

IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Public Schools Agenda - April 11-12, 2002 Eastern Idaho Technical College

- A. Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Overview, Tom Farley**
- B. Proposed School Accreditation Process, Shannon Page**
- C. Request for Letters of Authorization, Bob West**
- D. Curricular Materials Committee Appointments, Bob West**
- E. Proposals to Rezone School Districts, Bob West**
- F. Lewiston School District Waiver, Bob West**
- G. Remote & Necessary School Application, Tim Hill**
- H. Proposal to Rezone Salmon District #291, Dr. Candis R. Donicht**
- I. Proposal to Rezone Clark County District #161, Dr. Linda Carlsen**
- J. Superintendent's Report**

A. SUBJECT:

Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA): No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB)

BACKGROUND:

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) first became law under President Johnson in 1965. The law is often referred to as ESEA of 1965. ESEA was last re-authorized in 1994 as the Improvement of America Schools Act (IASA). Congress passed the current new reauthorization bill and the NCLB Act was signed into law by President Bush on January 8, 2002.

ESEA is the federal legislation that authorizes federal funding to states for education. Under the new act there are some significant increases in federal support of education. The most notable program in ESEA is the Title I program. Title I is the program that provides supplemental support for educating disadvantaged children in high poverty schools. However, ESEA authorizes funding in other areas of education.

DISCUSSION:

The majority of dollars appropriated are to impact those children who have not succeeded academically in the past. They are generally allocated to districts based on poverty (the number of low socio-economically disadvantaged children in the district). These children include children from diverse backgrounds, second language learners, migrants, and some children who may have learning disabilities.

Dollars are supplemental and cannot be used to supplant. Federal dollars may not be used to pay for that which the state is required to do. The use of federal dollars is to be aligned with the State's priorities and wherever possible they will be used to further the efforts being made. The majority of dollars flow through to the districts. The state may keep 1% of the federal allocation for administrative purposes.

The following list includes requirements outlined in the law that have the most implications for states:

- * states must meet the intent of the 1994 law as well as NCLB,
- * school reform efforts must use scientifically research-based programs,
- * states must have assessments aligned to high state content and performance standards for all children,
- * starting in at least 2005 all children grades 3 through 8 and children in at least one grade 10, 11, or 12 will be tested in reading/language arts and mathematics,
- * adequate yearly progress (AYP) will be required for all students by 2005,
- * all children (100%) are to be performing at the proficient or higher level by 12 years,
- * there are accountability requirements including sanctions and rewards,
- * there are provisions for public school choice due to low performance of schools,
- * supplemental services must be provided for low performing schools,
- * services must be provided for limited English proficient (LEP) students,
- * there is to be a highly qualified teacher (certified in subjects they teach) in every classroom by 2005,
- * there are limitations and qualifications for paraprofessionals that include having duties clearly defined, and new hires as of January 8, 2002 must have two years of college, earn an AA degree, or meet high state standards as well as pass competency assessments in reading and math, and
- * there are flexibility provisions that allow for moving monies from other programs into Title I.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Outline of Programs in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001
2. Executive Summary of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (*Note: This attachment was not received in electronic form. For a copy, call Traci Hossfeld at 208-332-6890*)

OUTLINE OF PROGRAMS

IN THE

NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT OF 2001

(Program Outline)

The following is a list of programs included in the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*, signed by the President on January 8, 2002.

Authoritative statements of the Department's interpretation of the Act, and of the amendments it makes to the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* and other statutes, are set out in regulations, guidance, and other appropriate documents.

TITLE I

- Title I-A Basic Programs Operated by LEAs
- Local School Improvement Grants
- Reading First State Grants
- Early Reading First
- Even Start
- Improving Literacy Through School Libraries
- Education of Migratory Children
- Neglected and Delinquent Children
- Title I Evaluation and Demonstrations
- Close Up Fellowships
- Comprehensive School Reform
- Advanced Placement
- School Dropout Prevention
- Title I General Provisions

TITLE II

- Improving Teacher Quality State Grants
- Mathematics and Science Partnerships
- Troops-to- Teachers
- Transition to Teaching
- National Writing Project
- Civic Education
- Teaching of Traditional American History
- Teacher Liability Protection
- State and Local Technology Grants
- Ready-to- Learn Television

TITLE III

- Language Instruction for LEP and Immigrant Students

TITLE IV

- Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities, State/National Programs
 - Community Service for Expelled or Suspended Students
 - School Security and Technology Resource Center
 - National Center for School and Youth Safety
 - Grants to Reduce Alcohol Abuse
 - Mentoring Programs
- 21st Century Community Learning Centers

TITLE V

- Innovative Programs State Grants
- Charter Schools
- Charter School Facilities – Credit Enhancement Initiatives
- Voluntary Public School Choice
- Magnet Schools Assistance
- Fund for the Improvement of Education
 - Elementary and Secondary School Counseling
 - Character Education
 - Smaller Learning Communities
 - Reading is Fundamental – Inexpensive Book Distribution
 - Gifted and Talented Students
 - Star Schools
 - Ready to Teach
 - Foreign Language Assistance
 - Physical Education
 - Community Technology Centers
 - Exchange Programs for Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians, and Their Historical Whaling and Trading Partners in Massachusetts
 - Excellence in Economic Education
 - Mental Health Grants (also separate School Readiness Grants)
 - Arts in Education
 - Parent Assistance and Local Family Information Centers
 - Combatting Domestic Violence
 - Healthy, High-Performance Schools
 - Capital Expenses for Private School Children
 - Additional Assistance for LEAs Impacted by Federal Property Acquisition
 - Women’s Educational Equity

TITLE VI

- Grants for State Assessments and Enhanced Assessments
- ESEA Flexibility Provisions
 - State and Local Transferability
 - State Flexibility Authority
 - Local Flexibility Demonstration
- Rural Education Initiative
 - Small Rural School Achievement Program
 - Rural and Low-Income School Program
- National Assessment of Educational Progress

TITLE VII

- Indian Education
- Education of Native Hawaiians
- Alaska Native Education

TITLE VIII

- Impact Aid

TITLE IX

- General Provisions

OTHER

- Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers
- Eisenhower Regional Mathematics and Science Consortia
- Regional Technology in Education Consortia
- Education of Homeless Children and Youth
- Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology
- Protection of Pupil Rights

B. SUBJECT:

Proposed School Accreditation Process

BACKGROUND:

Idaho Code 33-119 requires the State Board of Education to establish accreditation standards for secondary schools and gives the Board authority to set standards for elementary schools as deemed necessary. On April 1, 1997, new State Board of Education rules went into effect that outlined the requirement that all public schools be state accredited. Four methods of state-accepted accreditation are currently outlined in the rules to which all schools respond.

Considerable discussion has surfaced regarding the purpose of accreditation, how it helps schools, and what accountability is inherent in the process. During the summer of 2000, Dr. Marilyn Howard, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, named a ten-person ad hoc committee chaired by Dr. Bob Haley to study the State's accreditation process and make recommendations. Three major improvement recommendations came out of the committee's work: (1) amend Idaho Code, Section 33-119 to reflect the Idaho's current practice of accrediting elementary schools as well as secondary schools; (2) change State Board of Education rules to allow for only two ways to be accredited [regional or state accreditation]; and (3) rewrite the criteria for the state accreditation standards to reflect a results-driven process.

A report was delivered to the State Board at the October 2000 meeting requesting permission to conduct field tests of the changes being proposed in the state accreditation process. The Board recommended strengthening the accountability frameworks and a review of changes before approval could be considered. Dr. Haley presented a revised draft of the proposed annual accreditation report to the State Board in April 2001, and the Department was granted approval to field test in the fall 2001.

DISCUSSION:

Six school districts (one from each region of the state), as well as two private, one state and one charter school, were asked to participate in the field test, for a total of 55 schools. The Department of Education's Coordinator of Accreditation & Elementary Services, Shannon Page,

conducted the field test in October 2001. Feedback regarding the proposed accreditation process and the new annual report was gathered from the participating school administrators by a written survey followed by regional on-site visits for more in-depth discussion.

Ms. Page will present an updated concept for a state accreditation process based on the field test feedback and also on internal discussions among bureaus/sections within the Department of Education that also place school improvement and accountability requirements on Idaho schools. The State Department of Education will continue to research, develop, and refine a new state accreditation process. The accreditation model, when approved, would be fully implemented by 2005.

C. SUBJECT:

Letters of Authorization

BACKGROUND:

At its March 7-8, 2002, meeting, the Professional Standards Commission approved Letters of Authorization for recommendation to the State Board of Education for its final approval.

Pertinent to the Letters of Authorization, State Board of Education Rule IDAPA 08.02.02.070.01 states that, "The final recommendation of the Commission will be submitted to the State Board of Education by the Superintendent of Public Instruction."

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The State Department of Education recommends that the State Board of Education give final approval for the Letters of Authorization that have been submitted as approved by the Professional Standards Commission at its March 7-8, 2002, meeting.

BOARD ACTION:

The State Board carried to approve/disapprove/table the requests for Letters of Authorization as submitted by the Professional Standards Commission. It was moved by _____, seconded by _____, and carried.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. List of individuals for approval

D. SUBJECT:

Appointments to the Idaho State Curricular Materials Selection Committee.

BACKGROUND:

The Administrative Rules of the Idaho Board of Education, IDAPA 08.02.03.112, describe the membership of the Idaho State Curricular Materials Selection Committee. Membership on the Committee is for a term of five (5) years with the exception of the representatives from the State Department of Education and the Division of Professional-Technical Education. Their terms are for one (1) year. Currently there are five openings on the Committee. The Department of Education is recommending applicants for four of those positions at this time and welcomes recommendations from the Board for the one remaining opening. The open positions are: one content specialist from the State Department of Education (1 year), one representative from the Division of Vocational-Technical Education (1 year), one representative from one of the state's four colleges of education (ISU) (5 years), one representative from one of the state's four colleges of education (U of I) (5 years), and one representative who is not a public school educator nor a public school trustee.

RECOMMENDATION:

The State Department of Education recommends the appointment of Karen Fraley/Character Education to be the content specialist from the State Department of Education. This appointment is for a period of one (1) year.

The State Department of Education recommends the appointment of Don Eshelby as the representative from the Division of Professional-Technical Education. This appointment is for a period of one (1) year.

The State Department of Education recommends the appointment of Dr. David Squires, College of Education, Idaho State University to represent one of the state's four colleges of education. This appointment is for a period of five (5) years.

The State Department of Education recommends the appointment of Dr. John Davis, College of Education, University of Idaho to represent one of

the state's four colleges of education. This appointment is for a period of five (5) years.

BOARD ACTION:

The State Board of Education carried to approve/disapprove/table the request for Appointments to the Idaho State Curricular Materials Selection Committee as submitted. Moved by _____, seconded by _____ and carried.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Curriculum Vita for David Squires, Idaho State University
2. Curriculum Vita for John Davis, University of Idaho

(Note: These attachments were not received in electronic form. For a copy, call Deanie Grant at 208-332-6974)

E. SUBJECT:

Proposals to Rezone School Districts

BACKGROUND:

Idaho Code 33-313 states that following the release of the decennial census data each school district board of trustees shall prepare a proposal to equalize the population of their trustee zones. It also states that the boundaries of the trustee zones in each school district shall be defined and drawn so that, as reasonably as may be, each such zone shall have approximately the same population. These proposals must be submitted to the State Board for approval.

DISCUSSION:

The Department of Education reviewed proposals from the following school districts. The review included insuring population equalization based on the numbers submitted and correcting legal descriptions and maps as needed.

Bliss Jt. School District No. 234

Dietrich School District No. 314

Cascade School District No. 422

Bruneau-Grandview Jt. School District No. 365

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended the State Board of Education approve the proposals.

BOARD ACTION:

It was carried to approve/disapprove/table the proposals from the above-listed school districts to redefine their trustee zones. Moved by _____, seconded by _____, and carried.

F. SUBJECT:

**Waiver of State Board Rules for Lewiston Independent School District
No. 1**

BACKGROUND:

The Administrative Rules of the State Board of Education, IDAPA 08.02.03.104.02.a., list health (wellness) and physical education (fitness) as required courses for middle school/junior high school students.

DISCUSSION:

In April 2001, the State Board granted a fifth, one year waiver of the above-referenced rule to Lewiston Independent School District. The district gave the State Board of Education, at its regular meeting held in June 2001, a detailed presentation on its integrated programs dealing with health and physical fitness. The district again requests an “ongoing” waiver of this rule, based on considerations set forth by Superintendent Joy C. Rapp in her letter dated March 12, 2002.

The Department of Education has approved a sixth one-year waiver of IDAPA 08.02.03.104.02.a. for Lewiston Independent School District for the 2002-2003 school year. We will continue to require an annual request for this waiver from Independent School District No. 1 as part of the standards implementation process in which the Department is now engaged.

G. SUBJECT:

Request for Approval as Remote and Necessary School - Arbon Elementary District #383

BACKGROUND:

Arbon Elementary District #383 has applied for recognition as a remote and necessary school under the provisions of section 33-1003.3, Idaho Code, for the 2002-2003 school year. This district operates and maintains a school that is remote and isolated from the other schools of the state because of geographical or topographical conditions.

DISCUSSION:

For the past several years, Arbon Elementary District #383 has applied for and received approval to be recognized as remote and necessary.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Department of Education recommends that the above request be approved with the understanding that remote and necessary funding may not be required.

BOARD ACTION:

The State Board of Education carried to approve/disapprove/table the request by Arbon Elementary District #383 to be recognized as remote and necessary. Moved by _____, seconded by _____ and carried.

ATTACHMENT:

1. Petition for Recognition as a Remote School

(Note: This attachment was not received in electronic form. For a copy, call LaRae Ashby at 208-332-6840)

H. SUBJECT:

Proposal to Rezone Salmon School District #291

BACKGROUND:

Idaho Code 33-313 states that following the release of the decennial census data, each school district board of trustees shall prepare a proposal to equalize the population of their trustee zones. It also states that the boundaries of the trustee zones in each school district shall be defined and drawn so that, as reasonably as may be, each such zone shall have approximately the same population. These proposals must be submitted to the State Board for approval.

The Salmon School District #291 timely submitted its proposal in 2001, which the State Board of Education approved. However, the district has found a procedural error in its submission, and irregularities in the proposal it submitted, and requests that the State Board of Education rescind its approval of its earlier proposal so it may correct these errors and submit a new proposal.

DISCUSSION:

See attached letter from John S. McKinney, attorney for Salmon School District #291. Dr. Candis Donicht, district superintendent, will present additional information and answer any questions regarding this proposal.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Board of Education rescind its approval of the previously submitted proposal from Salmon School District #291, and allow the district to submit a new proposal.

BOARD ACTION:

It was carried to approve/disapprove/table the request to rescind approval of the district's proposal to redefine trustee zones. Moved by _____, seconded by _____, and carried.

ATTACHMENT:

1. Letter from John S. McKinney, attorney at law

(Note: This attachment was not received in electronic form. For a copy, call Deb Stage at 208-332-6853)

I. SUBJECT:

Proposal to Rezone Clark County School District #161

BACKGROUND:

Idaho Code 33-313 states that following the release of the decennial census data, each school district board of trustees shall prepare a proposal to equalize the population of their trustee zones. It also states that the boundaries of the trustee zones in each school district shall be defined and drawn so that, as reasonably as may be, each such zone shall have approximately the same population. These proposals must be submitted to the State Board for approval.

Clark County School District #161 submitted their proposal in 2001, which the State Board of Education approved. However, the district has found a clerical error in the proposal submitted, and requests that the State Board of Education rescind its approval of their earlier proposal so they may correct that error and submit a new proposal.

DISCUSSION:

See attached letter from Dr. Linda Carlsen, superintendent of Clark County School District #161. Dr. Carlsen will present additional information and answer any questions regarding the district's proposal.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Board of Education rescind its approval of the previously submitted proposal from Clark County School District #161, and allow the district to submit a new proposal.

BOARD ACTION:

It was carried to approve/disapprove/table the request to rescind approval of the district's proposal to redefine trustee zones. Moved by _____, seconded by _____, and carried.

ATTACHMENT:

2. Letter from Dr. Linda Carlsen, Superintendent

(Note: This attachment was not received in electronic form. For a copy, call Deb Stage at 208-332-6853)

J. SUBJECT:

Superintendent's Report