Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)

*Summary of Illinois State Plan Draft #1 as of 9/5/2016*

Dr. Darlene Ruscitti, Regional Superintendent
DuPage Regional Office of Education
Purpose of Summary Brief

• Identify key definitions and decision points in the proposed state plan
• Alert readers to areas in which ISBE is seeking feedback
• Readers are encouraged to refer to the complete draft for specific information on areas of interest or concern.

• [Website Link] www.isbe.net/essa
1: Consultation & Coordination
The Illinois ESSA state plan addresses the needs of the “whole child” in order to fully ensure that all children have equitable opportunities to meet the challenging standards required by the state. In addition to the challenging academic standards and high expectations for student achievement, there needs to be a refocusing on the social/emotional needs of students.
1.2 Coordination

ISBE is looking for most appropriate ways to combine funding from multiple sources to increase collaboration across agencies and within ISBE.
2: Challenging State Academic Standards and Assessments
2.1 Challenging Standards

Noticeably silent on Common Core and English Language Proficiency Standards. No request for feedback on this section.
2.2 Academic Assessments, p. 7-13

• PARCC exams in ELA and Math in grades 3-8
• SAT including writing component for all public high school juniors, beginning 2016-2017
• IL Science Assessment in grades 5 and 8 and in high school based on the content of Biology I.
• Middle school math assessed based on alignment to course content (e.g. Algebra I)
• Nationally recognized college entrance exams exception
2.2 Academic Assessments, p. 7-13

- Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities
  - DLM-AA aligned to the ILS using Essential Elements
  - Universal Design for Learning is used to deliver the assessment through technology

- EL Students
  - ISBE is considering raising the overall composite proficiency level on ACCESS. Current levels are overall 5.0, reading 4.2, and writing 4.2
  - ISBE seeking solutions for second language students
3: Accountability, Support and Improvement for Schools, p. 13
3.1 Requirements for Academic Indicators, p. 13-16

A. Is valid, reliable, and comparable across all LEAs in the state;
B. Is calculated the same for all schools across the state, except that the measure or measures selected within the indicator of Academic Progress or any indicator of School Quality or Student Success may vary by grade span;
C. Can be disaggregated for each subgroup of students;
D. Includes a different measure than the state uses for any other indicator;
E. Is supported by research finding that performance or progress on such measure is likely to increase student academic achievement or, for measures used within indicators at the high school level, graduation rates; and
F. Aids in the meaningful differentiation among schools by demonstrating varied results across all schools.
3.1 Suggested Indicators, p. 13-16

- Academic (10)
- School Climate (10)
- Engagement (3)
- Post Secondary Readiness (7)
- Access to Advanced Coursework (4)
- Non-academic Indicators (6)
### 3.1 Accountability System: Example One, p. 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Elem/Middle (Points)</th>
<th>High School (Points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Achievement (10 ELA/10 Math, Total 20)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Graduation/Extended Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL Proficiency</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Success/School Quality</th>
<th>Elem/Middle</th>
<th>High School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8\textsuperscript{th}/9\textsuperscript{th} grade on track</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Absenteeism and/or attendance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Curricular measure AP/IP/Dual/CTE</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PreK-2 (2017-2018)</td>
<td>No points yet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 3.1 Accountability System: Example Two, p. 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Elem/Middle (Points)</th>
<th>High School (Points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Achievement (10 ELA/10 Math, Total 20)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Graduation/Extended Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL Proficiency</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Success/School Quality</th>
<th>Elem/Middle</th>
<th>High School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8th/9th grade on track (4 groups)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Absenteeism and/or attendance (4 groups)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Curricular measure AP/IP/Dual/CTE</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PreK-2 (2017-2018)</td>
<td>No points yet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ISBE Feedback Request

- Do these indicators make sense within an accountability system?
- Comments on two weighting samples?
- Ideas regarding the overall composite proficiency levels on Access for ELS.
3.1 Goal Setting, p. 19

- Ambitious long term goals:
  - Continuous improvement
  - Improved equity/outcomes for students
- Framework of achievable interim goals balanced with the right equity and resources

ISBE Feedback Request

- The relationship between long-term goals that are ambitious and achievable and long term goals that are aspirational.
- The relationship between interim goals that are ambitious and achievable and interim goals that are relevant.
- Timeline to achieve interim goals?
3.1 Aggregating Measures, p. 19

- Proposed regulations require performance levels and a summative rating consistent with long term goals and measures of interim progress.
- IL needs to develop a process to meaningfully differentiate school quality for parents and the public.

ISBE Feedback Request

- Performance Levels
  - Number of levels
  - Terminology to express performance levels
  - Suggestions to assist parents and others in understanding performance levels and what they mean for a school
3.1 Timeline, p. 20

• Interim goals – 2 or 3 years
• Federal accountability system implemented 2017-2018
• ISBE intends to use this time to develop a system that is realistic, reliable, achievable and attainable.
• Federal regulations expected Fall 2016.
• Modifications to state law will be needed.
ISBE Feedback Request

• What is the appropriate timeframe for interim and long-term goals, and why?
• How might a system avoid the “bubble syndrome,” which focuses on students who are most likely to meet standards instead of those who need additional supports to meet standards or who are at the higher end of the spectrum?
• What is necessary in order to create a system wherein students are able to be identified as part of multiple subgroups?
• What is necessary in order to develop a system that addresses disparities in funding and resources (state, local, federal)?
• What needs to occur in order to ensure that schools are able to provide an accurate story to the public?
• How should Illinois define growth?
• What are other ways to define achievement?
• What other data tells our story?
3.2 Identification of Schools for Comprehensive Support and Improvement, p. 22

Schools eligible to receive multi-tiered system of support (MTSS) and services will include:

1) the lowest-performing 5 percent of schools as determined by the state accountability system,
2) high schools with a four-year graduation rate of less than 67 percent, and
3) schools with one or more student groups whose performance remains on par or is lower that the performance of the “all students” group in the lowest-performing 5 percent of schools after a school improvement plan has been implemented for a state-determined number of years.

• Pending approval of the proposed regulations, schools in the first two categories will first be identified and notified in 2017-18, using data from 2015-16 and 2016-17, and every three years thereafter.

• Schools in the third category will be identified in the second round of identification, in 2020-21.
ISBE Feedback Request

• Should Illinois identify the lowest-performing 5 percent of schools first, and then identify high schools with a four-year graduation rate of less than 67 percent?

• Or should the state identify high schools first, then calculate a lowest-performing 5 percent from the remaining pool? Alternate methods will either increase or decrease the number of schools identified.

• How many years (up to four inclusive of a possible planning year) should schools with a student group whose performance is on par or lower than the performance of the “all students” group in the lowest-performing 5 percent of schools have to implement a school improvement plan before it is identified as requiring comprehensive supports and services, and why?
3.2 Uniform Exit Criteria for Comprehensive Support, p. 23

1. Increase student outcomes, and
2. No longer meet the eligibility criteria for comprehensive support and improvement.

*It is ISBE’s belief that its definition of increased student outcomes should be aligned to the *totality* of the state’s accountability system, not a single assessment or measure.*
ISBE Feedback Request

• With respect to the definition of improved student outcomes, should improvements in achievement be required, or is increased growth sufficient? If so, why? If not, why not?

• Should there be minimal required amounts of growth (beyond the requirement to no longer meet the criteria for identification)? If so, what amount of growth would be sufficient? If not, why not?
3.2 Identification of Consistently Underperforming Schools, p. 24

- Illinois proposes to define schools with “consistently underperforming” subgroups as schools with a subgroup of students that is performing at the lowest performance level in the system of annual meaningful differentiation on two or more academic indicators.

- Illinois will identify the methodology for identification for these schools after the development and definition of its state accountability system.
ISBE Feedback Request

• For how long should a student group be underperforming before it meets the definition of “consistently underperforming”?

• The proposed regulations suggest identifying schools with these student groups every two years. What might the intended and unintended consequences of such a timeline be?
3.2 Identification of Schools for Targeted Support

Definition: “A school with a student group whose performance is at or below that of the performance of the ‘all students’ group in schools identified for comprehensive supports and services.”

1. Identify schools that meet the criteria for comprehensive supports and services.
2. For each of the identified schools, identify the highest performance level on the state accountability system.
3. Compare the individual school disaggregated data against the values identified in Step 2.
4. Notify any school where one or more subgroup is at or beneath the performance level identified above.
3.2 Exit Criteria for Targeted Support, p. 25

1. Increase student outcomes, and
2. No longer meet the eligibility criteria for comprehensive support and improvement.
ISBE Feedback Request

• With respect to the definition of improved student outcomes, should improvements in achievement be required, or is increased growth sufficient? If so, why? If not, why not?

• Should student group performance on relevant indicators be compared to state averages for the “all students” category or the comparable student group? Why?

• Should there be minimal required amounts of growth (beyond the requirement to no longer meet the criteria for identification)? If so, what amount of growth would be sufficient? If not, why not?

• How should these exit criteria support or hinder progress toward the state long-term goals and measures of interim progress?

• What is the appropriate timeline for improvement of performance of underperforming student groups? Literature on systems change and school turnaround suggests a five-year minimum timeline, which is not presently an option under the law. What, if any, additional exit criteria should Illinois use? If so, what criteria and why?
3.3 State Support: Allocation of Resources, p. 26-29

- FY 16  $48,665,646 for school improvement activities
- FY 17  $48,665,646 for school improvement activities
- Thereafter no less than 7%
- State expects to receive $1 billion in Title funding
3.3 State Support: 5% Reserve, p. 26-29

• Identify schools for comprehensive or targeted support
• Develop state formula for allotment of funds and services to identified LEAs
• Design review and approval process for external providers
• Monitor and evaluate the use of the funds by LEA’s
• Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) (95% of reserve)
  • Statewide support liaisons
  • Peer review teams
3.3 State Support: Sub-Grants Formula Elements, p. 26-29

1. Status as a comprehensive or targeted improvement, with schools requiring comprehensive improvement receiving a larger allotment of funds or supports than targeted.
2. Number of staff and students
3. Phase of implementation (Year 1, Year 2 or Year 3)
4. Number of schools in LEA identified as comprehensive or targeted
5. Concentration (%) of schools in LEA identified as comprehensive and concentration (%) of schools identified as targeted.
6. Level of “need” of the school and district, and
7. Quality of the plan itself and readiness of the schools and district to implement the plan effectively.
3.3 State Support: Sub-Grants Formula Elements, p. 26-29

• ISBE required to prioritize LEA’s that “demonstrate the greatest need for such funds” and the “strongest commitment to using funds.”

• ISBE will make base-equitable awards of one year for the purpose of planning. Thereafter, ISBE will make awards of three years in duration on a formula basis for the purpose of implementation of comprehensive and targeted improvement plans.

• Varying amounts to schools that submit acceptable comprehensive or targeted improvement plans on a formula basis for a period of not more than three years.
ISBE Feedback Request

• How should the state define “greatest need”?

• Which should be prioritized, districts with the highest concentrations of identified schools or highest numbers? Why?

• What are practical ways for the state to include practitioners and stakeholders in the creation of a state formula and/or instruments that evaluate the quality of an improvement plan?

• How should the state define and measure “readiness” and “strongest commitment” to implement change?
3.3 B. Evidence-based Interventions, p. 30

• Planning Year Tasks:
  • “Conduct a school-level needs assessment
  • Develop structures for meaningful stakeholders
  • Develop strong improvement plans”

• Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS)
  • Technical assistance, professional development support to LEAs and schools in the development of their comprehensive and targeted improvement plans
  • Conduct needs assessments, curriculum audits, equity audits and other diagnostic supports and services for LEAs and schools necessary to develop strong plans.
  • Curate, annotate and update a list of evidence-based strategies as defined in statute from previous work done to support school improvement
3.3 C. Rigorous Interventions, p. 31

Schools identified as comprehensive or targeted must use these funds only for interventions reflecting the three highest levels of evidence (Strong, Moderate, Promising.)

- **Strong** – at least one well-designed and well-implemented experimental study (e.g. a randomized controlled trial)

- **Moderate** – at least one well-designed and well-implemented quasi-experimental study

- **Promising** – at least one well-designed and well-implemented correlation study with statistical controls for selection bias

- **Research-based rationale** – high quality research findings or evaluations that show the intervention is likely to improve outcomes that include ongoing efforts to examine effects of the activity, strategy or intervention.
ISBE Feedback Request

What are the challenges in regard to the identification and implementation of “evidence-based” practices?
3.3 D. Periodic Resource Allocation Review, p. 32

For each LEA identified for either comprehensive or targeted support and improvement:

- Equity gaps in funding per student of General State Aid
- Equity gaps in Title allocations, including section 1003 funds, supports and services
- Equity gaps in special education allocations from IDEA Parts B and D
- Equity gaps in funding to gifted and talented grant programs
- Equity gaps in bilingual education funding
- Equity gaps in access and provision of education loan repayment grants
- Gaps in the provision of all technical assistance, professional development and other support and services provided by agency staff
- Gaps in the provision of all technical assistance, professional development and other support and services provided by MTSS
- Gaps in the impact of funding, supports and services relative to allocation for all students, relevant student groups and teachers
4: Supporting Excellent Educators
ISBE will ensure that the professional development (PD) the LEAs offer their teachers and other instructional staff is consistent with the definition of “professional development” by the following means:

- Align the process of auditing approved PD providers with the definition of “professional development” and remove provider approval status from those providers not in compliance with the definition.
- Establish an annual PD audit. The first provider audit process will begin in the fall of 2016.
- Communicate the definition to LEAs in guidance for local plans and require plans align activities to definition
4.2 B. Skills to Address Specific Learning Needs, p. 36-38

- MTSS focus on improving student performance K-12
- Illinois Data for Fiscal and Instructional Results, Study and Transparency (IL Data FIRST)
  - Fiscal Equity and Return on Investment (ROI)
  - Instructional Support
- Ed360
  - Identify and develop formative and summative assessments
  - Using technology and tools in the classroom
  - Content resources
  - Professional learning: behavioral and mental health, equity and diversity issues to support healthier school environments
- Illinois Open Education Resource (IEOR)
- IL Virtual School – self paced PD
- Online Impact – PD site for teachers – 15 courses available
4.3 Educator Equity, p. 39-41

Definitions:

• **Ineffective Teacher**: “A teacher who has received an “unsatisfactory” rating in his/her most recent performance evaluation rating or a teacher who has received a “needs improvement” on an evaluation and in a subsequent evaluation has received an “unsatisfactory” or “needs improvement.”

• **Inexperienced Teacher**: A teacher with less than one/two/three/four years of teaching experience.
4.3 Educator Equity, p. 39-41

Definitions:

• **Out of Field Teacher**: A teacher teaching in a grade or content areas for which he or she does not hold the appropriate state-issued license or endorsement.

• **Low-Income student**: Students from families receiving public aid, living in institutions for neglected or delinquent children, being supported in foster homes with public funds or eligible to receive free or reduced-price lunches.
ISBE Feedback Request

*ISBE is seeking feedback on the definitions for ineffective and inexperienced teacher.*
5: Supporting All Students, p. 41
5.1.A. Continuum from Preschool to Grade 12, p. 41 -45

- Illinois Early Learning Guidelines
- Birth to 5 Program standards and grants (23 IL Admin Code 235, Subchapter f, Part 235.
- Illinois Early Learning and Development Standards (ELDS) (23 IL Admin Code 1 Appendix D)
- K-12 Illinois Learning Standards in math, science, social science, English language arts, fine arts, and physical education/health
- Education for employment Regional Delivery System (EFE) career pathways
- Carl D Perkins Act of 2006 and state Career and Technical Education Improvement Funds
- Response to Intervention
- Public Act 99-0456 addresses “unequitable discipline practices” that contribute to dropping out or being pushed out.”
5.1.B. Equitable Access, p. 45

- MTSS framework to ensure equitable access
- Educational outcomes are improved in schools with
  - Positive school climates
  - A highly qualified workforce that is trained in engaging academic and climate and culture education
  - Adequate academic, social, emotional and behavioral health supports and interventions; and
  - Coordinated systems for engaging, identifying, referring and addressing student needs in a positive and proactive manner.
5.1.B. Conditions for Learning, p. 46

- A safe, caring, participatory, and responsive school/classroom climate, and;
- The development of academic, social, emotional, behavioral, and physical competencies.
5.1.B. Barriers to Learning, p. 46-47

Districts/schools need to provide programming at three levels of care and instruction \textit{(promotion, prevention, intervention)} as they develop a safe, caring, (re-) engaging and participatory environment. These levels:

\begin{itemize}
  \item Foster the well-being of all students through universal schoolwide approaches (care standards – aligned academic curriculum and instruction and practices that promote healthy development and prevent issue.)
  \item Provide early intervention supports to reduce the possibility of escalating issues (evidence-based practices for content areas and social, emotional behavioral and physical supports); and
  \item Provide intensive, individualized supports for those students demonstrating complex, multi-faceted needs.
\end{itemize}

All of the work needs to be done within an integrated manner throughout the school and the support of resources from local district and ISBE.
5.1.C. Activities to Reduce: p. 47

• Incidents of bullying and harassment;

• The overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom; and

• The use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety.
1. Increased access to broadband and devices to mitigate the Digital Divide.

2. Regional technology centers known as Learning Technology Centers provide PD and network/device consultation to its schools.

3. Resources including The Illinois Virtual School, The Illinois Open Education Resources project, Standards-aligned resources designed to differentiate content for students and Tech for Teachers website.
Meaningful Family Engagement is based on the premise that parents, educators and community members share responsibility for the academic, physical, social, emotional and behavioral development of youth.
5.1.E. Parent, Family and Community Engagement, p. 50-53

- ISBE will update the Family Engagement Framework and its companion tools.
- ISBE will update and develop family engagement PD
- ESSA contains a set-aside requirement for parent and family engagement. The allocation for IL is more than $500,000. 90% of those funds must be distributed to schools with a priority for high-need schools.
- Sample Parent Right to Know letters are available from ISBE for the start of school.
- Timely notice to parent of assignment of a teacher for four or more consecutive weeks who does not meet state certification or licensure requirements at the grade level and subject area in which the teacher has been assigned
- Capacity building for high-quality after-school programming for 21st Century Community Learning Center grantees
- Illinois after-school statewide network, the ACT Now Coalition – quality standards for after-school program providers
- ELL Division guidance framework for schools that integrated the four core principles of the ISBE Family Engagement Framework. ISBE will work with WIDA and the IL Resource Center to build capacity.
- Early Childhood’s Continuous Improvement Quality Rating System recognition
- Preschool Expansion Grant – Illinois Early Learning Council, public-private partnership (PA 93-380)
- Coordination with Health and Human Services Transformation Agenda
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5.1.F. Accurate Identification of English Learners and Children with Disabilities, p. 53-54

Every evaluation will include assessments in English and in the native language of the student to determine if language is or is not the cause of the learning difficulty. Every IEP team will include a bilingual/dual language specialist to speak both to the disability and the language questions.
ISBE is expected to receive more than $1 billion in Title I, Part A; Title II; and Title IV, Part A funds to distribute to 852 districts.

• The consolidated grant application will be updated

• The 852 districts will submit a plan developed in consultation with stakeholders for approval.
5.1.G. New Application Components, p. 54-55

- How the LEA will identify and address disparities in teacher distribution, and

- How the LEA will support efforts to reduce the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom, which may include identifying and supporting schools with high rates of discipline, disaggregated by each of the subgroups of students.
ISBE seeks information on constraints that districts have experienced preventing them from using and/or braiding federal funds to carry out innovative ways to support students.
State Use of Funds: Title IV, Part A and Part B and other Federal Funds – purpose, p. 55

- Provide all students with access to a well-rounded education;
- Improve school conditions for student learning and
- Improve the use of technology in order to improve the academic achievement and digital literacy of all students
- ISBE will use funds for coordinating new plans and resources with pre-existing; monitoring the implementation of Title IV, Part A activities and programs; offering technical assistance to districts and identifying the appropriate division to provide equitable access for all students to the activities supported.
ISBE Feedback Request

ISBE requests additional suggestions for ways it may consider the use of Title IV, Part A funds to:

1) Provide all students with access to a well-rounded education;

2) Improve school conditions for student learning; and

3) Improve the use of technology in order to improve the academic achievement and digital literacy of all students.
Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers, p. 57-58

• 2% of funds will be used for state administration
• 5% of funds will be used for state activities
• Remaining 93% will be awarded to eligible applicants through competitive sub-grants using a peer review process. A financial and programmatic risk assessment will need to be completed to receive funds.
5.2. A. Title I, Part A, Poverty Threshold p. 58

Criteria for waiving the 40% threshold:
• ISBE will use 20% poverty for the initial threshold.
• Educational need for schoolwide status:
  • School size
  • Benefit schoolwide status will provide
  • Other factors the school wishes the state to consider

ISBE Feedback Request

• *ISBE welcomes suggestions for other factors it may wish to consider in waiving the 40% threshold.*
5.2.B. Title I, Part C: Migratory Children, p. 59-68

For the purposes of the Migrant Education Program (MEP), eligible children/youth are defined as those who:

- Are younger than the age of 22 who have not earned a high school diploma or high school equivalency certificate from a granting institution in the United States; and
- Are migrant agricultural workers or fishers or have a parent, spouse, or guardian who is a migrant agricultural worker or fisher; and
- Have moved due to economic necessity from one school district to another (special conditions apply for Alaska and Hawaii); and
- Have changed residence within the preceding 36 months with/to join a parent, spouse, or guardian in order to obtain or seek temporary or seasonal employment in qualifying agricultural or fishing work.

ISBE will establish key personnel responsible for identification and recruitment of MEP-eligible students.
5.2.B. Title I, Part C: Migratory Children Needs Assessment p. 60

Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CAN) to identify and assess

(1) The unique educational needs of migrant children that result from the children’s migrant lifestyle; and

(2) Other needs of migrant students that must be met in order for them to participate effectively in school.
Based on the needs identified in through the comprehensive needs assessment, each local MEP may offer the following educational services:

1. Preschool developmentally appropriate programs designed to prepare migrant children for a successful school experience,
2. Grades K-12 integrated classroom instruction – Math; reading; science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (summer school); and tutorial support (during the regular academic year),
3. Secondary school services to assist high school students in achieving graduation, and
4. Continuity of instruction between and among school districts and states.
5.2.B. Title I, Part C: Migratory Children Services, p. 62

For migrant students, Illinois also offers the following services:

(1) MEPs offer migrant students help to enroll in regular school year programs according to their needs.

(2) In areas of high concentration, a migrant advocate works with schools and families to make sure their needs are addressed, and

(3) Require migrant programs in high school to meet with the migrant counselor and the family of the student to review and update their graduation plan.
5.2.B. Title I, Part C: Migratory Children Services, Educational Needs based on CAN, p. 63 - 65

Refer to pages 64-65 for specific needs in each of the following categories for

• Reading and Mathematics
• School Readiness
• High School Graduation and Services to Out-of-School Youth
• Ancillary and Support Services
Every local MEP program in the state is required to maintain a current list of eligible migrant students as well as a list of students who meet PFS (Priority for Service) criteria. In accordance with ESEA—Section 1304(d), MEPs in Illinois must give PFS to migrant children who are failing, or most at risk of failing, to meet the state’s content and performance standards and whose education has been interrupted during the school year.
5.2.B. Title III, Part A. English Learners and Immigrant Students, p. 68-70

- Home Language Screening Survey
- Mandated Screening Tests and corresponding scores
- ACCESS testing
- Exit criteria
5.2.B. Title V. Part B. Rural and Low-Income School Program, p. 70

- Grants will be based on new accountability measures.
5.2.B. McKinney-Vento Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program, p. 70-96

• ISBE will disseminate guidance on new and existing program requirements.
• School District Homeless Liaison duties
• Use of Common Form (83-01) for enrollment
• School of Origin
• Immediate enrollment
• Rights of unaccompanied homeless youth
• Prompt placement and dispute resolution
• Procedures
• Early Childhood and Transition to Secondary
Check out www.isbe.net/essa for more information

The comment period ends 9/28/2016 for Draft #1.
Your feedback may be sent to essa@isbe.net