State Fiscal Stabilization Phase II

When submitting the Phase II application, please provide the indicator or descriptor the State has amended.

Indicator/Descriptor	**Date Amended**
Part 2.A: Update of Maintenance-of-Effort Data	2/12/10
Descriptor (a)(1), (a)(2), Indicators (a)(3), (a)(4), (a)(5), (a)(6), and (a)(7) [*amendment to plan applicable to all*]	2/12/10
Indicator (a)(1)	2/12/10
Indicator (a)(2)	2/12/10
Indicator (c)(4)	2/12/10
Indicator (c)(11)	2/12/10
Indicator (c)(12)	2/12/10
Descriptor (d)(1)	2/12/10
Indicator (d)(3)	2/12/10
Indicator (d)(4)	2/12/10
Indicator (d)(5)	2/12/10
Indicator (d)(6)	2/12/10
Indicator (d)(8)	2/12/10
Indicator (d)(9)	2/12/10
Indicator (d)(10)	2/12/10
Indicator (d)(11)	2/12/10
Indicator (d)(12)	2/12/10
Indicator (b)(1)(#8)	2/12/10
Indicator (b)(1)(#9)	2/12/10
Indicator (b)(2)	2/12/10
Indicator (b)(3)	2/12/10

STATE OF ILLINOIS – AMENDED 2/12/10

Application for Funding for Phase II of the Education Fund under the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Program

CFDA Number: 84.394

U.S. Department of Education

Washington, D.C. 20202

OMB Number: 1810-0695
Expiration Date: 05/31/2010

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0695. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 4,990 and 5,577 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington,

D.C. 20202-4537. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to: State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Program, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., S.W., Room 3E108, Washington, D.C. 20202-3118

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction
Purpose of Program 3
Program and Application Background 3
Background Information on Assurances 4
Requirements for Phase I Funding 5
About the Application for Phase II Funding 6
Data Collection 6
Public Reporting on a State Website 7
Preparing the Application 7
Application Instructions 8
Application
Part 1: Application Cover Sheet 9
Part 2: Maintenance-Of-Effort Information 10
Part 2A: Update of Maintenance-Of-Effort Data 11
Part 2B: Attestation of Maintenance-Of-Effort Compliance 12
Part 3: Data Collection, Public Reporting, and Planning 13
Part 3A: Assurance Indicators and Descriptors 16
I. Assurance (a): Achieving Equity in Teacher Distribution 17
II. Assurance (b): Improving Collection and Use of Data 29
III. Assurance (c): Standards and Assessments 33
IV. Assurance (d): Supporting Struggling Schools 50
Part 3B: Data Collection & Public Reporting Plan 65
I. Assurances (a), (c), and (d) 65
II. Indicator (b)(1) 68
III. Indicator (b)(2) 70
IV. Indicator (b)(3) 71
V. Indicators (c)(11) and (c)(12) 72
Part 3C: General Requirements 74
Appendices 75
Appendix A: State Allocation Data A-1
Appendix B: Additional Information for Part 2: Maintenance-Of-Effort (MOE) B-1
Appendix C: Authorizing Statute for State Fiscal Stabilization Fund C-1
Appendix D: Other Applicable Statutes D-1
Appendix E: Notice of Final Requirements, Definitions, and Approval Criteria E-1
Appendix F: Application Checklist and Submission Information F-1

APPLICATION FOR FUNDING FOR PHASE II OF THE EDUCATION FUND UNDER THE STATE FISCAL STABILIZATION PROGRAM

Purpose of Program

The State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF or Stabilization) program provides approximately $48.6 billion in formula grants to States to help stabilize State and local budgets in order to minimize and avoid reductions in education and other essential services, in exchange for a State's commitment to advance essential education reform in key areas. Almost $36.8 billion have already been awarded during SFSF Phase I. Approximately $11.5 billion will be awarded under SFSF Phase II (through this application).

Program and Application Background

Section 14005(d) of Division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) requires a State receiving funds under the Stabilization program to provide assurances in four key areas of education reform: (a) achieving equity in teacher distribution, (b) improving collection and use of data, (c) standards and assessments, and (d) supporting struggling schools. For each area of reform, the ARRA prescribes specific action(s) that the State must assure that it will implement. In addition, section 14005(a) of the ARRA requires a State that receives funds under the Stabilization program to submit an application to the U.S. Department of Education (the Department) containing such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

As part of its application for Phase II funding under the Stabilization program, a State must demonstrate its ability to meet specific data and information requirements (the assurance indicators and descriptors) with respect to the statutory assurances. In addition, in cases where a State is not currently able to meet the specific data and information requirements, a State must submit a State plan to describe how it will respond to the requirements of each assurance indicator and descriptor. Together, these two sets of requirements aim to provide transparency on the extent to which a State is implementing the actions for which it has provided assurances.

Increased access to and focus on this information will better enable States and other stakeholders to identify strengths and weaknesses in education systems and determine where concentrated reform effort is warranted. The Department will also use the data and information that States collect and report in assessing whether a State is qualified to participate in and receive funds under other reform-oriented programs administered by the Department.

An assurance indicator or descriptor may relate to data or other information that States currently collect and report to the Department, or to data or other information for which the Department is itself the source. In those cases, there are no new data or information collection requirements for a State; rather, the Department will provide the State with the relevant data or other information that the State will be required to confirm and make publicly available. In the other cases, requirements constitute new data or information collection and/or public reporting responsibilities for the State, to the extent the State does not currently collect and publicly report such data or information for other purposes.

The Department recognizes that requests for data and information should reflect an integrated and coordinated approach among the various programs supported with ARRA funds, particularly the SFSF, Race to the Top, School Improvement, and Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems grant programs. Accordingly, the Department has taken into consideration the context of those other programs in developing the requirements for SFSF Phase II.

Background Information on Assurances

Achieving Equity in Teacher Distribution

Regarding education reform area (a), achieving equity in teacher distribution, section 14005(d)(2) of the ARRA requires a State receiving funds under the Stabilization program to assure that it will take actions to improve teacher effectiveness and comply with section 1111(b)(8)(C) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (ESEA) (20 U.S.C. 6311), in order to address inequities in the distribution of highly qualified teachers between high- and low-poverty schools and to ensure that low-income and minority children are not taught at higher rates than other children by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers. A State must collect and publicly report data and other information on the extent to which students in high- and low-poverty schools in the State have access to highly qualified teachers; on steps the State is currently taking to ensure that students from low-income families and minority students are not taught at higher rates than other students by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers; on how teacher and principal performance is evaluated and how the results of those evaluations are used for decisions regarding compensation, promotion, retention, and removal; and on the distribution of performance evaluation ratings or levels among teachers and principals.

Improving Collection and Use of Data

Regarding education reform area (b), improving collection and use of data, section 14005(d)(3) of the ARRA requires a State receiving funds under the Stabilization program to provide an assurance that it will establish a statewide longitudinal data system that includes the elements described in section 6401(e)(2)(D) of the America COMPETES Act (20 U.S.C. 9871). To provide indicators of the extent to which a State is meeting that requirement, the State must provide information on the elements of its statewide longitudinal data system and on whether the State provides teachers with: (1) data on student growth in a manner that is timely and informs instructional programs, and (2) reports of teacher impact on student achievement.

Standards and Assessments

Regarding education reform area (c), standards and assessments, section 14005(d)(4) of the ARRA requires a State receiving funds under the Stabilization program to assure that it will: (A) enhance the quality of the academic assessments it administers pursuant to section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA (20 U.S.C. 6311) through activities such as those described in section 6112(a) of the ESEA (20 U.S.C. 7301a); (B) comply with the requirements of paragraphs (3)(C)(ix) and (6) of section 1111(b) of the ESEA (20 U.S.C. 6311) and section 612(a)(16) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1412) related to the inclusion of children with disabilities and limited English proficient students in State assessments, the development of valid and

reliable assessments for those students, and the provision of accommodations that enable their participation in State assessments; and (C) take steps to improve State academic content standards and student academic achievement standards for secondary schools consistent with section 6401(e)(1)(A)(ii) of the America COMPETES Act (20 U.S.C. 9871). To provide indicators of the extent to which a State is taking these actions, the State must collect and publicly report data and other information regarding State assessment systems, including the assessment of students with disabilities and limited English proficient students, the public reporting of State National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) data, and data on the number of students who graduate from high school, enroll in an Institute of Higher Education (IHE) (whether public or private, in-state or out-of-state), and complete at least one year of coursework (towards a degree) within two years of enrollment in a public in-state IHE.

As States prepare to significantly improve the rigor and effectiveness of their standards and assessment systems, this information will, in general, provide stakeholders with vital transparency on the current status of those systems and on the efforts to improve them that are currently underway.

Supporting Struggling Schools

Regarding education reform area (d), supporting struggling schools, section 14005(d)(5) of the ARRA requires a State receiving funds under the Stabilization program to provide an assurance that it will ensure compliance with the requirements of section 1116(b)(7)(C)(iv) and section 1116(b)(8)(B) of the ESEA (20 U.S.C. 6316) with respect to Title I schools identified for corrective action and restructuring. In order to provide indicators of the extent to which a State is implementing the statutory assurance, the State must provide data on the extent to which dramatic reforms to improve student academic achievement are implemented in Title I schools in improvement under section 1116(b)(1)(A) of the ESEA, in corrective action, or in restructuring and secondary schools that are Title I eligible, but not receiving funds. Additionally, a State must provide data on the operation and performance of its charter schools.

Requirements for Phase I Funding

Earlier this year, States applied to receive their initial allocation under the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (Stabilization) program. States with approved applications were awarded at least 67 percent of their Education Fund allocation and all of their Government Services Fund Allocation. Governors submitted assurances that their State would commit to advancing education reform in the four assurance areas, and confirmed baseline data for purposes of demonstrating the State's current status in each of the four education reform areas for which the State provided assurances, or submitted alternative baseline data. In addition, to receive SFSF Phase I funds, States provided maintenance of effort (MOE) information (see Part 2 of this application for more information), including an assurance that the State would comply with the Stabilization program MOE requirements (or, if applicable, an assurance that the State met or would meet the eligibility criterion for a waiver of those requirements), as well as MOE baseline data.[1] States were also required to describe how they intended to use the funds allocated under (1) the Education Stabilization Fund and (2) the Government Services Fund, in addition to submitting accountability, transparency and reporting assurances.

[1] Guidance on the Maintenance of Effort Requirements for SFSF and MOE Waiver Form are available at http://www.ed.gov/policy/gen/leg/recovery/statutory/moe-guidance.pdf.

About the Application for Phase II Funding

States requesting the remainder of their State Fiscal Stabilization Fund monies—in most cases, the remaining 33 percent of the Education Fund allocation[2]—must complete and submit the application contained in this packet in its entirety. To receive funding, applications will need to meet standards of both completeness and quality. The Department will employ a two-tier review process to evaluate State applications. The first review will verify that a State submitted a complete Phase II application. The second review will judge the application against the approval criteria identified in the NFR to assess the quality of the plan.

The Department is taking steps to ensure that the process for awarding SFSF Phase II funds is transparent. Immediately upon the Department's receipt of a State application, the application will be made available for public viewing on the Department's web site at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/index.html. The final approved version of a state application will also be posted on the Department's web site in addition to any revisions subsequent to an approved application. In addition to facilitating transparency, the Department's public sharing of applications will allow members of the public to learn about the availability of data and information related to the four assurance areas in each state. Also, such a level of transparency provides an additional layer of accountability for States.

Data Collection

This application asks States to answer questions about 37 separate items: indicators (of which there are 34) and descriptors (of which there are three). The Department is, as a general rule, *not asking States to submit the actual data* that respond to these indicators and descriptors; rather, the Department wants to know how States will respond to the requirements of the indicators and descriptors and make the data and information accessible to the public. Specifically, for assurances (a), (c), and (d) (with the exception of, in some cases, indicators (c)(11) and (c)(12)), the application requests a response as to whether or not States are collecting and publicly reporting the data or information via a State website for each indicator and descriptor. If the State is not currently collecting and/or publicly reporting the data for a particular indicator or descriptor, the Department also is requesting the State's plan for doing so as soon as possible, but no later than September 30, 2011. In the case of indicators (c)(11) and (c)(12), if a State will develop, but not implement, the capacity to collect and publicly report the data, the State plan need only address the development of capacity, and not implementation and public reporting for the relevant indicator (s). For indicators (b)(1) and (b)(2), a State must specify whether or not the State collects the information, and if not, what its plans and timelines are for developing and implementing the capacity to do so as soon as possible, but no later than September 30, 2011. For indicator (b)(3), a State must specify whether or not the State collects the information, and, if not, what its plan and timeline are for developing and implementing the capacity to implement this requirement.

[2] If a State's FY 2009 shortfall exceeded 67 percent of the Education Fund allocation, they could request an amount equal to the needed restoration amount, up to 90 percent of the State's total Education Fund allocation.

Public Reporting on a State Website

For the purposes of this program, indicator and descriptor data are largely intended for public use, rather than for Federal reporting. Individual States and communities have the greatest power to hold their schools accountable for the reforms that are in the best interest of their students. Rather than the Department collecting and warehousing this information, it is the intention that State Education Agencies (SEAs) and Local Education Agencies (LEAs) will make the information available to the public in a manner that is useful for stakeholders to understand key information about education in each state and community.

As such, the Department believes that the most effective and expeditious way for States to share information with the public is via the internet. For the purposes of this program, *publicly report* means that the data or information required for an indicator or descriptor are made available to anyone with access to an Internet connection without having to submit a request to the entity that maintains the data and information in order to access that data and information. Therefore, States are required to maintain a public website that provides the data and information that are responsive to the indicator and descriptor requirements. If a State does not currently provide the required data or information, it must provide on this website its plan with respect to the indicator or descriptor and its reports on its progress in implementing that plan.

The URLs (i.e., website addresses) where the data and information are available should be provided where requested in Part 3A of the application. URLs should link to the actual page where the data are available, rather than the main page of the website. Websites where the required data and information are available should show the last date on which the data and information were updated. For example, the URL should not link to the main page for an SEA or Governor's office. For further information on public reporting and website submission, please refer to SFSF Phase II guidance.

Preparing the Application

The Department strongly recommends that States involve parents, educators, content experts, policy makers, technical advisors, teachers' union(s), business, community, and civil rights leaders, and other community stakeholders when preparing the application. While such involvement is not a requirement for approval of State applications, the Department believes that stakeholder input and expertise will help States develop stronger applications and more successful implementation strategies.

APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

To receive the remaining portion of a State's allocation under Education Fund of the Stabilization program, a Governor must submit to the Department an application that provides the following information:

- A completed application cover sheet that includes the signature of the Governor or authorized representative *(Part 1 of the Application)*.
- A complete updated and/or reaffirmation of Maintenance-of-Effort (MOE) data *(Part 2A of the Application).*
- An attestation that the State has met all MOE requirements for FY 2009 that includes the signature of the Governor or authorized representative, or acknowledgement of inability to meet MOE requirements *(Part 2B of the Application).*
- The State's status with regard to collection, public reporting and other information related to the indictors and descriptors in the following education reform assurance areas:

  (a) achieving equity in teacher distribution;
  (b) improving collection and use of data;
  (c) standards and assessments; and
  (d) supporting struggling schools *(Part 3A of the Application).*

- A completed State plan that describes how the applicant will collect and publicly report the data and information related to the assurance indicators and descriptors *(Part 3B of the Application).*
- Complete responses to the questions in the General Requirements section *(Part 3C of the Application).*

STATE FISCAL STABILIZATION FUND PHASE II APPLICATION

PART 1: APPLICATION COVER SHEET

(CFDA No. 84.394)

Legal Name of Applicant (Office of the Governor):	Applicant's Mailing Address:
Office of the Governor Pat Quinn	Office of the Governor Pat Quinn 207 State House Springfield, Illinois 62706

State Contact for the Education Stabilization Fund
Name: David Vaught

Position and Office: Director, Governor's Office of Management and Budget

Contact's Mailing Address:
Governor's Office of Management and Budget
James R. Thompson Center
100 W. Randolph, 15-100
Chicago, Illinois 60601

Telephone: (217) 782-4520
Fax: (217) 524-1514
E-mail address: david.vaught@illinois.gov

To the best of my knowledge and belief, all of the information and data in this application are true and correct.

Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor (Printed Name):	Telephone:
Pat Quinn, Governor	(217) 782-0244
Signature of Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor: X Pat Quinn	Date: 2/12/10

Recommended Statement of Support from the Chief State School Officer *(Optional)*:
The State educational agency will cooperate with the Governor in the implementation of the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund program.

Chief State School Officer (Printed Name):	Telephone:
Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D.	(217) 782-2223
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X Christopher Koch	Date: 2-16-10

Form Approved OMB Number: XXXX-XXXX; Expiration Date: XX/XX/XXXX

PART 2: MAINTENANCE-OF-EFFORT INFORMATION

In the SFSF Phase I Application, States were required to submit the following in order to receive the first portion of funds:

- A *Maintenance-of-Effort Assurance* (Part 4, Section A) of maintaining State support for elementary and secondary education and for public institutions of higher education (IHEs) at least at the level of such support in FY 2006 for FYs 2009, 2010, and 2011.
- A *Maintenance-of-Effort Waiver Assurance* (Part 4, Section B). In the event that a State anticipated being unable to comply with one or more of the Stabilization program MOE requirements referenced in the Maintenance-of-Effort Assurance, the State would provide an assurance that it met the eligibility criteria for a MOE waiver.[3]
- A *Maintenance-of-Effort Baseline Data* form.

In order to complete this Phase II Application, States must reaffirm and/or update the MOE baseline data referenced above as requested in Phase I. Part 2A of this application, *Update of Maintenance-of-Effort Data*, asks that a State reaffirm or update the baseline data provided in Phase I (Maintenance-of-Effort Baseline Data), including actual levels of support for FY 2009.

In Part 2B, a Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor must provide an attestation that the State has met the MOE requirements as was assured in Phase I. If a State cannot meet the MOE requirements, it must submit a Waiver of MOE Requirements or note that it has submitted one already.

Additional information on the MOE requirements can be found in Appendix D—*Instructions for Part 2, Maintenance-Of-Effort*.

[3] Guidance on the Maintenance of Effort Requirements for SFSF and MOE Waiver Form are available at http://www.ed.gov/policy/gen/leg/recovery/statutory/moe-guidance.pdf.

PART 2A: UPDATE OF MAINTENANCE-OF-EFFORT DATA

SPECIAL NOTES:

- In the SFSF Phase I Application, States were required to submit MOE data. The Department is requesting that States reaffirm these data for Phase II, and in particular, to update FY 2009 data to actual levels of State support.
- *For further information, see* Appendix D – Instructions for Part 2: Maintenance of Effort.

1. **Levels of State support for elementary and secondary education** *(the amounts may reflect the levels of State support on either an aggregate basis or a per-student basis):*

   FY 2006 $5,324,281,700

   FY 2009 $5,358,039,600

*This amount is updated from SFSF Phase I Application to reflect final FY 2009 State support expenditures. Final FY 2009 State support expenditures were not available at time of the SFSF Phase I Application submission. See Attachment 3, ISBE FY 2009 Elementary and Secondary Education Financial Ledger.

   FY 2010* $5,752,136,800

   FY 2011* $_____

*FY 2011 data is not yet available.

2. **Levels of State support for public institutions of higher education** *(enter amounts for each year)*:

   FY 2006 $1,604,852,068

   FY 2009 $1,657,594,043

   FY 2010* $1,605,024,500

   FY 2011* $_____

   (* Provide data to the extent that data are currently available.)

3. **Additional Submission Requirements**: In an attachment to the application –

   (a) Identify and describe the data sources used in determining the levels of State support for elementary and secondary education; - and -

SEE ATTACHMENT 1

(b) Identify and describe the data sources used in determining the levels of State support for public IHEs.

SEE ATTACHMENT 2

PART 2B: ATTESTATION OF MAINTENANCE-OF-EFFORT COMPLIANCE

The Governor or his/her authorized representative attests to the following:

To the best of his/her knowledge and based on the best available data, the State has met all maintenance-of-effort requirements for the State Fiscal Stabilization Program for FY 2009 (check all that apply):

X for elementary and secondary education.

X for public Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs).

Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor (Printed Name): Pat Quinn, Governor	
Signature: Pat Quinn	Date: February 12, 2010

<u>If a State has not met or cannot meet MOE for either elementary and secondary education or public IHEs, or both, it must complete the following:</u>

The State has not met all maintenance-of-effort requirements for the State Fiscal Stabilization Program for FY 2009 and

(check one):

☐ has already submitted a MOE Waiver Request to the US Department of Education.

☐ is submitting a MOE Waiver Request with this application package.

PART 3: DATA COLLECTION, PUBLIC REPORTING, AND PLANNING

Requirements

The State plan must describe the State's current ability to collect the data or other information needed for the assurance indicators and descriptors as well as the State's current ability to publicly report (as defined in the Notice of Final Requirements, included here as Appendix E) the data. If the State is currently able to fully collect and publicly report the required data or other information, the State must provide a URL where the most recent data or information may be accessed. If a State is not currently able to collect or publicly report the data or other information, the plan must describe the State's process and timeline for developing and implementing the means to do so as soon as possible but no later than September 30, 2011. These requirements apply to the assurance indicators and descriptors in the following education reform assurance areas: (a) Achieving Equity in Teacher Distribution, (c) Standards and Assessments (with the exception, in many cases, of Indicators (c)(11) and (c)(12)), and (d) Supporting Struggling Schools. Sections related to these assurances are located in sections I, III, and IV of Part 3A and Section I of Part 3B in the application.

In the event that a State will develop, but not implement, the ability to fully collect and publicly report the data for Indicator(s) (c)(11) and/or (c)(12), its plan need not meet the requirements of Section I of Part 3B. Rather, a State should complete a plan that meets the requirements of Section V of Part 3B for the relevant indicator(s). If a State will be able to both develop and implement collection and public reporting of either of these indicators, the plan requirements of Section I of Part 3B will apply to the relevant indicator(s).

Regarding education reform assurance area (b) Improving Collection and Use of Data, the State must describe in the State plan whether the State's data system includes the required elements of a statewide longitudinal data system and whether the State provides teachers with their students' growth data and information related to individual teacher impact. If the State does not meet the requirement, the State plan must describe the State's process and timeline for developing and implementing the means to meet the requirement in accordance with the requirements in the notice. Sections related to this assurance are Section II of Part 3A and Sections II, III, and IV of Part 3B.

The data or information needed for an assurance indicator or descriptor are in some cases already reported to the Department by the State, or are provided by the Department. In those cases, it is understood that the State does and is currently able to collect the data or information. For those elements, the State's plan only needs to address the State's ability to publicly report the data or information, and the State does not need to include a plan for collecting the data or information in Part 3B. The indicators and descriptors involving data or information currently reported to the Department or provided by the Department are marked below with a Confirm icon (see Icon Key below). Sections requiring States to confirm data or information already reported to the Department contain specific links to the appropriate Department webpage. The overall webpage housing all information for indicators requiring confirmation is http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/confirm-indicators.html.

Some elements in this application are of a cross-cutting nature, sharing indicators and/or definitions with another Recovery Act initiative, Race to the Top. These elements are marked by a Cross-Cutting icon with the recovery.gov logo and the Race to the Top logo (see Icon Key below). It is the Department's hope that marking these cross-cutting elements will facilitate consistency and improve the ease of completing the application for the Race to the Top program.

Icon Key

Confirm Icons

Cross-Cutting Icon

Numbering of Fields

Applicants may notice small numbers to the left of checkboxes and text fields in Part 3A. These numbers do not have any significance in terms of point values or codes. Rather, they are designed to be used by both applicants and Department staff alike as a convenient reference point when referring to a particular part of the application.

Overview of Part 3

Part 3A, *Indicators and Descriptors under the Assurances*, is designed to collect short answers about the State's current status with respect to each indicator and descriptor. If you are using the macro-enabled[4] MS Word version of this form, you will be able to check boxes and type your answers directly into the form. If you wish to attach narrative answers in a separate document, you may do so, but be sure to clearly note in the relevant text box that the response is attached and mark the attachment with the citation of the indicator or descriptor to which you are responding.

[4] To enable macros in Microsoft Word, select Save As (if you are using the 2007 version, Save As is under the round icon in the top left hand corner; in older versions, Save As is under the File menu) and from the Save File as Type menu, select Word Macro-Enabled Document.

Part 3B is the *State Plan* section. For those indicators and descriptors for which the State is not currently collecting and/or publicly reporting the requested data and information in such a way that addresses the program requirements, you must provide a plan for doing so in Part 3B. If, based on your answer, you are directed to address the element in Part 3B, write the element reference in the Plan Element Verification chart in Part 3B to keep a running list of the items you will need to address in your State Plan. Directions for which elements must be addressed in the State Plan are embedded into each indicator and descriptor boxes below. Part 3B contains five subsections. The subsections provide separate instructions for the plan elements that must be included for:

I. Assurances (a), (c) (with the exception of Indicators (c)(11) and (c)(12)), and (d);
II. Indicator (b)(1);
III. Indicator (b)(2);
IV. Indicator (b)(3); and,
V. If applicable, Indicators (c)(11) and (c)(12) (Section V).

PART 3A: ASSURANCE INDICATORS AND DESCRIPTORS

Instructions

For each indicator and descriptor, please follow the specific directions in the boxes below. There are two basic types of elements: indicators and descriptors.

- An **indicator** requests a discrete response (e.g., a yes/no answer or short answer) about whether a State is collecting or publicly reporting certain information, as well as where the information can be found. Indicators that involve data already submitted by States to the Department through preexisting collections will only need to be confirmed. The Department will ask States to confirm whether or not these data are accurate and to verify public reporting of them. States need not submit the actual data for each indicator; rather, the data should be reported directly to the public per the application instructions.
- A **descriptor** asks about information which could be provided in a narrative response (e.g., about the development of a type of assessment or teacher evaluation system) about the progress or development of system elements. The Department of Education also asks whether information requested in descriptors is publicly reported. As with the indicators, States do not have to submit the actual descriptor information to the Department. Rather, the State must publicly report the information per the application instructions.

I. Assurance (a): Achieving Equity in Teacher Distribution

A State must collect and publicly report data and other information on: (1) the extent that students in high- and low-poverty schools in the State have access to highly qualified teachers; (2) the extent that current strategies and efforts to address inequities in the distribution of inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers; (3) how teacher and principal performance is evaluated and how performance ratings are used; and (4) the distribution of performance evaluation ratings or levels among teachers and principals.

Indicator (a)(1)	Confirm, for the State, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of core academic courses taught, in the highest-poverty and lowest-poverty schools, by teachers who are highly qualified consistent with section 9101(23) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (ESEA).

Please respond (Yes or No): Are the data related to this indicator at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-a1.xls correct?

[1] ☐ Yes, the data are correct.

[2] X No, the data are not correct.

If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct data and any supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient:[3] http://www.isbe.net/SFSF/ (*See Teacher Quality, Achieving Equity in Teacher Distribution*)

Please respond (check only one):

[4] X The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are provided by the State to the public:[5] http://www.isbe.net/SFSF/

[6] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website but updates it *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Provide the State website where the most recently updated data are provided by the State to the public: [7] Click here to enter text.

[8] ☐ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (a)(2)	**Confirm whether the State's Teacher Equity Plan (as part of the State's Highly Qualified Teacher Plan) fully reflects the steps the State is currently taking to ensure that students from low-income families and minority students are not taught at higher rates than other students by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers (as required in section 1111(b)(8)(C) of the ESEA).**	

Please respond (Yes or No): Is the State's Teacher Equity Plan located at http://www.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/hqtplans/index.html correct?

[1]☐ Yes, the information is correct.

[2]X No, the information is not correct.

➔ If checked, provide below or in an attachment the State's most updated Teacher Equity Plan. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient:[3] See following website address for the State's updated Teachers Equity Plan: http://www.isbe.net/SFSF/pdf/equity_plan.pdf.

Please respond (check only one):

[4]X The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is provided by the State to the public:[5] http://www.isbe.net/SFSF/pdf/equity_plan.pdf.

[6]☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website but updates it *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 2B. Cite "Indicator (a)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:[7]

[8]☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating the information annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification chart in Part 4B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Descriptor (a)(1)	Describe, for each local educational agency (LEA) in the State, the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers and the use of results from those systems in decisions regarding teacher development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State collect a description of the system each LEA uses to evaluate the performance of teachers?

[1] ☐ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information are provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] X No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State collect a description of the manner in which each LEA uses the results of the evaluation systems described above related to the performance of teachers in decisions regarding teacher development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal?

[8] ☐ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[9] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[10] Click here to enter text.

[11] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information are provided by the State to the public: [12] Click here to enter text.

[13] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[14] X No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (a)(3)	Indicate, for each LEA in the State, whether the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State request information on whether the system each LEA uses to evaluate the performance of teachers includes student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion?

[1] ☐ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(3)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(3)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] X No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(3)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (a)(4)	Provide, for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers rated at each performance rating or level.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State collect, for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage of teachers rated at each performance rating or level?

[1] ☐ Yes, the State collects these data.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the data *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(4)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated data are provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(4)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] X No, the State does not collect these data.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(4)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (a)(5)	Indicate, for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, whether the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers rated at each performance rating or level are publicly reported for each school in the LEA.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State collect, for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers rated at each performance rating or level?

[1] ☐ Yes, the State collects these data.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the data *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column. Provide the State website where the most recently updated data are provided by the State to the public: [5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] X No, the State does not collect these data.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Descriptor (a)(2)	Describe, for each LEA in the State, the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals and the use of results from those systems in decisions regarding principal development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State collect a description of the system each LEA uses to evaluate the performance of principals?

[1] ☐ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates it *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] X No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State collect a description of the manner in which each LEA uses the results of the evaluation systems described above related to the performance of principals in decisions regarding principal development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal?

[8] ☐ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[9] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[10] Click here to enter text.

[11] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information are provided by the State to the public: [12] Click here to enter text.

[13] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[14] X No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (a)(6)	Indicate, for each LEA in the State, whether the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect information on whether the system each LEA uses to evaluate the performance of principals includes student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion?

[1] ☐ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates it *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates it *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(6)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(6)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] X No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(6)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (a)(7)	Provide, for each LEA in the State whose principals receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of principals rated at each performance rating or level.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect and publicly report, for each LEA in the State whose principals receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage of principals rated at each performance rating or level?

[1] ☐ Yes, the State collects these data.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the data *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(7)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated data are provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(7)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] X No, the State does not collect these data.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(7)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

II. Assurance (b): Improving Collection and Use of Data

A State must collect and publicly report information on the elements of its statewide longitudinal data system, on whether teachers receive data on student growth in a manner that is timely and informs instructional programs, and on whether the State provides teachers with reports of individual teacher impact on student achievement.

Indicator (b)(1)	Indicate which of the 12 elements described in section 6401(e)(2)(D) of the America COMPETES Act are included in the State's statewide longitudinal data system.

Instructions: Please indicate which of the 12 elements of the America COMPETES Act are included in the State's statewide longitudinal data system.

Please respond (check Yes or No): For pre-K through postsecondary education, does the State's statewide longitudinal data system include the following elements:

(1) A unique statewide student identifier that does not permit a student to be individually identified by users of the system?

X Yes.
☐ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #1 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

(2) Student-level enrollment, demographic, and program participation information?

X Yes.
☐ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #2 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

(3) Student-level information about the points at which students exit, transfer in, transfer out, drop out, or complete pre-K through postsecondary education programs?

X Yes.
☐ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #3 in the Plan Element

Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

4) The capacity to communicate with higher education data systems?

X Yes.
☐ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #4 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

(5) An audit system assessing data quality, validity, and reliability?

X Yes.
☐ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #5 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

Please respond (check Yes or No): For pre-K through grade 12 education, does the State's statewide longitudinal data system include the following elements:

(6) Yearly State assessment records of individual students?

X Yes.
☐ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #6 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

(7) Information on students not tested, by grade and subject?

X Yes.
☐ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #7 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

(8) A teacher identifier system with the ability to match teachers to students?

☐ Yes.
X No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #8 in the Plan Element

Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

(9) Student-level transcript information, including on courses completed and grades earned?

☐ Yes.
X No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #9 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

(10) Student-level college readiness test scores?

X Yes.
☐ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #10 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

Please respond (check Yes or No): For postsecondary education, does the State's statewide longitudinal data system include the following elements:

(11) Information regarding the extent to which students transition successfully from secondary school to postsecondary education, including whether students enroll in remedial coursework?

X Yes.
☐ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #11 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

(12) Other information determined necessary to address alignment and adequate preparation for success in postsecondary education?

X Yes.
☐ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #12 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

Indicator (b)(2)	Indicate whether the State provides student growth data on their current students and the students they taught in the previous year to, at a minimum, teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects in a manner that is timely and informs instructional programs.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State provide student growth data on their current students and the students they taught the previous year to, at a minimum, teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects, in a manner that is timely and informs instructional programs?

☐ Yes. You are not required to provide further information. In Part 3B, Section III, check "Not Applicable."

X No. Provide a plan for providing this information to teachers in Part 3B, Section III.

Indicator (b)(3)	Indicate whether the State provides teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects with reports of individual teacher impact on student achievement on those assessments.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State provide teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects with reports of individual teacher impact on student achievement on those assessments?

☐ Yes. You are not required to provide further information. In Part 3B, Section IV, check "Not Applicable."

X No. Provide a plan for providing this information to teachers in Part 3B, Section IV.

III. Assurance (c): Standards and Assessments

A State must collect and publicly report data and other information on whether students are provided high-quality State assessments; whether students with disabilities and limited English proficient students are included in State assessment systems; whether the State makes information available regarding student academic performance in the State compared to the academic performance of students in other States; and on the extent to which students graduate from high school in four years with a regular high school diploma and continue on to pursue a college education.

Indicator (c)(1)	Confirm the approval status, as determined by the Department, of the State's assessment system under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA with respect to reading/language arts, mathematics, and science assessments.

Please respond (check one): Is the status of the Department's approval, available at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-c1.xls, correct?

[1] X Yes, the status is correct.

➔ [2] ☐ No, the status is not correct. If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct information and any other supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient: [3] Click here to enter text.

Please respond (check one):

[4] X The State makes the status information *publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the status is provided by the State to the public: [5] http://www.isbe.net/SFSF/

[6] ☐ The State makes the status information *publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

➔ If checked, provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public: [7] Click here to enter text.

[8] ☐ The State does not make the status information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Indicator (c)(2)	**Confirm whether the State has developed and implemented valid and reliable alternate assessments for students with disabilities that are approved by the Department.**

Please respond (Yes or No): Is the information related to this indicator, available at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-c2.xls, correct?

[1] X Yes, the status is correct.

➔ [2] ☐ No, the status is not correct. If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct information and any other supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient: [3] Click here to enter text.

Please respond (check one):

[4] X The State makes the status information *publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the status is provided by the State to the public:[5] http://www.isbe.net/SFSF/

[6] ☐ The State makes the status information *publicly available* on a website and *does not keep it up-to-date*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the status publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[7] Click here to enter text.

[8] ☐ The State does not make the status information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the status publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Indicator (c)(3)	Confirm whether the State's alternate assessments for students with disabilities, if approved by the Department, are based on grade-level, modified, or alternate academic achievement standards.

Please respond (check one): Is the information related to this indicator, available at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-c3.xls , correct?

[1] X Yes, the information is correct.

[2] ☐ No, the information is not correct.

➔ If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct information and any other supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient: [3] Click here to enter text.

Please respond (check one):

[4] X The State makes the information *publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[5] http://www.isbe.net/SFSF/

[6] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(3)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[7] Click here to enter text.

[8] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(3)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Indicator (c)(4)	Indicate whether the State has completed, within the last two years, an analysis of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the accommodations it provides students with disabilities to ensure their meaningful participation in State assessments.

Please respond (check one): Has the State, within the last two years, completed an analysis of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the accommodations it provides students with disabilities to ensure their meaningful participation in State assessments?

[1]X Yes, this has been completed within the last two years.

[2]☐ No, this has been completed, but it occurred more than two years ago.

[3]☐ No, this has never been completed.

Please respond (check one):

[4]X The State makes the information *publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[5] http://www.isbe.net/assessment/pdfs/ISAT_comparability1.pdf

***Please note that this report includes analysis of students who were administered Form S. Form S is specifically administered to students with disabilities.**

[6]☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(4)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[7] Click here to enter text.

[8]☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(4)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Indicator (c)(5)	Confirm the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of students with disabilities who are included in State reading/language arts and mathematics assessments.

Please respond (check one): Can the State confirm that the number and percentage of students with disabilities who are included in State *reading/language arts* assessments, available at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-c5r.xls , are correct?

[1] X Yes, the data are correct.

[2] ☐ No, the data are not correct.

➔ If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct data and any supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient:
[3] Click here to enter text.

Please respond (check one):

[4] X The State makes the data relative to the inclusion of students with disabilities on State assessments in *reading/language arts publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[5] http://www.isbe.net/SFSF/

[6] ☐ The State makes the data relative to the inclusion of students with disabilities on State assessments in *reading/language arts publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[7] Click here to enter text.

[8] ☐ The State does not make the data relative to the inclusion of students with disabilities on State assessments in *reading/language arts publicly available* on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Please respond (check one): Can the State confirm that the number and percentage of students with disabilities who are included in State *mathematics* assessments, available at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-c5m.xls , are correct?

[9]X Yes, the data are correct.

[10] ☐ No, the data are not correct.

➔ If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct data and any supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient:
[11] Click here to enter text.

Please respond (check one):

[12]X The State makes the data relative to the inclusion of students with disabilities on State assessments in *mathematics publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[13] http://www.isbe.net/SFSF/

[14] ☐ The State makes the data relative to the inclusion of students with disabilities on State assessments in *mathematics publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[15] Click here to enter text.

[16]☐ The State does not make the data relative to the inclusion of students with disabilities on State assessments in *mathematics* publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Indicator (c)(6)	Indicate whether the State has completed, within the last two years, an analysis of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the accommodations it provides limited English proficient students to ensure their meaningful participation in State assessments.

Please respond (check one): Has the State completed, within the last two years, an analysis of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the accommodations it provides limited English proficient students to ensure their meaningful participation in State assessments?

[1]X Yes, this was completed within the last two years.

[2]☐ No, this was completed more than two years ago.

[3]☐ No, this has never been completed.

Please respond (check one):

[4]X The State makes the information *publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[5] http://www.isbe.net/SFSF/htm/approval_ltr.htm

[6]☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(6)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[7] Click here to enter text.

[8]☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(6)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Indicator (c)(7)	Confirm whether the State provides native language versions of State assessments for limited English proficient students that are approved by the Department.

Please respond (check one): Is the information related to this indicator, available at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-c7.xls , correct?

[1] X Yes, the information is correct.

[2] ☐ No, the information is not correct.

➔ If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct information and any supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient:
[3] Click here to enter text.

Please respond (check one): Is the State's current status available on the State's website?

[4] X The State makes the information *publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[5] http://www.isbe.net/SFSF/

[6] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(7)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[7] Click here to enter text.

[8] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(7)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Indicator (c)(8)	Confirm the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of limited English proficient students who are included in State reading/language arts and mathematics assessments.

Please respond (check one): Can the State confirm that the number and percentage of limited English proficient students who are included in State *reading/language arts* assessments, available at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-c8r.xls , are correct?

[1] X Yes, the data are correct.

[2] ☐ No, the data are not correct.

➔ If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct data and any supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient:
[3] Click here to enter text.

Please respond (check one):

[4] X The State makes the data relative to the inclusion of limited English proficient students on State assessments in *reading/language arts publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[5] http://www.isbe.net/SFSF/

[6] ☐ The State makes the data relative to the inclusion of limited English proficient students on State assessments in *reading/language arts publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(8)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[7] Click here to enter text.

[8] ☐ The State does not make the data relative to the inclusion of limited English proficient students on State assessments in *reading/language arts publicly available* on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(8)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Please respond (check one): Can the State confirm that the number and percentage of limited English proficient students who are included in State *mathematics* assessments, available at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-c8m.xls , are correct?

[9]X Yes, the data are correct.

[10] ☐ No, the data are not correct.

➔ If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct data and any supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient:
[11] Click here to enter text.

Please respond (check one):

[12]X The State makes the data relative to the inclusion of limited English proficient students on State assessments in *mathematics publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[13] http://www.isbe.net/SFSF/

[14] ☐ The State makes the data relative to the inclusion of limited English proficient students on State assessments in *mathematics publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(8)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[15] Click here to enter text.

[16]☐ The State does not make the data relative to the inclusion of limited English proficient students on State assessments in *mathematics* publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(8)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Indicator (c)(9)	Confirm that the State's annual State Report Card (under section 1111(h)(1) of the ESEA) contains the most recent available State reading and mathematics National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) results as required by 34 CFR 200.11(c).

Please respond (check one): Does the State Report Card include the most recent available State reading and math National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) results?

X Yes, the State Report Card includes this information.

☐ No, the State Report Card does not include this information.

➔ If checked, please provide a plan for including this information on the State Report Card in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(9)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I, and mark the Public Reporting column.

Please supply the following information:

Please attach the State Report Card or provide the URL where the State Report Card is provided to the public: http://www.isbe.net/research/htmls/report_card.htm; also

http://webprod.isbe.net/ereportcard/publicsite/getsearchcriteria.aspx

Indicator (c)(10)	**Provide, for the State, for each LEA in the State, for each high school in the State and, at each of these levels, by student subgroup (consistent with section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA), the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of students who graduate from high school using a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate as required by 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1)(i).**

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect these data (as defined in Indicator (c)(10))?

[1] X Yes, the State collects these data.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the data *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(10)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] X The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(10)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect these data.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(10)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Collection and Public Reporting column.

Indicator (c)(11)	**Provide, for the State, for each LEA in the State, for each high school in the State and, at each of these levels, by student subgroup (consistent with section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA), of the students who graduate from high school consistent with 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1)(i), the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) who enroll in an institution of higher education (IHE) (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (HEA)) within 16 months of receiving a regular high school diploma.**

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect these data (as defined in Indicator (c)(11))?

[1] ☐ Yes, the State collects these data.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the data *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Mark the Public Reporting column next to "Indicator (c)(11)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I.
➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Mark the Public Reporting column next to "Indicator (c)(11)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I.

[7] X No, the State does not collect these data.

If No, please respond (check one):

X The State will develop and implement the means to collect and publicly report the data (i.e., the State will collect and publicly report the data) by September 30, 2011.

➔ Provide the State's plan for collecting, making the data publicly available, and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B, Section I. Mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns next to "Indicator (c)(11)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I.

☐ The State will develop but not implement the means to collect and publicly report the data (i.e., the State will not collect and publicly report the data) by September 30, 2011.

➔ Provide the State's plan for developing the means to collect and to publicly report the data (but not the State's implementation of those means) in Part 3B, Section V.

Indicator (c)(12)	**Provide, for the State, for each LEA in the State, for each high school in the State and, at each of these levels, by student subgroup (consistent with section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA), of the students who graduate from high school consistent with 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1)(i) who enroll in a public IHE (as defined in section 101(a) of the HEA) in the State within 16 months of receiving a regular high school diploma, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) who complete at least one year's worth of college credit (applicable to a degree) within two years of enrollment in the IHE.**

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect these data (as defined in Indicator (c)(12))?

[1] X Yes, the State collects these data.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the data *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Mark the Public Reporting column next to "Indicator (c)(12)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I.
➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] X The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Mark the Public Reporting column next to "Indicator (c)(12)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I.

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect these data.

If No, please respond (check one):

☐ The State will develop and implement the means to collect and publicly report the data (i.e., the State will collect and publicly report the data) by September 30, 2011.

➔ Provide the State's plan for collecting, making the data publicly available, and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B, Section I. Mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns next to "Indicator (c)(12)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I.

☐ The State will develop but not implement the means to collect and publicly report the data (i.e., the State will not collect and publicly report the data) by September 30, 2011.

➔ Provide the State's plan for developing the means to collect and to publicly report the data (but not the State's implementation of those means) in Part 3B, Section V.

IV. Assurance (d): Supporting Struggling Schools

A State must collect and publicly report data and other information on the progress of certain groups of schools in the State on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics; on the extent to which reforms to improve student academic achievement are implemented in the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State; and on the extent to which charter schools are operating in the State.

Indicator (d)(1)	Provide, for the State, the average statewide school gain in the "all students" category and the average statewide school gain for each student subgroup (as under section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v) of the ESEA) on the State assessments in reading/language arts and for the State and for each LEA in the State, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that have made progress (as defined in this notice) on State assessments in reading/language arts in the last year.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect these data?

[1] X Yes, the State collects these data.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the data *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated data are provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] X The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.
➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect these data.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (d)(2)	**Provide, for the State, the average statewide school gain in the "all students" category and the average statewide school gain for each student subgroup (as under section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v) of the ESEA) on State assessments in mathematics and for the State and for each LEA in the State, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that have made progress on State assessments in mathematics in the last year.**

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect these data?

[1] X Yes, the State collects these data.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the data *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated data are provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] X The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect these data.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Descriptor (d)(1)	Provide the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" (consistent with the requirements for defining this term set forth in the Definitions section of the NFR) that the State uses to identify such schools.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State have a definition of "persistently lowest achieving schools" (consistent with the requirements for defining this term set forth in the Definitions section of the NFR) for the purposes of this indicator?

[1] X Yes, the State has a definition of "persistently lowest achieving schools" for the purposes of this indicator.

Provide the definition here:[2]

Note: This is a draft definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" that will be modified in consultation with the U.S. Department of Education as necessary as part of our application for funding under the School Improvement Grant program.

To identify "persistently lowest-achieving schools," Illinois has created the following three designations:

- Illinois Priority Schools Designation: The list of schools designated as "Illinois Priority Schools" was derived using data from all schools in the State, regardless of Title I status, that have been in existence for more than three years. The list consists of the lowest achieving 5% of those schools, using three-year average performance of the "all students" group on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined.
- Tier I Designation: The list of schools designated as "Tier I" was derived using data only from Title I schools in federal status (i.e., improvement, corrective action, or restructuring) that have been in existence for more than three years. The list consists of:
  i. The lowest achieving 5% of those schools, using three-year average performance of the "all students" group on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined; or
  ii. Any secondary school in federal improvement status with an average graduation rate of less than 60% over the last three years.
- Tier II Designation: The list of schools designated as "Tier II" was derived using data only from secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds that have been in existence for more than three years. The list consists of:
  i. The lowest achieving 5% of those schools, using three-year average performance of the "all students" group on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined; or
  ii. Any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds with an average graduation rate of less than 60% over the last three years.

By using three-year average performance data and graduation rates, the designations account for multiple years of insufficient school progress. The

list of schools designated as "Illinois Priority Schools" is inclusive of all schools designated as Tier I and Tier II, and also includes other significantly underperforming schools that fall within the bottom 5% of student achievement statewide. Tier I and Tier II designations will be used by ISBE to prioritize funding for certain federal funding, such as the Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants, to the extent required by the U.S. Department of Education. Generally, however, the State will use the "Illinois Priority Schools" designation for reporting requirements applicable to "persistently lowest-achieving schools" and for the targeting of State and federal supports for such schools (including the programs and supports the State intends to propose in its Race to the Top application). As part of its reporting, ISBE will indicate whether an Illinois Priority School is either a Tier I or Tier II school, for School Improvement Grant prioritization purposes.

➔

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[3] X The State has made the definition *publicly available* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the definition is publicly available:[4] http://www.isbe.net/SFSF/

[5] ☐ The State does not make the definition publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the definition publicly available in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (d)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[6] ☐ No, the State does not have a definition of "persistently lowest achieving schools" for the purposes of this indicator.

➔ Provide the State's plan for developing a definition and making it publicly available on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (d)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

* We will consult with the U.S. Department of Education in the coming weeks in the development of an approvable definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools as part of our application for funding under the School Improvement Grant program. Within 15 days of being notified that the Department has approved our definition, we will make that definition publicly available at http://www.isbe.net/SFSF/.

Indicator (d)(3)	Provide, for the State, the number and identity of the schools that are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, that are identified as persistently lowest-achieving schools.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

[1] X Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] X The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] http://www.isbe.net/SFSF/

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(3)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(3)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(3)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

* Within 15 days of being notified that the Department has approved our definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools, we will also update or provide, as applicable, our response to this Indicator (d)(3).

Indicator (d)(4)	**Provide, for the State, of the persistently lowest-achieving schools that are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, the number and identity of those schools that have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed (as defined in the NFR) in the last year.**

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

[1] ☐ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(4)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(4)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] X No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(4)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

* Within 15 days of being notified that the Department has approved our definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools, we will also update or provide, as applicable, our response to this Indicator (d)(4).

Indicator (d)(5)	Provide, for the State, the number and identity of the schools that are secondary schools that are eligible for but do not receive, Title I funds, that are identified as persistently lowest-achieving schools.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

[1] X Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] X The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] http://www.isbe.net/SFSF/

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

* Within 15 days of being notified that the Department has approved our definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools, we will also update or provide, as applicable, our response to this Indicator (d)(5).

Indicator (d)(6)	**Provide, for the State, of the persistently lowest-achieving schools that are secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, the number and identity of those schools that have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed in the last year.**

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

[1] ☐ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(6)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(6)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] X No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(6)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

* Within 15 days of being notified that the Department has approved our definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools, we will also update or provide, as applicable, our response to this Indicator (d)(6).

Indicator (d)(7)	**Provide, for the State and, if applicable, for each LEA in the State, the number of charter schools that are currently permitted to operate under State law.**

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

[1] X Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] X The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] http://www.isbe.net/SFSF/

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(7)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(7)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(7)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (d)(8)	Confirm, for the State and for each LEA in the State that operates charter schools, the number of charter schools currently operating.

Please respond (check one): Is the number of charter schools publicly reported as currently operating for the State and for each LEA at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-d8.xls correct?

[1] X Yes, the data are correct.

[2] ☐ No, the data are not correct.

➔ If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct data and any supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient:[3]

Please respond (check one):

[4] X The State makes the data *publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[5] http://www.isbe.net/charter/pdf/schools_count.pdf

[6] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(8)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
[7] Click here to enter text.

[8] ☐ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(8)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Indicator (d)(9)	Provide, for the State and for each LEA in the State that operates charter schools, the number and percentage of charter schools that have made progress on State assessments in reading/language arts in the last year.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

[1] X Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(9)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] X The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(9)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(9)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (d)(10)	Provide, for the State and for each LEA in the State that operates charter schools, the number and percentage of charter schools that have made progress on State assessments in mathematics in the last year.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

[1] X Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(10)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] X The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(10)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(10)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (d)(11)	Provide, for the State and for each LEA in the State that operates charter schools, the number and identity of charter schools that have closed (including schools that were not reauthorized to operate) within each of the last five years.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

[1] X Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] X The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] http://www.isbe.net/SFSF/ (See Charter Schools, 2009 Annual Report, Table I, pg. 7.)

[4] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(11)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(11)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(11)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (d)(12)	Indicate, for each charter school that has closed (including a school that was not reauthorized to operate) within each of the last five years, whether the closure of the school was for financial, enrollment, academic, or other reasons.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

[1] ☐ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3]

[4] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(12)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(12)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] X No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(12)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

PART 3B: DATA COLLECTION & PUBLIC REPORTING PLAN

Requirement: The State must collect and publicly report the data or other information required by an assurance indicator or descriptor. If the State is not able to fully collect or publicly report, at least annually through September 30, 2011, the State plan must describe the State's process and timeline for developing and implementing, as soon as possible but no later than September 30, 2011, the means to fully collect and publicly report the data or information, including the milestones that the State establishes toward developing and implementing those means, the date by which the State expects to reach each milestone, and any obstacles that may prevent the State from developing and implementing those means by September 30, 2011, including but not limited to requirements and prohibitions of State law and policy. The plan must also include the nature and frequency of reports that the State will provide to the public regarding its progress in developing and implementing those means; the website where the State will make the plan and progress reports publicly available (as defined in the Notice of Final Requirements, Definitions, and Approval Criteria for the SFSF Phase II), the amount of funds the State is using or will use to develop and implement those means, and whether the funds are or will be Federal, State, or local funds.

I. ASSURANCES (a), (c), AND (d)

Important note regarding indicators (c)(11) and (c)(12):

If the State will develop and implement the means to collect and publicly report the data (i.e., the State will collect and publicly report the data) for either of these indicators by September 30, 2011, the plan requirements of this section apply to the indicator(s) for which this is the case.

If the State will develop but not implement the means to collect and publicly report the data (i.e., the State will not collect and publicly report the data) by September 30, 2011, for either of these indicators the requirements for this section do not apply to the indicator for which this is the case. Proceed to Section V.

State Plan Instructions: For each assurance indicator or descriptor under education reform areas ***(a), (c), and (d)*** for which the State is not able to fully collect or publicly report annually the required data or information (as indicated in Part 3A), please attach a plan that provides:

The process and timeline for developing and implementing, as soon as possible, but no later than September 30, 2011, the means to fully collect and/or publicly report (as required) the data or information, including:

- The milestones that the State establishes toward developing and implementing those means;
- The date by which the State expects to reach each milestone;

- Any obstacles that may prevent the State from developing and implementing those means by September 30, 2011, including but not limited to requirements and prohibitions of State law and policy;
- The nature and frequency of reports that the State will provide to the public regarding its progress in developing and implementing those means; and
- The amount of funds the State is using or will use to develop and implement those means, and whether the funds are or will be Federal, State, or local funds.

Furthermore, the plan must satisfy the following general requirements:

(A) Describe the agency or agencies in the State responsible for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, including the institutional infrastructure and describe the capacity of the agency or agencies as they relate to each of those tasks;

(B) Describe the agency or agencies, institutions, or organizations, if any, providing technical assistance or other support in the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, and describe the nature of such technical assistance or other support;

(C) Provide the overall budget for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan.

(D) Describe the way the State will publicly report the plan and the State's progress reports on its plan, including the nature and frequency of updated reports to the public on State actions taken under the plan and the website where the State will make the plan and progress reports publicly available (as defined in the Notice of Final Requirements, Definitions, and Approval Criteria for the SFSF Phase II).

Plan Element Verification: Please fill out the following chart to indicate which elements, per the instructions in Part 1, must be addressed in the State plan, and whether they must address collection, public reporting, or both. Do not list elements that do not need to be addressed in the State plan. Only list those for which the State has been directed to do so in completing Part 3A.

Element	Collection (check if applies)	Public Reporting (check if applies)
I. Indicator (a)(2)		X
II. Descriptor (a)(1)	X	X
Indicator (a)(3)	X	X
Indicator (a)(4)	X	X
Indicator (a)(5)	X	X
Descriptor (a)(2)	X	X
Indicator (a)(6)	X	X

	Element	Collection (check if applies)	Public Reporting (check if applies)	
	Indicator (a)(7)	X	X	
	III. Indicator (c)(10)		X	
	IV. Indicator (c)(11)	X	X	
	V. Indicator (c)(12)		X	
	VI. Indicator (d)(1)		X	
	Indicator (d)(2)		X	
	VII. Indicator (d)(4)	X	X	
	Indicator (d)(6)	X	X	
	VIII. Indicator (d)(9)		X	
	Indicator (d)(10)		X	
	Indicator (d)(12)	X	X	

II. PART 3B.I: ASSURANCES (a), (c), AND (d)

I. INDICATOR (a)(2).

The Illinois State Board of Education ("ISBE") currently makes the State's Teacher Equity Plan publicly available on a website as required by Indicator (a)(2) but has updated the plan less frequently than annually. ISBE has developed a plan to implement the means to update the Teacher Equity Plan at least annually.

A. Plan

ISBE will update and post for public viewing on ISBE's website the State's Teacher Equity Plan at least annually. In August of 2009, ISBE adopted a strategic plan that included as Goal 2 ISBE's intention to expand and improve the pool of highly qualified educators by supporting the preparation, recruitment and retention of educators with expertise both in content areas and instruction. To reach this goal ISBE intends to do the following: 1) strengthen professional development, 2) support National Board Certified teacher attainment for high needs schools, 3) provide induction and mentoring for high needs schools, 4) establish data systems to track teacher data, 5) establish scholarship, loan forgiveness, and recruitment programs for teachers and principals aspiring to teach in high needs schools, and 6) eliminate funding inequities and inadequacies among districts. ISBE will integrate these goals into its existing Teacher Equity Plan and post the updated plan on ISBE's website. The most recently updated information provided by the State to the public is available at www.isbe.net/SFSF/.

ISBE has the existing institutional capacity to design and implement the changes to ISBE's website to include the annual updates to the Teacher Equity Plan.

B. Milestones

Since the Teacher Equity Plan required by this Indicator has already been drafted, ISBE only needs to update such plan and publish the updated version on its website in order to comply with Indicator (a)(2). ISBE has already determined the additional elements that will be added to the plan, and prepared a revised draft of the Teacher Equity Plan. ISBE will coordinate with the U.S. Department of Education to determine the approval process for the revised draft of the Teacher Equity Plan and post the final approved plan on its website.

C. Potential Obstacles

Since the required Teacher Equity Plan has already been drafted and ISBE has determined the updates that are to be included in such plan, ISBE does not foresee any obstacles that would prevent the State from posting the updated Teacher Equity Plan by early in 2010.

D. Budget

ISBE will use existing staff and resources to design and implement the changes to ISBE's website to include the updated Teacher Equity Plan. Existing staff and resources applied to this project will be funded through a combination of State and federal funds.

II. DESCRIPTORS (a)(1), (a)(2), INDICATORS (a)(3), (a)(4), (a)(5), (a)(6), AND (a)(7).

The Illinois State Board of Education ("ISBE") is not currently collecting and/or publicly reporting the data identified in Descriptors (a)(1), (a)(2), Indicators (a)(3), (a)(4), (a)(5), (a)(6), and (a)(7). ISBE has developed a plan to implement the means to collect and publicly report such data or information no later than September 30, 2011. In developing its plan, ISBE has identified discrete milestones that it will accomplish throughout the process to ensure full compliance no later than September 30, 2011. ISBE has also established a budget to ensure the performance evaluation data collection system will be appropriately funded. Finally, ISBE has established a process to inform the public of the progress of implementing performance evaluation data collection system as well as publish collected data.

A. Plan

The U.S. Department of Education has established the indicators and descriptors relating to performance evaluation systems so that the data and information on performance ratings, together with the descriptive information on performance evaluation systems, will provide greater transparency on the design and usage of performance evaluation systems and will serve as an important indicator of the extent to which effective teachers are equitably distributed within local education agencies (LEAs) and states. While ISBE agrees with the need for greater transparency, ISBE also believes data and information on performance evaluations should be coupled with resources that assist LEAs with the design and implementation of more effective evaluation systems. ISBE therefore intends to collaborate with various stakeholders and national experts to design an LEA survey on evaluation instruments that identifies best practices and directs LEAs to areas for system improvement.

In order to meet the requirements for the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund program and ensure LEAs have access to resources to improve their evaluation systems, ISBE is proposing the following plan for collection of the data specified in Descriptor (a)(1) and (a)(2) and Indicators (a)(3) through (a)(7) through a "Performance Evaluation Report and Survey."

1. Initial Development and Reporting

ISBE will collaborate with stakeholders and national experts to design and administer the Performance Evaluation Report and Survey consisting of two separate parts.

- Part I of the instrument will include information addressing all of the SFSF Performance Evaluation Information Elements, including the data identified in Descriptors (a)(1), (a)(2), Indicators (a)(3), (a)(4), (a)(5), (a)(6), and (a)(7). Part I will be mandatory for all districts.
- Part II of the instrument will include survey questions necessary to assist districts with the design and implementation of more valid, reliable, and effective evaluation systems. ISBE believes data and information on performance evaluations should be coupled with resources that assist LEAs with the design and implementation of more effective evaluation systems. ISBE therefore intends to collaborate with various stakeholders and national experts to design a survey on evaluation instruments that identifies best practices and allows LEAs to identify areas for improvement in their local systems. The survey results will be available on a website and linked to tools and resources that can assist districts with implementation of improved evaluation systems. Questions relating to the following aspects of teacher evaluation systems will be considered for inclusion in Part II of the Performance Evaluation Report and Survey:

1. Training provided to individuals performing teacher evaluations.
2. Whether evaluators are monitored, normed regularly, and scheduled as necessary for retraining.
3. The district's data infrastructure to link teachers to individual students.
4. The number of classroom observations used for evaluations.
5. The frequency of evaluations.
6. Whether the district solicits annual feedback from teachers regarding the evaluation process, quality of leadership, and instructional support.
7. Whether school administrators are evaluated and held accountable for the quality of teacher performance evaluations.
8. Whether evaluation ratings are used for compensation and/or career ladder decisions.
9. Whether the district tracks the retention rates of teachers at different levels of effectiveness.
10. Whether teachers and their evaluators develop specific performance goals for professional growth and student learning as the result of evaluations.
11. The percentage of a teacher's rating attributable to student growth.
12. The methods used in tested and untested grades to measure growth.
13. Whether the district tracks evaluation ratings to ensure ratings correlate to student outcomes.

The Performance Evaluation Report and Survey will be administered via ISBE's Web Application Security (IWAS) portal to all district superintendents in the State. The IWAS portal will allow the dissemination of a Web-based instrument and the necessary authentication and authorization security. Initially, data for the mandatory portions of the Performance Evaluation Report and Survey will be self-reported by districts. With the redesign of the TCIS/ECS and TSR applications and the creation of a new interactive TCIS/TSR system, as described in the following sections, certain data can be pre-populated.

ISBE has the existing institutional capacity to design and implement the new system with self-reported data. Foundation assistance and in-kind contributions from various stakeholder organizations will be leveraged to develop Part II of the instrument.

2. Redesign of TCIS/ECS and TSR

As described more fully in Part 3B.II. of this Application regarding Indicator (b)(1), ISBE will redesign the Teacher Certification Information System (TCIS), TCIS Scanning, and Educator Certification System (ECS) to create one live, web-based application that is compatible with current technologies used externally and within ISBE. ISBE will also redesign the Teacher Service Record (TSR) to create a second live, web-based application that incorporates data interoperability with other entities and systems. The redesign of these applications will allow for real-time data reporting to ISBE and point-in-time data extractions by ISBE and other authorized users. The applications will also maintain historical data and track all data changes and uploads. The new TCIS/ECS application will be linked via a live connection to the new TSR application to create a new interactive system.

3. Pre-populated Performance Evaluation Data

As part of the redesign of the TCIS/ECS application described in Part 3B.II of this Application, ISBE will require districts to submit data for each teacher and principal indicating the summative evaluation rating for each performance evaluation. ISBE expects the redesigned TCIS/ECS and TSR applications to be fully deployed by June 30, 2012. Data submitted to ISBE through TCIS/ECS on individual teacher and principal ratings can be aggregated at the school and LEA level, and used to pre-populate the mandatory portions of the Performance Evaluation Report and Survey.

B. Milestones

ISBE has established the following milestones for development and implementation of the performance evaluation data collection system.

Date	Activity
May 2010	Completion of mandatory and optional components of the Performance Evaluation Report and Survey in collaboration with stakeholders
May 2010 – August 2010	o Pilot administration of the Performance Evaluation Report and Survey o Design of website reporting data and providing tools and resources
September through December 2010	First administration of Performance Evaluation Report and Survey to all LEAs in the State
January 2011	Initial posting of information to website. This posting will fulfill all requirements of the SFSF Phase II Application for Descriptors (a)(1) and (a)(2) and Indicators (a)(3), (a)(4), (a)(5), (a)(6), and (a)(7).
June 30, 2012	Full deployment of redesigned TCIS/ECS and TSR; incorporate pre-populated data into Performance Evaluation Report and Survey.

C. Potential Obstacles

ISBE does not foresee any obstacles that would prevent the State from developing the Performance Evaluation Report and Survey and reporting results by September 30, 2011. However, several challenges and obstacles must be addressed in implementing this plan:

Data Quality: ISBE must rely on districts to submit quality data for the Performance Evaluation Report and Survey. As part of ISBE's recognition process for LEAs, ISBE will institute procedures to verify the accuracy of the data submitted. Presumably, data that is pre-populated from TCIS will be of higher quality as teachers and principals will have access to their own data for verification.

Privacy: ISBE must ensure that teacher and principal privacy is protected during the collection and reporting of performance evaluation data. ISBE will institute procedures to ensure the masking of data below a minimum cell size (not less than 10) for the reporting of principal evaluation data, to ensure that data on principals in small districts is not personally identifiable.

Inconsistent Evaluation Instruments: In Illinois, all teachers and principals in public schools must be evaluated, and these evaluations must comply with Article 24A of the School Code. For teacher evaluations, Article 24A specifies the use of three rating categories (excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory). However, over 60 districts have obtained waivers from the requirements of Article 24A through the State's statutory waiver process; many to use more or fewer rating categories. For principals, Article 24A does not specify the rating categories that must be used. Therefore, the variance among rating categories will make it difficult for ISBE to provide a consistent reporting format for the number of teachers and principals evaluated at each performance rating level.

To address this inconsistency and provide for other reforms to the State's teacher and principal evaluation system, ISBE intends to pursue legislation that will:

- Require evaluations using four rating categories for teachers and principals; and
- Eliminate the ability of districts to obtain waivers from the statutory evaluation rating categories.

The legislation will also require all teacher and principal evaluation systems to include student growth as a significant factor in the evaluation.

Funding: ISBE will use existing staff, in-kind contributions, and foundation support to develop the Performance Evaluation Report and Survey, the IWAS data collection instrument for self-reported data, and the website. To use pre-populated data collected through the TCIS/ECS and TSR applications, ISBE will need federal, state, or foundation funding to implement the planned TCIS/TSR system redesign.

D. Budget

As stated above, ISBE will use existing staff, in-kind contributions, and foundation support to develop the Performance Evaluation Report and Survey, the IWAS data collection instrument for self-reported data, and the website. The budget for the redesign of the TCIS/ECS and TSR applications is included in Part 3B.II. of this Application regarding Indicator (b)(1).

E. Publication of Results and Progress

ISBE will collaborate with stakeholders and national experts to design a website that displays data from both the mandatory and optional portions of the Performance Evaluation Report and Survey, in a manner easily accessible and a format easily understandable by the public. This website will also include tools and resources to design and improve upon evaluation systems based on the LEAs' responses to the survey questions. Data on the website will be updated annually.

III. INDICATOR c(10)

Describe the process and timeline for developing and implementing, as soon as possible, but no later than September 30, 2011, the means to fully collect , publicly report (as required) and provide **for the State, for each LEA in the State, for each high school in the State and, at each of these levels, by student subgroup (consistent with section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA), the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of students who graduate from high school using a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate as required by 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1)(i).**

A. Overview

In Illinois, ISBE provides report cards for the State, each LEA and each school. The public site for report card data is:
http://webprod.isbe.net/ereportcard/publicsite/getsearchcriteria.aspx

In addition, the Illinois Interactive Report Card (IIRC), administered by Northern Illinois University through an intergovernmental agreement with ISBE, provides similar information on an interactive website (iirc.niu.edu). The IIRC contains publicly available data on test results and accountability information on all Illinois public schools and students. The IIRC currently contains the number and percentage of students who graduate from each high school.

The currently reported graduation rates on ISBE's website and IIRC are not a "four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate" as required under 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1)(i), as ISBE has not yet collected a sufficient number of years of student-level data to calculate a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate. As a result, ISBE will implement a plan to replace the currently reported graduation rates with four-year adjusted cohort graduation rates following the first school year when ISBE has sufficient data for such calculation. The State, LEA and school report cards issued following the 2010-11 school year will contain the new cohort graduation rates for the State, all LEAs and high schools in Illinois.

B. Project Element

In order to update the report cards for the State, LEAs and high schools and provide IIRC with the new four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate as required by 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1)(i), ISBE, through information it already collects from LEAs and high schools through its Student Information System (SIS), will calculate the new four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate as required under this indicator c(10). ISBE will include this new graduation rate on the State, LEA, and School Report Cards and provide to Northern Illinois University for posting on the IIRC website.

C. Project Management and Governance

ISBE will be responsible for calculating the new four-year adjusted cohort graduation rates for the State and each LEA and school in the State and providing this information to Northern Illinois University for posting on the IIRC.

D. Phasing and Project Scheduling

The below charts identify the milestones and activities for ISBE's implementation of the new four-year adjusted cohort graduation rates into the IIRC, including the anticipated beginning and end dates for each milestone.

Project Milestone Chart

Implementation of New Four-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rates

Project Task	Responsible Party(ies)	Beginning/End Dates
Project planning, calculation, and implementation of new four-year adjusted cohort graduation rates and transfer of such information for posting to the IIRC.	ISBE	January 1, 2011 August 15, 2011
Issuance of first modified report cards including new graduation reports; inclusion of new graduation rate data on IIRC.	ISBE and Northern Illinois University	On or before September 30, 2011

E. Budget

ISBE will use existing staff resources for calculation and implementation of the new four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate. The existing staff and resources applied to this project will be funded through a combination of State and federal funds.

F. Obstacles to the Development and Implementation of the System

Given that ISBE already collects the data to provide this new graduation rate, ISBE does not currently foresee any major obstacles to implementation that are not otherwise being addressed through its current data collection processes.

G. Reporting on Development and Implementation

As ISBE already collects the data to calculate and implement the new four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate, there are no reporting and implementation milestones to report. The public sites for access to this data upon release are identified above. ISBE, in cooperation with Northern Illinois University, as administrator of the IIRC, will update these public sites at least annually upon receipt of updated data.

IV. INDICATOR c(11)

Describe the process and timeline for developing and implementing, as soon as possible, but no later than September 30, 2011, the means to fully collect, publicly report (as required) and provide **for the State, for each LEA in the State, for each high school in the State, and at each of these levels, by student subgroup (consistent with section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the**

ESEA), of the students who graduate from high school consistent with 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1)(i), the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) who enroll in an institution of higher education (IHE) (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (HEA)) within 16 months of receiving a regular high school diploma.

The State, in partnership with the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE), the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE), the Illinois Community College Board (ICCB), the Illinois Shared Enrollment and Graduation File (ISEG) and ACT, is in the process of creating a High School Feedback Report (HSFB) which will utilize information from both public four (4) year institutions and community colleges to provide the state with data that will include the number and percentage of students who enroll in an institution of higher education (IHE) within 16 months of receiving a regular high school diploma. The HSFB Report will also include information from private institutions who wish to participate.

The High School Feedback Report

A. Overview.

In 2007, the Illinois General Assembly adopted Senate Joint Resolution No. 59, which called for IBHE, ISBE and ICCB to, among other directives, develop a HSFB Report in conjunction with testing services that would better inform high school administrators and education policymakers about students' performance during their first year of postsecondary education and ensure that the HSFB Report be available to the public. In response to this Joint Resolution, ISBE, ICCB, IBHE and ISEG ("HSFB Parties") entered into the Intergovernmental and Data Sharing Agreement for the Productions of the High School Feedback Report and P-20 Research and Analysis on August 6, 2009 (the "Agreement"). Through this Agreement, the parties have agreed to develop a High School Feedback Report to inform schools and districts on their graduates' postsecondary outcomes with the intent of using this information to inform district and State program to improve student achievement. In addition, under this Agreement, the parties will establish the necessary data sharing arrangements among the parties to link student test scores, length of enrollment and graduation records over time. The HSFB Parties anticipate that the first HSFB Report will be issued in Spring 2010. While the first HSFB Report will not contain the information requested under (c)(11), subsequent reports will include the data requested under this element (c)(11).

B. Core Project Elements.

1. Modification to the HSFB Report.

The Agreement referenced above contained the form HSFB Report to be prepared by ACT through the data provided by the HSFB Parties. This report provides a summary of statistics for ACT-tested graduates for a particular school year from a particular Illinois high school who attended an Illinois IHE and compares those students to all Illinois high school graduates who have attended an Illinois public IHE. Currently, the report includes the number of graduates of a particular high school who attend an Illinois public IHE, but it does not include the total number of graduating students from that high school. As a result, in order to provide the

number and percentage of graduating students who go on to attend an IHE, the HSFB Parties will work with ACT to modify the report to include in the appropriate chart the total number of graduating students from the particular high school. Additionally, the report currently only accounts for students who enroll in an Illinois public IHE the Fall immediately following their graduation from high school. Therefore, the HSFB Parties will work with ACT to expand the scope of the report to include high school graduates who enrolled in an IHE within 16 months after high school graduation. For example, the 2010-11 HSFB Report will be based on 2008 high school graduates and will provide enrollment data for graduates entering a postsecondary IHE during the 2008-09 school year or the Fall of 2009.

2. Expansion of Scope of HSFB Report.

As the report contains data only for high school graduates that attend an Illinois public IHE, it cannot provide comparison data for students who attend a private IHE inside or outside of Illinois, nor does it provide any data for those students who attend a public IHE outside of Illinois. Therefore, the report, in its current form, fails to provide data for a large portion of Illinois high school graduates. Recognizing this limitation, the HSFB Parties will expand the data collected to include postsecondary institutions outside of Illinois. In order to capture this additional data, ICCB, on behalf of the HSFB Parties, will contract with the National Student Clearinghouse, which is able to provide these data on a nationwide basis. While ICCB will initially contract with the National Student Clearinghouse to provide these data for in-state private IHEs, IBHE, per the P-20 Longitudinal Educational Data System Act, is developing a process to collect student enrollment data from private in-state IHEs. Once this process is established, IBHE will use its own data instead of National Student Clearinghouse data for private in-state students.

IBHE will also lead the efforts of the state education partners to pursue multistate collaborations to share student performance data. To date, IBHE has engaged in preliminary conversations with Midwest Higher Education Compact member states and the Higher Learning Commission. In particular, IBHE will focus on pursuing data-sharing agreements with neighboring states, which tend to enroll most Illinois high school graduates who go out-of-state for college and which employ many Illinois high school and college graduates. With these data-sharing agreements in place, Illinois and its neighboring states can provide joint reports on education outcomes.

3. Student Sub-groups and Student Confidentiality.

Per the modifications to the HSFB Report outlined above, Illinois will be able to publicly report the number and percentage of students who enroll in an IHE within 16 months of receiving a regular high school diploma. In addition, sub-tables will be provided for each student subgroup consistent with Section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA. To protect student confidentiality, no information that contains any personally identifiable student information or data cells comprising information from less than ten students will be included in the HSFB Report.

C. Project Management and Governance

The primary State agencies responsible for the development, implementation, and oversight of the HSFB Report, with the modifications set forth above are the HSFB Parties. The HSFB Report will be prepared by ACT through a contract with ISBE. The HSFB Parties and, where appropriate, ACT will: 1) determine the processes for modifying the HSFB Report, 2) work with the National Student Clearinghouse to obtain the data necessary to the HSFB Report to include data for all high school graduates enrolling in a postsecondary IHE outside of Illinois, 3) identify and develop processes for obtaining this same information on private, in-state IHEs internally through IBHE rather than through the National Student Clearinghouse as a cost saving mechanism for the State, and 4) implement the modified HSFB Report in order to better inform high school administrators, education policymakers and the public about students' performance during postsecondary education. The HSFB Report will be managed by the HSFB Parties in accordance with the procedures and timelines set forth in the Agreement, as amended.

D. Phasing and Project Scheduling

The below charts identify the milestones and activities for the development of the modified HSFB Report, including the anticipated beginning and end dates for each milestone.

Project Milestone Chart

Modification of Illinois High School Feedback Report to Include Data Required under c(11)

Project Task	Responsible Party	Beginning/End Dates
Plan and design modifications to HSFB Report to expand upon information regarding postsecondary enrollment and performance.	HSFB Parties	January 4, 2010 June 30, 2010
Plan and design process to incorporate data from National Student Clearinghouse to access public and private higher education data nationwide to better track transfer and concurrent enrollment students.	IBHE, ICCB, ISBE	January 4, 2010 June 30, 2010
Pursue and enter into multistate collaborations to share postsecondary data, particularly with neighboring states.	IBHE, ICCB, ISAC	July 1, 2010 June 30, 2012
Implement modifications to HSFB Report to include total number of high school graduates from subject high school and expand timeframe for measuring student	HSFB Parties and ACT.	July 1, 2010 October 31, 2010

enrollment in an IHE.		
Implement expansion of data set used for HSFB Report to include postsecondary IHEs outside of Illinois and private IHEs nationwide through contract with National Student Clearinghouse.	ICCB in partnership with other HSFB Parties	July 1, 2010 October 31, 2010
Issuance of first modified HSFB Report including information required by Indicator c(11).	HSFB Parties and ACT	On or before1/31/2011

e. Budget

The budget for the development, execution and oversight of the modifications to the HSFB Report is as follows:

Statewide IHE Enrollment Rate Data Collection System

Budget Item	Amount	Source of Funds (federal, State or local)
Plan, design, and implement modifications to HSFB Report to expand upon information regarding postsecondary enrollment and performance.	$25,000	State (ISBE, IBHE and ICCB) Federal Grant (pending)*: SLDS
Plan and design process to incorporate data from National Student Clearinghouse to access public and private higher education data nationwide to better track transfer and concurrent enrollment students.	$50,000 (Implement HSFB modifications) $200,000 (obtaining Nat'l Student Clearinghouse data; annually re-occurring cost)	State (ISBE, IBHE and ICCB) Federal Grant (pending)*: SLDS

*If federal funding is not provided, ISBE will seek State funding for this project.

F. Obstacles to the Development and Implementation of the System

The State, through its planning process, has identified and will continue to work to identify technical obstacles to the modification of the HSFB Report so that the State can address and resolve any issues which may impede its ability to implement these modifications by the dates set forth in the Project milestone chart set forth above. For example, one obstacle the State has already identified is the need to obtain data from the National Student Clearinghouse for students attending out-of-state and in-state private IHEs. Also, the inclusion of the information required by Indicator c(11) will involve substantial modifications to ACT's standard HSFB form, which may involve programming or technical challenges. With the enactment of the P-20

Longitudinal Education Data System Act, there are no regulatory or statutory obstacles to the modification of the HSFB Report.

G. Reporting on Development and Implementation

The Illinois Interactive Report Card (IIRC), administered by Northern Illinois University, provides publicly available data on test results and accountability information on all Illinois public schools and students, includes the ISBE web-based school and district improvement planning templates, and provides school districts with access to student-level data for analysis and planning. The HSFB Report developed in Spring 2010 will be uploaded to the IIRC so that the report for each high school can be easily obtained by members of the public, and used by school districts in combination with other data for analysis and planning.

ISBE, through its website, will post the agreements between the key stakeholders in the development and implementation of the HSFB Report. Until the issuance of the first modified HSFB Report in early 2011, ISBE's website will also provide periodic progress reports, at least semi-annually, on the development of the HSFB Report and the modifications to it discussed above.

V. INDICATOR c(12)

Describe the process and timeline for developing and implementing, as soon as possible, but no later than September 30, 2011, the means to fully collect, publicly report (as required) and provide **for the State, for each LEA in the State, for each high school in the State and, at each of these levels, by student subgroup (consistent with section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA), of the students who graduate from high school consistent with 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1)(i) who enroll in a public IHE (as defined in section 101(a) of the HEA) in the State within 16 months of receiving a regular high school diploma, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) who complete at least one year's worth of college credit (applicable to a degree) within two years of enrollment in the IHE.**

The State, in partnership with the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE), the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE), the Illinois Community College Board (ICCB), the Illinois Shared Enrollment and Graduation File (ISEG) and ACT, is in the process of creating a High School Feedback Report (HSFB) which will utilize information from both Illinois public four (4) year institutions and community colleges to provide the State with data including the number and percentage of students who enroll in an institution of higher education (IHE) within 16 months of receiving a regular high school diploma who complete at least one year's worth of college credit (applicable to a degree) within two years of enrollment in the IHE.

<u>The High School Feedback Report</u>

A. Overview.

In 2007, the Illinois General Assembly adopted Senate Joint Resolution No. 59, which called for IBHE, ISBE and ICCB to, among other directives, develop a HSFB Report in

conjunction with testing services that would better inform high school administrators and education policymakers about students' performance during their first year of postsecondary education and ensure that the HSFB Report be available to the public. In response to this Joint Resolution, ISBE, ICCB, IBHE and ISEG ("HSFB Parties") entered into the Intergovernmental and Data Sharing Agreement for the Productions of the High School Feedback Report and P-20 Research and Analysis on August 6, 2009 (the "Agreement"). Through this Agreement, the parties have agreed to develop a High School Feedback Report to inform schools and districts on their graduates' postsecondary outcomes with the intent of using this information to inform district and State program to improve student achievement. In addition, under this Agreement, the parties will establish the necessary data sharing arrangements among the parties to link student test scores, length of enrollment and graduation records over time. The HSFB Parties anticipate that the first HSFB Report will be issued in Spring 2010. While the first HSFB Report will not contain the information requested under c(12), subsequent reports will include the data requested under this element (c)(12).

B. Core Project Elements.

1. Modifications to the HSFB.

In addition to the modifications of the HSFB Report set forth under element c(11), the HSFB Parties will work with ACT to further modify the HSFB Report to include in the appropriate chart the number and percentage of students who enroll in an Illinois public institution of higher education (IHE) within 16 months of receiving a regular high school diploma who complete at least one year's worth of college credit (applicable to a degree) within two years of enrollment in the Illinois public IHE. As IBHE and ISEG already have this data from Illinois public IHEs, the State will not need to use an outside contractor to provide such data.

2. Student Sub-groups and Student Confidentiality.

Per the modifications to the HSFB Report outlined above, Illinois will be able to publicly report the number and percentage of students who enroll in an institution of higher education (IHE) within 16 months of receiving a regular high school diploma who complete at least one year's worth of college credit (applicable to a degree) within two years of enrollment in the IHE. In addition, sub-tables will be provided for each student subgroup consistent with Section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA. To protect student confidentiality, no information that contains any personally identifiable student information or data cells comprising information from less than ten students will be included in the HSFB Report.

C. Project Management and Governance

The primary State agencies responsible for the development, implementation, and oversight of the HSFB Report, with the modifications set forth above are the HSFB Parties. The HSFB Report will be prepared by ACT through a contract with ISBE. The HSFB Parties and, where appropriate, ACT will determine the processes for modifying the HSFB Report and implement the modified HSFB Report in order to better inform high school administrators, education policymakers and the public about students' performance during postsecondary

education. The HSFB Report will be managed by the HSFB Parties in accordance with the procedures and timelines set forth in the Agreement, as amended.

D. Phasing and Project Scheduling

The below charts identify the milestones and activities for the development of the modified HSFB Report, including the anticipated beginning and end dates for each milestone.

Project Milestone Chart

Modification of Illinois High School Feedback Report to Include Data Required under c(12)

Project Task	Responsible Party	Beginning/End Dates
Plan and design of modifications to the HSFB Report to include the information required under this indicator c(12).	HSFB Parties and ACT.	January 4, 2010 June 30, 2010
Implementation of modifications to the HSFB Report to include the information required under this indicator c(12).	HSFB Parties and ACT.	July 1, 2010 September 30, 2010
Issuance of first modified HSFB Report including information required by Indicator c(12).	HSFB Parties and ACT	On or before January 31, 2011

E. Budget

The budget for the development, execution and oversight of these modifications to the HSFB Report is as follows:

IHE Completion of 1 Year of College Credit Data Collection System

Budget Item	Amount	Source of Funds (federal, State or local)
Planning, designing and implementing the modification to the HSFB Report to include the information required under this indicator c(12).	Budget for modification to HSFB Report set forth in c(11) includes the modification to the HSFB Report required under this indicator c(12).	State (ISBE, IBHE and ICCB) Federal Grant (pending): SLDS *If federal funding is not provided, ISBE will seek State funding for this project.

F. Obstacles to the Development and Implementation of the System

The State, through its planning process, will identify and address any technical obstacles to the modification of the HSFB Report which may impede its ability to implement this modification by the dates set forth in the Project Milestone Chart set forth above. With the enactment of the P-20 Longitudinal Education Data System Act, there are no regulatory or statutory obstacles to the modification of the HSFB Report.

G. Reporting on Development and Implementation

The Illinois Interactive Report Card (IIRC), administered by Northern Illinois University, provides publicly available data on test results and accountability information on all Illinois public schools and students, includes the ISBE web-based school and district improvement planning templates, and provides school districts with access to student-level data for analysis and planning. The HSFB Report developed in Spring 2010 will be uploaded to the IIRC so that the report for each high school can be easily obtained by members of the public, and used by school districts in combination with other data for analysis and planning.

ISBE, through its website, will post the agreements between the key stakeholders in the development and implementation of the HSFB Report. Until the issuance of the first modified HSFB Report in early 2011, ISBE's website will also provide periodic progress reports, at least semi-annually, on the development of the HSFB Report and the modification to it discussed above.

VI. INDICATORS (d)(1) AND (d)(2).

The Illinois State Board of Education ("ISBE") is not currently publicly reporting the data identified in Indicators (d)(1) and (d)(2). ISBE has developed a plan to implement the means to publicly report such data or information by January 31, 2010.

A. Plan

ISBE will post for public viewing on ISBE's website the following data in a manner easily accessible and a format easily understandable by the public:

- average statewide school gains in the "all students" category on State assessments in reading/language arts in the last year;
- average statewide school gains in each subgroup on State assessments in reading/language arts in the last year;
- the number and percentage of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that have made progress on State assessments in reading/language in the last year;
- average statewide school gains in the "all students" category on State assessments in mathematics in the last year;
- average statewide school gains in each subgroup on State assessments in mathematics in the last year; and
- the number and percentage of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that have made progress on State assessments in mathematics in the last year.

ISBE has the existing institutional capacity to design and implement the changes to ISBE's website to include this additional school performance data.

B. Milestones

Since the school performance data required by these Indicators is already collected by ISBE, design of the reporting format and publication are the only steps remaining to comply with Indicators (d)(1) and (d)(2). ISBE will determine how to integrate the above data into its website appropriately and post it for public viewing by January 31, 2010.

C. Potential Obstacles

Since the required data has already been collected by ISBE, ISBE does not foresee any obstacles that would prevent the State from posting these required components of the school performance data by January 31, 2010.

D. Budget

ISBE will use existing staff and resources to design and implement the changes to ISBE's website to include this component of school performance data. The existing staff and resources applied to this project will be funded through a combination of State and federal funds.

VII. INDICATORS (d)(4) AND (d)(6).

- **Number and identity of persistently low-performing schools that have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed in the last year; and**
- **Number and identity of persistently low performing schools that are secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds that have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed in the last year.**

The Illinois State Board of Education ("ISBE") is not currently collecting and/or publicly reporting the data identified in Indicators (d)(4) and (d)(6). ISBE has developed a plan to implement the means to collect and publicly report such data or information no later than September 30, 2011. In developing its plan, ISBE has identified discrete milestones that it will accomplish throughout the process to ensure full compliance no later than September 30, 2011. ISBE has also established a budget to ensure the school performance data collection will be appropriately funded. Finally, ISBE has established a process to inform the public of the progress of implementing school performance data collection as well as publish collected data.

A. Plan

In order to meet the requirements for the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund program and ensure LEAs and the general public have access to data that aids in the identification and support of struggling schools, ISBE is proposing the following plan for the collection and reporting on ISBE's website of the data specified in Indicators (d)(4) and (d)(6). ISBE currently has established a web-based system for School Improvement Plans (SIPs), School Restructuring

Plans, District Improvement Plans (DIPs), and Technology Integration Plans (TIPs). ISBE will integrate the collection of the above school performance data into this process. All of these plans must be completed using the *ePlans* system housed on the Interactive Illinois Report Card (IIRC) site administered by Northern Illinois University. The *ePlans* system provides an interactive framework where data is automatically downloaded to the plan template, and educators must develop plans in response to identified needs. ISBE will include as part of the SIP and Restructuring Plan for schools meeting the definition of "persistently low-performing schools" a question requiring schools to indicate whether or not they have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed in the prior year. The *ePlans* template will include clear definitions and guidance on these four terms, and require schools that have implemented a turnaround, restart, closure, or transformation to describe the approach used.

SIPs and Restructuring Plans must be submitted to ISBE with the approval of the local school board within 135 days after the district's notification regarding status. SIPs and Restructuring Plans cover a two-year period.

ISBE will amend its intergovernmental agreement with Northern Illinois University to redesign and implement the *ePlans* system with this additional self-reported school performance data.

ISBE will include data and information regarding schools that have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed on its website in a manner easily accessible and a format easily understandable by the public by January 30, 2011.

Note on City of Chicago District 299: Unlike all other districts in the State, District 299 does not use *ePlans* for its school improvement and restructuring planning processes. ISBE will require CPS to submit a report to ISBE containing data and information indicating whether its "persistently low-performing schools" have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed, in accordance with the same timelines as districts using *ePlans* for reporting. ISBE will then include this data and information on its website with the similar data and information from other districts.

B. Milestones

ISBE has established the following milestones for development and implementation of this plan.

Date	Activity
July – September, 2010	Modify *ePlans* to include definitions, questions and information on whether persistently low-performing schools have turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed in the prior year. Beta testing on changes to *ePlans* system.
Fall 2010	Collect school performance data regarding schools that have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed during the 2009-2010 school year through *ePlans* system.
January 2011	Post collected school performance data regarding schools that have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed during

	the 2009-2010 school year on ISBE's website.

C. Potential Obstacles

ISBE does not foresee any obstacles that would prevent the State from collecting and posting these required components of the school performance data by September 30, 2011.

However, ISBE may need to address certain challenges related to data quality. Since *ePlans* are self reported by schools and districts, ISBE must rely on such schools and districts to provide information that accurately reflects the actions taken in the school during the prior year. As part of ISBE's auditing and recognition process for LEAs, ISBE will institute procedures to verify the accuracy of the data submitted.

D. Budget

ISBE anticipates that the cost to implement the modifications to the *ePlans* system through ISBE's intergovernmental agreement with Northern Illinois University will be $50,000. Once this data has been collected through the *ePlans* system, ISBE will use existing staff and resources to design and implement the reporting of this data on ISBE's website. The existing staff and resources applied to this project will be funded through a combination of State and federal funds.

VIII. INDICATORS (d)(9), (d)(10), AND (d)(12).

- **Number and percentage of charter schools that have made progress on State assessments in reading/language arts in the last year; and**
- **Number and percentage of charter schools that have made progress on State assessments in mathematics in the last year.**
- **Indicate, for each charter school that has been closed (including a school that was not reauthorized to operate) within each of the last five years, whether the closure of the school was for financial, enrollment, academic, or other reasons.**

The Illinois State Board of Education ("ISBE") is not currently publicly reporting the data identified in Indicators (d)(9), (d)(10), and (d)(12). ISBE has developed a plan to implement the means to collect and publicly report such data or information no later than September 30, 2011. In developing its plan, ISBE has identified discrete milestones that it will accomplish throughout the process to ensure full compliance no later than September 30, 2011. ISBE has also established a budget to ensure the school performance data collection will be appropriately funded. Finally, ISBE has established a process to inform the public of the progress of implementing school performance data collection as well as publish collected data.

A. Plan

Illinois law currently requires ISBE to compile annual evaluations of charter schools received from local school boards and prepare a annual report on charter schools. 105 ILCS 5/27A-12. In reference to Indicator (d)(12), these annual evaluations do not currently require closing charter schools to state the specific reason for school closure. ISBE will revise these

annual evaluations to require closing charter schools to report the specific reason for the school closure (financial, enrollment, academic, or other reasons). If this information is not obtained from the charter school, ISBE will obtain the reason for the charter school's closure from the local school board.

As required by the Illinois Charter Schools Law, on or before the second Wednesday of every even-numbered year, the State Board shall issue a report to the General Assembly and the Governor on its findings for the previous 2 school years. 105 ILCS 5/27A-12. ISBE is required to compare the performance of charter school pupils with the performance of technically and economically comparable groups of pupils in other public schools who are enrolled in academically comparable courses. 105 ILCS 5/27A-12.

In even-numbered years, ISBE will include in its biennial report the following data specified in Indicators (d)(9), (d)(10), and (d)(12):

- Number and percentage of charter schools that have made progress on State assessments in reading/language arts in the last year; and
- Number and percentage of charter schools that have made progress on State assessments in mathematics in the last year.
- The specific reasons for the closure of any charter schools during the above-mentioned period.

In odd-numbered years, this data will be provided as a supplement to the prior biennial report.

ISBE will provide the biennial reports and supplements thereto on its existing website, in a manner easily accessible and a format easily understandable by the public.

ISBE has the existing institutional capacity to design and implement the changes to ISBE's website to include this additional school performance data and school closure data.

B. Milestones

ISBE has established the following milestones for development and implementation of the performance evaluation data collection system.

Date	**Activity**
January 2010	ISBE will issue its biennial report on charter schools to the General Assembly and Governor, as required by 105 ILCS 5/27A-12.
	ISBE will post to its website supplemental charter school performance data for the 2008-2009 school year, including the data specified in Indicators (d)(9) and (d)(10).
February-March 2010	ISBE will revise the charter school annual evaluations to require any closing charter school to report the specific reason for its closure.
Annually, commencing in	ISBE will post to its website the charter school performance data,

January 2011	including the data specified in Indicators (d)(9), (d)(10), and (d)(12). On even-numbered years, when ISBE is required to provide a biennial report to the General Assembly and Governor, this information will be included in the biennial report. On odd-numbered years, this information will be published as a supplement to the previous biennial report.

C. Potential Obstacles

For Indicators (d)(9) and (d)(10), since the required data is already collected, ISBE does not foresee any obstacles that would prevent the State from posting these required components of the school performance data in accordance with the schedule set forth above. For Indicator (d)(12), given that all charter schools are required to submit annual evaluations to the State, ISBE does not foresee any obstacles in revising the annual evaluations to include information on charter school closures and collecting this information from applicable charter schools, or local school boards, if needed.

D. Budget

ISBE will use existing staff and resources to design and implement the changes to ISBE's website to include this component of charter school performance data. The existing staff and resources applied to this project will be funded through a combination of State and federal funds.

II. INDICATOR (b)(1)

Plan Instructions

If (as indicated in Part 3A) the State does not have a statewide longitudinal data system that fully includes all 12 elements of the America COMPETES Act, as addressed in indicator **(b)(1),** please attach a plan that provides the process and timeline for developing and implementing, as soon as possible, but no later than September 30, 2011, a statewide longitudinal data system that includes all 12 elements of the America COMPETES Act, including the following information:

- The milestones that the State establishes toward developing and implementing those means;
- The date by which the State expects to reach each milestone;
- Any obstacles that may prevent the State from developing and implementing those means by September 30, 2011, including but not limited to requirements and prohibitions of State law and policy;
- The nature and frequency of reports that the State will provide to the public regarding its progress in developing and implementing those means; and
- The amount of funds the State is using or will use to develop and implement those means, and whether the funds are or will be Federal, State, or local funds.

Furthermore, the plan must satisfy the following general requirements:

(A) Describe the agency or agencies in the State responsible for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, including the institutional infrastructure and describe the capacity of the agency or agencies as they relate to each of those tasks;

(B) Describe the agency or agencies, institutions, or organizations, if any, providing technical assistance or other support in the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, and describe the nature of such technical assistance or other support;

(C) Provide the overall budget for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan; and

(D) Describe the way the State will publicly report the plan and the State's progress reports on its plan, including the nature and frequency of updated reports to the public on State actions taken under the plan and the website where the State will make the plan and progress reports publicly available (as defined in the Notice of Final Requirements, Definitions, and Approval Criteria for the SFSF Phase II).

Plan Element Verification: Please mark which elements, per the instructions in Part 1, must be addressed in your state plan:

COMPETES Element	Must be addressed in plan	Does not need to be addressed in plan
1		X
2		X
3		X
4		X
5		X
6		X
7		X
8	X	
9	X	
10		X
11		X
12		X

INDICATOR (b)(1)(#8)

Description of plan providing the process and timeline for developing and implementing, as soon as possible, but no later than September 30, 2011, a statewide longitudinal data system that includes **a teacher identifier system with the ability to match teachers to students.**

A. Overview

The P-20 Longitudinal Education Data System Act establishes the legal authority for the creation of a statewide teacher identifier system with the ability to match teachers to students. Specifically, the ISBE data warehouse must include a "teacher and administrator identifier system with the ability to match students to early learning, elementary, and secondary teachers and elementary and secondary administrators." Public Act 96-0107, Section 15(c)(5).[5]

The state plan for establishing a teacher and administrator identifier system with the ability to match students to their teachers will include data collection mechanisms coordinated with the Statewide Transcript System, data collection through ISBE's Student Information System (SIS), and the use of teacher certification and course code information collected in the ISBE Teacher Certification Information System (TCIS), Educator Certification System (ECS), and Teacher Service Record System (TSR). In addition to collecting the necessary data, ISBE will need to address the business rules for establishing student and teacher linkages to ensure the data can be used in meaningful ways. Further enhancements to the Teacher Data Warehouse will permit reporting that benefits the state and institutions providing teacher education.

B. Core Project Elements

1. Redesign of TCIS/ECS and TSR

Over the next three years, ISBE will undertake the development of a data warehouse within the agency that will link data across key agency systems. In coordination with the development of the data warehouse, ISBE will redesign the following data collection systems to allow for the matching of students to their teachers:

- TCIS/ECS–TCIS collects and manages data and processes that support teacher certifications, teacher placement, professional development, and teacher demographic information. ECS is a web portal that allows educators and LEA administrators to access certification information in TCIS.
- TSR–TSR collects position and assignment data for teachers and administrators employed by Illinois LEAs and other local educational agencies.

For most middle and high school students, defining teacher/student linkages requires establishing the connection between students, teachers, and course information. Therefore, implementation of the statewide system matching middle and high school students to their teachers will be implemented in close coordination with the establishment of the Statewide Transcript System. As the course codes are established as part of the statewide transcript system,

[5] ISBE's Teacher Service Record System ("TSR") establishes an administrator identifier and collects data on administrator assignment at the school building level. Therefore, by linking the school-level data in TSR to the school-level data in ISBE's Student Information System, ISBE can create the administrator/student linkage required by the P-20 Longitudinal Education Data System Act.

TSR will be modified to include this course code data for teachers of record who assign letter grades. The student-level course code and letter grade information captured through SIS will then be linked with the teacher-level data included in TSR.

ISBE expects the redesigned TCIS/ECS and TSR applications to be fully deployed by June 30, 2012. However, ISBE will advance the development of the course codes collection process to integrate with the Statewide Transcript System implementation by no later than September 30, 2011, in order to meet all requirements under this State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Phase II application.

When redesigning the TCIS/ECS system, ISBE will seek to create one live, web-based application that is compatible with current technologies used within and external to ISBE. Similarly, the redesign of TSR must create a second live, web-based application that incorporates data interoperability with other entities and systems as a major consideration. Both applications need to allow for real-time data reporting to ISBE and point-in-time data extractions by ISBE and other authorized users. The applications also need to maintain historical data and track all data changes and uploads. The new TCIS/ECS application must be linked via a live connection to the new TSR application to create a new interactive system.

The new system will include, but not be limited to, web-based educator applications (eliminating the need for paper applications and transcripts); the receipt and filing of electronic educator transcripts; the ability to send, receive, and file documentation via PDF images; the ability to track and monitor receipt of such documentation; enable connection of the educator to his/her preparation program in order to measure how well each institution is preparing educators; allow for printable certificates in a PDF format with a watermark; merge the Professional Development Provider System and the Illinois Administrator Academy Management System to allow for a connection between educator performance and professional development; track educator renewal audits; track mentoring progress for individual educators throughout the year and how the mentoring process affects educator performance; track educators at the point of employment, assignment, and termination; broaden the system to include the tracking of paraprofessionals; and using course codes collected in TSR, link students to their teachers of record that assign letter grades in order to measure teacher effectiveness.

All data collections via the two redesigned web-based applications will be ongoing and the information for all data fields/elements will be kept current by real-time uploads from LEAs and other entities that are required to provide data to ISBE. In addition, the new system will incorporate any statutory or administrative rule changes pertaining to evaluations and certification that are made during FY09 and FY10.

2. Business Rules for Teacher-Student Linkages

In designing a system to match teacher and student data, ISBE and its partners will need to identify the numerous variables involved in the teacher/school setting and how to address these variables in the teacher-student linkage system. In linking students to teachers and administrators, the proposed system will have to account for such issues as attendance rates, extended teacher leave, and long-term substitute teachers. The system will also need to factor in different instructional strategies, such as grouping, pull-outs, room aides, and team teaching, as well as address nontraditional schools and programs and cooperative arrangements. ISBE must

identify and address these obstacles during the planning phase of the teacher-student linkage system in order to produce high-quality data and meaningful reports from this system.

C. Project Management and Governance

The primary State agency responsible for the development, execution, and oversight of the Teacher-Student Data Linkage System is ISBE. Activities will also be coordinated with ISAC, with respect to linking with the Statewide Transcript System. ISBE will convene teachers and educators to begin the mapping process and the development of course codes.

ISBE will establish and maintain a Project Management Office to support the development of a teacher and administrator identifier system with the ability to match students to their teachers and to manage day-to-day operations and coordination with other agencies and key stakeholders. This Project Management Office will also be responsible for supporting other key elements of this application as well as certain components of Illinois' developing State Longitudinal Data System. ISBE will contract with a vendor for implementation of the redesign of the TCIS/ECS and TSR systems. The Project Management Office will be accountable to the State Superintendent of Education for ensuing the project is completed on time and within scope and budget.

D. Phasing and Project Scheduling

The development of the system for matching teacher and student data will be undertaken in two phases:

- Project Planning: This phase will commence in January 2010 and generally be completed in June 2010, although the development of business rules for teacher-student linkages will continue through December 2010.
- Project Implementation: This phase will commence in July 2010 and be completed in June 2012. However, ISBE will advance the development of the course codes collection process to integrate with the Statewide Transcript System implementation by no later than September 30, 2011, in order to meet all requirements under this State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Phase II application.

The below charts identify the milestones and activities for the development of the system matching teacher and student data, including the anticipated beginning and end dates for each milestone.

Project Milestone Chart

Project Planning		
Project Task	**Responsible Party(ies)***	**Beginning/End Dates**
Plan and analyze for the development and collection of the course codes in conjunction with Statewide Transcript System.	ISBE, ISAC, and course code facilitator	January 4, 2010/ June 30, 2010
Plan and analyze to modify TSR with	ISBE, SIS vendor, and	January 4, 2010/

Project Planning		
Project Task	**Responsible Party(ies)***	**Beginning/End Dates**
course code and letter grades captured through SIS and linking of such information to teacher-level data in TSR.	TCIS/ECS/TSR vendor	June 30, 2010
Develop business rules for teacher-student linkages.	ISBE and TCIS/ECS/TSR vendor	January 4, 2010/ December 31, 2010
Project Implementation		
Implement redesign of TCIS/ECS and TSR systems, to include: ▪ Redesign TCIS, TCIS Scanning, and ECS to create integrated website for more effective teacher performance evaluations. • Modify TSR with course code and letter grades captured through SIS and link such information to teacher-level data in TSR.	ISBE and TCIS/ECS/TSR vendor	July 1, 2010/ June 30, 2012
Continue development of Teacher Data Warehouse to match teacher and administrator preparation to student performance.	ISBE	January 4, 2010/ June 30, 2013

*TCIS/ECS/TSR Vendor = Procured by ISBE to implement the redesign of the TCIS/ECS and TSR systems.

E. Budget

Project Planning		
Budget Item	Amount	Source of Funds (federal, State, or local)
Plan and analyze for the development and collection of the course codes in conjunction with Statewide Transcript System.	Included in planning budget for Statewide Transcript Data Collection System	State
Plan and analyze to modify TSR with course code and letter grades captured through SIS and linking of such information to teacher-level data in TSR.	$500,000	State
Project Implementation Phase		
Budget Item	Amount	Source of Funds (federal, State, or local)

Implement redesign of TCIS/ECS and TSR systems, to include: ▪ Develop business rules for teacher-student linkages. ▪ Redesign TCIS, TCIS Scanning, and ECS to create integrated website for more effective teacher performance evaluations. ▪ Modify TSR with course code and letter grades captured through SIS and link such information to teacher-level data in TSR.	$4,000,000	Federal (pending) *If federal funding is not provided, ISBE will seek State funding for this project.
TOTAL:	**$4,500,000.00**	

F. Obstacles to the Development and Implementation of the System

The State, through its planning process, has identified and will continue to work to identify technical obstacles to the development and implementation of matching teacher and student data so that the State can address and resolve any issues which may impede its ability to implement the system by September 30, 2011. For example, one obstacle the State has already identified is the development of business rules addressing the numerous variables involved in the teacher/school setting to ensure that data is meaningful and appropriate for use in policymaking and local decision-making. ISBE will use resources available to it via the Institute for Education Sciences to bring in consultants from other states that have successfully developed and implemented student and teacher linkages to provide guidance to the Illinois longitudinal data system. With the enactment of the P-20 Longitudinal Education Data System Act, there are no regulatory or statutory obstacles to the implementation of a statewide system matching teacher and student data.

G. Reporting on Development and Implementation

ISBE, through its website, will create a webpage specifically dedicated to the development and implementation of the State's longitudinal data system, which includes the establishment of a statewide system to match teachers and their students. This webpage will provide periodic progress reports, at least semi-annually, on the development of the system, including proposed plans for various elements of the system from the development of business rules to the timelines for implementation of the system. The State Board of Education will consult with various stakeholders and others in the design and content of the webpage.

INDICATOR (b)(1)(#9)

Description of plan providing the process and timeline for developing and implementing, as soon as possible, but no later than September 30, 2011, a statewide longitudinal data system that includes **student-level transcript information, including courses completed and grades earned.**

Statewide Transcript System

A. Overview

The State of Illinois plans to develop a statewide transcript system for middle and high school students, which will include the courses completed and the grades earned for each student. On July 30, 2009, Governor Quinn signed into law Public Act 96-0107, the P-20 Longitudinal Education Data System Act. This Act establishes the requirements and framework for the development of the State's longitudinal data system. In addition, in early 2009 the State of Illinois received an approximately $9 million grant from the U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, for the implementation of a longitudinal data system. Both the P-20 Longitudinal Education Data System Act and the IES grant provide the foundation for the development of a Statewide Transcript System consistent with the SFSF Program requirements. Specifically, the Act requires ISBE's data warehouse to include "Student-level transcript information, including information on courses completed and grades earned, from middle and high schools." Public Act 96-0107, Section 15(c)(6). The Act further requires the State Board to establish "a statewide course classification system based upon the federal School Codes for Exchange of Data or a similar course classification system. Each school district and charter school shall map its course descriptions to the statewide course classification system for the purpose of State reporting." *Id.*

The Illinois Student Assistance Commission (ISAC) has established a voluntary electronic transcript initiative for Illinois LEAs to facilitate the submission of transcripts to postsecondary educational institutions and to provide data to ISAC for its scholarship and student assistance programs. To date, 205 public high schools in 95 LEAs and 55 colleges and universities in Illinois participate in the ISAC electronic transcript initiative.

ISBE and ISAC have entered into a Memorandum of Understanding dated November 20, 2009 in order to expand the existing ISAC electronic initiative into a statewide transcript system. ISAC will undertake the procurement and contracting process to select a vendor that will work with ISBE and ISAC in the implementation of the system (System Vendor). ISAC will be undertaking a procurement for full implementation of the Statewide Transcript System, with an anticipated July 2010 effective date for the new contract. ISBE will exercise its authority under state and federal law, including its authority under the P-20 Longitudinal Education Data System Act, to ensure full participation by all public middle and high schools in the statewide transcript system. In addition, ISBE and ISAC will coordinate activities with the Illinois Community College Board (ICCB) and the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) as appropriate to ensure the transcript data can be accessed and effectively used by all postsecondary institutions throughout Illinois.

B. Core Project Elements

1. Statewide Course Classification System

A critical step in the implementation of the statewide transcript system is the establishment of a statewide course classification system for high school and middle school courses. Through a statewide course classification system, Illinois can ensure that student

transcript data from multiple LEAs or statewide is standardized for research and policy analyses. While LEAs will be required to cross-walk their local course designations to the statewide course classification system for state reporting, they will still be able to use local course designations for all other purposes. The process for establishing the course classification system must include engagement and participation by a broad range of stakeholders, including representatives of LEAs and postsecondary institutions.

For high school courses, Illinois will use the Secondary School Course Classification System: School Codes for the Exchange of Data (SCED), provided and supported by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). The SCED consists of over 1,400 secondary school courses, categorized into 22 subject areas. Each school course is further identified by a course description, course level, available credit and sequence in order to account for differences in rigor and other course variations. For middle school courses, Illinois intends to use a system adapted from and aligned with the SCED, after analyzing other state course classification systems for middle school courses.

2. Records Capture and Approval

In Illinois, the sophistication of LEA student information systems varies greatly, and LEAs collect and transfer information to ISBE data collection systems through various means. As a result, the State is planning to use direct upload of transcript data from the ISBE Student Information System (SIS) to the statewide transcript system. All data uploaded to State Repository System will be stored as XML in order to provide for greater ease in transmission to intended parties.

The development of a statewide course classification system will allow for the direct upload of course code, grade, and credit information to SIS from LEAs. Once collected in SIS, transcript data elements will be available for direct upload to the State Transcript Repository.

3. State Transcript Repository

The State Transcript Repository will be created for the storage of the student transcript data provided by LEAs. The State Transcript Repository will be updated semiannually to ensure that each student's transcript information is current. Safeguards will be put in place to ensure that data transmissions from the State Transcript Repository maintain confidentiality and comply with federal and state privacy laws. Furthermore, the System Vendor will use data encryption software to ensure the secure transmission of the data from SIS to the repository and will provide the necessary safeguards to protect the security of student and institutional data.

4. Transcript Data Delivery

Transcript data maintained in the State Transcript Repository will be fed to the following locations, strictly following all federal and state privacy laws: 1) to ISAC, for scholarship and student assistance programs; 2) to postsecondary educational institutions, for student application and enrollment functions; and 3) to other institutions requiring the collection of student transcript data (e.g., NCAA, independent scholarship entities, etc.). The State Transcript Depository will

track all record requests from the initial request to the delivery of the data to the intended recipient.

5. Field Implementation

The Statewide Transcript System will be managed through a Project Management Office, with joint staffing by ISBE and ISAC. In order to ensure the smooth transfer of data from LEAs to SIS, and eventually to the statewide transcript system, the contractual project manager will use field implementation teams staffed by the Learning Technology Centers to work at the LEA and school levels and help facilitate the technical connection of each school to SIS. Established in 1995, the Learning Technology Centers assist ISBE with statewide initiatives by supporting Illinois LEAs with hardware and software infrastructure, as well as classroom and teacher readiness for integrating technology in the classroom and curriculum. The Learning Technology Centers have played an integral role in facilitating prior LEA integrations with SIS. The field implementation teams will be coordinated through the SIS project manager, the Illinois Longitudinal Data System (ILDS) project manager, and by the Project Management Office.

C. Project Management and Governance

The Statewide Transcript System will be governed by ISBE, in partnership, as applicable with ICCB, IBHE, and ISAC. The process for establishing the Statewide Transcript System must include engagement and participation by a broad range of stakeholders, including representatives of LEAs and postsecondary institutions. ISBE, ISAC, the course code facilitator and the system vendor, where appropriate will 1) design and establish a statewide course classification system for high school and middle school students, 2) plan and design a system for linking SIS data with the Statewide Transcript System, including the number of data transfers necessary for each year, 3) plan the processes to map local course descriptions to the statewide course classification system, and 4) implement transcript data collection statewide for all public high schools and middle schools.

ISBE and ISAC will also consult with various stakeholders and individuals from other states who have developed and successfully implemented a course code and transcript system.

ISBE will establish and maintain a Project Management Office to support management of the Statewide Transcript System project components and to manage day-to-day operations and coordination with other agencies and key stakeholders. This Project Management Office will also be responsible for supporting other key elements of this application as well as certain components of Illinois' developing State Longitudinal Data System. The Project Management Office will be jointly administered by project sponsors designated by both ISBE and ISAC. ISAC will contract with a vendor to develop the Statewide Transcript System, who will designate a contractual project manager to coordinate directly with the ISBE and ISAC project sponsors. The Project Management Office will be accountable to the State Superintendent of Education and the Executive Director of ISAC for ensuing the project is completed on time and within scope and budget.

In order to ensure the smooth transfer of data from LEAs to the ISBE Teacher Service Record (TSR), SIS, and eventually to the Statewide Transcript System, the contractual project

manager will use field implementation teams such as the Learning Technology Centers to work at the district level and help facilitate the technical connection of each school to SIS. The field implementation teams will be coordinated through the SIS Project Manager, the Project Manager for the State Longitudinal Data System, and by the Project Management Office.

d. Phasing and Project Scheduling

The development of the Statewide Transcript Data Collection System will be undertaken in two phases:

- Project Planning and Stakeholder Engagement: This phase will commence in January 2010 and be completed in June 2010.
- Project Implementation: This phase will commence in July 2010 and be completed in September 2012 (although all State Fiscal Stabilization Fund program requirements will be met by September 2011).

The below charts identify the milestones and activities for the development of the Statewide Transcript System, including the anticipated beginning and end dates for each milestone.

Project Milestone Chart

Project Planning and Stakeholder Engagement Phase		
Project Task	Responsible Party*	Beginning/End Dates
Design and establish a statewide course classification system for high school and middle school students.	ISBE and course code facilitator (with advisory input from ISAC, ISAC vendor, ICCB, IBHE, and other stakeholders selected by ISBE)	January 4, 2010/ June 30, 2010
Preliminary plan and design for linking SIS data with the Statewide Transcript System, including the number of data transfers necessary for each year.	ISAC, ISBE, and SIS, LDS, and State Transcript System project manager	January 4, 2010/ June 30, 2010
Preliminary plan for processes to map local course descriptions to the statewide course classification system.	ISBE and course code facilitator	January 4, 2010/ June 30, 2010
Implement a pilot project to validate assumptions, test the project plan, and explore barriers to implementation.	ISAC, ISBE, and course code facilitator	April 1, 2010/ June 30, 2010
Develop stakeholder engagement processes to inform system development and course classification system.	ISAC, ISBE, and course code facilitator	January 4, 2010/ June 30, 2010
Project Implementation Phase		
Project Task	Responsible Party*	Beginning/End Dates

Implementation transcript statewide for all public high schools, to include: o Direct upload of transcript data to SIS. o Establishment of data feeds from SIS to: 1) the State Transcript Depository for the development of transcripts; 2) ISAC for scholarship and student assistance programs; and 3) postsecondary institutions for student application and enrollment functions. o Field implementation teams staffed by the Learning Technology Centers to work at the LEA and school levels to provide technical assistance for SIS data uploads.	System Vendor, with ISAC and ISBE oversight	July 1, 2010 September 30, 2011
Implement course and grade data collection statewide for all public middle schools. This will include similar tasks as required for implementation in high schools, except that the data will only be fed to ISBE for integration with student data in SIS.	System Vendor, with ISAC and ISBE oversight	October 1, 2011 September 30, 2012

*Course code facilitator = The consultant will be selected to conduct the project planning and stakeholder engagement activities.
System Vendor = Procured by ISAC to implement the Statewide Transcript Repository.

E. Budget

The budget for the development, execution and oversight of the Statewide Transcript Data Collection System is as follows:

Statewide Transcript Data Collection System

Project Planning and Stakeholder Engagement Phase (1/4/2010 – 6/30/2010)		
Budget Item	Amount	Source of Funds (federal, State, or local)
Establishment of statewide course classification system for high school and middle school courses. The process for establishing the course classification system must include engagement and participation by a broad range of stakeholders, including representatives of school districts and postsecondary institutions.	$100,000	State
Preliminary plan and design for linking SIS data with the Statewide Transcript System,	$50,000	State

including the number of data transfers necessary for each year. Preliminary plan for processes to map local course descriptions to the statewide course classification system. Implement a pilot project to validate assumptions, test the project plan, and explore barriers to implementation.		
Total Project Planning and Stakeholder Engagement	$150,000	
Project Implementation Phase (7/1/2010 – 6/30/2012)		
Budget Item	Amount	Source of Funds (federal, State, or local)
(7/1/2010 – 9/30/2011) Implement transcript data collection system statewide for all public high schools, to include: o Direct upload of transcript data to SIS. o Establishment of data feeds from SIS to: 1) the State Transcript Depository for the development of transcripts; 2) ISAC for scholarship and student assistance programs; and 3) postsecondary institutions for student application and enrollment functions. o Support for Learning Technology Center (LTC) teams and other regional staff to assist districts in uploading SIS data elements.	$3,800,000	Federal ARRA SLDS Grant (pending)*: $3,000,0000 State: $800,000
Field implementation – 10/11 School Year: Field implementation teams staffed by the Learning Technology Centers to work at the LEA and school levels to provide technical assistance for SIS data uploads.	$1,000,000	Federal ARRA SLDS Grant (pending)*: $200,000 State: $800,000
Field implementation and Ongoing Data Extraction - 11/12 School Year: o Field implementation teams to work at LEA and school levels to provide continued technical assistance for SIS data uploads. o Ongoing high school data uploads,	$1,300,000	Federal ARRA SLDS Grant (pending)*: $500,0000 State: $800,000

downloads, and management.		
Total Project Implementation:	$6,100,000	
TOTAL:	$6,250,000	

*If federal funding is not provided, ISBE will seek State funding for this project.

F. Obstacles to the Development and Implementation of the System

The State, through its planning process, has identified and will continue to work to identify technical obstacles to the development and implementation of the Statewide Transcript System so that the State can address and resolve any issues which may impede its ability to implement the System by September 30, 2011. This will require the state to work closely with all stakeholders.

G. Reporting on Development and Implementation

ISBE, through its website, will create a webpage specifically dedicated to the development and implementation of the State's longitudinal data system, which includes the establishment of a statewide transcript system. This webpage will provide periodic progress reports, at least semi-annually, on the development of the system, including proposed plans for various elements of the system from data extraction to course classification and the timelines for implementation of the system. Other key stakeholders in the statewide transcript system will provide links to this webpage from their individual websites. Various stakeholders will be consulted on the design and content of the webpage.

III. INDICATOR (b)(2)

Instructions: If (as indicated in **Part 3A, Indicator (b)(2)**) the State does not provide student growth data on their current students and the students they taught in the previous year to, at a minimum, teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects, in a manner that is timely and informs instructional programs, please attach a plan that provides:

The process and timeline for developing and implementing the means to provide teachers with such data by September 30, 2011, including:

- The milestones that the State establishes toward developing and implementing those means and the date by which the State expects to reach each milestone;
- Any obstacles that may prevent the State from developing and implementing those means by September 30, 2011 (including but not limited to requirements and prohibitions of State law and policy);
- The nature and frequency of reports that the State will provide to the public regarding its progress in developing and implementing those means; and
- The amount of funds the State is using or will use to develop and implement those means, and whether the funds are or will be Federal, State, or local funds.

Furthermore, the plan must satisfy the following general requirements:

(A) Identify the agency or agencies in the State responsible for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, including the institutional infrastructure and describe the capacity of the agency or agencies as they relate to each of those tasks;

(B) Identify the agency or agencies, institutions, or organizations, if any, providing technical assistance or other support in the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, and describe the nature of such technical assistance or other support;

(C) Provide the overall budget for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan; and

(D) Describe the way the State will publicly report the plan and the State's progress reports on its plan, including the nature and frequency of updated reports to the public on State actions taken under the plan and the website where the State will make the plan and progress reports publicly available (as defined in the Notice of Final Requirements, Definitions, and Approval Criteria for the SFSF Phase II).

INDICATOR b(2): Describe the plan for providing by September 30, 2011 student growth data on teachers' current students and the students they taught in the previous year to, at a minimum, teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects in a manner that is timely and informs instructional programs.

A. Overview.

The State of Illinois needs to move forward to identify, develop and adopt a student growth model methodology and report student growth model data to schools and LEAs. A student growth model can be used for multiple purposes such as:

- Report growth data through state data systems to aid classroom instruction and school improvement;
- Use to evaluate teacher preparation programs; and
- Provide benchmark data to measure local evaluation systems.

Through the P-20 Longitudinal Education Data System Act, ISBE is given the legal authority for the creation of a statewide teacher identifier system with the ability to match teachers to students. In order for ISBE to provide teachers with student growth data on their current students and the students they taught in the previous year to, at a minimum, teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects, ISBE must first be able to link students to their teachers. As a result, the creation of a student growth model will be tied directly to the establishment of a statewide teacher identifier system with the ability to match teachers to students. However, developing a student growth model, involves a number of separate and distinct elements including the means of measuring student growth, the proposed uses for such data, the delivery of the student growth data to LEAs and schools, and the guidance and support provided to LEAs and schools on using this data to aid classroom instruction and school improvement.

B. Core Project Element

1. Retention of Consultant with Expertise in Student Growth Data Models and Assessment of Available and Needed Student Growth Data

ISBE plans to retain a consultant with expertise in student growth data models in order to assist ISBE through the development and implementation of student growth plan. Specifically, this consultant will assist ISBE with the assessment of the data required for implementing a student growth plan. Before ISBE can determine the additional data needed for developing a student growth plan, it must evaluate the content and quality of the data available from ISBE's Student Information System (SIS). Given that SIS already collects testing information from the LEAs and schools, the data available from SIS will likely provide the foundation of the student growth data system in Illinois. Therefore, ISBE, with the student growth consultant, will review the data already available through SIS and will then determine the additional data elements which need to be collected for development of a student growth data system. This will require consideration of the purposes of the growth model, as different data may be need to support use of the growth model for such purposes as:

- Reporting growth data through state data systems to aid classroom instruction and school improvement;
- Evaluating teacher preparation programs;
- Providing benchmark data to measure local evaluation systems; and/or
- School and district accountability.

2. Linking of Teacher and Student Data

As mentioned above, in order for ISBE to implement a student growth model, ISBE must first be able to link students to their teachers. As a result, a core project element of the development of a student data growth system is the establishment of a statewide teacher identifier system with the ability to match teachers to students. ISBE, through the P-20 Longitudinal Education Data System Act, will create a statewide teacher identifier system with the ability to match teachers to students. Specifically, the ISBE data warehouse must include a "teacher and administrator identifier system with the ability to match students to early learning, elementary, and secondary teachers and elementary and secondary administrators." Public Act 96-0107, Section 15(c)(5).[6] The creation of a plan for establishing a teacher and administrator identifier system with the ability to match students to their teachers is also a requirement of the State Fiscal Stabilization Phase II Application. As further described in indicator b(8), to develop a plan for linking teachers to their students, ISBE will redesign certain data collection systems including the Teacher Service Record (TSR) and the Teacher Certification Information System (TCIS) to allow for the matching of students to their teachers. ISBE will be able to use the statewide teacher identifier system to match teacher data to student data by September 30, 2011.

3. Development of Psychometric Model and Web-based Display Tool for Student Growth Data

In order to produce meaningful and accurate data and develop a web-based display of this data, ISBE will contract with an outside vendor to develop the psychometric model and a web design application for this data. The web-based displays will include student growth data for each school and LEA in Illinois, for each individual student in Illinois, and eventually student growth data will be utilized to calculate individual teacher impact on student achievement. In addition, ISBE will work with key stakeholder groups to inform them about the growth model employed and the web-based student growth data display tools available for school/LEA use.

4. Implementation of Student Growth Data Plan

After the student growth model has been developed, the necessary data collected, the psychometric model developed, a web-based display of the student growth data created and a successful pilot of the implementation of the student growth system, ISBE will begin full implementation of the student growth data system and outreach to schools/LEAs to provide them with training and assistance on using this data. The implementation phase of the student growth system will include: implementation of statewide teacher identifier system with the ability to

[6] ISBE's Teacher Service Record System ("TSR") establishes an administrator identifier and collects data on administrator assignment at the school building level. Therefore, by linking the school-level data in TSR to the school-level data in ISBE's Student Information System, ISBE can create the administrator/student linkage required by the P-20 Longitudinal Education Data System Act.

match students to teachers as described above, implementation of the web-based tools to report student growth data through a variety of measurement options and dissemination of this student growth data to all LEAs/schools in the State. ISBE will provide guidance to schools and LEAs throughout the State in order to assist them with navigating the web-based display tools and guiding them on appropriate uses for the student growth model data. While ISBE will be providing the student growth model data directly to schools and LEAs, ISBE will also review whether certain data files can be provided to LEAs and schools for further disaggregation and analysis. In regard to teacher impact data, ISBE, based on the analysis provided by the student growth consultant, may decide to withhold dissemination of the teacher impact data until new state assessments are implemented, which ISBE plans to do in the coming years. *See indicator b(3)*.

C. Project Management and Governance

ISBE will be responsible for the development, execution, and implementation system of the student growth data system in accordance with the requirements of this indicator b(2). As mentioned above, ISBE will also retain a student growth model consultant ("Growth Model Consultant" in table below) to assist with the development and implementation of the student growth data system and a vendor to develop a web-based display of this data ("Growth Model Implementation Vendor"). ISBE will also engage LEAs, schools, teachers and other key stakeholders in the development of this student growth data system in order to ensure that this system will produce data that can be used in meaningful ways.

D. Phasing and Project Scheduling

Project Milestone Chart

The below charts identify the milestones and activities for ISBE's development and implementation of student growth plans in accordance with the requirements set forth in this indicator b(2), including the anticipated beginning and end dates for each milestone.

Implementation of Student Growth Data System

Project Task	Responsible Party(ies)	Beginning/End Dates
Retain consultant with expertise in growth models.	ISBE	Acquired October, 2009
Evaluation of content and the quality of the available data from SIS and determination of additional data to be collected.	ISBE/Growth Model Consultant	December 1, 2009 December 31, 2009
Determination of state growth model uses for data analysis (i.e. accountability, school/district improvement, aid for classroom instruction, teacher evaluation).	ISBE/Growth Model Consultant	December 1, 2009 February 28, 2010
Develop and release RFSP, if needed.	ISBE	February 1, 2010 March 31, 2010
Negotiate contract for the development of the psychometric model and the web-based display of data and development of psychometric model and application	ISBE	April 1, 2010 June 30, 2010

design.		
Meet with Technical Advisory Committee to review growth model and psychometric model considerations.	ISBE	May 1, 2010 May 31, 2010
Develop web-based data display tool for school and district display and work with key stakeholder groups regarding announcement of availability of the data and methodology.	ISBE/Growth Model Implementation Vendor	June 1, 2010 August 31, 2010
School/district growth data available for informational purposes.	ISBE/Growth Model Implementation Vendor	October 1, 2010 October 31, 2010
Develop web-based tool for individual student projection information, if desired.	ISBE/Growth Model Implementation Vendor	July 1, 2010 October 31, 2010
Develop program for school/district use for calculating teacher impact data.	ISBE/Growth Model Implementation Vendor	July 1, 2010 December 31, 2010
Pilot teacher impact program.	ISBE/Growth Model Implementation Vendor	March 1, 2011 June 30, 2011
Implement teacher impact program for school/district use available and school/district growth data available for accountability purposes.	ISBE/Growth Model Implementation Vendor	September 1, 2011 October 31, 2011
Implementation of Teacher/student linkage data reporting at state level.	ISBE/Growth Model Implementation Vendor	August 1, 2011 September 30, 2011
Implementation of calculations of teacher impact completed by state, if determined that is preferred.	ISBE	September 1, 2014 October 31, 2014

E. Budget

The budget for the development and implementation of the student growth data plan is as follows:

Student Growth Data System

Budget Item	Amount	Source of Funds (federal, State or local)
Retention of student growth model consultant re planning, developing and implementing the student growth data system	$150,000	State: ISBE
Designing and implementing the student growth data system, including development and implementation of web-based display tools to report the student growth data and assistance to schools and	$500,000	State: ISBE

LEAs on using the student growth data system for accountability and policymaking purposes.		

F. Obstacles to the Development and Implementation of the System

The State, through its planning process, has identified and will continue to work to identify technical obstacles to implementing a student growth data system so that the State can address and resolve any issues which may impede its ability to implement this system by the dates set forth in the Project milestone chart set forth above. One obstacle, as briefly described above, will be the collection and dissemination of student growth data for individual teacher impact on student achievement. The State, as will be further discussed in indicator b(3), is in the process of selecting new state assessments. As a result, ISBE will have to decide whether it wants to share information of teacher impact prior to implementation of the new state assessments or whether it should not report on teacher impact on student achievement until the new state assessment can be implemented. With the enactment of the P-20 Longitudinal Education Data System Act, there are no regulatory or statutory obstacles to implementation of student growth data connected to individual teachers.

G. Reporting on Development and Implementation

ISBE, through its website, will create a webpage specifically dedicated to the development and implementation of the State's longitudinal data system. While the State's longitudinal data system does not specifically require states to implement a student growth data system, it does requires the State to establish a statewide system to match teachers and their students. As a result, ISBE will include periodic progress reports, at least semi-annually, on the development of the student growth data system within ISBE reporting of the student/teacher identifier system. These progress reports will include updates on the development of the system, including proposed plans for various elements of the system and information on the project timelines mentioned above. The State Board of Education will consult with various stakeholders on the content of the progress reports to be posted on the website.

IV. INDICATOR (b)(3)

Instructions: If (as indicated in **Part 3A, Indicator (b)(3)**) the State does not provide teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects with reports of individual teacher impact on student achievement, please attach a plan that provides:

The process and timeline for developing and implementing the means to provide teachers with such data, including:

- The milestones that the State establishes toward developing and implementing those means and the date by which the State expects to reach each milestone;
- Any obstacles that may prevent the State from developing and implementing those means (including but not limited to requirements and prohibitions of State law and policy);
- The nature and frequency of reports that the State will provide to the public regarding its progress in developing and implementing those means; and
- The amount of funds the State is using or will use to develop and implement those means, and whether the funds are or will be Federal, State, or local funds.

Furthermore, the plan must satisfy the following general requirements:

(A) Identify the agency or agencies in the State responsible for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, including the institutional infrastructure and describe the capacity of the agency or agencies as they relate to each of those tasks;

(B) Identify the agency or agencies, institutions, or organizations, if any, providing technical assistance or other support in the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, and describe the nature of such technical assistance or other support;

(C) Provide the overall budget for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan; and

(D) Describe the way the State will publicly report the plan and the State's progress reports on its plan, including the nature and frequency of updated reports to the public on State actions taken under the plan and the website where the State will make the plan and progress reports publicly available (as defined in the Notice of Final Requirements, Definitions, and Approval Criteria for the SFSF Phase II).

INDICATOR b(3): Describe the plan for providing teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects **with reports of individual teacher impact on student achievement on those assessments.**

A. Overview.

As discussed in indicator b(2) above, ISBE will be developing and implementing a student growth data system which will provide data on teachers' current students and the students they taught in the previous year to, at a minimum, teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects in a manner that is timely and informs instructional programs. As part of the student growth data system, ISBE will be collecting and eventually reporting on individual teacher impact data on student achievement for certain state administered standardized assessments. However, ISBE is currently in the process of developing new state assessments which will serve as appropriate tools of measuring teacher impact on student achievement. Consequently, while ISBE current state assessments do not provide the means to accurately measure teacher impact, ISBE anticipates that the new state assessments will be designed to effectively measure teacher impact.

B. Core Project Element

Illinois will be joining a consortium of states participating in the Common Core State Standards Initiative to jointly develop and implement common, high-quality assessments aligned with the Common Core K-12 standards. Through this consortium ISBE will be able to ensure that the new state assessment is designed to effectively measure individual teacher impact on student achievement. The first administration of the new assessments will be in the 2013-2014 school year, with the 2014-2015 school year serving as the first school year with two years of state assessment data for calculating student growth. The teacher impact data developed from the new state assessment will then be integrated into the student growth data system set forth in indicator b(2).

C. Project Management and Governance

ISBE will be responsible for the development and implementation of the new state assessments and for integrating information from the new assessments into the student data growth system as described in indicator b(2). ISBE will also engage key stakeholders including LEAs and teacher in the process for selecting the new state assessments.

D. Phasing and Project Scheduling

Project Milestone Chart

The below charts identify the milestones and activities for ISBE's selection of the new state assessments and its integration of teacher impact data from those assessments into the student growth data system, including the anticipated beginning and end dates for each milestone.

Selection of New State Assessment to Provide Teacher Impact Data

Project Task	Responsible Party(ies)	Beginning/End Dates
Adopt common core standards	ISBE	January 1, 2010 August 1, 2010
Develop new assessments, in partnership with consortium of states, aligned with multi-state common core standards.	ISBE/Assessment Vendor(s)	January 1, 2010 December 31, 2012
Selection of pilot LEAs and schools for administration of new state assessment.	ISBE/Assessment Vendor(s)	January 1, 2011 July 31, 2012
Pilot administration and continued development of new assessments; planning in all other districts.	ISBE/Assessment Vendor(s)	August 1, 2012 July 31, 2013
Initial full administration of new state assessments.	ISBE/Assessment Vendor(s)	August 1, 2013 June 30, 2014
First year with two years of state assessment data for calculating student growth and implementation of data from new state assessments into student growth data system.	ISBE/Assessment Vendor(s)	July 1, 2014 June 30, 2015

Duplicated below is the project milestone chart for indicator b(2). The Student Growth Data System will be developed as part of the implementation of the Student Growth Data System.

Implementation of Student Growth Data System

Project Task	Responsible Party(ies)	Beginning/End Dates
Retain consultant with expertise in growth models.	ISBE	Acquired October, 2009
Evaluation of content and the quality of the available data from SIS and determination of additional data to be collected.	ISBE/Growth Model Consultant	December 1, 2009 December 31, 2009
Determination of state growth model uses for data analysis (i.e. accountability, school/district improvement, aid for classroom instruction, teacher evaluation).	ISBE/Growth Model Consultant	December 1, 2009 February 28, 2010
Develop and release RFSP, if needed.	ISBE	February 1, 2010 March 31, 2010
Negotiate contract for the development of the psychometric model and the web-based display of data and development of psychometric model and application design.	ISBE	April 1, 2010 June 30, 2010
Meet with Technical Advisory Committee to review growth model and psychometric model considerations.	ISBE	May 1, 2010 May 31, 2010
Develop web-based data display tool for	ISBE/Growth Model	June 1, 2010

school and district display and work with key stakeholder groups regarding announcement of availability of the data and methodology.	Implementation Vendor	August 31, 2010
School/district growth data available for informational purposes.	ISBE/Growth Model Implementation Vendor	October 1, 2010 October 31, 2010
Develop web-based tool for individual student projection information, if desired.	ISBE/Growth Model Implementation Vendor	July 1, 2010 October 31, 2010
Develop program for school/district use for calculating teacher impact data.	ISBE/Growth Model Implementation Vendor	July 1, 2010 December 31, 2010
Pilot teacher impact program.	ISBE/Growth Model Implementation Vendor	March 1, 2011 June 30, 2011
Implement teacher impact program for school/district use available and school/district growth data available for accountability purposes.	ISBE/Growth Model Implementation Vendor	September 1, 2011 October 31, 2011
Implementation of Teacher/student linkage data reporting at state level.	ISBE/Growth Model Implementation Vendor	August 1, 2011 September 30, 2011
Implementation of calculations of teacher impact completed by state, if determined that is preferred.	ISBE	September 1, 2014 October 31, 2014

E. Budget

The budget for the development and implementation of the student growth system is set forth in the plan for indicator b(2). That budget is duplicated below.

Student Growth Data System

Budget Item	Amount	Source of Funds (federal, State or local)
Retention of student growth model consultant re planning, developing and implementing the student growth data system	$150,000	State: ISBE
Designing and implementing the student growth data system, including development and implementation of web-based display tools to report the student growth data and assistance to schools and LEAs on using the student growth data system for	$500,000	State: ISBE

accountability and policymaking purposes.		

Other costs associated with the integration of teacher impact data will be included within the budget for new state assessments. In addition, as shown below, the State is budgeting $250,000 as a contingency to modify the student growth system as necessary to account for teacher impact data.

Teacher Impact Program

Budget Item	Amount	Source of Funds (federal, State or local)
Contingency to modify the student growth system as necessary to account for teacher impact data.	$250,000	State: ISBE

F. Obstacles to the Development and Implementation of the System

The State, through its planning process, has identified and will continue to work to identify technical obstacles to developing new state assessments and integrating information from those assessments on teacher impact data into the student growth data system so that the State can address and resolve any issues which may impede its ability to implement this system by the dates set forth in the Project milestone chart set forth above. As previously noted, the most significant barrier is that the current state assessments do not provide the means to accurately measure teacher impact. With the enactment of the P-20 Longitudinal Education Data System Act, there are no regulatory or statutory obstacles to implementation of the new state assessments.

G. Reporting on Development and Implementation

ISBE, through its website, will create a webpage specifically dedicated to the development and selection of the State's new assessments. This website will include periodic progress reports, to be provided at least semi-annually, on the State's development and implementation of the new assessments, including updates on the adoption of common core standards for the assessments and information on the project timelines mentioned above. ISBE will consult with various stakeholders on the content of the progress reports to be posted on the website.

V. INDICATORS (c)(11) AND (c)(12)

Important note regarding this section:

In the case of new Indicators (c)(11) and (c)(12), regarding the data States will collect from IHEs, the State is required to, at a minimum, possess the ability to collect and report the data. In such circumstances, a State plan need only address the development of capacity, and not implementation and reporting for the relevant indicators.

If the State will develop and implement the means to collect and publicly report the data (i.e., the State will collect and publicly report the data) for either of these indicators by September 30, 2011, the full plan requirements for this section **do** apply. If that is the case, please report all elements of that plan in Part 3B, Section I above.

State Plan Instructions: For each of *Indicators (c)(11) and (c)(12)* for which the State is not able to fully collect or publicly report annually the required data or information (as indicated in Part 3A), please attach a plan that provides:

(1) The process and timeline for achieving the ability to implement the means to fully collect and/or publicly report (as required) the data or information by September 30, 2011, including:

- The milestones established toward developing those means;
- The date by which the State expects to reach each such milestone; and any obstacles that may prevent the State from developing those means by September 30, 2011, including but not limited to requirements and prohibitions of State law and policy;
- The nature and frequency of reports that the State will provide to the public regarding its progress in developing those means; and
- The amount of funds the State is using or will use to develop those means, and whether the funds are or will be Federal, State, or local funds.

(2) A description of the evidence that the State will provide to the Department of Education to demonstrate that it has developed the means to collect and publicly report the data for each indicator for which the State is not able to fully collect or publicly report annually the required data, by September 30, 2011.

Furthermore, the plan must satisfy the following general requirements:

(A) Identify the agency or agencies in the State responsible for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, including the institutional infrastructure and describe the capacity of the agency or agencies as they relate to each of those tasks;

(B) Identify the agency or agencies, institutions, or organizations, if any, providing technical assistance or other support in the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, and describe the nature of such technical assistance or other support;

(C) Provide the overall budget for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan; and

(D) Describe the way the State will publicly report the plan and the State's progress reports on its plan, including the nature and frequency of updated reports to the public on State actions taken under the plan and the website where the State will make the plan and progress reports publicly available (as defined in the Notice of Final Requirements, Definitions, and Approval Criteria for the SFSF Phase II).

Plan Element Verification: Please check only the boxes that apply in the following chart to indicate which elements must be addressed in this section of your state plan:

Element	Not Applicable: The State will develop and implement the means to collect and publicly report the data (Complete Plan in Section I).	Applicable: The State will develop but not implement the means to collect and publicly report the data (Complete Plan in this section).
Indicator (c)(11)		
Indicator (c)(12)		

PART 3C-- GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

Please attach the following information—

(1) Describe the processes the State employs to review and verify the required data and other information on the indicators and descriptors.

ISBE program staff are responsible for overseeing data submissions in various areas and assisting LEAs with the provision of timely, quality data. As part of ISBE's auditing and recognition processes for LEAs, ISBE has in place numerous procedures to verify the accuracy of data that has been submitted to the State. ISBE will incorporate a verification of the data described in this application into its auditing and recognition processes for LEAs. All student information reported to ISBE is verified against data maintained in ISBE's Student Information System (SIS). SIS data are compared to previous years in order to signal any anomalies.

(2) Describe the processes the State employs to ensure that, consistent with 34 CFR 99.31(b), the required data and other information are not made publicly available in a manner that personally identifies students, where applicable.

To protect student confidentiality, no information that contains any personally identifiable student information or data cells comprising information from less than 10 students will be included in any data reporting. ISBE currently masks all student data below a cell size of 10 on all of its public reporting, and will apply the same masking procedures to data required for this application.

ISBE must all ensure that teacher and principal privacy is protected during the collection and reporting of performance evaluation data. ISBE will institute procedures to ensure the masking of data below a minimum cell size (not less than 10) for the reporting of evaluation data. This will particularly important to ensure that data on principals in small districts is not personally identifiable.

8963097_v5

APPLICATION CHECKLIST and SUBMISSION INFORMATION

Please use the following checklist to ensure that your application is complete:

PART 1: State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Phase II Application Cover Sheet

- ❑ Is all of the requested information included on the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Phase II Application Cover Sheet?
- ❑ **SIGNAURE REQUIRED –** Has the Governor or his/her authorized representative signed the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Phase II Application Cover Sheet?
- ❑ **SIGNATURE REQUIRED –** Has the Chief State School Officer signed the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Phase II Application Cover Sheet?

PART 2: Maintenance-of-Effort Information

- ❑ Has the State provided all data as requested?
- ❑ Is any of the data reported different from the State's most current Phase I application?
- ❑ Has the State included attachments responding to Part 2A(3)(a) and Part 2A(3)(b)?
- ❑ **SIGNATURE REQUIRED –** Has the Governor or his/her authorized representative signed the other Assurances and Certifications?
- ❑ If applicable, has the State indicated whether the MOE waiver request has already been submitted or whether it is included with this application package?

PART 3A: Assurance Indicators and Descriptors

- ❑ Has the State responded appropriately to all indicators and descriptors?

PART 3B: Data Collection and Public Reporting Plan

- ❑ For each assurance indicator or descriptor under education reform areas (a), (c), and (d), for which the State is not able to fully collect or publicly report annually the required data or information (as indicated in Part 3A), has the State provided a plan for developing and implementing, as soon as possible, but no later than September 30, 2011, that includes all plan elements detailed in Part 3B?
- ❑ Has the State completed the Plan Element Verification table as applicable?
- ❑ For Indicator (b)(1), has the State completed the America COMPETES Plan Element Verification table as applicable?
- ❑ For Indicator (b)(2), has the State ensured that the plan meets the requirements described in Part 3B?
- ❑ For Indicator (b)(3), has the State ensured that the plan meets the requirements described in Part 3B?
- ❑ For Indicators (c)(11) and (c)(12), has the State completed the Plan Element Verification table as applicable?

PART 3C: General Requirements

- ❑ In an attachment, has the State described the processes employed to review and verify the required data and other information for the indicators and descriptors?
- ❑ In an attachment, has the State described the processes the State employs to ensure that, consistent with 34 CFR 99.31(b), the required data and other information are not made publicly available in a manner that personally identifies students, where applicable.

SUBMISSION INFORMATION

Please submit your application to the Department as follows:

1. E-mail an electronic version of your application in .PDF (Portable Document) format to phaseIIapplication@ed.gov and

2. Mail the original and two copies of your application by express mail service through the U.S. Postal Service or through a commercial carrier to the following address:

   Dr. Joseph C. Conaty

   Director, Academic Improvement and Teacher Quality Programs

   Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

   U.S. Department of Education

   400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Room 3E314

   Washington, D.C. 20202

8963097_v5

ATTACHMENT 1

Levels of State Support for Elementary and Secondary Education

In determining the level of State support for elementary and secondary education, Illinois used the funding provided to LEAs through the State's General State Aid and mandated categorical programs in a given year as the level of State support for elementary and secondary education for that year.

General State Aid (105 ILCS 5/18-8.05): The purpose of General State Aid is to provide general flexible state aid to schools. GSA represents approximately 62% of state funds for elementary and secondary education. Funds are distributed through a formula grant to school districts that accounts for a district's property wealth and average daily attendance. Supplemental General State Aid is available to school districts to provide additional funding for the impact of poverty in the district.

Mandated Categoricals: Mandated categoricals include a number of programs which districts are mandated to undertake by the Illinois School Code, and for which the State provides partial or full reimbursement. Mandated categorical programs include:

- **Personnel Reimbursement (Special Ed) (105 ILCS 5/14-13.01):** Funding is provided to LEAs to employ staff to serve children and youth with disabilities, ages 3 - 21 years old. The State reimburses LEAs for certified and non-certified personnel based upon reimbursement rates established by law.
- **Funding for Children Requiring Special Ed Services (105 ILCS 5/14-7.02b):** The State provides supplemental funding to LEAs for expenditures relating to students with disabilities. For all districts other than Chicago 299, funds are distributed by formula that accounts for each district's three best months average daily attendance and poverty rates. Chicago 299 receives funding through a block grant.
- **Orphanage Tuition (Special Ed) (105 ILCS 5/14-7.03):** Reimbursement is provided to LEAs for providing special education services to children residing in orphanages, children's homes, foster families or other state-owned facilities. Reimbursements are made based on actual per pupil educational costs for delivering services less federal funds and certain limitations on administrative, supervisory and facility use costs.
- **Private Tuition (Special Ed) (105 ILCS 5/14-7.02):** Funding is provided to LEAs to provide special education services in private facilities for children with disabilities when the public school system does not have the necessary resources to fulfill the student's education needs. The Illinois Purchased Care Review Board approves tuition per diem costs for students placed in private facilities.
- **Summer School (Special Ed) (105 ILCS 5/18-4.3):** Funding is provided to LEAs to provide educational services through the summer for students with disabilities so that they do not lose what progress was made during the regular academic year. Formula grants are based on the number of special education students enrolled in one or more courses offered for at least 60 clock hours in the summer session.
- **Transportation (Special Ed) (105 ILCS 5/14-13.01):** Funding is provided to LEAs for transportation reimbursement for students with disabilities who have special transportation needs as stated in their individualized education program. Reimbursement is based on prior-year costs and is based on 80 percent of the "allowable costs" of transportation.

- **Illinois Free Lunch/Breakfast (105 ILCS 125/0.01):** Funding is provided to school districts to pay a portion of the costs to provide quality nutritious meals to all children who meet the free income-level guidelines established in the National School Lunch Program. Reimbursement at the statutory rate of $0.15 for each meal served is paid monthly based on the number of meals claimed.
- **Orphanage Tuition (Regular Education) (105 ILCS 5/18-3):** Funding is provided to LEAs for providing educational services to children residing in orphanages, foster homes, children's homes, state welfare or penal institutions and state-owned housing in lieu of the local property tax revenue associated with such children. Funding is made by formula that accounts for the average daily attendance of eligible pupils and a district's per capita tuition charge.
- **Transportation (Regular/Vocational) (105 ILCS 5/29-5):** Funding is provided to LEAs to reimburse transportation costs for students who reside 1.5 miles or more from their attendance center, reside less than 1.5 miles with an approved safety hazard, or attend a vocational program and are transported by their resident district during the school day. Reimbursement is based on prior-year costs and is calculated as the difference between a district's allowable costs and the computed minimum local taxes.

For more information on General State Aid and mandated categorical programs, please see the Illinois State Board of Education FY 2010 Proposed Budget:

http://www.isbe.net/budget/FY10_budget_book.pdf

ATTACHMENT 2

Levels of State Support for Public IHEs

In determining the level of State support for public universities, Illinois used the funding provided to public universities for ordinary and contingent expenses. These funds are appropriated by line item, including personal services, medicare, group health insurance, contractual services, equipment, travel, automotive expenses, etc. State support for public universities also includes legislatively-directed appropriations for education and general expenses.

In determining the level of State support for community colleges, Illinois used funding provided to the community colleges through appropriations made to the Illinois Community College Board for the following specific purposes:

- **Base Operating Grant (BOG):** The base operating grant focuses on equity, productivity, and mission. By providing the same allocation for the same programs to each district, the formula provides for an equitable distribution of funds. Because enrollment growth and decline affect the allocation of funds, productivity is addressed. Because the funding strategy recognizes differences in programming; e.g., some districts have a greater concentration of technical programs than others, mission differences are recognized in the funding strategy.
- **College & Career Readiness:** This grant supports programs that assist various students to become academically prepared for college and success in postsecondary education.
- **Designated Grant - City Colleges of Chicago:** This grant originated in fiscal year 2005 to compensate for the district's loss in equalization funding. The grant can be used for operating expenditures at City Colleges of Chicago.
- **East St. Louis Higher Education Center:** Funding for the East St. Louis Community College Center provides support to fund higher education consortium activities at the center. Higher education training has been offered at the Center since 1999 after the closing of Metropolitan Community College.
- **Equalization Grants:** This grant program focuses on funding equity and minimizes the effect of the variances in support resulting from tax base differences within Illinois.
- **P-16 Initiative Grant:** This grant focuses on providing incentives to districts for accelerated college enrollment.
- **Retirees Health Insurance Grant:** This grant is intended to provide health insurance for the district's annuitants. Eligible districts shall be defined as those community college districts not eligible for participation in the retirees health insurance plan administered through the Department of Central Management Services.
- **Small College Grants:** This grant is designed to recognize that small colleges have fixed costs, particularly in administrative areas, and that these costs should be recognized to some extent in funding.
- **Student Success Grant:** This grant is intended to provide needed supplemental services to assist students in developing the academic skills necessary to remedy or correct educational deficiencies to allow the attainment of college educational goals.

- **Veterans Shortfall Grants:** This grant is provided to offset the cost of the mandated tuition and fee waivers for veterans enrolling at community colleges.

For more information, please see:

Fiscal Year 2006: IBHE summary of PA 94-0015 presented at the June 2005 IBHE meeting, Agenda Item #10(b), June 7, 2005

http://www.ibhe.org/Board/agendas/2005/June/Item%2010b.pdf

Fiscal Year 2009: IBHE summary of PA 95-0731 presented at the August 2008 IBHE meeting, Agenda Item #10, August 8, 2012

http://www.ibhe.org/Board/agendas/2008/August/Item10.pdf

Fiscal Year 2010: Chapter 6, Illinois State Budget, Fiscal Year 2010, presented by Governor Pat Quinn, March 18, 2009.

http://www.state.il.us/budget/FY2010/FY2010_Operating_Budget.pdf