

Ad Hoc Rules Committee of the Whole

Wednesday, June 15, 2005

5:15 p.m.

4th Floor Conference Room

(This meeting will begin at the conclusion of the previous session.)

Public Conference Call Access Number: 1-866-297-6391 (listen only);

Confirmation # 1 1 8 8 7 3 1 7

AGENDA

1. Public Participation
2. Discussion of Rules for Initial Review
 - a) Part 1 (Public Schools Evaluation, Recognition and Supervision)
 - b) Part 260 (Reading Improvement Program)
3. Discussion of Rules for Adoption
 - a) Part 1 (Public Schools Evaluation, Recognition and Supervision)
 - b) Part 25 (Certification)
 - c) Part 120 (Pupil Transportation Reimbursement)
 - d) Part 275, Repeal (Pupil Transportation)
 - e) Part 260 (Reading Improvement Program: Emergency)
4. Informational Update: Less Red Tape (written update in packet)
5. Additional Issues
6. Adjourn

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

June 15-16, 2005

TO: Illinois State Board of Education
FROM: Dr. Randy J. Dunn, State Superintendent of Education (Interim)
Jonathan Furr, General Counsel

Agenda Topic: **Lessredtape Update**

Materials: Summary of New Submissions
List of Responses
Chart of Affected Laws and Rules

Staff Contact: Shelley Helton

Purpose(s) of Agenda Item

The purpose of this agenda item is to provide an update to Board members about the status of lessredtape submissions and to provide a summary of lessredtape activity.

Expected Outcome of Agenda Item

This item is informational only.

Background Information

In October 2004, the agency created an email account system so that its constituents could submit ideas for streamlining agency rules and processes. As of Tuesday, May 31, 2005, the agency had received a total of 265 submissions concerning 71 different subjects from superintendents, school staff, regional offices of education, higher education staff, and individuals. (An additional 109 e-mails have been spam or test emails and needed no response.)

Included with this executive summary are databases of the 23 new requests received since the May Board report, and of the submissions and responses provided for those issues that have been resolved.

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

In the last month, agency staff completed and sent responses to 71 issues raised in 59 lessredtape submissions. Of the 23 submissions received since the April Board report, 13 have been resolved. In all, 80 percent of the 265 submissions received through May 31, 2005, have been completely resolved.

A summary of the status of lessredtape inquiries by submission and issues is provided below for each calendar year. Since a single submission may address several issues, the number of submissions received will be fewer than the number of issues addressed in those submissions.

| Status | 2004 (156 Total Submissions) | | 2005 (109 submissions to date) | |
|---|-------------------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------------|---------------|
| | Submissions | Issues | Submissions | Issues |
| Resolved (<i>all issues resolved</i>) | 127 | 159 | 86 | 97 |
| Internal Response | 16 | 16 | 0 | 0 |
| No Response | 13 | 15 | 23 | 24 |

The goal of the lessredtape initiative is to reduce administrative burdens on school districts, particularly those found either in the School Code or the agency’s administrative rules. A chart is attached that summarizes the submissions and responses upon which the agency has taken action or will consider a change in the law or rules to address the concerns raised.

Staff will continue to monitor those submissions for which follow-up is needed and contact the persons making the submissions to keep them apprised of any progress.

Superintendent’s Recommendation

No recommendation is being made at this time.

| Number | Subject | Message (<i>as originally submitted</i>) |
|--------|---------------------|--|
| 392 | Curriculum | See #395 below. |
| 393 | Certificate Renewal | 1. Remove the requirement of Initial Certificate holders to submit the letter(s) of experience and have them accountable for an audit (especially if the Teacher Service Record shows 4 years of experience. OR Provide a tracking system where we (ROE) can record receipt of a letter. 2. Allow Initial Certificate holders to mix coursework with CPDUs to account for the 60 CPDUs they need. |
| 394 | Certificate Renewal | 1. Have the CERTS system automatically check the maximum allowed CPDUs and disallow any claims that exceed the limit. For example, maximum allowed for student teachers is 1 per cycle. Do not allow teachers to claim more than one student teacher. 2. Have CeRTS check for the minimum number of Purpose E CPDUs required. |
| 395 | Curriculum | <p>(Corrected version of letter sent with #392)</p> <p>Having received and carefully read your April 11, 2005 letter, I applaud what you are doing and your passion to improve K-12 education in our state. As a Chicago Public School and local university product (James G. Blaine Elementary, Lake View High School and DePaul University), I too have a commitment to helping educators and teachers bring high-quality content to K-12 Illinois classrooms.</p> <p>I am also Chairman of <i>[identifying information deleted]</i>, a provider of visual education content for K-12 schools, nationally; in that capacity I was disappointed to find our market research shows Illinois ranking near the bottom of all states in “visual learning.” Our company, <i>[identifying information deleted]</i> has designed and developed a new digital delivery system Classroom Content Click! (CCC!) of visual content that is available, on-demand, through the teacher’s computer. There is no hardware, wiring or software to purchase. The savings to Illinois would be in the hundreds of thousands annually.</p> <p>As you know, children learn by multiple intelligences (visual, auditory, linguistic, kinesthetic and others). Even our sister states are far ahead of us; for example, Iowa is a national leader in providing visual content to supplement K-12 core curricula. Classroom Content Click! (CCC!) has been piloted in 25 school systems across the country with remarkable results. The following are some of the unsolicited comments we have received about our new visual learning resource:</p> <p>“Classroom Content Click! is the easiest digital delivery system I’ve ever seen.”</p> <p>Wisconsin Media Specialist “The content on Classroom Content Click! is second to none.”</p> <p>Indiana Curriculum Director “Our people loved the simplicity of the navigation.”</p> <p>Texas Media Specialist “Your search, select, play, ease-of-use and superior picture quality are very impressive.”</p> <p>California Instructional Media Supervisor “The system’s Teacher Support material offers great higher order thinking activities.”</p> <p>Kentucky School District Curriculum and Instruction Chairperson “Classroom Content Click! has great academic value.”</p> <p>New Mexico School District Media Specialist</p> <p>Many months ago we presented Classroom Content Click! to the former Director of Education Technology, <i>[identifying information deleted]</i>, who was impressed with what he saw but regrettably maintained that Illinois had no funds.</p> <p>If your new State Board or media and/or education technology staff would like a special presentation of Classroom Content Click!, I will be happy to arrange it. <i>[identifying information deleted]</i>, Senior Vice President of Content and Programming would be pleased to meet with your associates and describe how powerful this new teaching resource can be for K-12 students.</p> <p>Governor, I do not have political friends or influence, but I do share your passion for improving K-12 education in Illinois. Some day our students will seek challenging and hopefully rewarding opportunities to build families and contribute to their community</p> |

| Number | Subject | Message (as originally submitted) |
|--------|--------------------|---|
| | | and state. We should do everything possible to help them fulfill their dreams. [identifying information deleted] and I are ready to help you and your associates meet that objective. |
| 396 | Certification | Just teachers on how they perform after taking education classes. The Basic Skills Test will keep out many excellent teachers, who do not test well. It should be Basic Skills or ten years of reviews and classes to help them improve in all areas. One class limit, since the teachers are working. |
| 397 | Health-Life Safety | This might not be the correct forum for this problem, but I was informed recently that manufacturers are again putting asbestos in building materials! This seems ironic when considering the huge amounts of money schools have spent removing this substance. Perhaps a mandate that materials containing this substance must be identified? Schools must somehow be made aware of this problem. John Marshall, Supt. VIT #2 Fulton County |
| 398 | Elections | Our Regional Board of Trustees was asked to meet in April to canvass votes. They have also been asked to meet the third Monday of May for reorganization. IS THERE ANY REASON THE LAW CANNOT BE CHANGED SO THAT THEY CAN REORGANIZE AT THE SAME TIME THEY COME TO CANVASS? Thank you for considering this matter. I look forward to your response. |
| 399 | Certification | I am writing in hope that you can help me with an urgent problem. In August/2004, I accepted the position of Lead Dean at [identifying information deleted] High School. At that time, I was told that I would have to get a secondary certificate. I then call ISBE and was told that I could apply to have my transcripts reviewed and take the needed courses. I was further told that I had until July/2005 in which to apply. Since then, I have been promoted to Director of our soon to open, Math and Science Academy. District [identifying information deleted] maintains a policy that requires that even administrators hold secondary certificate. On April 29, 2005, I went to the [identifying information deleted] ROE to complete the application for transcript review and to renew my current certificates. To my shock, I was then told that the deadline for doing such was January 2004. While at the ROE, I called Springfield and was told that I would have to find a university and take their required coursework for secondary certification. I have looked around and found that the universities are requiring 32 hours of coursework. I was aware from the beginning that I would need to complete some additional courses, this is UNACCEPTABLE! I am asking your help in resolving this matter. If you know of the appropriate person/persons that can assist me with this, please forward this message to him/her. My District will allow me time but, a full program is out of the question. |
| 400 | Certification | We at District [identifying information deleted] IL have been given the run around and so many different instructions it is ridiculous. Having my initial certificate, a Masters and now completing course work for a Type 75 and not being able to move from an initial to a standard is ridiculous. I do not have four years experience, but subbing for two years doesn't count. I am in my third year and will get tenure next year. Your system needs to be looked at carefully. Coming from the real world in a change of career's, making this more difficult than it has to be will scare people away. It seems that you are making teachers do more jumping through hoops than doctors do! And we don't get paid as well as they do! Your system should be stream lined and any teacher earning a Masters and credits after should automatically be moved. What about Master teacher status? Many of us are bringing other talents to our classrooms and earning a Masters doesn't seem to be a benefit in being able to move certificate standings. Another innovative idea about saving money in education and making funds available where they are desperately needed, would be to do away with Bi-lingual and transitional education. ELL support is good, but holding hands of students who were born here for three years while they learn English is a waste of funds. Children should be in English classrooms from the beginning. Illinois should follow the leads of Texas, California and Massachusetts. These states now have test scores on the rise. Children pick up any language more quickly when they are young. Thank you for your time and I know that these recommendations will not be taken in any consideration in the near future, but I feel much better now. |
| 401 | Criminal Checks | My husband and I just retired from teaching. We went to the ROE to register to substitute. We must go through finger printing background check and tb test. We would like to teach in Peoria county and Tazewell. We found out that we must go through process in every county we would like to sub. Can't the counties share infor. We will not make ourselves available to Peoria because of the inconvenience of going through this process more than once. We almost didn't go through the process having just retired and been through the process as active teachers. Could have a separate process that streamlines for retiring teachers who |

| Number | Subject | Message (as originally submitted) |
|--------|---------------------|--|
| 402 | Certification | <p>want to substitute.</p> <p>Hello, I have a teaching degree from another state that I earned many decades ago and chose to not teach at the time because I went into the military instead. My degree was to teach foreign languages, specifically French but I am fluent in other languages as well. I could use a little refresher here and there to catch up on some other languages that I am not fluent in. As the saying goes...if you don't use it, you lose it. I am now at a point in my life where I am able to share my knowledge and teach other children what I have learned. I have traveled a lot in my life. My dilemma, I would like to teach foreign languages but by Illinois law I have been found deficient in one psychology course, identification and teaching methods for exceptional children. I understand the need for this course because the laws have changed over the years (I also am an elected school board member so I understand the necessity) but the cost to take it is rather steep. Especially when you factor in all the other fees associated with becoming a teacher today. Are there programs out there to help people like me with the financial costs of getting back in the classroom? If I do go back to teaching, it won't be to make any money because I would start out as first year teacher and we all know how little they get paid. I would do it to share my knowledge and experience in foreign languages. My other dilemma. Illinois law also requires that I take a basic skills test and a test in my subject area. I understand the test in my specialty but I'm not sure why I need to be up to speed in algebra, etc., when my degree is a "special teaching" category. Not to mention that it has been many decades since I last had to solve an algebraic equation. I can understand a basic skills test for someone who will teach a variety of other subjects and become highly qualified in those subjects. Are there provisions/exceptions for people like me who just want to teach a special area? Is there a way around this red tape? Thank you for your time and consideration.</p> |
| 403 | Curriculum | <p>My name is Xochi(So-chee) Herrera Pannell of Moline, IL. I have been a school volunteer for many years and have been a committee member for the Bilingual Education Committee for the Moline School District for 5 years. In addition to being self employed, my associate Josh Wright and I have written several children's books. Our latest collaboration is called "Mario & Frida, Double Trouble." This story was written in English and Spanish. I volunteer at a school that is 80% Hispanic where the children really enjoyed reading our book in both languages. Over the last few years, Josh and I have been to over 25 schools to share our program in an "auditorium style" program. Today we happen to be at Erie Elementary, Erie, IL where we gave a program. The principal suggested that we contact to share our story. In our story Mario and Frida take on the bullies of the world. We thought the subject of bullying and then offering it in English and Spanish might be a good combination. What do you think? Would you be interested in learning more about us?</p> |
| 404 | Substitute Teachers | <p>Why not use college students who are in Teacher Education Programs to Substitute teach? There are SO many unqualified subs out there. On many occasions I've seen subs run out of my school for lack of competence. Many subs don't speak English, are not capable of handling students, and do not have the educational background to actually understand what to do in given situations with students. Its horrible what happens when subs go into schools. The times are few and far between when a real capable person comes in is GOOD. Those are the ones that the principals hire on a cadre. Please be realistic about the sub issue. YOU are hiring a warm body to babysit students. I think that this isn't fair to the students. At least if you hire a college student with some educational pedagogy under their belt they have a sense of what to do and how to do it. You could also pay them less than a regular sub because they aren't necessarily certified and let them earn hours towards their degree. It's a win win situation. As far as certification goes, just because a sub has a degree in engineering and is retired doesn't mean that he/she is qualified to be in a classroom with children. Students in teacher prep programs have a working knowledge of educational practices that is useful, and they won't be there for the money as much as for the experience. They'll be there because teaching is something that they are interested in. YOU would not believe the number of student teachers that I've worked with that would have loved to be in the classroom before their final practicum experiences. Somebody really needs to reevaluate the situation with substitute teachers. It really is a horrid when these incompetent subs come into the classroom.</p> |
| 405 | Governance | <p>The truth is that education will continue to flounder until, or unless the whole top down structure of governance is changed. Can't you understand that over the last 50 years, no matter how much you have tried to "help" education, you have failed. Test scores are on a continuing decline. I served on my local board of education for 8 years and came away with an "outside the box" kind of solution to helping education. If you would like a copy of my book outlining the problems and a possible solution I call "real</p> |

| Number | Subject | Message (as originally submitted) |
|--------|-------------------------------|--|
| | | local control," please let me know. I will forward a copy. Just give me the proper information so I can get a copy to you. The title, "How Boards of Education Are Failing Your Children" gives an insiders view why education continually falls short. And hey, there may be just one thing that you may come away with that will inspire you to action. |
| 406 | Elections | Please refer to 105 ILCS 5/16-17, election of president for Regional Board of School Trustees. We ask you to consider allowing trustees to reorganize on the same date that they canvass votes. This year, under the requirements of the code, trustees canvassed votes within 21 days of the April election and then were required to return the third Monday of May for reorganization. These members are paid mileage only and spend days listening to and deciding school annexation/detachment, consolidation, and dissolution matters. Many are farmers and do not appreciate being required to meet twice in less than a month during the height of the planting season. We need to accommodate these members as much as possible in order to find people willing to serve. Are there any valid reasons that would not allow trustees to canvass votes and reorganize on the same day? Thank you for your consideration of this matter. |
| 407 | IWAS | In the future can Public School Update ISBE form 60-63 be placed on IWAS for updating? This would save a lot of envelopes, postage and time for everyone involved in this process. I think the implementation of IWAS has been one of the best time and money savers that ISBE has implemented. The more we can place on this system the better. |
| 408 | Regional Offices of Education | Please refer to 105 ILCS 5/3A-16, Regional Office of Education Advisory Board. This board was established in 1995 when ROE's began providing staff development and administrator's academy services. Since our budget has been reduced by 55%, we can no longer provide many of the programs and services mentioned in Section 5/2-3.62. Therefore, it is not necessary to meet 6 times a year to inform the Advisory Board about our budget and how we are spending the monies. Three time a year would be an adequate number of dates to meet. Since the committee must consist of 2 administrators, 4 teachers and 7 community representatives, our meetings are held after school hours. Consequently, we provide the members with a light meal and reimburse for mileage, which is an additional expense for the ROE's. In order to assure fair representation of all three counties served, many of our members are traveling over 100 round trip miles per meeting. Without offering refreshments and mileage, we could not find people willing to serve on the committee. These small expense are necessary in order to find people to serve on the committee. Please consider revising the advisory board mandates so that they are in line with today's budget-- meet less often because there is less to report due to reduced budgets. Again, three times would be an adequate number of meeting dates. Thank you for your consideration of this matter. |
| 409 | Employees | Please forward to the best section within the ISBE to address this issue: The ISBE needs to change the status of the school library from "noneducational" to "educational" within the administrative code, so that certified librarians are hired at elementary schools. Currently schools take the low-road and hire the cheapest staff for Illinois' elementary libraries. Those people do the best job they can, but without training, that is not what our Illinois students deserve. I realize that the large number of retiring boomers will make this an increasing problem, but that is true of all subject areas within schools. Please consider addressing the need for certified / trained librarians at all school levels. |
| 410 | Employees | 1) required physicals for new teachers be allowed to be used for all districts in Illinois - not each district requiring their own physical. Some schools may for the physicals so would save the school district that money. 2) standarized policies for teachers applying for jobs in Illinois e.g. one transript be able to be used for all jobs for which the teacher is applying. Presently, it becomes very expensive for the applicant to request many transcripts from college of attendance to send along with the applicationn - only to not hear from the school, or not be offered the job. What a waste of money for the new teacher !!! |
| 411 | Lesson Plans | If there was an already formatted lesson plan that had columns for the different levels of learners in one's class, more might plan for each individual level. An example could be Group A...will classify each picture animal as a bird or mammal; Group B...will state why each picture animal belongs in which group; Group C will write a paper comparing and contrasting the two groups of animals. Each person would be graded on his/her goal and all could receive A's |
| 412 | Health-Life Safety | Every ten years each school district must complete a 10-year life/ safety survey. Items listed on this survey, except for emergency items, must be completed within a 5-year window. A seemingly meaningless and time consuming requirement is that each year said district must file for an extension of time. It would seem that an extension should only be necessary if these |

| Number | Subject | Message (as originally submitted) |
|--------|-------------------|---|
| 413 | Paraprofessionals | <p>projects had not been completed within the 5-year window.</p> <p>Dear Dr. Dunn, In 2001, [identifying information deleted] Community College, [identifying information deleted] in [identifying information deleted] and CUSD #[identifying information deleted] in [identifying information deleted] formed a partnership to encourage paraeducators to become certified teachers through a "Grow Your Own" Program. With the requirements that have been placed on paraeducators through the NCLB and IDEA, the partnership shifted its focus to adopt a program under the auspices of [identifying information deleted] Community College. The program developed into Basic Skills 1 & 2 course taught by paraeducators and certified teachers from both districts. We believe the Basic Skills 1 & 2 classes should be approved to meet the requirements for Highly Qualified for paraeducators paid under Title and for those who work with Special Education under the rules for IDEA. We believe this will retain qualified paraeducators and, therefore decrease additional costs to the Districts which would otherwise have to replace large numbers of current paraeducators with people who possess the higher qualifications. Currently, [identifying information deleted] employs approximately 500 paraeducators and CUSD #[identifying information deleted] employs about 300. Of the combined 800 paraeducators, about 500 have successfully completed the program. In the area of "less red tape," currently paraeducators seeking to be Highly Qualified must obtain 60 or more college credit hours or successfully pass the ETS ParaPro Assessment or the ACT Work Keys Test. Acquiring up to 60 hours of college credit speaks for itself for those who have never been required to have more than 30 hours. In fact, the State for many years has allowed great numbers of Special Education paraeducators to work with fewer than 30 hours. In order to take one of the approved tests, paraeducators must travel to a limited number of test sites on a limited number of test dates. Although the closest site to these two districts is [identifying information deleted] (25 miles), that site is often filled and the paraeducators are scheduled to test at much more distant sites. Recent examples include people being sent to [identifying information deleted], [identifying information deleted], and [identifying information deleted], Indiana. Finally, the Basic Skills 1 & 2 classes are designed around the curricula presently being used in each district. This has created such a significant improvement to the past staff development programs of the districts that each has negotiated into the paraeducator collective bargaining agreements guarantees that the costs associated with these courses will be borne by the districts. The course content has also been substantial enough to allow [identifying information deleted] Community College to secure grants from the Illinois Community College Board for the last two years which ECC in turn transferred to [identifying information deleted] and District [identifying information deleted] to help defray the costs of instructors and textbooks.</p> |
| 414 | Student Loans | <p>This may not pertain to this category, but I am presently going back to college for a degree in paralegal. I was accepted for a student loan, but now I am on probation and suspension from the student loan. The reason that the Federal Loan Department gave me: When I went to college in 1992 I withdrew from my courses. The reasoning behind my withdrawal is: I had recently went through a divorce and my funded child care provider at the time questioned my five year old and my three year old sons if their dad still lived with us. My children did not understand what was going on in the first place. I then was dropped from the program and had no one else to watch my children while I attended college. I was not receiving any child support, so I could not afford the extra daycare. Now it has been thirteen years later and I am ADD which I always have been, but I just started to take the medication this year. I feel that I should not have been put on probation nor suspension from receiving Federal Student Loan in which I have to pay back. Please, if there is anything that you could do to help me out of this mess, please contact me by E-Mail [identifying information deleted]. I would appreciate the effort, I really want to go back to school and learn law, it is something I have always wanted. I am presently not working and can not afford to pay as I go and my husband only works during the summer. So, I guess my idea to you is that I feel the Federal Loan Department should change their policy on probation against students, especially since it has been thirteen years ago. I can not even fullfill the qualifications for an appeal against their decision, because it has been too long. The child care program in which I was affiliated with most likely does not have proof of their aligations from 1992. Considering that most bussiness only have to keep records for at least seven years, that is the last time I knew, it might have changed by now? Thank You and I hope to hear from you. If you can not help me at least guide me in the right direction, please</p> |

Lessredtape: Messages and Responses (5-5-05 through 6-6-05)

Attachment B

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|---|----------|--|
| 10/12/05 | 006 | change be made to the form school districts use to list teacher vacancies. The change I see that needs to take place is an addition to point out what secondary and post-secondary programs had to close because Career and Technology Education teachers could not be located. Since school districts close CTE programs when they can not locate a teacher and find substitutes for other teacher vacancies there appears to be no shortage. This information also tells universities that they don't need to support these degrees in their programs, consequently contributing to the teacher shortage. I believe I heard a statistic that over 50 school closed CTE programs this year in Illinois solely due to not being able to find a teacher to fill a vacancy. | 5/17/05 | <p>You have asked that a form used to report unfilled positions be modified to indicate whether a particular program is no longer being offered. I believe the form to which you are referring is the unfilled position survey. The report of unfilled teaching positions is required by Sections 3-14.25 and 10-20.27 of the School Code (copied below). As you can see from the statutory requirements, the purpose of the survey is to gather information on positions that schools and districts have not filled by September 30 of each year. The data are used in the Educator Supply and Demand study (see http://www.isbe.net/research/htmls/supply_and_demand.htm).</p> <p>The purpose of this data collection effort is to determine the number of unfilled positions each school year rather than to ascertain whether school districts are no longer offering programs due to their inability to find qualified staff. Currently, the State Board of Education is not authorized to require school districts to provide this information. I recommend that you contact the Illinois Association of Career and Technical Education, which may be collecting information about staff availability and program closures (see http://www.iacte.org).</p> |
| 10/12/04 11/5/04 1/14/05 | 009-1 106 229 | <p>#009 Special Education contains by far the most rules, regulations, and red tape of any area of public education. Each year there are new requirements added on to the already voluminous mandates that have continuously accrued over the 28 years since the original enactment of PL 94-142. Many of these requirements are imposed by the federal government and I realize the state needs to ensure compliance in order to receive federal funding. Ironically, of course, IDEA '97 was supposed to reduce paperwork -- from my own experience and that of many others working in the field, it clearly has done the opposite. Special education personnel spend as much time filling out paperwork to meet regulatory requirements as they do working with children -- sometimes more. However, the progress that could be made with such children is further hampered by the "red tape" that so burdens special education and has led to many excellent educators leaving this worthwhile field. If you are really concerned about red tape in Illinois' public education, special education would be a good place to look -- you will find more of it there than any place else. Where should you start looking? Don't mandate special education practices that exceed those of the federal government. Carefully review federal</p> | 5/23/05 | <p>The Division of Special Education Services is reviewing rules governing Special Education (23 Ill. Adm. Code 226; see http://www.isbe.net/rules/archive/default.htm) in response to P.A. 93-1036. This law, in part, required the agency to review all of its rules in an "effort to streamline procedures, improve efficiency, and eliminate unnecessary forms and paperwork" (see http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/publicacts/fulltext.asp?name=093-1036&GA=093). Further, the State Board of Education and the State Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities recently engaged in a review of state rules to identify those that exceed federal requirements, as directed by HR 359 (see http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/BillStatus.asp?DocNum=359&GAID=3&DocTypeID=HR&LegId=7008&SessionID=3&GA=93).</p> <p>Many state rules result from federal regulations that direct states to define parameters in their applications for federal funding. ISBE will continue to review the practices of other states and the resources of the U.S. Department of Education in determining best practices for students with disabilities.</p> <p>The State Board of Education appreciates your concerns about apparent conflicts between federal and state requirements. We will be keeping you informed of our progress.</p> |

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|---|----------|---|
| | | <p>requirements and remove those "add-ons" that the state has imposed. Eliminate paperwork that does not lead to compliance with a federal regulation. Make it clear that failure to dot every single "i" and cross every "t" does not by itself result in a lose of FAPE for special education children. Give schools more breathing room so that they can do the job they are expected to do -- teach children. In the meantime, we will continue to spend much time reviewing and complying with federal and state requirements. We will continue to review our journals and provide staff development to continuously improve our instruction for children with disabilities. And we will continue to await the day when there is a proper balance between legislative mandate and appropriate support for the education of students with disabilities.</p> <p>#106 I am a special education director in [identifying information deleted] and a member of the Illinois Alliance of Administrators in Special Education. I know that Dr. Koch and his department spent a great deal of time soliciting input from IAASE regarding Part 226 regulations that exceed federal law (IDEA). I would urge you to take a look at those particular sections of the school code and eliminate those sections that are in excess of federal law.</p> <p>#229 Illinois (ISBE) in the BARRIERS REPORT had put in place special education rules which exceeded federal IDEA standards. All of these should be elimanted. Then one may look indiviually at the extra rules if any have merits to being restored. None should be implemented if costs are involved due to the fact that the state and federal government have failed to fund special education. Instead, this has been left to local property taxes or general state aid which could support other students.</p> | | |
| 10/12/04 10/25/04 11/2/04 | 009-2 049 096 | <p>#009-2 Simultaneously the expectations for student outcomes in subgroups like children with disabilities is increasing at an unrealistic pace witnessed by the mandate that all such children meet state standards by 2014. This is not likely to happen in any case -- you can't simply legislate a state, like that of Lake Wobegone, in which all children are "average." Research has never supported that this can be done with large groups of</p> | 5/23/05 | <p>Concerns such as those described in your submissions about special education students taking state tests have been expressed by many special education teachers and school administrators. The Student Assessment and Special Education Services divisions have had and continue to have discussions about these concerns and are trying to find ways to meet the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, as well as meet individual student needs for assessments. There are a few things that are in the works now.</p> <p>The Illinois State Board of Education has submitted to the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE) amendments to Illinois' workbook on accountability. One of the amendments is to provide a different readability level for the Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT). The State Board's rationale for this amendment is that different levels of readability for the ISAT would enable more students to perform</p> |

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|------|---|--|----------|---|
| | | <p>children with disabilities, especially across levels, and the new NCLB legislation is spotlighting just how little effective "evidence-based instruction" there really is in the special education field. Review how AYP is determined for subgroups like children with disabilities. You are creating a state in which the ISAT will drive instruction in the classroom and in which virtually all Illinois schools will end up being identified as "failing" largely because of the performance of these subgroups. This sends the wrong message and will eventually create a chaotic political atmosphere because the general public will not fully understand the unrealistic nature of what the schools are being required to do. Other states have taken a more reasoned approach to assessing AYP for children with learning difficulties -- study these and adjust accordingly. How is ISBE going to respond when this becomes all too apparent -- just say that the schools aren't doing a good enough job? This does not reflect reality. An alternate form of AYP assessment for children with disabilities and perhaps other subgroups is sorely needed. At the same time, if you know the evidence-based methods that schools can use to raise the performance of children with disabilities and other subgroups, then a mass staff development effort spearheaded by ISBE would seem warranted. I anxiously await this information.</p> <p>#049 Special Ed Testing (this is my favorite soapbox) Ok.. I understand we will NEVER get special education out from under NCLB. BUT.... why do we insist on punishing these kids with tests they cannot possibly perform? Is it our job to help cement in their minds how incapable they are??? I always thought that the object of assessment was just that. ASSESSMENT. It's not like we don't have enough data to determine where the typical special education student performs. SOMEONE/ANYONE to consider testing these students with "ability appropriate tests" - IE an 8th grade student with a 2nd grade reading level gets a 2nd grade level reading test. establish a fixed ratio of "test to ability" . For example, a special education student may not be tested using a test instrument that is designed for three or more</p> | | <p>and be independent in their test taking. USDOE has been very firm about not allowing Illinois to test at a student's instructional level; all students are supposed to have access to and be taught the content areas based on the Illinois Learning Standards. Therefore, ISBE has requested that the content be assessed at grade level, but that the ISAT include different reading levels. If USDOE accepts these changes, then we will announce it immediately. (A summary of the proposed changes to the workbook have been included in several recent Superintendent's Weekly Messages, which can be accessed at http://www.isbe.net/board/archivemessages/archivemessage.htm.)</p> <p>Regarding the Prairie State Achievement Examination (PSAE), the State Board has begun contract negotiations with ACT, and one of ISBE's issues with the PSAE is the provision of accommodations for students who have Individualized Education Programs (IEP).</p> <p>The State Board also will be holding a one-day conference in August on accommodations and assessment. This will be tied into the conference for special education directors. Agency staff hope to bring both administrators and special education teachers together to discuss accommodating IEP students when they are being administered the statewide assessment.</p> <p>In addition, the State Board of Education will be funding statewide professional development on the Standards-Aligned Classroom for Special Education. ISBE has supported the standards-aligned classroom project for years, but this year we will have teams focused on special education students. Details about this event will be announced soon. We hope that teachers – both special education and general education – will find support and resources to enhance the learning of students with disabilities. Please watch for this announcement.</p> <p>Finally, U.S. Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings announced last month an effort to provide an additional alternate assessment for those students who are disabled but not significantly disabled. We are waiting for federal guidance on this announcement and will pursue this option if the resources are available.</p> <p>As you know, both the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act require that students with disabilities participate in state assessments. National data have confirmed that when students with disabilities have access to the general education curriculum, they are better able to perform on standardized assessments and to successfully make the transition from high school into further training, education or employment. IEP teams should determine the appropriate assessment for students with disabilities and whether accommodations may help the student achieve. Many states have demonstrated that students with disabilities can achieve on state assessments when provided with access to the general education curriculum and appropriate accommodations.</p> |

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|---|----------------------------|--|----------------|--|
| | | <p>performance levels above the IEP stated ability. This way no special education student would ever be tested using a test instrument of more than two grades above their ability. At least they might have a prayer of successfully completing a portion of the test and therefore having (yet another) appropriate assessment. Or we can just go on giving our IEP students test they aren't ready or prepared for.... you choose. My heart is broken enough over this.</p> <p>#096 Our community has been made aware that the special education students have created the school of choice concern. This is unfair to the students. The students are having their educational needs met by meeting the goals. All the PSAE is doing is pointing out that they are not up to par with their peers. How degrading is it to be informed that you do not meet standards, and your school is being "punished" because of your learning disability?</p> | | |
| <p>10/13/04 10/26/04 2/8/05</p> | <p>018 056 313</p> | <p>#018 The current technology planning process is much more involved than it needs to be. All of the time spent in writing the plan and gathering research takes away time from working with teachers and students. All of the time spent writing the plan with the current guidelines will take away time from implementing it. Please look at the FCC guidelines and ISBE requirements in relation to AREA LTCs planning template. I think you will find that the LTCs go way beyond the other agencies in their demands.</p> <p>#056 As superintendent, I have written more than one district tech plan in my career. These were approximately three pages in length. The goals were simple. The expenses were clearly outlined. The plan was easily presented to the board, staff, and community. Everyone understood the plan, what was in it, and their roles towards its implementation. Then enter the state to "micromanage" the plan. Massive amounts of time are now being required for staff and community input. Additional, time is being required of the administration, the tech director, and the community. Technology plans have burgeoned to 80 and 90 pages with yearly rewrites being required to fit constantly changing formats thought up by</p> | <p>5/23/05</p> | <p>As you know, school districts are required to have approved technology plans in order to qualify for federal funding and for E-Rate. Toward that end, the Local Technology Centers (LTCs) have played an instrumental role in developing an on-line technology planning process that provides, at a minimum, the convenience of internet access, and at the other extreme, a process by which district personnel can reflect on practices so that effective strategic planning can occur.</p> <p>It is important to remember that the online format is only an option, and districts can choose to submit their plan in any other format that meets the statutory requirements and meets the needs of the district. With that said, the points you make are worthy of consideration. The State Board of Education is responsible for facilitating compliance with federal and state statutes, all while balancing the needs of school districts. Currently, State Board staff are reviewing the content of the various required plans to ascertain if there is potential for streamlining the processes, and your suggestions will be considered in that context.</p> |

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|------|---|--|----------|-------------------------------------|
| | | <p>government bureaucrats or no grant money for you! Certain methodology is being dictated in the classroom. Choice of methodology is the prerogative of the teacher in the classroom and has no place being dictated by bureaucratcs. As the superintendent, I do not have the time to wade through 90 pages of required goobledy gook to sift out the three relevant pages. Now there are parts of the plan which neither I nor the staff understand. If we do not understand it, it can not be communicated to the Board or the students let alone the community. Even the tech director who wrote the plan can not remember parts of it six months later let alone implement it, and she is a super tech director. This year, the tech director found it necessary to attend, count them, three workshops conducted by the ROE solely for the purpose of once again re-writing the district tech plan. We are fast approaching the time when we will be spending more time on writing the "tech plan" than we spend on implementing it. When is this madness going to stop? Cut the red tape and give us back control of our tech plans.</p> <p>#313 How could I have forgotten this one? Whoever is responsible for the guidelines for district technology plans . . . please restrain them as quickly as possible in a mental institution for the "criminally unpractical." As a superintendent since the age of the dinosaurs (Yes, I remember main frames and punch cards.), I have written a number of district technology plans before they were a requirement by the ISBE. The plans I wrote were three to six pages long. They included at least three goals and an estimate of budgetary expenses. They were easily presented to the staff and the Board who could understand them in five minutes, lend their input, and pass or implement them. People could even remember the goals and the budgetary amounts later. Unfortunately, the governmental bureaucrats at ISBE had to get involved. Districts had to write a plan to ISBE specifications or not be eligible for any technology grant money (nothing like a little motivational black mail). The ISBE specifications were long and complicated. Partly, because the specifications started</p> | | |

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|------|---|---|----------|-------------------------------------|
| | | <p>requiring specific learning methodologies and techniques to be included such as "engaged learning." Nothing is wrong with "engaged learning." I am even an advocate. On the other hand, what are learning methodologies and instructional techniques doing in a technology plan? This is State meddling and micromanagement in curriculum and instructional methodology. This is a territory that has traditionally been reserved for the districts and the professionals in the field the teachers. The State has absolutely no business dictating this. As a result of the State specifications, the district technology plan burgeoned in two years from six pages to 36 to 84 pages. Instead of the technology manager putting the plan quickly together with the input of the Superintendent, a committee of four had to be involved meeting over several days. Was this the end? Absolutely, not! Now we are up to 134 pages in my small district and my technology manager has to attend four all day workshops each year just to re-write the district technology plan. Has the State stopped interfering with curriculum through the tech plan requirements? Absolutely not! Now we actively need to include mention of "curriculum instruction." After ten years as manager and four all day workshops, my experienced tech plan manager still can't seem to get it right. This year, the plan was initially rejected because she dared to use "staff member" instead of "paraprofessional" and "recertification." Apparently, a tech plan just won't work without the latest buzz word. Oh, and did I mention the latest surprise for this year? Apparently, we are required to include a unit on professional development in the plan. That's not new. What is new is that the district must now fill out all of the paperwork to be a CPDU provider in order to provide the professional training. Apparently, it is no longer a choice that the "tech plan training" be tied to CPDUs or not. Apparently, in some mysterious way not offering CPDUs with the training is going to effect the quality of the training. Did I mention that our district tech plan is now difficult for the technology committee members to understand? We don't even try with the school board. We just pull out the</p> | | |

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|----------|----------------|---|----------|--|
| | | <p>three goals and the budget sheet for presentations just like before the State got involved. Nobody can comprehend or remember the rest of the plan. Enough is enough gentlemen. We are employing our technology plan manager to implement the plan, not to spend all of her time writing it. Please cut the red tape! For that matter, she is the "technology plan manager." She is not the district curriculum director. As she has aptly pointed out, if "engaged learning" and/or "curriculum instruction" is so important, why isn't the technology plan not a part of the School Improvement plan? As it is now, it is more and more resembling a curriculum plan rather than a true technology implementation plan. This is my sincere suggestion. Since the governor is cutting your budget once again, you need to make some further cuts. Start by cutting all of the "curriculum and instructional" requirements out of the technology plan specifications, and if you must, send them over to School Improvement. Fire the nine of the ten overly zealous, curriculum oriented monkies presently writing and overseeing the district technology plans. Take the tenth monkey, and put it in the mental institution as previously mentioned.</p> | | |
| 10/13/05 | 020-1 020-2 | <p>1. Sections 27-9.2 - 27-23.5 . . . axe everything, pledge to stop trying to micro-manage the school curriculums. 2. stop silliness, "Survey for Immigrants" purportedly required by NCLB. Since it states on the ISBE website that schools are prohibited from asking a student or their parent if they are immigrants, then we have no reliable information that can be reported. Why is ISBE asking for unreliable information? schools have no reliable way to determine this information. ISBE asked the school districts to report on the number of pregnant students in the district. I bet that report was really accurate.</p> | 5/10/09 | <p>Sections 27-9.2 and 23-23.5. A school district may determine whether it wishes to offer instruction in the area of family life. If the district should chose to teach family life education as a unit, then it is required to include instruction as outlined in Section 27-9.2. Section 27-23.5 also is an optional provision. The law states that a school district "may include" in its curriculum for students in grades 9 and 10 instruction relative to organ/tissue and blood donor and transplantation programs. The law does, however, require regional offices of education to distribute to school districts information and data that may be used in developing a curriculum. Both laws are at the end of this email, for your information. As you know, Illinois is a "local control" state; as such, the State Board of Education (ISBE) does not recommend curricula to school districts. Each school district chooses the curricula and textbooks which it believes best reflects the needs and interests of its students and communities. Immigrant Student Count. According to Robin Lisboa, Division Administrator for the Division of English Language Learning, you are correct when you state that districts are prohibited from asking students or parents about their immigration status. Ms. Lisboa suggests that districts collect the information needed for the survey with questions that do not violate this prohibition, such as "Where was the student born?" and "How many years has the student attended U.S. schools?"</p> |
| 10/13/04 | 021 | <p>I think there is some sense to having all intermediate service providers have congruent boundaries. I know that territory is both literally and figuratively difficult to reach consensus about. Consolidating service providers such as the ROEs, the EFE's and even special ed consortium would</p> | 5/23/05 | <p>This idea to have congruent boundaries for regional offices of education, education for employment regions, special education cooperatives and other intermediate service providers was considered in the early 1960's. Since that time, the joint agreement provisions have been put into the School Code. Additionally, the idea was abandoned due to fear that school districts would be tempted to "dump" troublesome or unwanted students in such districts. In the case of special education students, as a result of subsequent federal legislation, segregating such students would likely be in violation of the spirit if not the letter of the law.</p> |

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|----------|-----|--|----------|---|
| | | <p>help schools by presenting a one stop approach to these services. The community college system may provide the ideal boundaries as every district has at least one community college to which they are connected. In addition community colleges have accounting departments and grant management processes very similar to the intermediate service agencies and they have a tax base. The tax base allows them to provide insurance and other payments through their tort levy. If this could be extended to help intermediate school agencies it could help to maintain services through staff stability that currently suffer from the ups and downs of grant funding streams. I think there may be a number of economies worth the hassle of looking carefully at consolidation.</p> | | |
| 10/19/04 | 028 | <p>curtail much of the paperwork required by our state and federal governments related to placement and annual reviews of special education students. Many of the required special education reports should be the option of the individual child's committee whether these case study components are relevant to the individual child's educational needs. Often you do not need a cognitive evaluation as the student's classwork can be observed to be far beyond peers. Often you do not need a social developmental study with parent interviews as it usually is not relevant to the educational needs of the student. The list goes on and on. Further, we have staff assigned to collect information to acquire funding for special education students that can be streamlined . Harrisburg now has the capability of collecting our IEP individual data on special education students. Harrisburg has a record for the entire state for each child's type of services and minutes of services filed by all special education systems. Meanwhile all special education systems file with Public Aid for Medicaid funding to help support special education systems. Why can't all the information sent to Harrisburg simply be sent by Harrisburg to Public Aid, and then Public Aid through a simple formula (based on services to each child) can direct the appropriate amount of funds to each school district or special education cooperative.</p> | 5/23/05 | <p>Evaluation and Reevaluation. Districts currently have the flexibility to determine at what depth and level to conduct an evaluation. Although it is mandated that the district address all of the required domains, it is the resulting Individualized Education Program (IEP), developed with parent input, that determines the level of assessment that is necessary for each domain.</p> <p>Medicaid Issue. Harrisburg does collect a lot of information about students with disabilities. At this time, Social Security numbers are optional for use with the Harrisburg system; therefore, the use of Social Security numbers for Medicaid reimbursement purposes will not enable Harrisburg to access data from that system.</p> |

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|----------|-----|--|----------|--|
| | | <p>Currently our staff need to document their minutes of service with Medicaid eligible students, file these on-line, while we have a clerk who constantly checks which students are Medicaid eligible as this can vary from month to month as parents of these children are highly transient and have sporadic employment and are thus in and out of eligibility status throughout the school year. Only Public Aid has this eligibility status of each child at its fingertips; while each school system is constantly checking with Public Aid to acquire this information. In summary, the state education and Medicaid agencies have all the data necessary to group the information for special education funding (including extraordinary funding which also requires a lot of cost analysis by each system concerning each child) and Medicaid funding. We should simply input the IEP minutes of service for each of our 1,300 special education students and then receive payments from Medicaid, extraordinary funding and state grants based on services provided. Who cares if we get estimated payments? If the funding is off a few thousand dollars we will still benefit by having our staff work more time with students instead of providing thousands of hours of clerical work each year. Our clerical work is just local documentation about information state agencies already have. Often I hear of lack of sharing of student information due to confidentiality of students which is ridiculous as all employees of these services must have "legal confidential employee status" to maintain their positions.</p> | | |
| 10/20/05 | 032 | <p>The ROE'S do compliance visits every five years. Three representatives from the ROE will be spending two full days to complete their visit. To prepare for such a visit, the ROE provides us with a thirty-three page document that we have to go through and document we are in compliance with the multitude of requirements as outlined in the Illinois Administrative+E28 Code. Much of the required documentation is redundant and is required by other agencies (eg health life safety reports, copy of our teacher evaluation plans, copy of our approved calendar (the ROE already approves this every year!!!). Something needs to occur</p> | 5/17/05 | <p>As you are aware, a school district's recognition is based upon its compliance with Illinois laws and regulations. The purpose of the periodic recognition visits by the district's Regional Office of Education is to ensure that the actions attested to by school districts and individual school buildings are in fact taking place (see 23 Ill. Adm. Code 1.20 at http://www.isbe.net/rules/archive/default.htm). Fortunately, nearly all school districts and school buildings accurately report data and conditions in the schools; however, the State Board of Education has found instances where this is not the case. The on-site compliance visits are another check to make sure that schools and school districts are meeting all requirements.</p> <p>For example, an area of particular concern is compliance with the health-life safety codes. While school buildings in the state are inspected and certified every ten years by an architect, this decennial inspection does not detail whether safety precautions and other procedures are adequately followed. Reviewing these conditions on-site through the recognition visit assures parents served by the school district that their children are being educated by qualified teachers, that buildings meet minimum code requirements for fire safety and health standards, and that the curriculum offered to students meets the minimum requirements.</p> |

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|----------|-------|---|----------|---|
| | | that eliminates all this unnecessary paperwork and administrative time and effort to comply with all of these regulations. A clearinghouse whereby everything is stored electronically would eliminate the need for these exhaustive visits. | | |
| 10/22/05 | 037 | My name is [identifying information deleted], I am a student at [identifying information deleted] University, [identifying information deleted]. My Major is Spanish Education, my question is the following: Where can I find a book that will prepare us for the Basic Skill test on November 6, 2004? . Since, my native language is not english I would like to do more excercises in all the areas that are required to pass this test. The University does not have any other source where we can get more information about this test. Beside the "study guide" provided, in my opinion is not enough, comparing to the exigency of the real test. I would really appreciate if you could provide me any additional information in regards of this matter. Thank you for your time and consideration | 5/10/05 | <p>If you are still in need of the study guides, we suggest that you contact Dr. Dianne Ashby, dean of the College of Education at Illinois State University, where you indicated you are enrolled. Dean Ashby can share with you various options available to prepare for the test, such as tutoring and test-taking strategies. Dean Ashby can be contacted at 309.438.5882; by email at deashby@ilstu.edu; or in Room 506, DeGarmo Hall.</p> <p>Follow-up: As a follow-up to your lessredtape submission, we wanted to give you the website for the Illinois Certification Testing System study guides (see http://www.icts.nesinc.com/IL_SG_opener.asp). You may also locate the study guides, along with the test framework and suggestions and strategies for test-taking, on the State Board of Education's website at http://www.isbe.net/certification/html/testing.htm. While I realize that you mention in your inquiry that the "study guides" were not very useful to you, I was not sure which study guides you were using.</p> |
| 10/25/04 | 046 | The annual Special Education Report should be limited to: (Gross amounts only) 1. Salaries - internal 2. Benefits - internal 3. Expenses - program operation needs (supplies, cap outlay, etc.) 4. Purchased Svs - Cooperative fees, Legal fees, Testing services, etc. 5. Number of students with IEP's 6. Number of students with 504 plans 7. Number of students with FLEX plans Have the form automatically calculate the per-student costs to district. The entire document should be no more than 1/2 of one page, 12 pt - double spaced. | 5/23/05 | We are reviewing your suggestions and will be considering them in light of the next reporting period. |
| 10/25/05 | 053 | Less red tape is wonderful as long as it doesn't mean the elimination of support for school districts. The Regional Office of Education has long supported our district with necessary professional development for teachers and administrators. | 5/19/05 | <p>While the agency's lessredtape initiative is to reduce burdens on school districts and streamline procedures, the State Board of Education does not anticipate that current services and technical assistance of the Board and other intermediate service providers will be reduced or eliminated as a result of implementing the suggestions received.</p> <p>Your need to communicate this caution is understandable, and the State Board will strive to keep this criterion in mind as it evaluates lessredtape submissions.</p> |
| 10/25/05 | 054-3 | A number of school districts conduct their own survey of salaries. Secondly, a number of regional superintendents conduct their own surveys. Can the immigrant education program count (ISBE 92-05) and the immunization survey be included on the fall housing report via IWAS? | 5/10/05 | <p>According to the division administrators in Data Analysis and Progress Reporting and in English Language Learning, it would not be feasible to combine the immigrant and immunization reports with the fall housing report due to the differences in reporting deadlines.</p> <p>Information for the fall housing report is collected on the last school day in September. Section 27-8.1, however, requires school districts to report immunization data to the State Board of Education by November 15. The State Board is not authorized to set an earlier deadline than the one mandated in law.</p> <p>As for the immigrant education program count, that data are due to the federal government in April.</p> |

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|----------|-----|---|----------|---|
| | | | | The State Board sets a deadline for the collection of this data in November -- rather than earlier in the school year -- in order to have the highest number of limited English proficient students reported. Federal funding is tied to enrollment, and it would not be in school districts' best interest to require reporting of data earlier in the school year. |
| 10/26/05 | 058 | I have many concerns about NCLB. I believe these same concerns are shared by most of my colleagues. Below are some of the most significant concerns. 1. IEP and ELL students should not be treated as subgroups. By virtue of their special education needs and language needs, they cannot be judged by the same performance standards as other students. 2. 100% of all students meet expectations by 2013 is unrealistic. It is important to create a goal that is realistic and attainable. There will be greater support if the expectations can realistically be met. 3. When determining AYP, include only the scores of students who have been in the school for one year or longer. It is unrealistic to evaluate a school on students it didn't teach. 4. Look at other options for assessment based on individual student growth. An accurate measure of quality instruction would reflect the gains made by each child from one year to the next. It is the job of the educator to move a child along a continuum no matter where the child begins. 5. Remove the 1% limit on special education students who are allowed to take the alternative assessment. Along with that, revise the process used on the alternative assessment. Currently, the alternative assessment is evaluating the TEACHER - not the STUDENT. I know that some of these concerns fall entirely with the federal government. But as a state, we have chosen options that make it more difficult for our children and our districts to be successful. Can we bring back the Illinois NCLB Task Force to look at the NCLB expectations in our state? Can't we change some of the guidelines to be less restrictive, yet meet the federal requirements? Other states have asked for modifications and changes to NCLB and have received them. Can't Illinois do the same? I appreciate your time and effort in looking into our concerns. | 5/9/05 | I will deal with each of your concerns as they were presented in your submission. 1. Subgroups. The clear intent of NCLB is to ascertain the progress <u>all</u> students are making toward meeting the academic goals set by the state (i.e., Illinois Learning Standards). Therefore, students who have Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) or those who are limited English proficient are expected to meet the goals. As such, information about their progress is considered as one of many subgroups to ascertain that all students are making. The State Board of Education is not at liberty to eliminate these subgroups from the process of measuring annual yearly progress (AYP). 2. Attainment of Goals. You state that you believe it is unrealistic to expect that 100 percent of Illinois students will meet the goals of the Illinois Learning Standards by 2014, as is required under NCLB. This has been a very difficult issue for all school people and communities, but that is the current language of the law. 3. AYP Determination. You believe that students should be in a school for at least a year in order for their progress to be included in the determination of the school's AYP. Students must be enrolled for a full academic year before they are counted. We currently require that students must be enrolled on or before September 30th of a given school year before their test scores from the test administration in the following spring are included for AYP. 4. Assessments. You ask that options other than assessments be used to ascertain student progress. Under NCLB, the State Board of Education must implement a uniform system of accountability, which is required to use state testing as the way academic performance is measured. While the State Board can change some aspects of the testing program, it cannot implement "value-added" or "growth" models at this time. The State Board of Education will be looking into these models to see how they might be able to be used in the future. 5. Special Education Students. You ask that the 1 percent limit on special education students be removed. U.S. Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings announced that under certain conditions, USDOE will allow an exception to that requirement for students who are not severely cognitively disabled but have been unable to reach proficiency because of disabilities such as moderate mental retardation or severe emotional disabilities. Under the new plan, schools will be permitted to use test scores from alternate tests for an additional 2% of students in order to cover students in the second category. As of this date there are no further descriptions of this additional flexibility. The State Board is awaiting further guidance here in order to put this new flexibility into play for Illinois. It is unlikely that USDOE will relax requirements for certain aspects of NCLB, such as annual testing to determine student achievement, reporting results by student subgroups and highly qualified teachers. Other proposed changes are described in a new report, <i>Raising Achievement: A New Path for No Child Left Behind</i> , which can be reviewed at http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/raising/new-path-long.html . Additionally, the State Board of Education has submitted to USDOE proposed changes to its accountability workbook. Interim State Superintendent Randy J. Dunn has been using his weekly messages to summarize the proposal. You can access the weekly messages at http://www.isbe.net/board/archivemessages/archivemessage.htm . You should also check the NCLB website (http://www.ed.gov/nclb/landing.jhtml?src=pb) for further updates. |
| 10/27/04 | 061 | require receptionists to ask the callers to identify themselves and then when they transfer the call, tell the person they transfer to who it is – that way when you get a call, | 6/1/05 | You asked that staff who answer telephones be required to ask the name of the caller before transferring the call and then to inform the person to whom the call is being transferred who is on the line. This procedure has been agency practice in the past, and we will certainly address this issue both with training and a printed reference guide. This can be implemented quickly, and I expect the issue |

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|----------|-----|--|----------|--|
| | | you know it's Bob Jones from XYZ school district. It will help those of us receiving the call so we are mentally prepared and I think it makes us look more professional to the caller. | | will be corrected in the near future. |
| 10/28/04 | 068 | <p>One of the most difficult items for school officials to deal with are late changes to required collections of information. This is now the case with EDWIN the state data collection system for special education. EDWIN collects our Dec. 1 child count data and being a responsible Special Education Cooperative we have already sent out and inserviced staff on what we assumed were this years requirements. We give our staff lead time since the final data is only a month away and only 25 work days out. The problem is that today October 27th a message comes from the Harrisburg project of a new required field with up to 6 entries. This new field is Anticipated Services Needed with services for students 14-21 and choices of services A-S. None of this data has been collected in previous IEP meetings so how can this possibly be accurate. Are we suppose to just ask a teacher to pick or take there best guess? What about parent or team input? Also you can guess the staff frustration. We trained people, emphasize the existing rules and then lay one more issue on them without training. Also the input of a new field on a short timeline adds to our frustration with paperwork. This will require in our Cooperative about 1200 reentries into the system done by one person. What ever happened to planning, doing things on a school time frame, inservicing all changes at the beginning of a school year. I service 6 school districts and compliance is a difficult task which we take seriously and we strive for accurate date. This late change makes us look unknowledgeable, ill prepared, mocked for more rules by those in our field and flies in the face of the team process. I believe the obligation for Dec.1 child count submission should be immediately rescinded and all future changes should have more planning and forethought to a school calendar so we can professionally address change. Thank you for your immediate attention.</p> | 5/23/05 | <p>In your submission you expressed concerns about a new field that has been added to that system and the difficulties that you anticipate in collecting the requested data. The State Board of Education implemented this change at the request of the field in order to reduce the burdens associated with a separate data collection process that has now been eliminated. That report, called "Transition Data Collection Form and Instructions", most likely was being completed by staff other than special education directors. The recommendation to integrate this data collection effort into the Harrisburg system was also included in a study completed in December 2003.</p> <p>As you know, the collection of this data through the Harrisburg system is being piloted during the current school year (2004-05). It will be a required data element for the 2005-06 school year. We believe that you will find the inclusion of this data into the Harrisburg system will make the method of collection at the local level easier and more efficient.</p> |
| 10/28/04 | 070 | On-line Forms I have found the ISBE | 5/23/05 | The State Board of Education does have the ability to create PDF forms that can be completed using a |

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|----------|-----|--|----------|---|
| | | <p>website to have all of the forms that are needed to file the large quantity of paperwork that needs to be done in order to run a school. Many times when I download a form, I find that it is password protected or in pdf format. Password protection and/or pdf format renders the form useless for me to complete on my computer and I must either write the data into the document or have it typed. This my second year in the Superintendency so I did not live in the time when all forms had to be done this way so I know that I am a bit spoiled. I do appreciate IWAS and its ability to collect and process data online, but it is not yet able to do all things. It seems that it would be simple to post non-password protected forms on-line for our use and to post MS Word or Excel documents instead pdf documents when forms are involved.</p> | | <p>computer. Many forms already posted on the agency's website have such capability. Typically, these forms are developed by the State Board's Division of Data Systems when it is requested to do so by program administrators. Please note that the State Board of Education generally avoids the use of MS Word for creating forms and reporting documents since they are easier to manipulate and change from the original text.</p> <p>It is the intent of the State Board to ultimately have all major data collection forms available through IWAS. While PDF forms are an improvement from paper, they do cause problems for agency staff as well as our customers.</p> <p>If you have any forms, in particular, with which you are having difficulty, then please let us know.</p> |
| 10/28/04 | 074 | <p>I saw a draft of the assurance form 73-98 to be completed by teachers in the last year of their certificate's validity. I was chagrined to see reference to "Corey H." (re: the least restrictive environment CPDU requirement) on the form. I respectfully ask you to change that reference to a specific person to something a little more formal such as "Judicial requirements..." or "Special education requirements..." I don't feel that his name (or any name) should be perpetuated or honored on an ISBE form.</p> | 5/16/05 | <p>We recognize your concerns and do not mean by this reference to honor, disparage or in any way comment upon the named plaintiff in that case. The fact of the matter, however, is that the case is commonly, both inside and outside of ISBE, referred to as "Corey H." (as lawsuits are generally referred to in shorthand by the name of the first named plaintiff entity), and the reference in Assurance Form 73-98 allows for a level of specificity that would be lost through a mere reference to judicial requirements.</p> |
| 10/29/04 | 076 | <p>If one looks at the FACTS information and directions book developed by ISBE for 2004-2005, it indicates that the Anticipated Services Coding is optional. As you can see, the intent somehow changed so that it will soon no longer be optional at some point in the future - what that point is we do not know. The Harrisburg group which manages our childcount is developing a new form for IEPs called IEP Point.... they have been doing this development for a LONG time. It may not be ready in time for us to add these new field to the FACTS information. Therefore, each entity that submits data across the state to Harrisburg will need to develop their own system and form(s) for reporting this information. That means we have design costs, time, and additional paperwork being replicated across the state all the while that Harrisburg is</p> | 5/23/05 | <p>While I sent a response to your inquiry last fall, I just want to let you know that the state's electronic IEP will be available in September 2005. The Anticipated Services FACTS transmissions have been an optional field for the current school year (2004-05), but they will be required beginning in school year 2005-06. Failure to complete the field will generate a fatal error and prevent the data from being transmitted.</p> |

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|----------|-----|---|----------|---|
| | | <p>STILL working on the exact same forms. In fact, the expectation appears to be that all of us reporting districts and cooperatives will probably need to have our forms changes completed while Harrisburg is STILL working on the forms. It would make sense to me to have Harrisburg develop templates for these forms as quickly as possible that can be used across the state. In that case, submitting districts and Cooperatives can choose to use the model forms or not. In our case, we would choose to save the development time and cost and use the model form. Replication of efforts means the need for more staff in a manner that in no way improves services for children with disabilities - our true reason for being here. This replication of the same clerical activity across the state when it can be done by one entity and disseminated to all is the exact type of waste of time that drives me crazy in the field. Dr. Koch and Mr. Gunnell are doing a yeoman's task in ISBE's special education department, but the direction needs to be given that imposing a new paperwork and recording effort without technical support is not in keeping with (and is in fact directly against) the mandate to streamline efforts at the Illinois State Board of Education.</p> | | |
| 10/31/04 | 083 | <p>Presently (as of January 1, 2004), the ISBE lunch program requires ROEs to operate lunch programs at their alternative and safe school sites as school districts. This regulation requires an extreme amount of paper work from ROE staff members and additional time that cannot be afforded by the ROEs. Past practices (prior to 2004) have been for the Alternative Ed and Safe school sites to order the school lunches from the neighboring school and pay the school. The Alternative Ed and Safe School sites may have as many as 4 to 20 students, however, the present system requires the same amount of reporting and regulations as the school districts. What this has done is force the ROEs to assign staff to submit reports directly to ISBE and use extra time on meeting the ISBE requirements. As a result, less time is spent on supervising and servicing these "hard to serve" young adults. In the end, the students receive the effect of</p> | 5/16/05 | <p>You expressed concern about the regional office of education (ROE), which is administering the RSSP, serving as the operator of the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) rather than providing the program through an intergovernmental agreement with a local school district. Unfortunately, federal regulations require that the ROE, once it determines that it will participate in the NSLP, serve as the program administrator. Under Part 210.2 of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) child nutrition program regulations, a "school food authority means the governing body which is responsible for the administration of one or more schools; and has the legal authority to operate the Program therein or be otherwise approved by the [Food & Nutrition Service] to operate the Program". (See http://www.fns.usda.gov/cnd/Governance/regulations.htm.)</p> <p>Under these regulations, the School Food Authority (SFA) is given specific requirements as a participant in the NSLP. These requirements cannot be subcontracted to another SFA or entity; however, the SFA can enter into a contract or school-to-school agreement to have meals provided. However, the ROE would still be responsible for administering the program and ensuring compliance with USDA regulations.</p> <p>If the ROE would prefer to forego compliance with the USDA regulations and, hence, federal and state reimbursement, it could pay a school district directly for meals that the district provides; however, that entity would not be eligible to claim these meals for reimbursement since they do not serve as the governing body for the RSSP that the ROE administers.</p> |

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|---------|-----|--|----------|--|
| 11/3/05 | 100 | <p>this "red tape" decision.</p> <p>Summer Bridges 2004 (FY2005) Summary Report at the end of the summer session as required. It had no information requested on it about Students Free/Reduced (TANF) at that time. All was fine. However, we got an e-mail this week wanting the number of students who attended summer school by grade level who were Free/Reduced. The new form, which we found on your web site has this new line on it, but it wasn't there this summer when the principal completed his end of the year report for the State. Someone now wants that information. Since students were not chosen for the program because of their economic status, nor were they fed a breakfast or a lunch, why is this information necessary? And if the information was needed, why wasn't it told to us prior to summer school so that schools could provide that information at the time of registration? It will take someone here hours to look up all 220 students, coming from 7 different schools, to see if they were free/reduced last year.</p> | 5/16/05 | <p>I have spoken with staff in the divisions of Federal Programs, Budgets, and Funding and Disbursements. Summer Bridges is included in the Extended Learning (Bridges) initiative, a state-funded (General Revenue Fund [GRF]) program. Extended Learning is a TANF-claimable program, so it requires that school districts keep certain records for audit purposes. The State Board of Education helps the state receive the TANF reimbursement from the federal government (the Department of Human Services [DHS] is the submitting entity).</p> <p>The Free and Reduced Lunch Count is reported each quarter on the Extended Learning (Bridges) expenditure reports, and it is needed in order to net out students in those programs before the State Board calculates and transmits the per student expense to DHS for TANF reporting purposes. The expenditures are transmitted year round because there are some projects that do operate all year. This information has been collected for the last three years, and it is likely that it will continue to be collected in future funding cycles.</p> |
| 11/5/04 | 107 | <p>1. Work with the federal government to increase the flexibility of using federal I.D.E.A. funding. The current restrictions on using federal for new program growth severely restricts Illinois schools from meeting local needs with available federal I.D.E.A. funding. The federal supplanting rule is no longer necessary since new special education program development has slowed from its hectic pace of the late 60's and 70's. By not being able to use these funds to address major and priority district needs in current programming, requires an over reliance on State and local funds to pay the costs of expensive special education programs. 2. Allow the use of I.D.E.A. federal funding to offset the costs of special education directors statewide. The I.S.B.E. currently disallows the funding of Illinois special education directors with federal I.D.E.A. funds. Having discussed this issue with colleagues from other states, I have discovered that this practice is not occurring in some other states. There is no reason that this federal law should not be applied consistently across all states. Illinois should not be overly restrictive and more restrictive</p> | 5/23/05 | <p>Funding. Under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEIA), a local education agency (LEA) may use up to 50 percent of its funding as new funds, provided that the LEA has met its maintenance of effort obligations. LEAs may treat as local funds up to 50 percent of the amount of funds it receives under Part B of IDEIA that exceeds the amount it received for the previous fiscal year. To learn more about IDEIA, see please see http://www.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/idea2004.html.</p> <p>Director of Special Education Salary. The State Board of Education has long held the position that grant funds may not be used to supplant any state or local funds; this prohibition would include using federal funds to supplant the state and/or local funds used to pay the salary of the special education director.</p> |

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|------|---|--|----------|-------------------------------------|
| | | <p>the Cert Board turn over this authority to designees (State Board staff) as well so that these registrations can be processed more efficiently. Activities for Initial Certificate Holders The Cert Board also approves the Induction and Mentoring Programs for Initial certificate holders and the two coursework options for Initial certificate holders and Standard certificate holders. Although the I&M approval, once achieved, is "backdated" so that currently participating teachers may use the activity to meet requirements, this approval also delays the process and, as far as I can see, does not add value. From what I've observed, there has rarely been discussion on any of the submittals, just an approval of the list. 2. LPDCs Thousands of dollars and hours and hours of time for State Board and district staff (including our \$65-an-hour tech consultant) are spent including Local Professional Development Committees (LPDCs) in the renewal and moving from Initial to Standard processes. It is extremely confusing for teachers, who are treated differently depending on what district they are employed in (if in a district with an LPDC, their paperwork must submit paperwork to the LPDC for its recommendation rather than the regional superintendent directly as others do). LPDCs are reviewing a list of activities and making a recommendation and then the paperwork is sent to the regional superintendent for a review and recommendation—not much value for the dollar in repeating that activity. Our registration systems are compromised trying to accommodate the LPDCs. LPDCs could exist as consultants only and LPDC functions could be a local issue. If the districts want their teachers to submit summary forms to the teachers, let them track it. LPDCs can return to a role more "helpful" than "regulatory." Their current authority, reviewing a summary at the end of the process, may not necessarily help anyone, and it certainly hinders the process. Teachers with LPDCs who submit paperwork directly to the regional office cannot have their paperwork processed until they go back to the LPDC for a recommendation. The summary form may</p> | | |

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|------|---|---|----------|-------------------------------------|
| | | <p>be as simple as checking a box “completed advanced degree” with the higher ed institution and date of issue indicated. Getting an LPDC recommendation isn’t worth the staff time it takes to notify the teachers that they have to go back to the LPDC. There’s time spent writing the notification letter to the teachers, getting the regional superintendent’s signature, copying and storing the notification, mailing the notification (certified mail no doubt), etc. This can result in major expenditures. Teachers who submit directly to the regional office can submit a complete packet of all materials. Otherwise, LPDCs are sending in summary/assurance forms, sometimes on paper, sometimes electronically. Matching all the paperwork at the regional office when it comes in separately is a nightmare. Since we are the regional office for Chicago, we’ve learned this first-hand. 3. The certification process may be simpler if we issued ONE Illinois certificate that lists all the certificate holders’ areas of certification. I believe the argument has been that some teachers didn’t want to be assigned to certain areas they were certified in so they could “hold” that certificate to “hide” that information. Since OTIS (Online Teacher Information System) allows administrators to view the teachers’ certification files, although there are limitations, the administrators can see the teachers’ areas of certification anyway. 4. Two-tiered teaching certificates Although the following idea will undoubtedly be met with opposition, the lines between the Initial and Standard level of certification has blurred to the point to where it’s almost invisible and somewhat worthless. Initial certificate holders have to 1) earn four years of teaching experience and 2) complete a professional development option to be eligible for Standard certificates. Standard certificate holders teaching in public schools complete a professional development option. The four years of teaching experience means that the Initial certificate holder has to be a warm body in a school. The person could be the worst teacher to ever walk the halls of the four different districts the teacher would probably teach at, but that isn’t relevant to the process. People treated</p> | | |

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|------|---|--|----------|-------------------------------------|
| | | <p>differently = more dollars and time. If teaching for four years does not add value, what is the point? If administrators who accept responsibility for their positions would evaluate teachers appropriately and remediate any problems or fire a teacher who doesn't respond to remediation, wouldn't that be the value we are looking for? The activities that are allowable to meet requirements are quite similar. Standard certificate holders can't use the Induction and Mentoring programs (although they SHOULD be able to since some may have never taught but held a certificate for several years) or the 12-semester hour certificate from an institution of higher education or the exam (currently not available) to meet requirements. Initial certificate holders can't use all the Continuing Professional Development Units options Standard certificate holders can (for example, an Initial certificate holder can earn credit for teaching a college-credit course but can't take a course and learn something new and earn CPDU credit). Eliminating the two-tiered system would allow all teachers to be issued the same certificate and complete the same professional development options. Every time a group is treated differently, whether teachers or children, it costs money. Lots of money</p> <p>#127 Providers of continuing education have to be approved by the State Board to offer credit that will apply towards certificate renewal or moving from Initial to Standard certification. The rules require that providers of conferences treat each session as an individual event. Recently, I presented at a conference hosted by an ROE in Southern Illinois. Following one of our suggestions for handling the documentation, the teachers first had to sign in. After the presentation, following the ROE's instructions for presenters, I distributed labels printed with the title of the session to each of the 70-some-odd teachers in attendance. I was swarmed with people who had questions in addition to needing the labels. As a result, teachers were late for the next session and many didn't get a chance to ask questions. Between the sign-in and the labels, approximately 10 to 15 minutes of the</p> | | |

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|----------|-----|---|----------|---|
| | | <p>session was eaten up. In addition, the regional office had requested teachers to "register" for sessions so that the number of labels required could be estimated. In my first of two sessions, I had more people than had registered, and in the second, less. I ran out of labels for the first session and wasted a page of labels for the second. Micromanaging the documentation wastes time and materials. The truth of the matter is that if teachers wanted to "cheat," all they need do is download the evidence of completion from our website, choose an approved provider from the website list, and make their own evidence of completion. Simple as that. recommend that approved providers be able to offer teachers evidence of completion forms that either indicate the timeframe of the entire conference or let the teachers write in the number of sessions they attended. Teachers should be treated as professionals, and providers should expend their time and effort in providing quality education, not jumping through paperwork hoops.</p> | | |
| 11/15/04 | 120 | <p>This is not my personal idea since I do not have great expertise in the matter of teacher certification. When I meet school's staff at conferences, workshops, etc I hear the same complaint over and over regarding the frequent changes in teacher certification and all the requirements that ISBE keeps on adding" which according to some, makes them think twice weather they should follow on their pursuit of a teacher's certificate. I am passing along what I hear in the field. Could SDs be made accountable for providing sound and meaningful professional growth/development, something beyond "faculty day" or routine workshops?. Couldn't colleges and universities provide courses for teachers that need them at the schools where teachers work? A great number of teachers are single mothers or fathers and beyond their long working hours, (so much preparation, paper work, etc) they have to steel evenings, Saturdays, to attend courses for their certification renewal thus taking time away from their families, which is so important in order that heir children succeed in school themselves, In addition they still have to go through the certification renewal</p> | 5/24/05 | <p>The points you have raised have been brought to our attention by others in the field as well, but many aspects of these requirements are outside ISBE's direct control. All the major requirements for certificate renewal are established in statute (see Section 21-14 of the School Code). These include the quantity of activities teachers must complete, the purposes to which the activities must be attributable, and the types of activities that may be used for this purpose. One difficulty with allowing these requirements to be established and controlled at the district level instead is that the teaching certificate is a State-issued license, meaning that the requirements for renewal must be uniform. As the staff in the Certification Division continually review what can be done to improve and streamline our processes, you can be sure they will be considering what changes to the certificate renewal system can be accomplished outside the legislative process and also identifying suggestions for legislative changes the agency might want to pursue.</p> |

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|----------|------------|---|----------|--|
| 11/19/05 | 135 136 | <p>process with ISBE.</p> <p>#135 The program cost accounting for 14-7.03a (Special Education Pupil Reimbursement) is not uniform in regard to center of cost. Each school district is required to complete a cost sheet to account for the per pupil cost to be reimbursed in part by the state. In doing so the district is allowed to chose the cost center to account for. It may be by program, by building, by classroom, by teacher, district wide etc. The method chosen involve many accounting records and many accounting choices which are not implemented uniformly among districts. Not only does this make the cost accounting unusually complex it results in manipulations and inequitable distribution of these categorical funds. Suggested remedy: All school districts use the same "cost center" for accounting. I would suggest program cost since program cost accounting should have been implemented in all districts already. A better solution might be to eliminate all "per pupil" reimbursements by the state altogether.</p> <p>#136 Special education transportation and other cooperatives and joint agreements should be required to prove to the state and their member districts that they are actually providing economies of scale. Perhaps in comparison to a state average cost or standard. For many of these coops the tail is wagging the dog. In recent times savvy districts have opted out of these expensive coops, but the accounting methods employed obscures the costs of these operations to district administrators. One major problem with coops is cash flow funding. Many employ elaborate pre-billing procedures to facilitate cash flow. This often requires post billings in the next fiscal year which interferes with the accuracy of claims filed with the state by member districts. Another problem is that claims are filed by the school districts and by the coops. It should be done by one or the other consistently state wide. Besides complicating state reimbursements it obscures the cost of special ed reported to the public on financial reports in the case that one district (not a member to a coop) is reporting total special ed costs, and another</p> | 5/19/05 | <p>Special Education Per Capita Tuition Cost. The determination of Special Education Per Capita Tuition Cost is governed by State Board of Education rules, 23 Ill. Adm. Code 130 (see http://www.isbe.net/rules/archive/default.htm). The rules provide the means for calculating special education costs that districts or special education joint agreements incur each year. In turn these costs are used either to bill another district for the costs associated with serving an out-of-resident special-needs student or to the state for pupil reimbursement.</p> <p>The rules allow for a district or joint agreement to define cost centers as broadly as "all special education" or as narrowly as "teacher's classroom". The suggestion for uniformity, specifically to define special education costs by a disability type, has been discussed and will most likely be a recommendation in the upcoming review of the Part 130 rules. The elimination of all per-pupil reimbursement is discussed in some fashion during each legislative session. Proposals such as establishing a block grant program, eliminating special education categoricals in favor of increasing the General State Aid foundation level, and/or streamlining current funding formulas in current special education line items have been discussed. In most instances, sweeping changes such as these gain little momentum if the data analysis indicates that some districts lose money under the proposed procedures.</p> <p>Economies of Scale: Districts and cooperatives. The formation of special education joint agreements are statutorily allowed per 105 ILCS 5/10-22.31 (see http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/ilcs/ilcs4.asp?DocName=010500050HArt%2E+10&ActID=1005&ChapAct=105%26nbsp%3BILCS%26nbsp%3B5%2F&ChapterID=17&ChapterName=SCHOOLS&SectionID=48899&SeqStart=51000&SeqEnd=71800&ActName=School+Code%2E).</p> <p>Many smaller school districts cannot provide a full range of service delivery to special-needs students with unique needs so being a member of a special education cooperative is their only option. Organizational structure and procedures, such as billing, should be discussed by the cooperative membership and outlined clearly in the Articles of Agreement. Further, some state special education programs, such as Special Education Personnel, must allow the flexibility for a special education cooperative to claim reimbursement directly from the state because they hire the staff. Recently, P.A. 93-1022 enacted in August 2004, changed the way Special Education Extraordinary funding was distributed and mandated that these particular funds can only be directed to school districts (see http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/publicacts/fulltext.asp?name=093-1022&GA=093).</p> |

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|----------|-----|---|----------|--|
| 11/22/04 | 153 | <p>is reporting their cost to the coop net of state reimbursements.</p> <p>In Illinois we are currently going beyond what is required in one area of Special Education. Federal Law (IDEA) indicates that children may be identified as having a developmental delay through age nine. In Illinois the rules and regulations indicate this can only occur with students through age five. This creates a bureaucratic problem for schools in Illinois because they are required to prematurely identify a specific disability in a very young child or determine that a student may not be eligible for urgently needed special services. I feel this artificial state determination is not beneficial for students or schools and creates unnecessary procedures. We could serve children with special needs in Illinois through age nine without having to go through a cumbersome evaluation process as currently mandated by ISBE and still meet the needs of these students. This change could allow schools to continue to intervene at an early age before children have established a pattern of failure without the additional "red tape".</p> | 5/23/05 | <p>The Division of Special Education Services agrees with the recommendation. Additionally, the State Board recommended this rule change last year. Due to the Reauthorization of IDEA on December 3, 2004, however, progress on amending the state rules has been delayed. The State Board will be addressing this requirement as it undertakes a review of rules governing Special Education (23 Ill. Adm. Code 226; see http://www.isbe.net/rules/archive/default.htm).</p> <p>The State Board appreciates your bringing this concern to its attention. We will be keeping you informed of our progress.</p> |
| 11/24/04 | 156 | <p>I work in a school district in [identifying information deleted]. There is [identifying information deleted] High school, [identifying information deleted] and [identifying information deleted] schools, [identifying information deleted] School, [identifying information deleted] School, [identifying information deleted] School, all in a two mile radius. Each one is its own district. [identifying information deleted] and [identifying information deleted] each are only 1 small elementary school. Each school has a Superintendent costing the "district" anywhere from \$100,000 - \$200,000 a year. If combined into one district there would be a savings of over 1/2 million dollars. Also each school has a bookkeeper that has to handle every job. They are responsible for Payroll, paying bills, receipts, budgets, tax levies, human resources, grants etc. etc. By combining the schools into one district with one district office you could combine the work force letting each person handle one area and be</p> | 5/19/05 | <p>The high school district and its feeder elementary districts could be consolidated into a unit district under the provisions of Article 11A of the School Code (see http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/ilcs/ilcs4.asp?DocName=010500050HArt%2E+11A&ActID=1005&ChapterID=105%26nbsp%3BILCS%26nbsp%3B5%2F&ChapterID=17&ChapterName=SCHOOLS&SectionID=49018&SeqStart=71800&SeqEnd=73600&ActName=School+Code%2E).</p> <p>As per Article 11A, any contiguous and compact territory can be organized into a community unit school district if the territory has \$12,000,000 in equalized assessed valuation (EAV) and between 4,000 and 500,000 in population.</p> <p>The steps for consolidation would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission of a consolidation petition to the regional office of education (ROE) where the largest percentage of EAV is located (based on the districts listed in your inquiry, this would be Cook County); • Local hearing by ROE; • State Superintendent approval; and • Referendum approval (under Article 11A, the proposition to form a unit district would pass if it is approved by a majority of the voters voting in the election in <i>each</i> affected district). <p>The petition may be filed by the school boards of each district involved or by voter signature. If filed by voter signature, then the petition must have a total of 200 total signatures, with signatures from the lesser of 50 voters or 10% of the total voters from <i>each</i> district.</p> <p>Since the School Code allows the petition to be filed by voter signature, the citizens of each district could file the petition for consolidation even if the school boards (or some of the school boards) are not in favor of the proposition. But the petitioners would need to convince a majority in each district to vote in favor of the question. If one district defeats the proposition, then the entire proposition fails.</p> <p>Many times, there are administrative savings due to a consolidation; for instance, multiple superintendent positions are replaced by one superintendent position for the newly created district. These savings, however, may be offset by the creation of a larger district that would be in need of</p> |

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|--|----------------|--|
| | | <p>more specialized and have better quality work. The Superintendent can be a very expensive fluff job that is draining our taxpayers money that should be spent on the students. We have aides that do so much work and truly care about the children that are making around \$9.00 an hour. One aide has been here for over 15 years and is making \$16,000.00 a year. Yet the loyalty and amount of work these people do amaze me.</p> | | <p>additional personnel, such as assistant superintendents and/or business managers. Those new positions could be ones that were not necessary in the smaller, original districts. In other instances, the savings may be diluted when other school-based administrative staff must be hired. An example would be when a superintendent of a single-school elementary district also serves as the principal of the school. After the consolidation, if all the elementary schools remain open, then each school would need a principal. If the schools were located within a small radius, the new school board may decide that some could be closed. On the other hand, the capacity at each building could be so high that closing a facility or facilities is not feasible. It is only after the petitioners and/or the new school board develop facility and staffing plans for the newly formed district that an accurate comparison can be made between the actual costs of operation for the new district and the total costs for the districts as originally configured.</p> |
| <p>11/24/04 1/14/05</p> | <p>159 234</p> | <p>#159 It seems that there is excessive oversight within the state bureaucracy. The State Board requires us to file reports and send in information that should and often is overseen by the ROEs. For example, the policy on the Children's Mental Health Act of 2003 was required to be passed by every local Board. Why does the State Board have someone in charge to see that a copy is on file with them and every local district has sent a copy to them? Doesn't the ROEs oversee policies when they conduct their 3 year visitations?</p> <p>#234 This Fall a bill was passed requiring that a district not only have a policy on Children's Mental Health but that it be filed with the State Board of Education. The requirement that a required policy be filed by the State Board is a new and ominous development. As you are well aware, it is not necessary for nine hundred districts to be making extra copies and mailing them off to sit in a dusty bin somewhere in the State Board Office to ensure compliance. This has certainly not been the case for the hundreds of policies required in the past. The Regional Office of Education can check on compliance during its three year inspection as it does with all of the other required policies. The requirement that this policy be treated differently than other policies is ridiculous and a colossal waste of local district time, money, and energy as it is a waste for the ISBE. I am very concerned that it is going to start a wasteful trend. Please nip it in the bud!</p> | <p>5/23/05</p> | <p>The requirement that school districts adopt mental health policies was put on place by P.A. 93-495 (see http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/publicacts/fulltext.asp?name=093-0495&GA=093). The law specifically required that school districts submit their policies to the State Board of Education by August 31, 2004. Since the law required submission of the policies, the State Board of Education could not by administrative action determine that an assurance statement or other proof that the policy had been adopted could be used instead. The School Code requires the adoption of numerous other policies, but most of these are not submitted to the State Board of Education. A district "assures" the state that these policies have been adopted when it completes its annual summary report for recognition. In addition, each district must have copies of its policies available for inspection at the time its regional superintendent of schools conducts a school evaluation as part of the compliance visit. The State Board of Education appreciates your frustrations about having to submit adopted policies to the agency and will provide a close review of any future proposal that contains a similar mandate.</p> |
| <p>11/24/05</p> | <p>163</p> | <p>The process for completing the special education personnel reimbursement forms is very time consuming and confusing. Why do districts have to submit reports during the year? Why not have one due date on the</p> | <p>5/19/05</p> | <p>The Special Education Personnel Claim for reimbursement is submitted once a year on or before August 15 (see 105 ILCS 5/14-12.01 at http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/ilcs/ilcs4.asp?DocName=010500050HArt%2E+14&ActID=1005&ChapAct=105%26nbsp%3BILCS%26nbsp%3B5%2F&ChapterID=17&ChapterName=SCHOOLS&SectionID=17314&SeqStart=95000&SeqEnd=99800&ActName=School+Code%2E).</p> |

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|----------|-------------------------|--|----------|---|
| | | <p>30th of June for the report that represents the entire school year? Secondly, superintendents must write a letter and additional justification for new teachers that have just graduated and their certificate is pending at ISBE to be processed. We had a teacher who held early childhood certification and their certificate was registered at both the regional office and ISBE. However, the teacher had to apply for a letter of approval in order to be approved on the personnel reimbursement form. Finding substitute teachers that have special education certification is close to impossible. Districts receive reimbursement for substitutes for home bound instruction with or without special education certification but not when they are substituting during the day for a special education teacher. Why is the process inconsistent? The process for special education personnel reimbursement needs to be streamlined and made simple.</p> | | <p>Based on the information that you supplied in your inquiry, staff in the State Board of Education's Division of Funding and Disbursements believe you are referring to the requirement to transmit throughout the year special education teacher approval files. For FY 2005, school districts and special education cooperatives are required to transmit information to the State Board four times; five optional transmissions also are accepted. The approval files are provided to the State Board of Education throughout year in order to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Verify that the district or cooperative is employing certified teachers, and 2. Ensure that the teacher approval files include all employees and match the information that is maintained by the Division of Certification. <p>Funding and Disbursements also indicates that it is consistent in the way in which reimbursement is provided for substitutes. Teachers who provide instruction to home-bound or hospitalized children must be certified. A substitute certification issued pursuant to Section 21-9 of the School Code is insufficient (see http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/ilcs/ilcs4.asp?DocName=010500050HArt%2E+21&ActID=1005&ChapAct=105%26nbsp%3BILCS%26nbsp%3B5%2F&ChapterID=17&ChapterName=SCHOOLS&SectionID=49265&SeqStart=122000&SeqEnd=126400&ActName=School+Code%2E).</p> <p>We are directing your statement regarding additional letters for new teachers to our Division of Certification; the Division of Funding and Disbursements does not require any additional documentation on our end. We will provide you with that response in the near future.</p> |
| 11/30/05 | 179-1 179-2 179-3 | <p>1) Please add the Reading Improvement Application and Report to the IWAS system. 2) Please add the supplemental state aid report to the IWAS system. 3) The Title IV portion of NCLB was nearly identical to the Supplemental Data for FY03/FY04 Federal Performance Report. Is there a way to merge these reports so that we aren't duplicating our work?</p> | 5/10/05 | <p>Reading Improvement Program. The application for this program will be added to the Electronic Grants Management System (eGMS) for the FY2006 funding cycle. Please look for the addition of the program near the end of this month or in early June.</p> <p>Supplemental General State Aid. The plan that is required to be completed in order to obtain this funding is expected to be on the IWAS system prior to the due date later this year.</p> <p>Title IV and Supplemental Data reports. The format used for these separate reporting efforts was inadvertently identical last year. Separate formats will be used this year, so that data being submitted will not be duplicated.</p> |
| 12/3/05 | 192 | <p>Funds used to be earmarked for professional development and our district utilized those funds to benefit not only the classroom teacher but also it improved the motivation level and hence the students and their performance. Since the block grant has wrapped the funds into one, our district has not allocated funds for professional development and has instead funneled it into salaries for reading aids, etc. I would like to see a certain amount of funds specifically designated to be used for professional development. The benefits from networking with colleagues and with business professionals outweigh the benefits from having a block grant. Help us get more professional development funding.</p> | 5/31/05 | <p>As you may be aware, school districts today have more funding available to meet professional development needs than ever before. Funding from Title I and Title II of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) are being used for staff development programs. Additionally, Title II, Part D of NCLB (Enhancing Education through Technology) requires that 25 percent of the budget be spent on professional development. (See http://www.ed.gov/nclb/landing.jhtml?src=pb for more information about NCLB; http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg34.html discusses the technology program.) However, you are correct that the Illinois General Assembly is no longer funding the Professional Development Block Grant program. The money for this program was rolled into the ADA School Safety and Educational Improvement Block Grant. In this grant, a district is allowed to choose where the money would do the most good for the district. Since you believe that your district is using discretionary funds that could be earmarked for professional development activities for other purposes, you might want to share your concerns with your district's board of education during its budget development process.</p> |
| 12/6/04 | 200 | <p>The ISRC data warehouse and its link with Just for the Kids website provides an invaluable tool for disaggregating data, especially for smaller districts. I noticed that</p> | 5/10/05 | <p>[Update to response sent on 5-4-05] You will be pleased to learn that this capability has been built into the system. I have copied below the instructions for accessing the SIP/DIP plans with data inserted. To access the SIP/DIP plans with data inserted, go to the Interactive Illinois Report Card: http://iirc.niu.edu</p> |

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|---------|-----|---|----------|---|
| | | <p>much of the data required in the School Improvement Plan is available in ISRC. Is there any way that each school could access an SIP form on IWAS with this student performance and demographic data loaded. It would free up our school leadership teams to analyze the data and create action plans rather than spending time manually transferring scores. Thanks for the opportunity to offer suggestions.</p> | | <p>Using the search options on the "Find Schools" tab on the top row of tabs on the homepage (or use the search options located on the bottom left of the homepage), locate the school or district of interest to you (contact Harvey Smith, Ph.D., at hsmith@niu.edu, if you need details).</p> <p>For School SIP: Step 1 Click on the school name of interest to you. Step 2 When you have opened the school information page (identified because the school name will be in the left top line of the information banner right below the tabs), click on the "AYP/School Improvement" tab; it is the second tab on the lower row of tabs at top of the page above the information banner. Step 3 A new row of tabs will open; now click on the fourth tab, "School Improvement". Step 4 Scroll down the page and click on the link that says: "School Improvement Template for [school name] with data filled in". Step 5 Wait while the program loads all the data into the SIP tables, and when it opens, the template will be populated with the data for your school. Now save this file to your computer hard drive. You will have the template with data inserted and can use the template to fill in the other parts of the SIP.</p> <p>For Districts (DIP) Follow the same procedures ONLY WHEN YOU USE THE "FIND SCHOOLS" TAB, SEARCH FOR A DISTRICT AND START FROM YOUR DISTRICT INFORMATION SCREEN (identified because the district name will be in the left top line of the information banner right below the tabs), then follow steps 1-5 (tabs will now specify "District" information/DIP). Use the same instructions to populate and download your DIP template.</p> |
| 12/6/04 | 202 | <p>f school funding did not depend upon attendance, it would eliminate a lot of red tape. We would not have to focus so much energy manually keeping attendance books. We could focus on teaching.</p> | 5/23/05 | <p>As you may be aware, in order to implement your suggestion, Section 18-8.05(C) of the School Code would need to be amended (see http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/ilcs/ilcs4.asp?DocName=010500050HArt%2E+18&ActID=1005&ChapAct=105%26nbsp%3BILCS%26nbsp%3B5%2F&ChapterID=17&ChapterName=SCHOOLS&SectionID=49211&SeqStart=112100&SeqEnd=115100&ActName=School+Code%2E). This subsection requires that general state aid be distributed based on each district's best three months of attendance. The State Board of Education has long supported efforts to reform the way in which public schools are funded in Illinois; however, school funding reform is often discussed but it is slow and difficult to implement.</p> |
| 1/3/05 | 223 | <p>Amid the complexity teachers/administrators face in determining when they are best able to retire, a seemingly obvious inequity seems to be noteworthy. When compiling an employee's service record for TRS, there is no distinction made between 12 month versus 9 month employees. One year is counted as one year, regardless of actual days/year worked. If 12 month TRS employees' annual years of service for each year they work(ed) 12 months were to count as 1.33, for example, those employees would benefit from an earlier retirement option (albeit likely without an actual ERO cost) as well as an exit with lower cost to TRS on an annual basis for those employees.</p> | 5/17/05 | <p>The calculation of regular service credit is governed by 40 ILCS 5/16-130 (see http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/ilcs/ilcs4.asp?DocName=004000050HArt%2E+16&ActID=638&ChapAct=40%26nbsp%3BILCS%26nbsp%3B5%2F&ChapterID=9&ChapterName=PENSIONS&SectionID=40982&SeqStart=183600&SeqEnd=195900&ActName=Illinois+Pension+Code%2E). It is not a matter of agency rulemaking. To change the calculation of regular service credit to allow more credit for 12-month employees would require action by the General Assembly to amend the current statute. You also may want to know that we have shared your suggestion with the Teachers' Retirement System.</p> |
| 1/10/05 | 225 | <p>I recently talked to Becky McCabe about a</p> | 5/24/05 | <p>As you know, the procedures for administering the assessment were changed this spring to allow</p> |

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|---------|-------|--|----------|--|
| | | <p>fourth grade student that I have, who has been critically ill. He is enrolled in school and has been too ill to attend school. We were able to start some homebound with him in October. I called Becky to ask if we needed to do a sticker for him and she said this kind of situation has been an issue. She said to do the sticker and keep her informed. I hope he is still with us in March. My suggestion is to give Becky McCabe the authority to exempt medically fragile children from testing when schools can produce the appropriate documentation. I appreciated the opportunity to give you feedback and thanks for all you do!</p> | | <p>school districts to exclude homebound students on a case-by-case basis from taking the state assessment. A Notification of Homebound Exemptions form was developed for this purpose and is posted on the State Board of Education's website at http://www.isbe.net/assessment under "Announcements". If you have not already done so, you would use this form to submit information about this and other medically fragile students who meet the definition of "Homebound Exempt" so that these students are excluded from the enrollment count in a school on the first day of testing and from taking the state assessment. Please note that this form is due to the State Board of Education, Division of Student Assessment, no later than August 22, 2005.</p> |
| 1/14/05 | 239-3 | <p>Maybe it's time for a single state teachers contract, a single state curriculum, and a single form of assessment, saving the citizens you serve Billions of dollars and again having a strong productive working school system again.</p> | 5/31/05 | <p>Rather than having a state-imposed curricula, Illinois has adopted state goals for learning that address the fundamental learning areas defined under Section 27-1 of the School Code (i.e., language arts; mathematics; the biological and physical sciences; social sciences; the fine arts; and physical development and health), as well as in the foreign languages.</p> <p>The goals, along with the learning standards and performance descriptors for each content area, are meant to guide the planning of instruction and anchor the assessment of learning from kindergarten through grade 12. The Illinois Learning Standards define what students in all Illinois public schools should know and be able to do in the content areas listed above as a result of their elementary and secondary schooling. The agency's Division of Student Assessment is responsible for developing and administering tests that measure the performance of students and schools against the Illinois Learning Standards. Illinois has not made any major changes in the Illinois Learning Standards since their adoption in 1997. In its effort to become a standards-led state, however, the State Board has listened to concerns and suggestions from the field and developed resources that <i>supplement not replace</i> the Illinois Learning Standards. Examples of resources that supplement the Standards:</p> <p>Rubrics for a Standards Implementation System – designed to define what districts, schools, educators, students, parents, and community members should “know and be able to do” in order to become standards aligned. The rubrics are based on the seven dimensions of implementation outlined in the <i>Evaluation of the Implementation of Illinois Learning Standards Year Four Report</i> to the Illinois State Board of Education, August 2002.</p> <p>Performance Descriptors, Classroom Assessments and Student Exemplars http://www.isbe.net/ils/html/descriptors_intro.htm – designed to define how well students perform at various points on an educational development continuum. This continuum shows how students can demonstrate mastery of progressively more difficult content and cognitive skills over ten incremental stages of development. Performance within each stage can be assessed by the extent to which students are meeting the standards (i.e., starting, approaching, meeting, exceeding). Performance standards include four essential elements: performance descriptors, performance levels, assessment tasks, and performance examples.</p> <p>The Illinois Assessment Framework (IAF) http://www.isbe.net/assessment/IAFIndex.htm – designed to assist educators, test developers, policy makers and the public by clearly defining those elements of the Illinois Learning Standards that are suitable for state testing. The IAF will form the basis for the enhanced tests required by state and federal law beginning with the 2005-06 school year.</p> <p>English Language Learner Standards http://www.isbe.net/bilingual – designed for the many audiences in the field of education who are affected by English language learners (ELLs), linguistically and culturally diverse students who have been identified as having levels of English language</p> |

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|---------|-----|---|----------|---|
| | | | | <p>proficiency that preclude them from accessing, processing and acquiring unmodified grade level content in English.</p> <p>Illinois Alternate Content Standards -- designed for the small number of students with disabilities who are unable to participate in the regular state assessment, even with appropriate accommodations.</p> <p>Early Childhood Standards http://www.isbe.net/earlychi/pdf/early_learning_standards.pdf – designed to provide teachers and caregivers useful information that is directly needed as part of their daily classroom work. These standards target students ages 3 to 5 years old.</p> <p>Illinois Birth to 3 Program Standards http://www.isbe.net/earlychi/html/03_standards.htm – designed to be the basis for the development, implementation, and evaluation of high-quality birth-to-age-three programs. These standards target children up to age 3 years old.</p> <p>Standards Aligned Classroom Initiative http://www.isbe.net/news/pdf/sac0901.pdf – designed to give teachers training in how to make standards-based instruction a reality in their classrooms.</p> |
| 1/14/05 | 241 | <p>Stop violence in schools. So students can concentrate on there subjects. Teachers or staff of school will not stop it. Students can not concentrate with the situation.</p> | 6/1/05 | <p>You are correct that students do not learn well in environments where they fear for their safety or are being disrupted by other students. School districts are charged with maintaining discipline in schools. Section 24-24 of the School Code addresses the actions that teachers may take to maintain discipline and ensure safety in schools (see http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/ilcs/ilcs4.asp?DocName=010500050HArt%2E+24&ActID=1005&ChapAct=105%26nbsp%3BILCS%26nbsp%3B5%2F&ChapterID=17&ChapterName=SCHOOLS&SectionID=49306&SeqStart=131200&SeqEnd=134600&ActName=School+Code%2E). Section 10-20.14 directs school boards to establish and maintain parent-teacher advisory councils to establish discipline guidelines in consultation with the board of education; such policies should include provisions "to address students who have demonstrated behaviors that put them at risk for aggressive behavior, including without limitation bullying, as defined in the policy" (see http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/ilcs/ilcs4.asp?DocName=010500050HArt%2E+10&ActID=1005&ChapAct=105%26nbsp%3BILCS%26nbsp%3B5%2F&ChapterID=17&ChapterName=SCHOOLS&SectionID=48899&SeqStart=51000&SeqEnd=71800&ActName=School+Code%2E).</p> <p>Additionally, Article 13A of the School Code establishes the Regional Safe Schools Program, an alternative education program for students determined to be disruptive. The program allows for certain disruptive students to be administratively transferred from their home schools to a safe school program as a way for a school district to "to ensure a safe and appropriate educational environment for all of its students" (see http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/ilcs/ilcs4.asp?DocName=010500050HArt%2E+13A&ActID=1005&ChapAct=105%26nbsp%3BILCS%26nbsp%3B5%2F&ChapterID=17&ChapterName=SCHOOLS&SectionID=17225&SeqStart=86100&SeqEnd=88000&ActName=School+Code%2E).</p> <p>We encourage you to work with your school district to address the problems that you believe exist. The State Board of Education has on its website other resources that you might find informative, including the "Safe at School: A Resource Manual for Self-Assessment, Planning and Training to Improve School Safety (see http://www.isbe.net/sos/pdf/school_safety_guide.pdf) and "School Safety Audit" (see http://www.isbe.net/sos/pdf/school_safety_audit.pdf).</p> |
| 1/24/05 | 242 | <p>Today, I received for the first time a letter from Connie Wise, Data Analysis and Progress Reporting at ISBE. The letter was a request to identify which district schools are receiving Title I money this year and which next year. It is incredible to me that the ISBE would not already have this information on hand in a database for the current year. As for next year, wait until the</p> | 5/17/05 | <p>While the State Board of Education has information relative to Title I status for the year previous to the current school year, it needs to have information for both the current year and the following school year (approximate) so that the agency can calculate Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) and identify consequences for schools not meeting AYP.</p> <p>Additionally, school districts often make changes to their Title I applications following approval, including making determinations to use Title I funding in eligible schools other than those originally targeted. Oftentimes, those changes will not be reflected in the database. Since only schools receiving Title I funding are subject to federal interventions for not meeting AYP, it is essential that the State Board of Education have the most current information available.</p> |

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|---------|-----|--|----------|---|
| | | data base is updated. Is it really necessary to be sending out letters to 880 district superintendents and for us to send a letter or fax back in order for Ms. Wise to obtain this data? We have more important things to do than to answer questions to which you should already have the answers. KILL THE RED TAPE! | | |
| 4/7/05 | 380 | How about focusing more on children with special needs. I have two children with special needs ages three and four. Both have had early intervention and now are attending preschool. How about allowing the therapist do more of their jobs. How about schools where only therapist work with children with cerebral palsy. The children with special needs are getting a very raw deal. | 5/25/05 | As you probably know, the programs and services provided to a child with disabilities is determined either by the Individualized Education Program (IEP) or a Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) team. The membership of either of these teams, as may applicable to your situation, would include you, as the children's parent, and others who design the educational program and services for each child based on his or her strengths and needs. When there is a conflict among the IEP team members, special education rules outline conflict resolution measures, including mediation and due process. I have provided a link to the State Board of Education's rules governing Special Education (23 Ill. Adm. Code 226) for your convenience (see http://www.isbe.net/rules/archive/default.htm , Part 226, Subpart C, "The Individualized Education Program"; Subpart G, "Due Process"; and Section 226.560, "Mediation"). Please feel free to call or email me with additional questions, in particular about the avenues that may be available to you to discuss with the school your frustrations about your children's education plans. |
| 4/19/05 | 384 | I just checked my profile on CeRTS, and noticed that my Request for Verification is still Pending a decision by the State Superintendent. It has been a month since the ROE approved it, but I'm still waiting on the State Superintendent's approval. Is there any way to speed up this process? | 5/17/05 | It is my understanding that you received an email from our Certification staff indicating that you were recommended for renewal of your certificates by the Regional Office of Education on March 31, 2005, and by the State Teacher Certification Board on April 4, 2005. Your certificates were registered on April 19, 2005, and are valid until 2010. |
| 4/21/05 | 388 | The paper Statement of Assurance form does not have an area to indicate if a teacher has a Master's degree or if they have more than one Master's Degree. The only way a reviewer would know how many CPDU's are needed is if the applicant includes the instruction sheet when submitting. It will be very time consuming for the person reviewing the statements to have to check and see if someone has an advanced degree and only has to complete the 80 CPDUs. I suggest adding a section, like what is on CeRTS, to the paper form to indicate already possessing an advanced degree. | 5/9/05 | Your suggestion was to add a box that will assist in determining the CPDUs needed based on the teacher's possessing an advanced degree. As a result of your suggestion, ISBE form 73-98 has been modified to include such a check. To view the change, please refer to http://www.isbe.net/certification/html/forms.htm , choosing 73-98 under the heading of "Statement of Assurances." The change that responds to your suggestion can be found on page 1 in the box on the left side of the page with the heading of "Certificate Type and Status"; it will be the last choice in that box. |
| 4/25/05 | 389 | According to the Private Business and Vocational Schools Act, forms need to be sent to Springfield with appropriate fees. Once Springfield 'approves' new courses, it is sent to local regional site, in this case Chicago to be re-approved. At this point the process seems to break down rapidly. Springfield's 'function' seems to be cash and deposit fees, while Chicago's function is to try and handle all the schools assigned to each person. With some of the cut backs | 5/19/05 | It is my understanding that since submitting your inquiry, you have worked with staff from the Workforce Development Board and the State Board of Education's Division of Accountability, and Omega is approved for Advanced CNA Training and Patient Care Technician courses. |

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|--------|------------|--|----------|---|
| | | the state has imposed, I was told 90 schools per each representative. It would seem if Springfield approves a class and sends a letter that class is approved, the local representative should 'rubber stamp' the approval. | | |
| 5/2/05 | 392 395 | <p>Having received and carefully read your April 11, 2005 letter, I applaud what you are doing and your passion to improve K-12 education in our state. As a Chicago Public School and local university product (James G. Blaine Elementary, Lake View High School and DePaul University), I too have a commitment to helping educators and teachers bring high-quality content to K-12 Illinois classrooms.</p> <p>I am also Chairman of [<i>identifying information deleted</i>], a provider of visual education content for K-12 schools, nationally; in that capacity I was disappointed to find our market research shows Illinois ranking near the bottom of all states in "visual learning." Our company, [<i>identifying information deleted</i>] has designed and developed a new digital delivery system Classroom Content Click! (CCC!) of visual content that is available, on-demand, through the teacher's computer. There is no hardware, wiring or software to purchase. The savings to Illinois would be in the hundreds of thousands annually.</p> <p>As you know, children learn by multiple intelligences (visual, auditory, linguistic, kinesthetic and others). Even our sister states are far ahead of us; for example, Iowa is a national leader in providing visual content to supplement K-12 core curricula. Classroom Content Click! (CCC!) has been piloted in 25 school systems across the country with remarkable results. The following are some of the unsolicited comments we have received about our new visual learning resource:</p> <p>"Classroom Content Click! is the easiest digital delivery system I've ever seen." Wisconsin Media Specialist</p> <p>"The content on Classroom Content Click! is second to none." Indiana Curriculum Director</p> <p>"Our people loved the simplicity of the navigation." Texas Media Specialist</p> | 5/16/05 | <p>Illinois is what is considered a "local control" state; therefore, it does not have a state curriculum that all school districts are required to follow. As such, the State Board of Education must take a neutral stance on products such as those you are promoting so as not to endorse nor appear to endorse a commercial product.</p> <p>We appreciate the time you took to share information about your company's endeavor and about its potential to improve education in elementary and secondary schools.</p> |

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|--------|-----|---|----------|--|
| | | <p>“Your search, select, play, ease-of-use and superior picture quality are very impressive.” California Instructional Media Supervisor “The system’s Teacher Support material offers great higher order thinking activities.” Kentucky School District Curriculum and Instruction Chairperson “ Classroom Content Click! has great academic value.” New Mexico School District Media Specialist Many months ago we presented Classroom Content Click! to the former Director of Education Technology, [identifying information deleted], who was impressed with what he saw but regretfully maintained that Illinois had no funds. If your new State Board or media and/or education technology staff would like a special presentation of Classroom Content Click!, I will be happy to arrange it. [identifying information deleted], Senior Vice President of Content and Programming would be pleased to meet with your associates and describe how powerful this new teaching resource can be for K-12 students. Governor, I do not have political friends or influence, but I do share your passion for improving K-12 education in Illinois. Some day our students will seek challenging and hopefully rewarding opportunities to build families and contribute to their community and state. We should do everything possible to help them fulfill their dreams. [identifying information deleted] and I are ready to help you and your associates meet that objective.</p> | | |
| 5/3/05 | 396 | <p>Just teachers on how they perform after taking education classes. The Basic Skills Test will keep out many excellent teachers, who do not test well. It should be Basic Skills or ten years of reviews and classes to help them improve in all areas. One class limit, since the teachers are working.</p> | 5/18/05 | <p>The testing requirement is part of the state of Illinois’ commitment to ensuring that our public school students are being taught by highly qualified teachers; you can find that statutory requirement in Section 21-1a of the School Code (see http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/ilcs/ilcs4.asp?DocName=010500050HArt%2E+21&ActID=1005&ChapAct=105%26nbsp%3BILCS%26nbsp%3B5%2F&ChapterID=17&ChapterName=SCHOOLS&SectionID=49265&SeqStart=122000&SeqEnd=126400&ActName=School+Code%2E).</p> <p>The State Board of Education, however, recognizes that some individuals have difficulty with standardized testing and, when possible, we provide alternative testing arrangements for requesting individuals with appropriate documentation of their needs. The types of alternative arrangements provided are tailored to the needs of the individual and include accommodations such as allowing extra time; testing in a small, distraction-free room; etc.</p> <p>Individuals who need help with test-taking strategies or enhancing their basic skills are encouraged to</p> |

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|--------|-------|--|----------|--|
| | | | | visit their local community college study skills center or their Illinois teacher preparation program. Also, the test preparation resource, "Study Strategies and Test-Taking Suggestions," is available at http://www.isbe.net/certification/pdf/STUDYSTRATEGIES.pdf . Additionally, we are working with our test contractor to develop a basic skills diagnostic test preparation program. This new resource will be available fall 2004, via the Internet, at no cost to the individual. |
| 5/5/05 | 398 | Our Regional Board of Trustees was asked to meet in April to canvass votes. They have also been asked to meet the third Monday of May for reorganization. IS THERE ANY REASON THE LAW CANNOT BE CHANGED SO THAT THEY CAN REORGANIZE AT THE SAME TIME THEY COME TO CANVASS? Thank you for considering this matter. I look forward to your response. | 5/18/05 | As you are aware, within 21 days after an election, the currently seated Regional Board of School Trustees must meet to canvass the votes. Those members who were not up for reelection and the newly elected board members will meet on the 3 rd Monday in May for their organization meeting. New members elected to the Regional Board might not be present at the canvassing meeting. The time delay between the canvassing of the votes and the organization meeting may have been put into the law to allow time to communicate to the new members the official results of the vote canvass as well as allow time to arrange for the organization meeting. If you believe your Regional Board of School Trustees might not need this time delay, or that the Board may be hampered by the delay, you may want to speak with your state legislators. They may be willing to sponsor legislation to change the law and allow more flexibility of the time between the canvass of votes and organization of board. |
| 5/6/05 | 399 | I am writing in hope that you can help me with an urgent problem. In August/2004, I accepted the position of Lead Dean at [identifying information deleted] School. At that time, I was told that I would have to get a secondary certificate. I then call ISBE and was told that I could apply to have my transcripts reviewed and take the needed courses. I was further told that I had until July/2005 in which to apply. Since then, I have been promoted to Director of our soon to open, Math and Science Academy. District [identifying information deleted] maintains a policy that requires that even administrators hold secondary certificate. On April 29, 2005, I went to the [identifying information deleted] County ROE to complete the application for transcript review and to renew my current certificates. To my shock, I was then told that the deadline for doing such was January 2004. While at the ROE, I called Springfield and was told that I would have to find a university and take their required coursework for secondary certification. I have looked around and found that the universities are requiring 32 hours of coursework. I was aware from the beginning that I would need to complete some additional courses, this is UNACCEPTABLE! I am asking your help in resolving this matter. If you know of the appropriate person/persons that can assist me with this, please forward this message to him/her. | 5/19/05 | As you have discovered, the deadline for applying through transcript evaluation for a subsequent certificate was December 31, 2004. Persons from other states with certificates comparable to the one sought here may still apply through transcript evaluation. Even before the deadline, persons applying through transcript evaluation for a secondary certificate had to provide evidence of a 32-hour major area of concentration since that requirement has always been in place. If you already hold a teaching credential, the institution is supposed to put you through a tailored program that gives you only the work you need to meet the standards for the certificate you seek. If you have never held a teaching credential and you applied through transcript evaluation, you would have been told that you must complete an approved program to obtain the first certificate, even if you had applied for it last summer. |
| 5/7/05 | 400-2 | Another innovative idea about saving money in education and making funds available | 5/18/05 | Your comments and observations will receive the consideration of staff in the Division of English Language Learning. The Illinois State Board of Education and our division reviews all comments from |

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|---------|-----|---|----------|---|
| | | <p>where they are desperately needed, would be to do away with Bi-lingual and transitional education. ELL support is good, but holding hands of students who were born here for three years while they learn English is a waste of funds. Children should be in English classrooms from the beginning. Illinois should follow the leads of Texas, California and Massachusetts. These states now have test scores on the rise. Children pick up any language more quickly when they are young. Thank you for your time and I know that these recommendations will not be taken in any consideration in the near future, but I feel much better now.</p> | | <p>language experts, educators and the general public in making decisions and/or policy recommendations regarding bilingual programs. In order to alter the Illinois requirements for bilingual education, amendments to or a repeal of Article 14C of the School Code would be necessary (see http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/ilcs/ilcs4.asp?DocName=010500050HArt%2E+14C&ActID=1005&ChapterID=105%26nbsp%3BILCS%26nbsp%3B5%2F&ChapterID=17&ChapterName=SCHOOLS&SectionID=49138&SeqStart=101800&SeqEnd=103300&ActName=School+Code%2E). Our goal is to ensure our public schools meet the needs of all Illinois students. As such, public input in achieving these goals is always welcome.</p> |
| 5/11/05 | 401 | <p>My husband and I just retired from teaching. We went to the ROE to register to substitute. We must go through finger printing background check and tb test. We would like to teach in Peoria county and Tazewell. We found out that we must go through process in every county we would like to sub. Can't the counties share infor. We will not make ourselves available to Peoria because of the inconvenience of going through this process more than once. We almost didn't go through the process having just retired and been through the process as active teachers. Could have a separate process that streamlines for retiring teachers who want to substitute.</p> | 5/23/05 | <p>The law currently requires that a new applicant for hire in any school district (other than substitutes within an ROE region) be required to submit to a background check. An applicant may be fingerprinted at any location that has the appropriate technology to transmit a fingerprint to the Illinois State Police and the FBI. This may be a private vendor, an ROE, a local police station, etc.</p> <p>Many ROEs already compile a list of substitute teachers who have cleared a background check and therefore are cleared to substitute in any district within the ROE region. A district should check with its ROE to determine the results of the background check for that substitute.</p> <p>Background check information is not transferable outside of an ROE region, however, so at this time a state-level database would serve the same purpose as an ROE-level database. No school board shall knowingly employ a person for whom a criminal background investigation has not been initiated 105 ILCS 5/10-21.9(d)). Thus, the check must be initiated prior to the person being hired, but employment can begin pending outcome of the background check. The applicant's entire criminal history will show up on the background check report. The hiring entity should review the results of the background check for conviction or attempt of any offense enumerated in Section 10-21.9(c) at any time in the applicant's history, any felony (or attempt) conviction within the last 7 years, and any felony (or attempt) conviction outside of Illinois that could have been punished as a felony in Illinois, if it had been committed in Illinois. The offenses listed in Section 10-21.9(c) are the offenses for which employment is prohibited, but any other above-mentioned felony (or attempt) conviction may be considered during the hiring decision. None of the requirements described above was affected by the change made to the law by P.A. 93-909, effective August 2004, except that a fingerprint check is required now. For more information about this process, please see http://www.isbe.net/pdf/criminal_background.pdf.</p> |
| 5/11/05 | 403 | <p>My name is [identifying information deleted] of [identifying information deleted], IL. I have been a school volunteer for many years and have been a committee member for the Bilingual Education Committee for the [identifying information deleted] School District for 5 years. In addition to being self employed, my associate [identifying information deleted] and I have written</p> | 5/23/05 | <p>Thank you for your submission to the lessredtape email account regarding the success you have had with your book, <i>Mario & Frida, Double Trouble</i>. I applaud your efforts and the efforts of Mr. Josh Wright to create a fun, educational tool that teaches children about bullying issues. As you know, in Illinois we place a great deal of emphasis on local control of schools; accordingly, the State Board of Education must take a neutral stance on educational materials so as not to endorse nor appear to endorse a commercial product. In response to what I suspect you are asking in your email, we are unable to help promote your program at the school district level. That said, we are able to refer your book to the Illinois Resource Center (IRC). The IRC is a not-for-profit entity that reviews educational resources for their appropriateness in meeting the needs of English</p> |

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|---------|-----|--|----------|---|
| | | <p>several children's books. Our latest collaboration is called "Mario & Frida, Double Trouble." This story was written in English and Spanish. I volunteer at a school that is 80% Hispanic where the children really enjoyed reading our book in both languages. Over the last few years, Josh and I have been to over 25 schools to share our program in an "auditorium style" program. Today we happen to be at <i>[identifying information deleted]</i> Elementary, <i>[identifying information deleted]</i>, IL where we gave a program. The principal suggested that we contact to share our story. In our story Mario and Frida take on the bullies of the world. We thought the subject of bullying and then offering it in English and Spanish might be a good combination. What do you think? Would you be interested in learning more about us?</p> | | <p>language learners. When the IRC determines that a resource is beneficial and in line with best practices or scientifically-based research, that resource is then shared with the field. Please let us know if you would like our English Language Learning Division to make such a referral.</p> |
| 5/13/05 | 405 | <p>The truth is that education will continue to flounder until, or unless the whole top down structure of governance is changed. Can't you understand that over the last 50 years, no matter how much you have tried to "help" education, you have failed. Test scores are on a continuing decline. I served on my local board of education for 8 years and came away with an "outside the box" kind of solution to helping education. If you would like a copy of my book outlining the problems and a possible solution I call "real local control," please let me know. I will forward a copy. Just give me the proper information so I can get a copy to you. The title, "How Boards of Education Are Failing Your Children" gives an insiders view why education continually falls short. And hey, there may be just one thing that you may come away with that will inspire you to action.</p> | 5/17/05 | <p>Dr. Dunn does have a copy of your book and has had an opportunity to review a portion of it. He indicates that he agrees with a number of points that you are making; however, it would be very difficult to enact some of your recommendations into law, given the current political climate in Illinois. Dr. Dunn is sympathetic to much of what you note in your book and appreciates your efforts to improve education for all children in Illinois.</p> |
| | 407 | <p>In the future can Public School Update ISBE form 60-63 be placed on IWAS for updating? This would save a lot of envelopes, postage and time for everyone involved in this process. I think the implementation of IWAS has been one of the best time and money savers that ISBE has implemented. The more we can place on this system the better.</p> | 5/25/05 | <p>First, I want to thank you for your kind words about IWAS. Implementation of this system in the last several years has been a joint effort between the State Board of Education and its customers as a way in which to continuously improve the data collection and data dissemination services that the agency provides. When IWAS was designed in 2001, the agency sought the assistance of the Learning Technology Center coordinators, regional superintendents, district superintendents and district personnel. The effort to collect data online through IWAS also has increased the level of data quality tremendously by providing online editing of data before it can be submitted to the State Board. In addition, the agency raised the bar on accountability by providing a secure transaction-oriented environment for its customers and its own employees. Your suggestion to include Form 60-63 in IWAS is a good one; however, the timing for doing so is dependent on many variables, including the human and financial resources that are available to the</p> |

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|---------|-----|---|----------|---|
| 5/16/05 | 408 | <p>Please refer to 105 ILCS 5/3A-16, Regional Office of Education Advisory Board. This board was established in 1995 when ROE's began providing staff development and administrator's academy services. Since our budget has been reduced by 55%, we can no longer provide many of the programs and services mentioned in Section 5/2-3.62. Therefore, it is not necessary to meet 6 times a year to inform the Advisory Board about our budget and how we are spending the monies. Three time a year would be an adequate number of dates to meet. Since the committee must consist of 2 administrators, 4 teachers and 7 community representatives, our meetings are held after school hours. Consequently, we provide the members with a light meal and reimburse for mileage, which is an additional expense for the ROE's. In order to assure fair representation of all three counties served, many of our members are traveling over 100 round trip miles per meeting. Without offering refreshments and mileage, we could not find people willing to serve on the committee. These small expense are necessary in order to find people to serve on the committee. Please consider revising the advisory board mandates so that they are in line with today's budget--meet less often because there is less to report due to reduced budgets. Again, three times would be an adequate number of meeting dates.</p> | 6/6/05 | <p>agency. The Division of Data Systems must work with the other divisions in the agency to coordinate these resources and prioritize the order in which various programs are placed into IWAS. We will keep you posted on the progress of this effort, as well as when other new applications become available.</p> <p>The original law contemplated that the boards would, in fact, "oversee" the Regional Offices of Education's (ROEs) provision of those programs and services previously administered by the Educational Service Centers in all counties of the state except for Cook County. (The Educational Service Centers remained in suburban Cook County.) Just over four months after the oversight boards were established, P.A. 89-335, effective August 17, 1995, amended Sections 3A-16 and 3A-17 to reduce the responsibility of the boards to one of providing advise rather than oversight. As you have noted, each board is to meet at least six times a year to advise its regional superintendent concerning the "planning and delivery of programs and services under Section 2-3.62 (educational service centers) and other programs under the control of the regional superintendent of schools". You believe that the requirement to meet six times a year is too burdensome on regional offices and members of your board due to budget reductions that have caused your regional office to "no longer provide many of the programs and services mentioned in Section 5/2-3.62."</p> <p>Despite the shift in the duties of the boards from providing oversight to advising, the Regional Offices of Education (ROEs) continued to retain responsibility for the delivery of programs and services listed in Section 2-3.62 of the School Code and agency rules (23 Ill. Adm. Code 525.110 at http://www.isbe.net/rules/archive/default.htm). The programs and services that ROEs are required to provide include computer technology education, and mathematics, science and reading resources for teachers (<i>as per the law</i>), as well as staff development through the Administrators' Academy and a directory of consultants who might be used by school districts (<i>as per agency rules</i>).</p> <p>Since the role of the boards is to provide advise only rather than oversight, your suggestion to reduce the number of times that they are required to meet seems reasonable. This suggestion could be considered as the State Board of Education shapes future legislative agendas. In addition, the State Board of Education is reviewing all of its rules, as per P.A. 93-1036 (see http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/publicacts/fulltext.asp?name=093-1036&GA=093); this review will include Part 525, which addresses the advisory boards and responsibilities of ROEs.</p> |
| 5/23/05 | 411 | <p>If there was an already formatted lesson plan that had columns for the different levels of learners in one's class, more might plan for each individual level. An example could be Group A...will classify each picture animal as a bird or mammal; Group B...will state why each picture animal belongs in which group; Group C will write a paper comparing and contrasting the two groups of animals. Each person would be graded on his/her goal and all could receive A's.</p> | 6/1/05 | <p>While the State Board of Education does not have sample lesson plans constructed around various ability levels of students, it has developed Performance Descriptors that describe how well students perform at various points on an educational continuum (see http://www.isbe.net/ils/html/descriptors_intro.htm). The descriptors are provided for each of the fundamental learning areas and are designed so that each stage represents growth from the previous stage. Concepts, techniques and strategies progress through the stages. Some bullets are repeated and some are dropped altogether as the student moves from one stage to the next and approaches mastery. A teacher, for example, could place the student at the stage where he or she would function the highest and chart his or her progress from that point.</p> <p>You will see that classroom-level assessments also have been developed for each of the standards for every stage of the fundamental learning areas. These assessments and student exemplars correspond to the numbering used with the Illinois Learning Standards.</p> <p>The Performance Descriptors are available for voluntary use at the local level. They are not intended to replace the Illinois Learning Standards. Instead, they supplement the standards by providing sufficient detail and examples to enable teachers to establish appropriate grade-level performance expectations for students.</p> |

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|---------|-----|---|----------|---|
| 5/25/05 | 413 | <p>Dear Dr. Dunn, In 2001, [identifying information deleted] Community College, [identifying information deleted] in [identifying information deleted] and CUSD #[identifying information deleted] in [identifying information deleted] formed a partnership to encourage paraeducators to become certified teachers through a "Grow Your Own" Program. With the requirements that have been placed on paraeducators through the NCLB and IDEA, the partnership shifted its focus to adopt a program under the auspices of [identifying information deleted] Community College. The program developed into Basic Skills 1 & 2 course taught by paraeducators and certified teachers from both districts. We believe the Basic Skills 1 & 2 classes should be approved to meet the requirements for Highly Qualified for paraeducators paid under Title and for those who work with Special Education under the rules for IDEA. We believe this will retain qualified paraeducators and, therefore decrease additional costs to the Districts which would otherwise have to replace large numbers of current paraeducators with people who possess the higher qualifications. Currently, [identifying information deleted] employs approximately 500 paraeducators and CUSD #[identifying information deleted] employs about 300. Of the combined 800 paraeducators, about 500 have successfully completed the program In the area of "less red tape," currently paraeducators seeking to be Highly Qualified must obtain 60 or more college credit hours or successfully pass the ETS ParaPro Assessment or the ACT Work Keys Test. Acquiring up to 60 hours of college credit speaks for itself for those who have never been required to have more than 30 hours. In fact, the State for many years has allowed great numbers of Special Education paraeducators to work with fewer than 30 hours. In order to take one of the approved tests, paraeducators must travel to a limited number of test sites on a limited number of test dates. Although the closest site to these two districts is [identifying information deleted] (25 miles), that site is often filled and the paraeducators are scheduled to test</p> | 6/1/05 | <p>It is my understanding that program representatives met on May 31, 2005, with Interim State Superintendent Randy Dunn and members of his staff about gaining approval for this program. The State Board of Education will be reviewing the course syllabus and will contact [identifying information deleted] Community College should staff have additional questions. Once a decision has been made as to whether the program meets the criteria, State Board staff will notify [identifying information deleted] Community College and the Illinois Education Association of the Superintendent's decision.</p> |

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|---------|-----|--|----------|---|
| | | <p>at much more distant sites. Recent examples include people being sent to [identifying information deleted], [identifying information deleted], and [identifying information deleted], Indiana. Finally, the Basic Skills 1 & 2 classes are designed around the curricula presently being used in each district. This has created such a significant improvement to the past staff development programs of the districts that each has negotiated into the paraeducator collective bargaining agreements guarantees that the costs associated with these courses will be borne by the districts. The course content has also been substantial enough to allow [identifying information deleted] Community College to secure grants from the Illinois Community College Board for the last two years which ECC in turn transferred to [identifying information deleted] and District [identifying information deleted] to help defray the costs of instructors and textbooks.</p> | | |
| 5/27/05 | 414 | <p>This may not pertain to this category, but I am presently going back to college for a degree in paralegal. I was accepted for a student loan, but now I am on probation and suspension from the student loan. The reason that the Federal Loan Department gave me: When I went to college in 1992 I withdrew from my courses. The reasoning behind my withdrawal is: I had recently went through a divorce and my funded child care provider at the time questioned my five year old and my three year old sons if their dad still lived with us. My children did not understand what was going on in the first place. I then was dropped from the program and had no one else to watch my children while I attended college. I was not receiving any child support, so I could not afford the extra daycare. Now it has been thirteen years later and I am ADD which I always have been, but I just started to take the medication this year. I feel that I should not have been put on probation nor suspension from receiving Federal Student Loan in which I have to pay back. Please, if there is anything that you could do to help me out of this mess, please contact me by E-Mail vsquirrel@peaknet.net. I would appreciate the effort, I really want to go back to school</p> | 6/1/05 | <p>The Illinois State Board of Education is responsible for elementary and secondary education in the state and has no involvement with postsecondary educational programs. In order to assist you, however, I have provided the web address of the U.S. Department of Education's Federal Student Aid program (see http://studentaid.ed.gov/PORTALSWebApp/students/english/index.jsp). I also have copied the web address for the Illinois Student Assistance Commission, which may be able to help you secure other forms of student aid (see http://www.collegezone.com/studentzone/94.htm).</p> |

| Date | # | Message (as originally submitted) | Resolved | Response (substantive portion only) |
|------|---|--|----------|-------------------------------------|
| | | <p>and learn law, it is something I have always wanted. I am presently not working and can not afford to pay as I go and my husband only works during the summer. So, I guess my idea to you is that I feel the Federal Loan Department should change their policy on probation against students, especially since it has been thirteen years ago. I can not even fullfill the qualifications for an appeal against their decision, because it has been too long. The child care program in which I was affiliated with most likely does not have proof of their aligations from 1992. Considering that most bussiness only have to keep records for at least seven years, that is the last time I knew, it might have changed by now? Thank You and I hope to hear from you. If you can not help me at least guide me in the right direction, please.</p> | | |

Lessredtape: Affected Laws and Rules

Attachment C

| Number | Summary of Submission(s) | Summary of Response | Law/Rule | Status |
|----------------------------|---|--|--------------------|--|
| 008 | The requirements for the waiver process are too burdensome. | Staff have initiated legislation to eliminate the requirement to have the public hearing on a day other than one in which board meetings are regularly scheduled. | 105 ILCS 5/2-3.25g | SB 1847, which was referred to Senate Rules Committee on March 18, 2005, and HB 3691, which was passed out of the House and referred to Senate Rules Committee on May 6, 2005. |
| 009-1 106 153 229 | Each submission addressed some aspect of rules governing Special Education, in particular to eliminate those state requirements that exceed federal requirements. | P.A. 93-1036 requires that the State Board review all of its rules while HR 359 requires that the State Board specifically review rules governing Special Education. | Part 226 | Pending review. |
| 020-3 109 | Submissions asked that the 5 percent limit on the annual increase in administrative expenses be eliminated or modified. | Staff have initiated legislation to repeal that provision. | 105 ILCS 5/17-1.5 | HBs 3688 and 3693 referred to House Rules Committee on March 10, 2005. SB 1855 referred to Senate Rules Committee on March 18, 2005. |
| 027 201 | Submissions inquired about progress in implementing recommendations from the 2003 report of the Governor's Commission on Revising the School Code. | Staff have initiated legislation to repeal those provisions that were determined to be obsolete or duplicative. | Various. | SB 1856, as amended, passed the Senate on March 24, 2005, and was referred to House Rules |

| Number | Summary of Submission(s) | Summary of Response | Law/Rule | Status |
|--|--|---|---------------------------|--|
| | | | | Committee on May 25, 2005. SBE will seek passage during fall veto session. |
| 041 077 203-1 220 221 226 | Submissions addressed the parent consent form and a proposed December deadline for submitting requests to the State Board of Education. | Rules are being amended to clarify that the parent or student may request the loan of a textbook through the program and to move the deadline for request submission from April to March. | Part 350 | Second notice period (JCAR review). |
| 404 146 | Submissions generally addressed whether school districts should be allowed to determine whether to observe legally mandated school holidays, with one specifically mentioning Casimir Pulaski Day. | Since 1998, the State Board of Education has proposed legislation to allow school districts to determine locally the use of legally mandated school holidays honoring Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Abraham Lincoln, Casimir Pulaski, Christopher Columbus and all veterans of foreign wars. | 105 ILSC 5/24-2 | HB 403 referred to House Rules Committee on March 10, 2005. |
| 059 | Asked that funding for gifted education be reinstated. | Referred to two bills introduced to set forth requirements for gifted programs wishing to qualify for state funding. | 105 ILCS 5/Art. 14A (new) | SB 223, which passed both Houses on May 25, 2005 and HB 881, which passed both houses on May 31, 2005. |
| 135 | Reimbursement: all districts, cooperatives use the same "cost center" for calculations. | The suggestion for uniformity, specifically to define special education costs by a disability type, has been discussed and will most likely be a recommendation in the upcoming review of the Part 130 rules (Determining Special Education Per Capita Tuition Charge). | Part 130 | Pending review. |
| 186 189 235 | Publication of the statement of affairs in a newspaper of general circulation is costly. | Consider amending Section 10-17 of the School Code to allow a school district to place the information on its website, provided proper notification is given to parents/guardians of the district's students. | 105 ILCS 5/10-17 | Pending review; 2006 legislative session. |
| 198 190 191 206 208 | Submissions expressed concerns about the way in which vocational education is funded and whether amendments to the state's rules for Vocational Education streamline the process. | Staff are awaiting the reauthorization of the federal Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998 so that the funding issues can be addressed within the context of the new federal requirements and existing state regulations. | Part 254 | Pending review. |
| 230 | A safety net is needed for high-cost special | Referred to P.A. 93-1022, effective August 24, 2004, | 105 ILCS 5/14- | Done. (NOTE: |

| Number | Summary of Submission(s) | Summary of Response | Law/Rule | Status |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| | education students. | which allows districts to claim excess costs for certain special education students. | 7.02b, 8.01 | <i>The legislation was enacted before the submission was received.</i> |
| 246 – 263 303 – 305 307, 308 310, 311 | Submissions asked that Section 14-1.03a of the School Code, which was recommended for repeal by the Governor's Commission on Revising the School Code, not be repealed. | That section was removed from consideration of repeal. <i>NOTE:</i> The vehicle for the repeal is SB 1856, which was referred to the House Rules Committee on May 25, 2005. | 105 ILCS 5/14-1.03a | Done. |
| 408 | Submission asked that the requirement be changed for Regional Offices of Education Advisory Boards to meet at least six times a year. | Since the boards are to provide advice only – as opposed to oversight, as was originally mandated – it is reasonable to require that the boards meet less often than is currently mandated. | 105 ILCS 5/3A-16, 3A-17 Agency rules at 23 Ill. Adm. Code 525 | Pending review (both law and rules). |