
 - Iroquois West #10
 - East Alton-Wood River Community HS District #14
 - Chicago Public Schools #299
- Approval of Student Racial/Ethnic Categories for State Testing and AYP

- Calculations (*pp. 13-15*)
- Approval of AYP Alternate Calculations (*pp. 16-18*)
- Approval of 2005 Test Dates (*pp. 19-26*)
- Adoption of Academic Early Warning and Watch Lists
- Authorization of Rules for Adoption:
 - Part 27: Standards for Certification in Specific Teaching Fields (*pp. 31-80*)
 - Part 29: Standards for Administrative Certification (*pp. 81-110*)
 - Part 350: Secular Textbook Loan (*pp. 111-117*)
- Approval of 2004 School District Financial Profile (*pp. 118-122*)
- Approval of State Superintendent's recommendation concerning East St. Louis School District #189's Petition to Dissolve the East St. Louis Board of Education Financial Oversight Panel (*pp. 123-128*)
- Acceptance of ISBE Monthly Reports (*pp. 135-150*)
- Approval of Superintendent's Travel Analysis (Nov. 2003-Jan. 2004)

F. Announcements and Reports

- Superintendent
- Chairman
- Committees
- Members

G. Other Information

- Monthly Status Report on Rulemaking (*pp. 168-170*)

H. Adjourn

*All State Board of Education meetings listed on this agenda will be accessible to persons with disabilities. Persons planning to attend who need special accommodations should contact the Board office no later than the date prior to the meeting.

Contact the Superintendent's office at the State Board of Education, 100 North First Street, Springfield, Illinois 62777-0001.

Phone: 217-782-2221
 TTY/TDD: 217-782-1900
 Fax: 217-785-3972

Illinois State Board of Education

100 North First Street
 Springfield, IL 62777

March 25, 2004
State Board Meeting

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

100 North First Street
4th Floor Board Room
Springfield, Illinois 62777

Thursday, March 25, 2004

<u>Call Meeting to Order/ Roll Call</u>	<p>The Chair, Dr. Janet Steiner, called the March 25, 2004 meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. She then requested that the roll be called. A quorum was present as all Board members were in attendance.</p> <p>MEMBERS PRESENT:</p> <table><tr><td>Beverly Turkal</td><td>Richard Sandsmark</td><td>Dean Clark</td></tr><tr><td>Ronald Gidwitz</td><td>Judith Gold</td><td>Joyce Karon</td></tr><tr><td>Gregory Kazarian</td><td>Janet Steiner</td><td></td></tr></table> <p>Note: Gregory Kazarian and Judith Gold joined the meeting shortly after roll call.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner stated that the meeting would be a one day meeting in which the Board would discuss and take action on the presented agenda items.</p>	Beverly Turkal	Richard Sandsmark	Dean Clark	Ronald Gidwitz	Judith Gold	Joyce Karon	Gregory Kazarian	Janet Steiner	
Beverly Turkal	Richard Sandsmark	Dean Clark								
Ronald Gidwitz	Judith Gold	Joyce Karon								
Gregory Kazarian	Janet Steiner									
<u>Items for Discussion</u>	<p>Dr. Steiner proclaimed that the meeting would begin with Items for Discussion, with the first item for discussion being the Supplemental Service Provider that is being proposed for addition to the current ISBE List of Approved Providers.</p>									
<u>Additional Supplemental Educational Services (SES)</u>	<p>Dr. Steiner stated that the purpose of bringing the Additional Supplemental Service Provider item for discussion was to inform the Board of the results of the review of the application received from Dolton West School District 148 in Riverdale, who applied to offer reading SES instruction through an extended day program.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller stated that Dolton West School District 148's application has been reviewed in light of the criteria and it is being recommended that the Board approve Dolton as a SES provider. Dr. Steiner then asserted that this item had been discussed in the Education Policy Planning Committee meeting and that if a Board member had</p>									

	<p>questions concerning the program, he or she could inquire to one of the committee members. The Superintendent also pointed out that staff has been soliciting information from a number of other providers that are serving other states. He stated that the agency has sent out letters to these providers to see to what extent Illinois can build up its provider base for the coming school year.</p>
<p><u>Appeals Advisory Committee Recommendations</u></p>	<p>Dr. Steiner stated that the next agenda item would be the Appeals Advisory Committee Recommendations. Dr. Steiner further stated that the purpose of the agenda item was to inform the Board of the recommendations to the Superintendent and to discuss the recommendations as a Board.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller asserted that there were three school districts that made appeals to Appeals Advisory Committee. He stated that the committee reviewed each appeal and then made recommendations to him. In turn, he reviewed the appeals and committee recommendations, with the assistance of counsel, in order to present his recommendations for the Board's consideration.</p> <p>The Superintendent then provided the Board with a summary of his recommendations in light of the appeals and the recommendations of the Appeals Advisory Committee regarding Iroquois West #10, East Alton—Wood River School District #14, and Chicago Public School District #299. Dr. Schiller stated that he agreed with the Appeals Advisory Committee's recommendation concerning Iroquois West to keep the AYP status of the schools in the district as they are, as the broader issue of including large residential facilities in the AYP calculations of local school districts is beyond the purview of the committee.</p> <p>Further, Dr. Schiller asserted that he concurred with the recommendation of the committee concerning East Alton to keep the AYP status of the high school as it is, due to the insufficient overall participation rate in 2002-2003. As stated by the committee, the school districted most likely acted in good faith on the information they received from ACT. However, the school district should have talked to ISBE and/or read guidance which was made available by the agency.</p> <p>On the three appeals from Chicago Public School District</p>

#299, Dr. Schiller stated that, on the first issue, Chicago requested that ISBE retain the 47 schools in question, who did not make AYP, in their current school improvement status for the 2003-2004 school year. The Appeals Advisory Committee recommended that the Board support Chicago on this first issue. However, Dr. Schiller stated that after a thorough review of the law and direction from the US Department of Education, it is clear that ISBE does not have the authority to supercede the federal law and that allowing this sought after “hold harmless” provision would be in direct violation of the law. Therefore, Dr. Schiller stated that he would recommend that the Board reject Chicago’s request to allow the 47 schools one additional year to improve before designating to them their current school improvement status.

Board member Beverly Turkal inquired as to what would happen if the school districts did not receive the score reports in a timely fashion and whose responsibility it is to get the results to the schools in a timely fashion. Dr. Schiller stated that the state agency indeed has a responsibility and obligation to get the results back to the schools in a timely fashion, and this was done. However, it is the obligation of the local education agency (LEA), according to the law, to make the determination on their own as to what schools must offer choice and provide Supplemental Educational Services as needed.

Ms. Turkal also questioned the purpose of instituting the Appeals Advisory Committee and how many recommendations have been accepted from the committee. Dr. Schiller asserted that the committee was formed last year as part of the Accountability legislation that it would serve to review the status of appeals and offer recommendations to the Superintendent. Further, Dr. Schiller stated that two out of three of the committee’s recommendations were accepted. Additionally, there was one time that a recommendation was made that went against established ISBE policies and procedures.

Greg Kazarian stated that he was also interest in the “track record” of accepting the recommendations of the Appeals Advisory Committee. However, more importantly, he stated that he believes that it is a good process as it is valuable for the Board to check its thinking against that of others close to the issues.

	<p>Dr. Steiner then stated that she would like to recognize Greg Kazarian and Judith Gold who joined the meeting by telephone.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller stated that the Appeals Advisory Committee is akin to The State Teacher Certification Board in that they both serve in an advisory capacity. Recommendations from each group and concurrent recommendations from the Superintendent are brought to the Board for consideration. The Board then has the prerogative to modify, reject, or accept the recommendations given.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller then proceeded to give brief overview of the Appeals Committee Recommendations on issue #2 and #3 regarding the Chicago Public School District #299. According to Dr. Schiller, the Appeals Advisory Committee rejected the appeal on Issue #2 regarding the inclusion of LEP subgroups in the calculation of AYP for the 2002-2003 school year. On Issue #3 the committee believed the issue on year-round schools was not one under the committee's purview. However, they do believe it is an important issue for ISBE to address. Dr. Schiller recommended to the Board the support of these two recommendations.</p> <p>Mr. Gidwitz then further questioned the Superintendent by asking if the advisory committee had knowledge of the law regarding Issue #1. Dr. Schiller stated that indeed the committee was knowledgeable as they were provided with the law and ISBE policies and guidelines related to this matter. He also reminded the Board that a similar circumstance occurred with an appeal from Decatur. Regarding Decatur District #61, the Appeals Advisory Committee took action to recommend overturning the designated status of Harris Elementary School for 2003-2004 and have that school remain in school improvement status for another year. Dr. Schiller asserted that as with this current issue, the federal law cannot be ignored but must be upheld, regardless of feelings about how the law should be applied in relation to school improvement status.</p>
--	--

<p><u>Student Racial/Ethnic Categories for State Testing and AYP Calculations</u></p>	<p>Dr. Steiner announced that the next item for Board discussion would be the Student Racial/Ethnic Categories for State Testing and AYP Calculations. Dr. Schiller then said that this issue was brought before the Education Policy Planning Committee. In the committee, staff discussed the importance of instituting a multi-race category in order to be sensitive to children who consider themselves multi-racial. Therefore, the Superintendent stated that it is being recommended that students be able to code more than one race on their testing documents to identify the race in which they belong to. In addition, it was recommended, in accordance with the intent of No Child Left Behind and state law, that a multi-racial/ethnic group of 40 or more students constitute a subgroup and factor as such into AYP calculations.</p> <p>The Education Policy Planning Committee Chair Greg Kazarian stated that the creation of such a multi-racial category was a result of an accommodation for those in the school communities that felt their students were not being properly identified with the current categories established by ISBE. Mr. Kazarian then asserted that it is important to be aware, as discussed in committee, of the potential consequence in adding an additional subgroup to AYP calculations. Dr. Schiller then reminded the Board that this issue was raised at the last Board meeting by a local educator. Therefore, he brought this issue back to the Board for further discussion and consideration.</p> <p>Dean Clark asked if, by creating the multi-racial category, there would be an infinite number of subgroups being created thereafter. The Superintendent responded to Mr. Clark's response and stated that White, Hispanic, African-American, Native American, Asian, Pacific Islander, and Multi-racial would be the six categories students would have to select from to identify themselves, unless the state receives further guidance from the US Department of Education. However, it is left to the individual states to determine their subgroups.</p> <p>Janet Steiner inquired as to how the state is going to get the children to recognize this process and take it seriously. The Superintendent stated that there are three important factors that should aid in this process: the utilization of the pre-coding labels, due diligence on behalf of districts to verify data, and the creation of a Student</p>
--	---

	<p>Identification System that would provide a secure database to alleviate the paperwork and subjectivity associated with coding students at the local level.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller then asked Mary Anne Graham and Lynne Curry to step forward to discuss with the Board the steps that have been taken so far this year with regard to inservicing school districts with information on the need for accurate submission of data as there were over 27, 000 inaccurate data submissions from districts. Lynne Curry then stated that she would request Mary Ann to discuss the specifics in relation to steps that have been taken to assist school districts. Dr. Curry did state that in general for this year, staff has instituted some additional data checks through an electronic enrollment checking system. This system will not allow districts to submit data that does not add up.</p> <p>In terms of racial and ethnic coding, when the test is taken, students and/or administrators will have a chance to mark more than one ethnic category and these markings will override the pre-identification labels. Concurrently, if there are errors on the labels, schools have an opportunity to correct that information as that section is being completed. According to Dr. Curry, 14,000 students were coded in the other category last year. Therefore, with the creation of a multi-racial category it will be easier to identify what students are meeting, exceeding, or not meeting the standards at all. Dr. Curry said that this new multi-racial category would also be more in line with the spirit of our state law and the federal law with regard to the reporting of student scores by subgroups for AYP calculation purposes.</p> <p>Mary Ann Graham stated that staff has been conducting in-services all over the state with various administrators and the Illinois Principals' Association. In the in-services, the administrators have been thoroughly trained regarding checking and double checking their data. Mary Ann Graham said that 800 districts have worked right with staff in making corrections to the 2003 data. Dr. Schiller then asserted that the sensitivity with regard to the importance of accurate data submission is finally being realized by districts as the stakes are rising.</p> <p>Joyce Karon stated that she hoped that as the agency moves through this process, it is clearly communicated to</p>
--	---

	<p>schools and districts that if the multi-racial group has 40 or more individuals, it will be a subgroup counted in AYP calculations.</p>
<p><u>AYP Alternate Calculations</u></p>	<p>AYP Alternate Calculations was the next item for Board discussion. Dr. Steiner announced that the purpose of this item would be to inform the Board of the status of recent revisions to the NCLB Accountability Workbook and propose a recommendation regarding the calculation of AYP in reading and math areas that will positively impact a few schools.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller then proceeded to say that the agency is continually looking for ways to refine our obligations under NCLB, particularly in regard to how to calculate Annual Yearly Progress. Dr. Schiller stated that agency staff has looked at the extent to which our current calculations for AYP compare to other state's calculations. Currently, our state holds that a school misses AYP if they do not meet standards in math or reading for 2 consecutive years. When researching the calculation of AYP in other states, it was found that some assert that a school is placed in school improvement status if that school does not make AYP in the same subject for two consecutive years. Utilizing 2002 and 2003 assessment data and disregarding all previous year's School Improvement Status lists, ISBE calculated the number of schools in need of improvement based on the Illinois' method vs. the alternative method used by other states. The difference between both methods was 10 schools.</p> <p>Lynne Curry then added that as the alternative calculation only affected a few schools with this calculation, it will begin to affect more as the bar begins to climb. Dr. Steiner stated that this is a positive for school districts. Dr. Schiller agreed and stated that in light of developing school improvement plans, the results of this method of calculation will draw attention to areas that need improvement. Lastly, Dr. Schiller added that this item had also been reviewed by the Education Policy Planning Committee.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner then inquired if there were any more questions or comments. Dr. Curry offered that if approved, the</p>

	<p>alternative calculation method would be made a part of Illinois' NCLB Accountability Workbook revisions which are due to USDE by April 1. Therefore, this calculation could then be applied to the 2004 calculations.</p>
<u>2005 Test Dates</u>	<p>Dr. Steiner then stated that the next item for Board discussion would be the 2005 Test Dates. Dr. Schiller stated that there is a cross pressure that the agency is trying to resolve. As a consequence of NCLB, a series of states are beginning to have to advance the date in which they give their tests for purposes of AYP calculations in order to notify schools of their AYP status. 10 states have in fact moved their test dates up to an earlier date. Therefore, the agency is looking at the pressure to get the data back earlier while allowing schools to test at the latest possible time in the year. However, as these options were explored, staff was unable to accomplish the assessment dates as they were in the past with an immediate turn around of the data. As an example, Dr. Schiller noted that the PSAE dates for this year are in late April (28-29) with make up dates scheduled for May 12-13. Therefore, it would not be likely that the scoring company would be able to generate testing results in a matter of a few weeks. Dr. Schiller then stated that staff looked at to what extent the agency would want to advance the testing dates in order to get the scores back on time. Staff also looked at keeping the testing dates as they are but bifurcating the return of data to get reading and math scores back earlier for AYP purposes, with regular data being returned on the regular schedule in July.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller then reviewed the recommendation for the Board to consider. If the testing dates were approved, the PSAE and 2nd grade testing dates would remain the same while the ISAT and Image Scores would advance a couple of weeks in order to have a return of the data in June. Dr. Schiller went on to say that the 45 day window or time frame that districts are allowed to report data discrepancies in a very liberal review period. He asserted that after speaking to a number of administrators in the state, it has been agreed that the time frame can be shortened as many of the other states have a 7-10 day turn around for data verification.</p> <p>Mr. Clark asked how long the process would take to</p>

	<p>change the rules. Dr. Curry responded by stating that it is hoped that the process could be completed by the fall of 2004.</p> <p>Mr. Gidwitz inquired as to whether or not the agency had a chart as to how many times the testing dates have been changed as he remembers them being changed quite often. Dr. Curry stated that the ISAT testing date has only changed one time in 2001 when the testing window was moved from January/February to April. According to Dr. Curry, the PSAE testing date has remained constant since the commencement of the test administration. Dr. Schiller asserted that there is an attempt to try to balance extended responses with turn around time when setting the testing dates.</p> <p>Mr. Gidwitz then said that he is not comfortable with changing the ISAT and IMAGE testing dates because there is a perception that the State Board is not consistent already. He further stated that there is great value of in the weeks if the dates change. Mr. Gidwitz then asked the Superintendent whether or not local superintendents were complaining about the change in the testing dates. The Superintendent responded by stating that the only feedback staff received were complaints about changing the PSAE testing date to an earlier date.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller then referenced the Attachment #1 in the board packet materials: Administration and Return of Scores For States Using Constructed Response Items Based on the Fall 2002 Annual Survey provided by the CCSSO (Please see attachment). When looking at every state that has extended response items and how quickly they can return their scores, it was found that each state has a minimum of 90 days recorded for the return of data. Mr. Gidwitz then inquired about the argument that Illinois should eliminate the constructed responses. It was stated that after hearing the public critique of eliminating these responses as the items address other learning standards, it was decided to put the items back in.</p> <p>Mr. Gidwitz then asked why the state cannot bifurcate the multiple choice items and extended response items to return the scores back more quickly. Mary Ann Graham stated that the constructed response items will make a difference in the final scores and ultimate AYP</p>
--	---

	<p>calculations. Mr. Gidwitz then went on to ask Dr. Graham why it takes so many days to complete the scoring. Dr. Graham stated that there is a whole quality checking process that takes place in order to verify that the submitted data is accurate. In addition, there is a training process that takes place for the scorers based on the testing items and processes for scoring. Mr. Gidwitz inquired as to why the scorers cannot be trained ahead of time. He then said that the agency needs to figure out a way to get the scoring done completed with validity in a more timely fashion. Dr. Curry said these technical scoring questions have been asked of the contractor before and that she would get the data that provides an answer to these questions.</p> <p>Mr. Gidwitz asserted that it would seem if more people were handling paper then the agency ought to be able to solve the problem, which is basically quality control. Mr. Kazarian then said that Mr. Gidwitz raised a good question about timing that should be discussed and considered by the Board. Therefore, Mr. Kazarian inquired whether it would be possible to move on the PSAE issue and pick up the ISAT and IMAGE question at the next month's meeting.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller then requested that Dr. Graham explain the process of testing earlier verses later before the Board considered Mr. Kazarian's question. Dr. Graham stated that if schools test late, data will be turned late. If schools test early, data will be returned earlier. Similarly, if the dates are shifted somewhat earlier, scores will be returned in a slightly earlier fashion. Mr. Clark then asked Dr. Graham to explain the benefit of moving the testing dates. She stated the benefit of returning the data earlier is that districts need to get their data back to know their AYP status and whether they will have to offer choice and/or SES for the upcoming school year. Dr. Graham further asserted that due to the electronic data return that was implemented this year, schools and district will receive their data at an earlier date. However, if the dates are kept the same, with no adaptations to the method of data return, the agency will continue to have a problem with late return of data.</p> <p>Ms. Turkal then asked if these testing dates would interfere with the ACT dates. Dr. Schiller responded by</p>
--	---

	<p>saying that these dates would not interfere with the national ACT test date, which is set for April 3.</p> <p>Mr. Sandsmark asserted that he just has a fear of changing the testing dates twice.</p> <p>Mr. Gidwitz said that he has a problem with accepting the March testing dates from the new contract.</p> <p>Mr. Kazarian asked if the decision was deferred until April would there be a negative consequence to districts. Ms. Karon stated that many districts are already formulating their calendars and need to know when the testing dates will be. Ms. Turkal suggested that the Board act on the dates so that school districts know how to plan their calendars.</p> <p>As there was no further discussion on the item, Dr. Steiner stated that the Board would move onto the next item for Board discussion, the Update on the Student Identification System. At that point (10:15 a.m.), Mr. Kazarian announced that he would have to leave the meeting and would return in about 45 minutes.</p>
<p><u>Update on Student Identification System and E-Grant Management System</u></p>	<p>Dr. Steiner then stated that the Board would receive an Update on the ISBE Student Information System and eGrant Management System. Dr. Schiller then asserted that staff thought it would be appropriate as the Board talks about the tracking of data to bring an update on two very important projects and their status that will significantly impact the data process. He informed the Board that staff would give a progress report toward eliminating paperwork through the eGrant Management System and the proposed state-wide Student Identification System. Dr. Schiller then requested that Eugene Finley commence the update.</p> <p>Mr. Finley began by stating that he believed the eGrant Management System is a jewel for the State of Illinois in terms of working with local school districts and providing them the necessary support they need with regard their expressed concerns relating to the burdensome paper processes. Mr. Finley stated that ISBE is in the process of finalizing the steps toward going live with the electronic system in May when the agency will release the eGrant Management System and publish the NCLB Consolidated</p>

	<p>applications. He further stated that the system is integrated with the agency FRIS system, which is the Financial Reimbursement System (an internal management system). The agency is now in the process of providing training. Mr. Finley then requested that Tim Imler, Division Administrator for Funding and Disbursement and eGrant trainer, discuss the training sequence.</p> <p>Tim Imler stated that he is very excited about this initiative as the agency has rolled out many electronic systems but not one as challenging. He then stated that the NCLB applications that would be rolled out would be for Titles I, II, IV, and V. There are workshops scheduled in North, Central, and South locations. According to Mr. Imler, those wishing to register for the workshops can on the agency website. He stated that a ninth workshop was instituted due to the high volumes of requests to attend the training. Mr. Imler stated that there has been a great interest as there were over 769 registrations in just two weeks. He stated that there will be external as well internal training in the agency. In early April there will be training sessions. In addition, on April 13 there will be dry run presentations in the Springfield State Board Room.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller then asked Mr. Imler to provide information on the advantages that will be gained through this system for school districts. Mr. Imler stated that on major benefit would be an elimination of the paper process as there are over 4,000 pieces of paper that would be eliminated by using this process. There are over 800 applicants for each of the programs that were mentioned. He also added that this system would provide improved data quality. With a paper process, there is a great chance of human error. With this process, the data quality will be greatly enhanced as well as the turn around time for review. Ultimately, the greatest benefit would be to get the money out to districts earlier. However, According to Mr. Imler, the disbursement of money depends upon when the federal grant awards are received. He stated that they are usually received in July or August. Then, the money could be disbursed to districts in late August or September.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller inquired whether or not the system would be</p>
--	---

	<p>interactive. Mr. Imler responded affirmatively by stating that districts will be able to request and receive assistance and immediate feedback through email.</p> <p>With regard to the benefits for districts, Mr. Finley stated that the system would enhance accountability as there is a built in tracking system through the agency IWAS system. He stated that there are other states that are looking at our system. These states have also purchased the modules that Illinois has. According to Mr. Finley, Nebraska is working with ISBE's vendor to start the process as well. Mr. Finley asserted that our agency will start with the formula grants and then phase in the competitive grants.</p> <p>Mr. Gidwitz then inquired as to who the owner of the technology is. Mr. Finley stated that the owner of the technology is ISBE. Mr. Gidwitz stated that since ISBE owns the technology, does the agency get a royalty for Nebraska's use of the system. Mr. Finley replied by stating that the agency receives 300 hours of free programming and free enhancements to the model. Mr. Gidwitz then asserted that there would come a time when the system was in effect in 50 states, and there would be an overabundance of programming hours. Mr. Finley stated that there is no limitation on the enhancements that the agency would receive. However, there is a limitation on the transfer of hours for free programming.</p> <p>Dennis Powell said that there is hope that the agency can form a consortium of states that have this system and share ideas throughout the process. Mr. Gidwitz then emphasized that he was inquiring about the money that would be earned. Mr. Finley stated that any funds that would be acquired would go back into the General Revenue pool not to them specifically.</p> <p>Mr. Gidwitz then inquired as to how much the system costs. Mr. Finley stated that the system costs \$ 2.5 million and \$2.5 million was budgeted. Mr. Finley also added that the agency is on target as far as the phase of implementation. He said that no problems are anticipated as the system is continually tested. Mr. Finely asserted that staff expects the system to be a tremendous success as it will address the concern of the loss of staff in the agency and capacity to provide assistance and services to</p>
--	---

	<p>districts.</p> <p>Dean Clark then inquired as to how much paperwork would be reduced locally. Mr. Imler stated that the paperwork at the local level would be reduced tremendously. He added that the best feature is the electronic communication as districts will receive confirmation electronically when their applications are submitted. In addition, districts will not have to fill in repetitive information. Only changes or additions will have to be made. Districts can therefore build upon whatever they have submitted in the past each year.</p> <p>Mr. Gidwitz then inquired as to whether the auditors looked at the system. Karl Vogl, Director of Internal Audits, stated that the auditors are a part of the team and are involved in this process as they are with all new systems.</p> <p>Mr. Gidwitz offered congratulations and stated that it seemed like this would be a very exciting system.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller then requested that Mr. Finley discuss the Student Identification System. Mr. Finley commenced by stating that he could not talk about a specific contractor. However, the agency is targeting a pilot for spring of the 2004-2005 school year toward full implementation in the 2005-2006 school year.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller asked the staff to explain what the identifier would look like and how it would benefit the districts. Dennis Powell commenced the explanation by stating that the agency will gather information from districts such as current student identification numbers and geographic information. From that information, the agency will generate a number, provide it to the districts, and then the identification number will be placed on the schools' local systems. According to Mr. Powell, the identification number will then appear on the assessment documents for pre-coding and data verification.</p> <p>Mr. Gidwitz then asked why social security numbers could not be utilized as the student identification numbers. Mr. Powell stated that by federal law, the agency cannot require students to provide their social security numbers. Mr. Gidwitz then stated that he was concerned that every time a student goes to a different school, they would</p>
--	--

	<p>receive a different identification number. Mr. Powell stated that the agency is working to address this issue by requesting that students provide other information such as their mother's maiden name, race, gender, etc. According to Mr. Finley and Mr. Powell, there will be a continuous working relationship with districts in the institution of this system.</p> <p>Mr. Gidwitz then inquired of the cost. Mr. Finley stated that the system would cost \$5 to \$6 million and will take at least three or four years to completely build. He stated that they are working with legal to make sure this system is set up to work with multiple vendors so that the system can coordinate with testing contractors. Mr. Finley then stated that staff is establishing relationships between districts to interface with the system.</p> <p>Ms. Karon asserted that she was concerned about the confidentiality of student info and hoped that the system would be very confidential. Mr. Finley stated that the system is very confidential and that they are working under the FERPA guidelines as each component is discussed and instituted.</p> <p>Mr. Gidwitz then asked if the data in the system would be encrypted. Mr. Powell stated that yes, the system would be encrypted.</p> <p>Ms. Karon then also expressed her concern about the repeated generation of student identification numbers for students who move to other schools or districts throughout the state. Mr. Powell stated that when a district submits information for a student to receive a number, the agency will check in the system first to see if the student exists and then attempt to retrieve an existing number code with all of the information provided. If a student identification number is not found on the student, then one is created.</p> <p>Mr. Gidwitz inquired as to whether a finger printing system could be utilized to identify students. Mr. Powell asserted that this could be a possibility. Dr. Schiller then requested that Mr. Powell and Mr. Finley check into the prospect of using a finger printing system.</p> <p>Ms. Turkal then asked where the agency was in this</p>
--	---

	<p>process. Mr. Finley stated that in a month, the agency would have a ready contract as it has been advertised. He further added that hopefully the contract would be done in a couple of weeks. Mr. Gidwitz then asked if the Board would be approving the contract. Dr. Schiller stated that he would be discussing this prospect with the Board members during the afternoon session.</p> <p>As there was no further discussion on topic, Dr. Steiner and Dr. Schiller thanked Mr. Finley and his team for their efforts. The Chair then announced that there would be a five minute break before the next agenda item.</p>
<p><u>Academic Early Warning and Watch Lists</u></p>	<p>Dr. Steiner called the meeting back to order and announced that the next item for discussion would be the Academic Early Warning and Watch Lists. Dr. Schiller then stated that these lists were being brought to the Board for review, discussion, and consideration toward adoption of the established lists. He stated that he would review the lists in a specific order. The first list that Dr. Schiller reviewed was the list of schools removed from Academic Early Warning and/or School Improvement Status. Dr. Schiller asserted that there are 22 schools on this list. The schools on this list are schools that successfully met AYP in 2002 and 2003. When schools in status meet AYP criteria for two consecutive years, they are removed from that status recognition. Therefore, these schools qualify to be removed from Academic Early warning status. According to Dr. Schiller, there are twenty Title I schools and 2 non-Title I schools that will be removed from the list. Dr. Schiller stated that these schools, as well as the schools on the other lists, received prior notification of their status.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller then stated that 664 schools were on the Academic Warning List last year. This year, there are 280 in Academic Early Warning Status. Dr. Schiller stated that this is not necessarily a good news story. There are still thirty four schools that are still going through data rechecking and proofreading. He stated that staff would bring the results and status of these schools back in a month or so once the data has been completely verified. Dr. Schiller asserted that these schools did not meet AYP for two years. He also pointed out that the thirty-four schools that are on the list pending data verification will still remain on the list even if they make AYP as a school</p>

	<p>must make AYP for two consecutive years to be removed from the Academic Early Warning Status.</p> <p>In terms of the Academic Watch List, Dr. Schiller said that last year it was reported that forty-nine schools moved into Academic Watch List Status. This year, an additional 286 schools moved into Watch List Status. Therefore, there is a total of 335 schools on the 2003 Academic Watch List. Furthermore, Dr. Schiller stated that an additional thirty-five schools are going through data verification as well. Seven schools that were on these list either closed or were reconfigured. In total, Dr. Schiller stated that sixty-nine schools have statuses that are pending. Dr. Schiller further asserted that the Board would be ask to adopt the lists for the purpose of complying with state law and offering the schools the necessary assistance needed.</p> <p>Mr. Gidwitz asked whether there was a fair way to characterize the schools that are on these lists in comparison to other schools that are not on these lists. Dr. Schiller responded by stating that a predominance of the schools are in urban populations. Many of the schools have large groups of minority students and have low income populations. Dr. Schiller further added that the conditions of poverty are most reflective in the performance of these schools.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller then asked staff if there were any important details that had been left out. Dr. Curry stated that amongst the Warning List, there are schools that did make AYP for 2003 and have a good chance of making AYP for 2004 before the standard is raised. Dr. Schiller then added that there are also schools that did not make AYP for one year that do not appear on the list as a school must miss making AYP for two consecutive years before being placed in Academic Early Warning and/or Watch List status.</p> <p>Mr. Gidwitz then inquired as to what ISBE is requiring for these schools in these statuses to do. Dr. Curry offered that these schools are required to offer Supplemental Educational Services and/or School Choice. They are also asked to redesign their School Improvement Plans to reflect a higher concentration in the areas of reading and</p>
--	--

	<p>math. It is also hoped that these schools would also take advantage of such programs as System of Support and the Summer Bridges/Extended Learning Program, which are programs designed to specifically help schools with these statuses.</p> <p>Mr. Gidwitz then inquired as to how ISBE can demonstrate that real progress has been made through the implementation of these programs. Dr. Curry stated that there is an evaluation process in the schools whereby data is collected to answer questions that relate to what in their system is working to help improve achievement. She added that the Educators in Residence program that was offered to support these schools had to be discontinued because there was no way to demonstrate or track progress through data collection. Dr. Curry further stated that in an effort to track and demonstrate real progress, the agency has been in collaboration with NIU doing a Spotlight School analysis to begin answering the question as to what is working and what will work for these schools to improve achievement.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller then stated that it is important to be aware of the fact that the Regional Offices of Education have an obligation, as outlined in the School Code, to assist with the elevation of the standards and in the improvement of the schools. He stated that as it has been discussed, the regional centers are appropriate places that provide assistance to these schools. However, these centers have experienced severe cutbacks and their capacity to serve the districts has been severely limited.</p> <p>Mr. Gidwitz asserted that it would seem that the Board would need to do more than publish these lists but also inform the legislators of the actual situations of these school districts, demonstrate that the resources are terribly strained, and recommend what should be provided for these districts in order to drive improvements.</p> <p>Ms. Turkal then inquired about the grants that are allocated to the ROEs to provide the support to districts. She asked if the agency had information on the districts that are being assisted. Dr. Schiller stated that this information does exist and that staff would, in April, provide an update on the System of Support.</p>
--	---

	<p>Dean Clark stated that he would like to know how many schools are in each district that are in Academic Early Warning and Watch Status. Dr. Schiller stated that staff could work on getting this information to the Board.</p> <p>Lastly, Richard Sandsmark asked what the growth factor would be for next year. Dr. Curry responded by stating 7.5 was the growth factor.</p>
<p><u>Rules for Adoption: Parts 27, 29, and 350</u></p>	<p>Dr. Steiner then announced that the next item for discussion would be the Rules for Adoption. Dr. Schiller asserted that each of the amendments to the rules had been discussed in the Education Policy Planning Committee. He stated that the Rules for Adoption contain amendments to existing rules due to changes in legislation. Dr. Schiller cited an example that the amendment to Rule 350: Secular Textbook Loan was a response to Public Act 92-112 which warranted a change in the administrative rules for the program.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller then added that of the 2800 pages of rules, only 1200 of them affect schools. He stated that a task force will be convened in a couple of weeks to address the rules that can be eliminated. For example, some rules exist that the agency does not have funding for. Accordingly, many of the existing rules are in response to federal requirements. However, no new requirements are being added to Parts 27, 29, and 350.</p> <p>In response to a question about the purposes of making changes to the rules, Dr. Schiller stated that the rules are changed as a result of needs in the field, by the will of the General Assembly, and to improve the quality of teaching and learning in our schools.</p>
<p><u>2004 School District Financial Profile Designation Lists</u></p>	<p>Dr. Steiner then stated that the Board would discuss the 2004 School District Financial Profile Designation Lists. Dr. Schiller then informed the Board that what they had before them was another announcement of status lists. He stated that there were changes and revisions made to the profiles by a good working committee that affect the designation lists for 2002 and 2003.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller stated that as a result of these revisions, there are seventy-five fewer schools that are in Financial Recognition and sixty-nine schools that moved into</p>

	<p>Financial Watch status. Dr. Schiller then requested that David Wood further discuss the profiles with the Board.</p> <p>Mr. Wood commenced by stating that it is important to point out that the financial profiles were created as a way to provide basic, consistent financial information about school districts from the Annual Financial Reports (AFRs) that are provided by the school districts because most of the public does not have access to the AFRs or know how to find or read the AFRs. Mr. Wood stated that the lists are a starting point for financial discussions about activities that are going on in each district. He stated that many of the measures can be argued, and staff will continue to work with groups to improve the lists. The lists are also a training measure as well as an early warning system. These lists are generated from last year's data. The increase in the Financial Watch list may be due to what happened last year at the state level.</p> <p>Mr. Gidwitz then stated that these lists reinforce and underscore the cries that have come from school districts regarding their lack of resources and capacities at the local level. He stated that there are no surprises in the designations. Mr. Wood stated that another important point is that these lists do not recognize the academic programs that exist or do not exist in these schools. Mr. Gidwitz then stated that possibly the academic and financial lists should be coordinated to compare how the loss in resources has affected the offering of programs in many of the school districts.</p> <p>Mr. Wood further asserted that there are no consequences to these lists. He stated that there are four criteria in the law that ISBE look to in order to certify that a district is in financial difficulty. However, legislation is being proposed to add that a school is in financial difficulty if they are in the bottom category of Financial Watch. He also stated that the agency is attempting to get the districts to look at the data in collaboration with ISBE staff to assist them in their financial difficulty.</p> <p>Ms. Karon said that the most valuable report is the one that shows the differences from 2001-2003. She offered that the weighted system is really great in that it allows one to see the status of the school districts from year to year. Ms. Karon then also stated that these financial lists</p>
--	--

	<p>should be correlated with the academic lists.</p> <p>In addition, Mr. Wood offered that 250 districts actually dropped to a lower category, and some have dropped not just one category but several categories.</p> <p>(Greg Kazarian then interjected at 11:30 a.m. to state that he had joined the meeting again.)</p> <p>Mr. Gidwitz stated that there is a System of Support for schools on the academic lists but not for school and districts on the financial lists. Mr. Wood offered that there are three people in the agency that travel the state. These ISBE staff members try to target the districts on the financial lists and seek answers as to why they are in their financial situations in order to offer them counsel and assistance. However, there is no special grant program for these schools in financial stress.</p> <p>Mr. Gidwitz then reflected upon the situations with Hazel Crest and Round Lake school districts. He stated that for two different reasons, the state loaned them money. However, money was made available to support these districts because School Financial Authorities were thereafter instituted.</p> <p>Mr. Gidwitz offered that it would make sense to communicate these lists to the Legislature as well and indicate to them what might be of help, aside from financial assistance, i.e. assistance in financial management. Mr. Wood stated that there is proposed legislation to mandate that districts submit a financial plan yearly if they appear on one of the designation lists. He stated that this would trigger a requirement for districts to share information with the agency that could possibly assist them financially in the year to come. It would also encourage districts to think through their financial situations in more depth and therefore establish a coherent financial plan. Mr. Wood asserted that these plans would be an attempt to get these districts to evaluate the trends in the data and share them with their community. He then cited Hazel Crest as an example as Hazel Crest was making decisions based on academics without looking at the financial ramifications.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller stated that a District Field Service division is</p>
--	---

	<p>being proposed to work with schools in financial stress, for example those school in watch areas and areas with SFA and FOPs. He proclaimed that the agency would also begin looking for volunteers from the business arena that could be available to identify and assist district that would need said assistance. Mr. Wood stated that these proposed actions are important as the federal government focuses on the academic side but has no equivalent effort when it comes to assisting these schools financially.</p> <p>Ms. Turkal inquired about the districts that appear to be getting a little better. She asked, "What did they do to get there?" Ms. Turkal stated that many of these districts now have very few innovative programs as there is no funding to support the program. Therefore, if the districts have cut all kinds of programs, it doesn't necessarily make them healthier.</p>
<p><u>East St. Louis District #189</u> <u>Petition for Dissolution of FOP</u></p>	<p>The East St. Louis District #189 Petition for Dissolution of the Financial Oversight Panel (FOP) was the next item for discussion. Dr. Schiller stated that the East St. Louis Board, East St. Louis FOP, and the Illinois State Board were all presented with a proposed recommendation (Please see attachment). He then stated that at this point, it would be up to the Board to make the determination as to whether they would approve the recommendation. Dr. Schiller then asserted that the Board was also presented with a draft final decision concerning the petition for dissolution (Please see attachment).</p> <p>Harry Blackburn, ISBE counsel was available for discussion and questions. However, there was no discussion or questions on the petition for dissolution. Dr. Schiller stated that the Board would hold a public comment section for individuals that might wish to address the Board on this issue.</p>
<p><u>Fiscal Year 2005 Proposed Budget</u></p>	<p>Dr. Steiner announced that the next item for discussion would be the Fiscal Year 2005 Proposed Budget. Dr. Schiller stated that there was discussion at a Finance Committee meeting several weeks ago and there was discussion on the previous day in committee. He stated that the agenda item was an update with regard to previous discussions on the proposed budget by the Governor. He stated that discussions involved how the \$400 million would be dispersed if indeed the amount</p>

	<p>would be approved by the Legislature. The Superintendent stated that in previous meetings, the numbers were therefore refined during the discussions to reflect the \$400 million.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller then asked the Chair of the Finance Committee how he would like to proceed in the discussion of the proposed budget. Mr. Sandsmark stated that the numbers were just revised to update the latest. Mr. Wood said that the main discussion focused on the fact that \$400 million was not enough. However, given this amount, the committee decided on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide funding to schools through a \$150 increase to the GSA foundation level (\$249.3 million); • Fully fund the Special Education Mandated Categoricals and maintain the FY 04 proration of non-Special Education Mandated Categoricals (\$117.4); and • Allocate the following new funding: \$15 million to Early Childhood, \$13 million to Bilingual Education, \$10 million to the ADA Block Grant, and \$3 million to the Reading Block Grant. <p>In total, programs increased by \$407.7 million and were offset by reductions of ISBE operations by \$4.2 million and the one year Transition Assistance funds by \$5.2 million (Please see attachments).</p> <p>Mr. Gidwitz stated that the early indication states that the General Assembly is not in support of the Governor's Proposed Budget. Therefore, he said that it is a mistake for the agency to revise the budget in public in accordance with the Governor's proposal. Janet Steiner and Dean Clark both said that they agreed with Mr. Gidwitz's comments.</p> <p>Richard Sandsmark stated that it was not the intention to endorse the \$400 million but to simply give staff direction if that number became real. Dean Clark stated that the original ISBE proposal of \$609 million can be defended line by line. He said that he is not comfortable with the \$400 million but does believe that if this number is approved, the agency should have some direction as to how it would disperse the money.</p> <p>Ms. Turkal stated that nothing has really been done to support the school districts in Illinois. She stated that</p>
--	--

	<p>what is happening in this state is so distressing. However, she does agree that some guidelines need to be set, even though the number is not an agreeable one.</p> <p>Dean Clark stated that it must also be communicated that Illinois will not be able to meet the intent of NCLB adequately with \$400 million. He stated that from the agency point of view, the \$609 million was a bare minimum amount. Mr. Gidwitz stated that the agency needs to also look at the consequences of not supporting the schools adequately. He said that the agency does have some hard evidence now to show the Legislature the consequences of inaction on their part.</p> <p>Mr. Kazarian then added that the scenarios that have been developed are useful to the Legislature in showing them the consequences of agreeing upon the \$400 million. He said that he is not comfortable with letting the Legislature “off the hook” by having ISBE determine what group of children should receive the funding and what group will be underserved. According to Dean Clark, this scenario proposes to “Let No Child Ahead” instead of “Leave No Child Behind.”</p> <p>Richard Sandsmark offered that it has been shown earlier that Summer Bridges is a program that works with regard to helping schools that are struggling academically. However, with the \$400 million, this program cannot even be funded. Greg Kazarian stated that it is wrong that we know what 3rd, 5th, and 8th graders need help and the agency cannot even provide them help due to a lack of funding. Dr. Steiner stated that she agreed and then thanked Mr. Wood for the update.</p>
<p><u>Assessment Contract Update</u></p>	<p>The Assessment Contract Update was the next item for Board discussion. Dr. Schiller stated that staff would give a status report on the Assessment Contract. He requested that Mary Anne Graham and Lynne Curry present themselves to the Board to provide the update.</p> <p>As staff made there way to the table, Dr. Schiller commenced a briefing on the federal and state mandates. He stated that in 2005-2006, the following changes are scheduled to take place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade level testing in reading and math for grades 3-8 and once in high school (meets federal

	<p>requirements);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Periodic assessment of science and with grade span assessments at grades 4, 7, and 11 (meets federal requirements); • Social science assessments in grades 5, 8, and 11 (state requirement); • Writing assessments in grades 3, 4, 6, 8, and 11 (state requirement); and • Mini-tests in fine arts and physical development/health attached to science and social science tests in lower grades (state requirement). <p>Dr. Graham stated that no funding will be provided for the voluntary administration of certain subject area tests. She did state that she wanted to point out that in 2005-2006, norm-referenced as well as criterion-referenced scores would be provided. Therefore, the burden to administer other tests could be taken off the local districts. Mr. Gidwitz asked what the cost savings would be. Dr. Curry stated that the agency did not know at this time. However, staff could look into the getting an update to the Board on the cost savings to districts.</p> <p>Dr. Graham then went on to state that Illinois would be receiving the following with the enhanced system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessments in all federal and state required grades and subjects that are aligned to the Illinois Learning Standards through Assessment Frameworks; • Norm-referenced and criterion-referenced scores; • More detailed score reporting based on specific reporting categories correlated to student achievement; • Vertically aligned scaled scores across the grades; • Bridge study to equate the past and new assessments; • Good information about the norming population and its congruence to the Illinois student population; • New accommodations for LEP students including reader scripts, CDs, audiocassettes, and bilingual glossaries; • User-friendly electronic and paper reporting and assistance to LEA's for interpreting and using data to make appropriate programmatic decisions; • 10% release items per year/on-line sample
--	--

	<p>tests/pilot of on-line assessment; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One primary contractor as point of contact and responsible party for the entire system. <p>Several Board members then inquired as to where the agency stood in the process of the contract. Dr. Curry stated that the RFSP has been issued and the agency received three responsive bidders. Mr. Wood stated that a letter was sent out to each bidder clarifying ISBE's expectations with regard to the contract. According to Mr. Wood, staff received information back from the bidders in response to the clarifying information. However, he stated that at the time of the meeting, there was still one outstanding bidder. Lastly, he said that staff would be meeting with the bidders in the next week.</p> <p>Mr. Gidwitz then inquired about the extended response turn around time. Dr. Curry stated that the extended response items and return time are part of the negotiations. Ms. Karon asked if the agency specified the timeframe. Dr. Curry stated that it was specified that the agency wanted a return date by June 1 with the latest testing date possible that would allow that to happen.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller then stated that he and staff would continue to update the Board throughout the process.</p>
<u>Recess for Lunch</u>	<p>Dr. Steiner stated that the discussion portion was complete and the Board would come back to take action on the items, as needed. She then announced that the Board would recess for lunch and go into Executive Session. Dr. Steiner asked Ms. Karon to read the motion. Ms. Karon therefore moved that the Illinois State Board of Education go into closed session under the exceptions set forth in the Open Meetings Act of the State of Illinois as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 2 (c) (1) for the purpose of discussing information regarding appointment, employment, compensation, discipline, performance, or dismissal of an employee. • Section 2 (c) (11) for the purpose of discussing litigation. <p>The motion was seconded by Dean Clark. The Board officially recesses and went into Executive Session at 12:00 p.m.</p>

<u>Reconvene</u>	At 1:15 p.m. Dr. Steiner reconvened the meeting and stated that the Board would begin the afternoon with Public Participation.
<u>Public Participation</u> <u>Ryan Robinson, Illinois FFA President</u> <u>Kenan Peters, Illinois FFA Vice President</u> <u>Rachel Baum, Illinois FFA Reporter</u>	<p>Dr. Steiner requested that public participants from the Illinois FFA come forward to speak.</p> <p>Ryan Robinson commenced by stating that he would discuss the importance of agriculture education and the effect that it has on thousands of students' lives across the State of Illinois. According to Mr. Robinson, the Agricultural Education departments around the state are comprised of three integral components: education classes, the FFA organization, and supervised agricultural experiences.</p> <p>Kenan Peters then went on to state that the National FFA is the largest youth organization in the nation with over 464,000 members. Mr. Peters stated that as an organization, the FFA encourages leadership, growth, and career success through agricultural education. In closing, he stated that there are many benefits that stem from being a member of the FFA, including the opportunity to be present to address the Board about agricultural education, what it means to him and the more than 25,000 Illinois FFA students.</p> <p>Rachel Baum proclaimed that while the activities in the agricultural education department are thought of as extracurricular, the activities are actually inter-curricular. According to Ms. Baum, students are able to take what they learn in the classroom and apply it to real world situations. She stated that students can also apply their experiences to a future job situation or toward continued studies in the field at a college or university.</p> <p>Mr. Peters then asserted that with all the activities and projects, the FFA is fortunate to have the agricultural education line item to support the 25,000 Illinois agricultural and horticultural students as well as some 218, 783 pre-kindergarten to adult students who are provided with materials to support agricultural literacy. According to Mr. Peters, the line item spends less than \$7.77 per students to provide an agricultural education that can be used in their futures as adults. He said that it</p>

	<p>is important to teach students that agriculture is not just about farming but obtaining an awareness of the foods that they eat and what happens to them before they get the store.</p> <p>Ms. Baum stated that through the funding, classrooms have purchased technology to enhance student projects. She stated that at her high school, the computers and digital cameras are not just used in the Agricultural Department but in the Math and Science classes as well. Therefore, the whole school benefits from the technology. Ms. Baum concluded by offering her appreciation to the State Board and the Governor for maintaining the Agricultural Education line item separate from the other line items and recognizing the importance of Agriculture Education in the State of Illinois.</p> <p>She then stated that the Illinois FFA members would welcome questions and/or if the Board had any. Beverly Turkal stated that she was very proud of each of the students and the leadership that they have expressed at such a young age.</p> <p>Dean Clark asked students to tell a little bit about the high schools that they represent. He expressed that he was especially curious about Mr. Peter's high school which has the last operating farm in Chicago. Ms. Baum commenced by stating that she attended Clinton High School where she was a part of the agriculture program for four years. She stated that the focus at her high school was on production. However, the school is starting to diversify into agriculture and horticultural. Board Chair Janet Steiner then shared that she also attended Clinton High School.</p> <p>Mr. Gidwitz then requested that the students share their plans for the year. Mr. Robinson stated that each of them graduated from high school and attends college. However, they took a year off from college to travel throughout the State of Illinois to each chapter in Illinois in the attempt to recruit students in all Illinois schools. He stated that they also planned their annual FFA conference in the winter and in the spring will host chapter banquets.</p> <p>Mr. Gidwitz then asked the students to share their most memorable experiences. Each of the members shared</p>
--	---

<p><u>Diane Johnson,</u> <u>Teacher, Rockford</u> <u>District 205</u></p>	<p>that their most memorable moments stem from the chapter banquets and visits. Mr. Peters particularly shared that a student told with him that what he said in his speech would stay with him the rest of his life.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner then inquired of Mr. Robinson where he attended high school. He stated that he attended Sullivan High School in a town of 4500 with 60 FFA members. Mr. Peters stated then stated that he attended Chicago Agriculture Science High School. He said that the FFA chapter has 605 members this year and every student that attends the school is a FFA member. He also shared that the school has set up career pathway, which are similar to majors in which students choose a pathway to study for two years. Internships are also available for students to pursue in these pathways.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner then thanked the students again for coming to present their information and experience to the Board. Mr. Robinson then extended to the Board an invitation to attend their FFA conference in Springfield at the Prairie Capital Convention Center on June 8-10. He also stated that the Board was welcome to visit their new FFA office on Dirksen Parkway, across from the Northfield Inn & Suites.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner then requested that Diane Johnson of the Rockford School District #205 come forward to give her comments to the Board. Ms. Johnson introduced herself as a Physical Education (P.E.) teacher who has taught in the district for 31 years. She was joined by Glen Patterson, a fellow P.E. teacher. She stated that she wanted to address the Physical Education waiver from her school district on behalf of the 110 P.E. teachers in the district and the thousands of children in her district. According to Ms. Johnson, childhood obesity is rising at an alarming rate as the percentage of obese children in and teenagers in the United States is about 13%. (Please see attachment.)</p> <p>Ms. Johnson then proclaimed that Rockford's request for a P.E. waiver would not align with the Governor's Education plan which, according to Johnson, states that the goal of his administration is to encourage an overall active lifestyle for students through an improved Physical Education curriculum. Ms. Johnson said that this P.E.</p>
--	--

**Rebecca Smith, PE
Teacher, Rockford
District 205**

curriculum is important for students to have as all of them are not a part of athletics. She further stated that our nation has expressed the importance of regular fitness activity by the growth in fitness centers in communities and at places of employment. In concluding, she stated that we must not give the message to students that academic success is more important than physical fitness and health. Ms. Johnson then thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak on her issue.

Dr. Steiner then announced that the next public participant would be Rebecca Smith, who was also from the Rockford School District. As Ms. Smith was coming to the table, Mr. Sandsmark stated that he did not believe that people understand how the waiver process works. He stated that the waivers come to ISBE but the Legislature approves or disapproves the waivers. Dr. Schiller concurred and stated that the Legislature exclusively makes the decisions with regard to waivers. Mr. Sandsmark then asserted that ISBE has in the past provided comments to the waiver submissions stating that they should not be approved. However, ISBE was ignored.

Ms. Smith then introduced herself as a PE teacher from Rockford. She was accompanied by Sue Johnson. Ms. Smith stated that she was present to discuss the PE Waiver submitted by Rockford School District 205 for grades 6-12. Ms. Smith asserted that her school districts did not submit with the waiver request the petitions against the PE waivers. According to Ms. Smith, 1700 signatures were gathered on the petitions and submitted to the school district on February 24. Ms. Smith also asserted that 12-15 individuals spoke at a February 9 meeting in support of the PE waivers, a meeting that they did not receive notification to attend. There was a host of teachers, doctors, and other professionals prepared to speak against the waivers. However, they were not provided proper notification of the open meeting date.

According to Ms. Smith, the district personnel were found to be out of compliance with hearing regulations in the past but still were granted a PE waiver under former State Superintendent Glen McGee in March of 2001. She also stated that the district did not follow through with the

<p><u>Peg Agnos,</u> <u>Executive Director</u> <u>of LEND</u></p>	<p>established guidelines of the existing PE waiver. Yet, the district is requesting another 5-year waiver. As an example, she stated that six graders are being allowed to “opt out” of PE to take band instead. However, the waiver is currently for grades 7-12. In conclusion, Ms. Smith then went on to explain the contents of the packet she provided the Board (petitions, letters, etc—please see attached).</p> <p>Dr. Steiner then thanked Ms. Smith and encouraged her to meet with her legislators. Ms. Smith stated that they also have a meeting set up over at the Capitol as well. Ms. Smith then asked what happens to the requests once they meet the process and whether any request is denied if it does not meet the process. Dr. Steiner replied by stating that ISBE can make a recommendation but the action lies with the Legislature. Mr. Sandsmark stated that a lot of time was put into the waiver process in the past to no avail. Mr. Gidwitz added that in the past the Board has stated that unless there is a compelling reason, such as the reconstruction of a school’s gymnasium, PE waivers should not be granted.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner then called for the next public participant: Peg Agnos. Ms. Agnos stated that she came before the Board in hopes of starting a dialogue and partnership between ISBE and the Legislative Education Network of DuPage (LEND) organization. She stated that in her 10 years serving for LEND she has been not only the Executive Director but registered lobbyist and Research Director. Ms. Agnos further asserted that the this year LEND formed a committee structure. According to Ms. Agnos, the LEND federal relations committee has been working with the congressional delegation to better understand No Child Left Behind and to also provide to Congresswoman Biggert and Congressman Hyde (sp) the limitations and challenges LEND believes that they have been faced with as a result of the NCLB Act.</p> <p>Ms. Agnos proclaimed that LEND is pleased to see the recommendation of the State Superintendent to move more toward the Wyoming plan in terms of alternate AYP calculations. According to Ms. Agnos, the Wyoming Plan states that a school fails to meet AYP if they have not successfully met AYP in the same content area for two consecutive years. She stated that many of the LEND members have focused on advocating for adjustments to</p>
--	---

<p><u>Leo Sherman,</u> <u>Superintendent of</u> <u>Iroquois West</u> <u>CUSD #10</u></p>	<p>be made to the AYP alternate calculations. According to Ms. Agnos, using a plan such as the Wyoming Plan would decrease the number of ways to determine if a school has met AYP. She then said that she understood that the process of AYP calculations is a work in progress and she hoped to work with the State Board during this process.</p> <p>Ms. Agnos then offered the LEND recommendation for calculating AYP. She stated that in order for a school to be considered as failing, it must fail to make AYP in the same subgroup and category for two consecutive years. She then said that it is understood by LEND that there are some legal issues as well as issues with the Department of Education and the congressional delegation. However, there is some flexibility according to the federal government. In concluding, Ms. Agnos stated that she would prepare the LEND recommendation in an acceptable format for the Board to review. She also asserted that LEND would take Dr. Schiller's recommendation of looking at the Administrative Rules in light of the LEND concerns and recommendations.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner then requested that Leo Sherman, Superintendent of Iroquois West come forward to speak. Mr. Sherman stated that he was not present to protest the Appeals Advisory Committee Recommendation but to encourage the Board to follow up on the issues surrounding the Iroquois appeal. The issues were testing and being held accountable at the middle and high schools and district level for students residing at Onarga Academy, a residential facility in the small district of Iroquois West, who attend the Nexus Education Center, an on-site facility operated by the special education cooperative since the beginning of the residential program.</p> <p>According to Mr. Sherman, the testing scores of the residential facility significantly impact his small district as the residential facility is 25% of the total testing population. He stated that in 2003, his district's overall score decreased by 10% due to the inclusion of the residential facility test scores. While the districts still met AYP, they are concerned for the upcoming years as the growth percentage increase. Dr. Schiller stated that he believes that this concern is a valid one and an issue that</p>
---	---

	<p>should be looked at as this is a situation in which one group may disproportionately influence the whole school.</p> <p>Several of the Board members then inquired about the population of the facility. Mr. Sherman said that the facility is for sex offenders and for those that have been sexually abused. He said that the district does not run the facility. The special education cooperative runs the facility. However, the district does sit on the board. Therefore, while the district has some responsible for the facility, the facility independently runs its financial and educational operations.</p> <p>Mr. Gidwitz then posed the question, if a school district doesn't control a population, is there some way to change the way the cooperative is run? Lou Ann Reichle, ISBE counsel, stated that the difference in the relationship between the district and this facility is that most of the students involved are wards of the state. If students are in a facility but still under parental control, their scores would be sent back to their districts. However, since the students at the residential facility are wards of the state, they are considered residents of Iroquois district.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller reiterated that this issue is an important one to explore and resolve as Iroquois West may not be the only district affected by such circumstances. The Superintendent stated that the agency must look into this issue so that districts are not hurt by circumstances such as these.</p> <p>Superintendent Schiller then asked Mr. Sherman if all of the students had IEPs. Mr. Sherman stated that most of the students do indeed have IEPs. Dr. Schiller then responded by saying that the route the agency may need to explore is the flexibility that the federal law provides with regard to states being able to file a petition for a waiver in light of the large numbers of special education students in their populations. Dr. Schiller stated that there may be other avenues to explore as well. Dr. Steiner then thanked Mr. Sherman for bringing the issue to the Boards attention. Mr. Sherman then offered his assistance on working through a solution for not only Iroquois West but for all districts that might be affected by such an issue.</p>
Approval of	Dr. Steiner then requested a motion to approve the

<u>Minutes</u>	February 18, 2004 minutes. Dean Clark moved that the Illinois State Board of Education approve the minutes of the February 18, 2004 meeting as published. The motion was seconded by Ronald Gidwitz. The motion passed as all members present voted yes.
<u>Action Items</u>	Dr. Steiner then stated that the Board would move onto the action items. She said that she would ask the Superintendent to summarize each item on the agenda, ask for a motion and second, allow for further discussion as needed, and then request that the Board take appropriate action.
<u>Approval of Additional Supplemental Educational Service Providers</u>	<p>The first item for Board action was the Approval of Additional Supplemental Educational Service Providers. Dr. Schiller stated that as discussed in the Education Policy Planning Committee meeting and during the discussion portion of the meeting, he recommends that Dolton West School District 148 be approved as a SES provider.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner then requested a motion to approve Dolton as a provider. Mr. Gidwitz made the following motion:</p> <p>Whereas the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 requires that the State Board of Education promote maximum participation of supplemental educational service providers and maintain an updated list of approved providers, I move that the Dolton West School District 148 be approved for addition to the Illinois list of approved supplemental educational service providers.</p> <p>Dean Clark seconded the motion. As there was no further discussion, Dr. Steiner requested a roll call vote. The motion passed as all members present voted affirmatively.</p>
<u>Appeals Advisory Committee Recommendations</u>	Dr. Steiner then requested that Dr. Schiller summarize the Appeals Advisory Committee Recommendations. Dr. Schiller stated that there would be three different motions for the Board to consider. He said that the recommendations were discussed in the Education Policy Planning committee and with the entire Board. Dr. Steiner then requested a motion concerning Iroquois West #10. Joyce Karon then moved that the Illinois State Board of Education support the State Superintendent's recommendation regarding Iroquois West #10 to: 1)allow the district to correct any data reporting errors in student enrollment and participation rates for the middle school and high school reflected in the 2003 test results,

2) maintain the reporting of scores for NEXUS students at Iroquois #10 and retain the current AYP status of the schools in the district, and 3) authorize the State Superintendent to consider the issue of students' scores and the impact from large residential facilities upon small local school districts, and the possible use of cooperatives or joint agreements for accountability purposes when appropriate. The motion was seconded by Ronald Gidwitz.

As there was no discussion on the motion, Dr. Steiner requested a roll call vote. The motion passed as all members present voted yes.

Dr. Schiller then asserted that his recommendation concerning East Alton—Wood River District #14 was in concert with the recommendation of the Appeals Advisory Committee. Dr. Steiner then requested a motion from the Board concerning East Alton. Richard Sandsmark then moved that the Illinois State Board of Education support the State Superintendent's recommendation regarding East Alton—Wood River District #14, to affirm the determination that the high school did not make AYP last school year, due to the insufficient overall participation rate in 2002-2003. Ronald Gidwitz seconded the motion. There was no discussion on the motion. The motion passed as all members present voted yes. (Judith Gold was not present for this vote.)

Dr. Steiner then requested Dr. Schiller to summarize the appeals from Chicago. Dr. Schiller stated that there were several issues brought up for appeal by Chicago School District #299. He further asserted that his recommendations were in concert with the Appeals Advisory Committee on issues #2 and #3 but not on issue #1 as the committee's recommendation was not aligned with the federal law.

Greg Kazarian then requested that the Chair take notice that he had to leave the meeting for a short while. He stated that he would return.

Richard Sandsmark then requested that Chair Steiner allow him to read a letter that was submitted for public participation concerning the first issue from Chicago. Before the letter was read, Dean Clark made the motion

that the Illinois State Board of Education support the State Superintendent's recommendation regarding Chicago Public School District #299, to retain the 47 Chicago schools in question in their current School Improvement status for the 2003-2004 school year. As a result, the 47 schools in question must offer public school choice and SES as provided by NCLB for the remainder of this school year, and must proceed on the accountability pathway in school year 2004-2005 to corrective action status; pending adequate yearly progress results in 2004.

Dr. Steiner then permitted Mr. Sandsmark to read the letter. In the letter Arne Duncan expressed his disappointment with ISBE's decision to decline the Chicago Public Schools' request to grant an additional year of School Improvement to 47 Chicago schools. According to Mr. Duncan, these schools were not properly notified by ISBE of their status in their first year on School Improvement in 2002-2003. (Please see the letter attached).

Mr. Gidwitz then requested, if the motion passes, that information be provided to Chicago which supports the recommendation and action on the part of the Board. Dr. Schiller then requested that Lou Ann Reichle discuss the guidance that was provided concerning this issue. Ms. Reichle stated that on February 6, 2004, the federal government issued guidance that asserts that a state is to give the academic results to school districts by the beginning of the school year. If the results are not given at the beginning of the year, the school district must offer choice as soon as they get notification.

Mr. Gidwitz then requested that information also be provided in the notification letter regarding the Board's decision on this issue as the amount of time Chicago has been in school improvement status, as they have been in this status since 1999 and even before. Therefore, the district should have been knowledgeable that they had the requirement to offer supplemental educational service and choice. Thus, according to Mr. Gidwitz, regardless of guidelines that are currently being established, these schools should have been receiving some kind of support already.

	<p>As there was no further discussion on issue #1, Dr. Steiner requested a vote on the motion. All members present voted yes. Thus, the motion passed.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner then requested a motion on issue #2. Ronald Gidwitz moved that the Illinois State Board of Education support the State Superintendent's recommendation regarding Chicago Public School District #299, to reject the appeal on the inclusion of LEP subgroups in the calculation of AYP for the 2002-2003 school year. The motion was seconded by Dean Clark. There was no discussion on the issue. Therefore, the roll was called at the request of the Chair. The motion passed as all members present voted affirmatively.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner then requested a motion on issue #3. Joyce Karon then moved that the Illinois State Board of Education support the State Superintendent's recommendation regarding Chicago Public School District #299, to reject the appeal on changing the enrollment cut-off date for students in year-round schools, given that this issue is outside the scope of the committee's authority under the School Code. The motion was seconded by Beverly Turkal. Dr. Schiller then stated that this was an issue involving start and finish dates for year-round schools. Chicago was attempting to petition the state to allow for a longer cutoff date to determine which students would be considered as being full-time and fully-enrolled in the school. However, Dr. Schiller stated that there cannot be a floating cutoff date. Each school in the state must be held to the same standard. The current cutoff date is in line with the Fall housing data submission, which is September 30. Once the discussion was complete, Dr. Steiner requested a roll call vote. All members voted yes. Thus, the motion passed.</p>
<p><u>Approval of Student Racial/Ethnic Categories for State Testing and AYP Calculations</u></p>	<p>Dr. Steiner then stated that the next item for Board action would be the Approval of Student Racial/Ethnic Categories for State Testing and AYP Calculations. She requested that a motion be made regarding the recommendation to include the multi-racial category and add the category as a subgroup. Dean Clark made the following motion:</p> <p>Whereas Illinois is entering its second year of implementing the provisions of No Child Left Behind, and Whereas the underlying accuracy of student data is</p>

	<p>critical to the fairness of NCLB reporting, I therefore move that the state use multiple racial/ethnic codes to more accurately collect and reflect student data, and I further move that these data be aggregated into a multi-racial/ethnic reporting category to be counted in Adequate Yearly Progress calculations for subgroups of 40 or more students.</p> <p>The motion was seconded by Ronald Gidwitz. Dr. Steiner then allowed for further Board discussion. Beverly Turkal stated that she understood the rationale behind the proposed recommendation. However, she said that she still has concerns which involve creating addition categories. Therefore, she wanted the Board to know that these concerns would affect her vote. As there was no further discussion, Dr. Steiner requested the vote. The motion carried as all members present voted yes, with the exception of Ms. Turkal voted no.</p>
<u>Approval of AYP Calculations</u>	<p>The next action item was the Approval of AYP Alternate Calculations. Dr. Schiller stated that as discussed and reviewed, this would be an opportunity for Illinois to revise the AYP calculation to determine that schools fail to meet AYP when they have failed to make adequate progress in the same content area for two consecutive years. Ronald Gidwitz then made the following motion:</p> <p>Whereas Illinois is entering its second year of implementing the provisions of No Child Left Behind, and Whereas we have an opportunity to modify the state's Accountability Workbook by April 1 of this year, and Where as we have data showing that several schools in the state would benefit from a modification to the Accountability Workbook,</p> <p>I therefore move that the state plan be modified to say that in order for a school or district to be classified as being in need of improvement, it must fail to make Adequate Yearly Progress for two consecutive years in the same content area.</p> <p>The motion was seconded by Dean Clark. As there was no discussion on the item, a request was made for the roll to be called. The motion passed as all members present voted affirmatively.</p>
<u>Approval of 2005 Test Dates</u>	<p>The next item for Board consideration and action was the Approval of the proposed 2005 Test Dates. Dr. Schiller stated that his recommendation would be to maintain the</p>

PSAE testing and makeup dates as they are and modify the ISAT and IMAGE testing dates slightly, all with the intent of getting data back sooner for the purposes of calculating AYP.

Dr. Steiner then requested a motion on the testing dates. Ronald Gidwitz moved that the Illinois State Board of Education approve the following 2005 Test Dates:

ISAT	March 7-18
PSAE	April 27-28; make ups on May 11-12
IMAGE	March 7-18
2 nd Grade	March 29-9

In order to allow for earlier notification with regard to districts' AYP status, the results for reading and math scores shall be returned in June with the remaining subject area scores being returned in July, as per normal reporting dates.

He further moved that ISBE begin the process for a rule change with regard to shortening the 45 day time frame districts have to notify the agency of any discrepancies in the testing data. 23 Illinois Administrative Code 1.50(d) currently states that each school district shall verify the accuracy of the score information received and shall notify the State Board, within 45 days after receipt of data from the Board, of any discrepancies identified in the data.

The motion was seconded by Richard Sandsmark.

Joyce Karon then asked if the Board had come up with an alternative to the 45 day time frame districts currently have to submit data corrections. Dean Clark responded by stating he was under the assumption it would be lessened to about 10-15 days. Dr. Schiller stated that staff and he would be discussing this as well as taking this issue to the ROEs and advisory groups as the rules are developed.

Mr. Gidwitz then stated that it would be his hope that in negotiations with the testing contractors, an agreement could be reached to allow for an early return of the testing data with later testing dates for each assessment.

As there was no further discussion, Dr. Steiner requested

	<p>the roll call vote. The motion passed as all members present voted yes, with the exception of Dr. Steiner who voted present. She stated that she voted present because the whole time she has been on the Board, the Board has discussed this matter and nothing has been resolved.</p>
<p><u>Adoption of Academic Early Warning and Watch Lists</u></p>	<p>The Adoption of the Academic Early Warning and Watch List was the next item for Board action. Dr. Schiller stated that he recommended that the Board adopt the determinations set for each schools' status for the purpose of complying with state law and offering the schools the assistance that they need.</p> <p>Dr. Steiner then requested a motion on the adoption of the lists. Dean Clark moved that the Board adopt the status groups designating Academic Early Warning and Academic Watch status for the 2003-2004 school year. He further moved that the Board approve the removal of the schools from Academic Early Warning status that have met Adequate Yearly Progress requirements for two consecutive years. The motion was seconded by Joyce Karon.</p> <p>There was no discussion on the motion. As requested, a roll call vote was taken. All members present voted yes. Therefore, the motion passed.</p>
<p><u>Authorization of Rules for Adoption: Parts 27, 29, and 350</u></p>	<p>The next item for Board consideration was the authorization of Rules for Adoption. Dr. Steiner requested a motion to authorize the adoption of the rules. Richard Sandsmark moved that the Illinois State Board of Education hereby adopt the proposed rulemaking for:</p> <p>Standards for Certification in Specific Teaching Fields (23 Illinois Administrative Code 27); Standards for Administrative Certification (23 Illinois Administrative Code 29);and Secular Textbook Loan (23 Illinois Administrative Code 350).</p> <p>He further moved that the Illinois State Board of Education authorize the State Superintendent of Education to make such technical or nonsubstantive changes as the State Superintendent may deem necessary in response to suggestions or objections of the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules. The motion was seconded Dean Clark. The call vote was then taken. The motion passed</p>

	as all members present voted yes.
<u>Approval of 2004 School District Financial Profile Designations</u>	Dr. Steiner announced that the next item for Board consideration was the Approval of the 2004 School District Financial Profile Designations. Joyce Karon moved that the Illinois State Board of Education approve both the 2004 School District Financial profile designations based on 2003 data and the revised 2003 School District Financial Profile based on 2002 data. The motion was seconded by Ronald Gidwitz. There was no discussion on the motion. Therefore, Dr. Steiner requested the roll be called to vote on the item. The motion passed as all members present voted affirmatively for the approval of the 2004 School District Financial Profile Designations.
<u>Approval of State Superintendent's Recommendation concerning East St. Louis School District #189's Petition to Dissolve the East St. Louis Board of Education Financial Oversight Panel</u>	The Approval of the State Superintendent's Recommendation concerning the East St. Louis School District #189's Petition to Dissolve the East St. Louis Board of Education Financial Oversight Panel was the next item for Board consideration. Ronald Gidwitz stated that in the best interest of the students of East St. Louis School District #189, he moved that the Illinois State Board of Education deny the East St. Louis School Board's Petition for Dissolution of the East St. Louis District #189 Financial Oversight Panel. He further moved that Financial Oversight Panel remain in place through its duration until October 2004.
<u>Acceptance of ISBE Monthly Reports</u>	Dr. Steiner then requested a motion to accept the ISBE Monthly Reports. Richards Sandmark moved that the Illinois State Board of Education accept the financial, agency operations, and budget status reports presented during the March 2004 meeting. The motion was seconded by Joyce Karon. Dr. Steiner then asked if there were any questions on the reports. Mr. Sandmark stated that the reports were reviewed in the Finance and Audit Committee meeting on the previous day. Dr. Steiner requested the roll to be called for the vote. The motion passed as all members present voted to accept the ISBE Monthly Reports.
<u>Approval of Superintendent's Quarterly Travel Analysis (Nov. 2003—Feb. 2004)</u>	The Approval of the Superintendent's Quarterly Travel Analysis was the next action item. Dr. Steiner requested a motion to approve the Superintendent's Quarterly Travel Analysis. Richard Sandmark moved that the Illinois State Board of Education approve the quarterly travel analysis of the Superintendent for the months of November 2003—February 2004. The motion was seconded by Dean

	Clark. The motion passed as all members present voted yes during the roll call vote.
<u>Announcement and Reports</u>	Once the action items were completed, Dr. Steiner announced that the Board would have announcements and reports from the Superintendent, Board Committee chairs, and any Board member that might have a report.
<u>Superintendent</u>	<p>Dr. Schiller stated that he would like to reiterate that he has invited all of the education organizations to nominate two individuals to serve on a work group to discuss and analyze the current Administrative Rules. He stated that work to convene this group is underway. The Superintendent the stated that Pete Leonis would provide during the Governmental Relations report a list of rules to consider removing from the rules as they no longer apply to current practices and operating procedures.</p> <p>Dr. Schiller stated that there was a very lengthy subject matter hearing on SB 1074 regarding the creation of an Independent Teacher Standards Board. He expressed his appreciation for the Board member attendance at the meeting. Board members Bev Turkal and Joyce Karon attended while Ron Gidwitz was in attendance to testify.</p> <p>Superintendent Schiller then reported on the Senate Education Committee hearing held in Elmhurst on SB 3000 and 3001 with regard to the proposed changes surrounding the Capital Development Board. He thanked Richard Sandsmark, Dean Clark, Joyce Karon, and Bev Turkal for attending the meeting. Dr. Steiner inquired as to how many were in attendance at the hearing. Dr. Schiller responded by stating there were about 75 in attendance and the hearing lasted until about 9:00 p.m.</p> <p>Mr. Gidwitz then inquired as to what would be done with the Annual Reports submitted by Hazel Crest and Round Lake. Dr. Schiller responded by stating that both reports were forwarded to the Legislature.</p>
<u>Joyce Karon, Board Operations Committee</u>	Joyce Karon reported that the Those Who Excel banquet would be held on Saturday, April 17. She requested that the Board members confirm their plans to attend the banquet as soon as possible.
<u>Richard Sandmark, Finance and Audit Committee</u>	Richard Sandsmark stated that he did not anticipate the need for another meeting until the time of the next Board meeting when there may be a need to further discuss the

<p><u>Ronald Gidwitz,</u> <u>JEC</u></p> <p><u>Bev Turkal,</u> <u>Governmental</u> <u>Relations</u></p>	<p>Board's position in relation to the Governor's proposed budget.</p> <p>Ronald Gidwitz stated that the Joint Education Committee has not had a meeting. Therefore, he did not have anything to report.</p> <p>Bev Turkal then requested that Peter Leonis come forward to provide the Governmental Relations Committee report. Mr. Leonis commenced by stating that the Senate hearing held in Elmhurst was very telling in that many individuals had several questions with regard to the Governor's Education Plan. He added that many of the questions involving details surrounding the Capital Development Board proposal could not be answered. Some of the questions were on classroom shortages and shared use facilities. Beverly Turkal then asked Mr. Leonis if there were other concerns that were expressed. Mr. Leonis responded by stating that there were concerns as to who would handle the architecture as well as how the shift in priorities would be handled. With regard to the latter, many inquired as to what would happen to schools who had already applied for funding.</p> <p>Mr. Leonis stated that the Superintendent and Mr. Gidwitz did a good job at the hearing on SB 1074 of presenting the facts surrounding the need for the current Certification Board to be kept in place. He stated that the Speaker doesn't want to turn over the Certification Board strictly to the teacher's unions.</p> <p>According to Mr. Leonis, the house has not taken up the Governor's education proposals at all and he is not certain of what their plans are. However, as stated, the senate held the second of three hearings on the Governor's proposals.</p> <p>As far as other legislation, Mr. Leonis stated that a whole set of bills would be going through chambers. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The School Construction Bill (which failed that afternoon), • The proposed graduation incentives, • The proposal to raise the GSA by \$250, • The proposed appeal to the method of proration for poverty grants, and
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal to limit P.E. Waivers. <p>Richard Sandsmark then raised a question about financially distressed schools and the different accounting practices. Mr. Leonis responded by stating that last year staff discussed drafting legislation about requiring that districts all have the same accounting method. Mr. Sandsmark stated that as a Board, it will be important to continue to look into this.</p> <p>Mr. Leonis presented the Board with a list of Administrative Rules that could be immediately removed from the school code as the rules no longer apply to current ISBE operations. He stated that staff will be meeting with the Administrative Rules Work Group to discuss the need for the current rules and how the current process can be streamlined. (Please see attached list.)</p>
<u>Other Information</u>	Dr. Steiner then requested that the Board review the Monthly Status Report on Rulemaking.
<u>Adjournment</u>	She then requested that a motion be made to adjourn the meeting. Ronald Gidwitz moved that the Illinois State Board of Education adjourn the March 25, 2004 Board meeting. The motion was seconded by Dean Clark. The meeting officially adjourned at 2:45 p.m.
	<p>Please contact the Illinois State Board of Education office in Springfield at 217/782-7497 for an audio tape of the meeting.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Respectfully Submitted,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">_____ Richard Sandsmark Secretary</p> <p style="text-align: right;">_____ Dr. Janet Steiner Chair</p>