P-20 Joint Education Leadership Committee
Minutes

Thursday, September 22, 2011
1:00-3:00 PM

Lt. Governor’s Chicago Office
James R. Thompson Center
Chicago, IL

Lt. Governor’s Capitol Office
Springfield, IL

Lt. Governor Simon called the meeting to order.

A— Roll call and approval August meeting minutes.

Members introduced themselves at their respective locations.

Chicago
Lt. Governor Sheila Simon
Miguel del Valle, P-20 Council Chair
Director John Sinsheimer, IL Student Assistance Commission
Director George Reid, IL Board of Higher Education
Sheila Chalmers, Office of the Lt. Governor
Dan Harris, Ounce of Prevention Fund
Maria Capoccia, Office of the Lt. Governor
Amber Kirchoff, Governor’s Office
Iryna Kryshtopa, U.S. State Department Parliamentary Intern—P20 Fellow
Iryna lakusheva, U.S. State Department Parliamentary Intern—International Trade Fellow (DCEO)
Maryna Tkeshelashvili, U.S. State Department Parliamentary Intern—Tourism Fellow (DCEO)

Springfield
President Geoff Obrzut, IL Community College Board
Director Brenda Klosterman, IL Education Research Council
Debbie Meisner-Bertauski, IL Board of Higher Education
Linda Tomlinson, IL State Board of Education
Eric Lichtenberger, IL Education Research Council
Karen Hunter Anderson, IL Community College Board
Elaine Johnson, IL Community College Board
Al Philips, IL Board of Higher Education
William Feurer, IL Board of Higher Education
The Lt. Governor asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Miguel del Valle motioned, George Reid seconded that motion. Motion passed unanimously.

B— Recommendation on Governance for Longitudinal Data System (George Reid, Bob Blankenberger)

At the last JELC meeting, George Reid indicated that he and Chris Koch had gotten together and come up with a recommendation for Governance of the Illinois Longitudinal Data System (ILDS). According to George, governance system was based off of the Data Quality Campaign’s recommendations of having all groups contributing data involved with governance, and eliminating different silos of data. After that JELC meeting, he called a meeting of all the major stakeholder groups on September 20th, with Chris Koch, Geoff Obrzut, John Sinsheimer, Jason Tyszko, Miguel del Valle, Bob Blankenberger, the IBHE General Council, and himself all attending. At the end of the meeting, they came to a consensus, and the recommendation represented in their handout was the result.

They recommend that an ILDS governance structure be formed. The ILDS Governance Board should be made up of the IL State Superintendent of Schools, the Executive Director of the IL Community College Board, the Director of IL Student Assistance Commission, the Executive Director of the IL Board of Higher Education, and the Deputy Chief of Staff for the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity, in addition to other members who will be selected by this board. The Governance Board will report to the P-20 Council and the JELC. An inter-governmental agency agreement between the five main members may be needed to form the Governance Board.

Miguel del Valle commended everyone for getting together and agreeing on this governance structure. He has checked with IBHE’s legal counsel, and this structure is allowable under the Public Act which created the ILDS. Del Valle hopes that the establishment of this governance structure will put the ILDS on a faster track as it will pull everything together.

Brenda Klosterman asked if the Governance Board may be establishing the data sharing policies with outside researchers or research groups. Currently, the IERC has to go to different state agencies to get approval for data. It would be helpful to have to only go to one entity to request data.

Reid said that is his hope. That is one of many things the Governance Board will have to decide. One thing that it has to decide first is how the ILDS will be managed. This is a governance board, not a management board.

Blankenberger said that the draft put forth in the last meeting was put together by John Evans at the State Board. There are few changes in the new proposal, but they are reflective of feedback they got from the group. There will likely be further iterations of this structure as they go along.

Blankenberger stated that one of the first decisions that need to be made is how much data will be housed in a single warehouse. The act establishing the ILDS only requires that the State Board, IBHE, and ICCB submit data to a warehouse, but additional data sets will need to be added to make this as functional as possible. The workforce data sets, for example, will need to be added. The ILDS Governance Board will therefore need to expand to include the heads of the agencies who submit data. There is a list of other groups who need to be part of the consultative process as well, pursuant to sec. 15e of the establishing act. So, there may be a two-tiered governance structure with one small Governance Board in addition to a more inclusive group.
He said there may need to be some standing committees formed to look at some of the questions facing the ILDS. They have also discussed putting together an initial research agenda which would allow them to pilot some of these initiatives. This way they could do some test runs to see where the problems are, where the obstacles are, and work out the kinks.

Reid said that, assuming this structure is approved by the P-20 Council, Reid will convene the group, and then they will get together and decide who will be the leader.

Lt. Governor Simon asked, based on some of her recent community college visits, if this is the place that community colleges could go to get data on their students’ achievement after they transfer to a 4-year institution.

Reid said yes, in its full iteration, it will be the place to go for any data related question.

Simon then asked what the possibility is of interfacing with other states’ data systems.

Reid said that without a unified system, it is nearly impossible. But, as we get going with the ILDS it will become increasingly possible as it becomes more refined.

Simon stated that getting to a place where we can share data with other states is very important because not all of Illinois students stay in-state for school, and we need to see how they are doing and what jobs they get once they come home.

Blankenberger said that they are seeking national data sets in the short run to supplement their data. The State Board, IBHE, and IHEC have discussed connecting to the national clearinghouse which provides student financial aid information and student unit record information. There is a charge for it, and they will have to work that out, but in the short term, this is a way to add out-of-state student unit record data.

On the research agenda side, there will be two tracks of research going on. One is state level and policy, the other is institution research. IHEC will serve the function of dealing with inter-institutional research questions, such as queries for data relating to transfers between institutions and the success of students after transfer. So there will be two threads, one granting data on an institutional and individual level, and one granting data at the State level. The federal government has looked on the possibility of IHEC very well as no other states have something quite like it, and they are interested to see how it plays out with us.

Dan Harris said that there is a data work group of the Early Learning Council that has some funding behind it that will help design an early learning data system. In the context of federal funding, the RTTT Early Learning Challenge has a significant component around data. If the State gets funding for that, a piece of that grant would go toward some data component. The face of early learning is changing in Illinois, and the data being collected is also changing.

Blankenberger said that is a good point. One of the issues that the ILDS Governing Board will have to deal with quickly is what we do after the federal grant money for the ILDS runs out. It is funded for about two years, and then after that, someone else will have to pick up the tab. There is a lot of money for start-up, not a lot for maintaining the system.

Reid stated that we shouldn’t expect too much too soon from the ILDS. We need to build the ILDS correctly, and it will take a little bit of time to do so.

Del Valle asked what role the P-20 plays in the ILDS as part of the establishing act.

Blankenberger cited 15-f of the act saying “Representatives of the State Education Authorities shall report to and advise the Illinois P-20 Council on the implementation, operation, and expansion of the longitudinal data system.” It does not mention governance, but it does mention reporting requirements.
Del Valle said that reporting to the P-20 Council has to be included. It is also important that we include the IERC directly involved as well, because they are in a position to begin research on the questions we need to answer. That being said, the Governance Board is very necessary to focus and get the job done right. The P-20 Council, which is made up of volunteers, is not in a position to dedicate the kind of time and energy that is necessary to get this right. We need to get this right, and get it right as soon as possible.

Reid said that he agrees that the ILDS Governance Board cannot operate in isolation from the P-20.

Geoff Obrzut asked if the proposed governance structure would need P-20 Council approval.

Reid said that he wants to take it before the Council, in order to cover all bases. Del Valle does not think it needs to be approved by the P-20. However, a report should be made. So the Governance Board can meet before the P-20 meeting.

Reid says that he will continue to have his General Counsel review whether or not an intergovernmental agreement will be required to establish this board. It will be something discussed when the Board first meets.

Simon asked if there is anything formal from this group he needs to proceed or if a general consensus will suffice. Reid said he would be glad to receive a letter of support from her on behalf of the proposed governance structure.

Simon asked if there was objection to her writing a letter of support for the proposed structure. Seeing none, she agreed to send one along and thanked everyone who has been working on the plan for the governance structure.

C—Discussion on ACT High School-to-College Success Report Implications (Bob Blankenberger)

Bob Blankenberger said that this has sparked a lot more interest than expected. The report is important, but it is based on a limited data set, and there are risks in making specific conclusions. There is a concern about the lack of private institution data participation, which is going to be addressed through the longitudinal data system. The 2013 cycle will include data from private post-secondary institutions that participate in the monetary award program. But, while that hole will be closed for the post-secondary side, it will persist for the secondary side because we won’t be getting those institutions’ data unless other agreements are reached. That may still be a possibility.

The other hole is the out-of-state information. This is a big concern for several high schools who say they have highly successful students that go out-of-state for school and are not included in this data, so therefore this data is skewed. That is perfectly understandable. That is why we are hesitant to tell people to draw any particular conclusions from this report, instead it provides direction. It helps us ask the right questions. For example, if you see that your students aren’t performing as well as their peers in English after transfer, for example, that should make you think about what kind of English coursework you are offering, and whether or not it’s successful. But, it doesn’t guarantee that you have a problem. It is a good basis for follow-up.

This data set is not complete, and does not capture everyone. It only includes first-time full-time students, and leaves out a lot of people. But, it helps us, moving forward, to see how to perfect your data. This is a good piloting system. You pilot with your existing data, see where your shortcomings are, and then use that information to inform better research in the future. But it is a good first step and it has been a very valuable tool.

Elaine Johnson added that at the Community Colleges, it has been a good tool for them as they do their articulation and alignment work to see what is happening with those students. President Lakeland gave her a call and told her that they found out when they sat down with their high school partners that their dual credit students were not included in this because of how they were tagged in their own system. So, it really is a communication piece.
Miguel del Valle said that this report has been long overdue. He is happy it garnered so much attention. He is happy to hear that we are moving quickly to include private and out-of-state students. This is a good example of how the longitudinal data system will be able to trigger activity in school districts.

Debbie Meisner-Bertauski said that there will be a webinar live on October 11, from 1:30 p.m. - 2:30 p.m., to provide an overview of The High School to College Success Report, a tool that can help facilitate conversations and partnerships between secondary and postsecondary institutions. April Hansen and George Schlott from ACT, Inc. will present the report as well as ways to interpret and utilize the data. Information on how to register will be part of their Friday Memo, and will also be sent around by ISBE and ICCB. The webinar will then be posted online for anyone to access thereafter. This will be a basis for the four workshops which will be in November.

D— The Status of Dual Credit (Bob Blankenberger, Elaine Johnson)

Elaine Johnson referred people to the handout in their packets, and said they will be talking about what dual credit is, what they are doing in the state, and some of the trends. She stated that dual credit, in the state of Illinois, is an instructional arrangement where an academically qualified high school student enrolls in a college level course, and after they complete the course they concurrently earn college credit and high school credit. Dual enrollment is where a qualified high school student enrolls in a college course, and upon completion of the course they earn college level credit. When a student is dual enrolled, it does not mean that the student will earn high school credit.

In order for a course to be a dual credit course, it has to be a college course, not a high school course. It also has to have a well-established secondary and post-secondary link, as well as administrative support. So if a community college and a high school want to create a dual credit course, the administrators of the community college and high school sit down and look at the curriculum, agree on it, and it is signed-off on by both the principal and the community college personnel.

There are different structures for dual credit. Dual credit can be offered at the college, high school, career centers, or online. Core courses, II approved courses, and first-year CTE courses which align with a certificate or AAS degree can be dual credit courses. High school teachers teaching dual credit courses must have the same credentials as instructors at the community college.

To ensure quality at the community college level, there are a set of rules, which are laid out in the powerpoint. Students enrolled in dual credit courses must meet the same criteria as a college student. Prerequisite standards required by the college are also required for high school students, including placement tests. The course taught at the high school level also has to be the same course taught at the college level.

ICCB ensures that community colleges are meeting these standards through the recognition process that community colleges go through once a year. They go in and pull random files to make sure everything is in compliance. One point of contention with high schools and individual community colleges is that ICCB does not allow mixed courses, with some qualified and some non-qualified students taking the same college level course, though only qualified students would receive credit. Since community colleges do not teach classes to non-qualified students, dual credit courses cannot be taught to them in the high school either. Some students do choose to take the college-level course, but not to receive the credit. That is ok.

In FY 2000 there were 14,622 students enrolled in dual credit courses. In FY 2011 there are 82,982 students. There has been huge growth in the last 11 years in dual credit. In FY 2010 there was a dip, likely due to the fact the ICCB was enforcing quality standards and telling some colleges they could no longer offer certain courses, but now they are building again.

Brenda Klostermann asked if the slide showed dual credit enrollment, not dual enrollment. Johnson said it was dual credit enrollment.
Johnson said that English Composition is the number one dual credit course in the state. Lewis and Clark Community College has the most dual credit enrollment in the state. Dual credit, in general, is not evenly distributed across the state. They are committed to bringing dual credit to City Colleges, and other specific areas to help the problem.

She indicated that IFT, during the last session, put forward a bill that would limit dual credit enrollment for seniors to 9 hours. It didn’t get anywhere, but it may come up again in future legislative sessions. That would decrease dual credit enrollment if it went through.

Bob Blankenberger said that there was a dual credit task force that many people on the JELC participated in. There was a concern within the task force of the quality of dual credit coursework. There was legislation that came out of that, which is currently in effect, called the Dual Credit Quality Act. This act gave IBHE access they didn’t have before for oversight of dual credit offered by private institutions. Universities have traditionally deferred to community colleges in offering dual credit coursework, however that has been changing. 13 institutions surveyed, as required by the Dual Credit Quality Act, are offering dual credit as of 2009, with 966 enrollments. This number pales in comparison to the community college enrollments.

Another element of the survey was a broad survey of the standard required. They followed up the analysis with letters to the institutions where they appeared not to be meeting the standards. This year they will follow up and see who is still not meeting standards and then begin the enforcement. The Board of Higher Education has limited ability to coerce institutions, especially grandfathered institutions. Though, there is some ability to do so. However, they do not want to discourage dual credit, so they are trying to do this as gently as possible, while ensuring quality standards are being met. Like with the community colleges, this has to be a college course and meet all college standards, first and foremost. If the high schools want to give students credit for taking it, that is great. Adjunct faculty members teaching these courses must be integrated into the assessment processes as you would any other faculty member.

He stated that dual credit is noted frequently in the literature for advancing the likelihood of completion. Those students will have credits in the bank, and will be more prepared and more ready to start their first year at college.

Johnson added that before the Dual Credit Quality Act there was legislation that required all community college teachers teaching in a high school classroom to have a teacher certification. The Act states that community college teachers are exempt from that since they have a Master’s degree in their field. So that is no longer an issue. Blankenberger said that was a great thing and an obstacle they needed to overcome.

Maria Capoccia asked Blankenberger if we have any data on how students who participate in dual credit perform when compared with their peers. Blankenberger said that the few research findings are weak. There have been several flawed research designs that have indicated that benefits from dual credit are a possibility. So, IBHE has been working with Eric Lichtenberger of the IERC to develop a better research model with cohort data, which they were going to release as a study later.

Lichtenberger said there are two weaknesses with the IERC study. First they cannot distinguish between dual credit and dual enrollment. And second, they cannot distinguish between CTE and transfer courses. They are working with historical data looking at students who graduated high school in 2003. What they have found is that dual credit and dual enrollment tends to happen in the southern part of the state. Based on the regression analysis, when predicting the accelerated bachelor’s completion among those enrolling in 4-year institutions, it works for students who fall in the low parental income category, which was a purpose of creating dual credit and dual enrollment. It does not add anything of statistical significance for those students coming from a higher income bracket. So it is working for poor students.

Blankenberger said this is a tremendously exciting finding. As the LDS comes online, we will have the opportunity to increase the number of control variables for this project. If this is the case, that low-income students and
minority students have a greater likelihood of finishing college as a result of taking dual credit, this will be a
tremendous tool for advocating for the expansion of dual credit opportunities, and a tool for getting money for us
to do so.

Miguel del Valle said they were saying this 25 years ago. We at one point had money in the budget for increasing
dual credit activity, and then it was cut. Johnson said it was cut three years ago. Del Valle asked how dual credit is
being funded right now. Are community colleges absorbing the cost? Are the students paying? Johnson said
there is a mix. Some community colleges waive all tuition for high school students, some charge tuition, and some
high schools are paying tuition for students. Every district is doing it differently. Blankenberger said that the
majority of private institutions treat this as a recruitment tool, so they waive the tuition or charge the community
college rate. The largest provider was DeVry.

Capoccia asked what makes Lewis and Clark unique in this. Johnson said they have built a lot of high school
partnerships and their leadership are very committed to it. Lt. Governor Simon said that Lewis and Clark is the
only community college in the state that has an accredited dual credit system. Johnson stated that their
accreditation is through a national dual credit association. In that region, too, they have of faculty qualified to
teach these classes, which can be a problem in some rural schools. Blankenberger said that a lot of the dual credit
disparities across the state have to do with faculty availability. Online courses are one solution, but aren’t the best
solution in all instances.

Del Valle asked what the numbers are for Chicago. Johnson said there were 237 enrollments in 2010. It went
down from upwards of 400 in 2009, but it is very low given the size of the city. But she is hopeful because the
mindset is changing. But it is hard to expand transfer courses when their students are coming in below grade level.
They have opportunities to expand CTE courses. They are looking at how they can move the numbers and get
more students graduating with college credit.

Del Valle asked if we have compared AP coursework, and the numbers of students getting 3s and above, to those
students who have done dual credit. Blankenberger said that this is something they need to hone in on as part of
the longitudinal data system. Lichtenberger said that the IERC controlled for AP participation in their model and
that AP courses didn’t have any statistical significance, with the exception of participation in a foreign language.
Blankenberger stated that two years ago some researchers at the University of Missouri found that AP credit and
dual credit produced equivalent results, and that they were equally effective. The benefit of AP is that there is a
high stakes test at the end, which tests equivalency to some extent. But if the student is taking a college credit
barring course and assessments are done appropriately, it should show the same acquisition of knowledge by the
end. Johnson added that even the University of Illinois is accepting dual credit now.

Lt. Governor Simon asked if Johnson knew why the IFT wants to put a lid on dual credit. Johnson said they have
talked about it only a little bit, and it is a mixed bag. They question the quality of the programs, and worry that it
will impact their load. They may need to sit down with IFT and talk with them more about it, because Johnson has
not gotten the same sentiments from IEA.

Lt. Governor Simon thanked everyone for the very useful discussion, and for providing them with a glimpse at the
new research that will be coming out.

E— Race to the Top and Early Learning Challenge Update (Linda Tomlinson, Susie Morrison)

Linda Tomlinson said that they are on a tight timeline for this submission for this round of RTTT and the Early
Learning Challenge. They met with outside experts in early September to go over the application, and leadership
then went out to DC to meet with Department of Ed technical assistance to ask questions and get some answers.

There are now five work groups each working to get at the different aspects of the grant. The groups are working
on quality rating and improvement, kindergarten readiness, data systems, workforce credentials, and program
standards (0-3 and 3-5). They have an EarlyChildhood.il.gov website, where they are encouraging input from the
public and ask questions. They are looking for letters of support from stakeholder organizations, which will be sent along with the application as before. The revised Early Learning Standards will be reviewed and approved for recommendation to the State Board at a special meeting in October, possibly October 11th. The application is due October 19th.

There are some concerns with alignment of teacher preparation throughout the education spectrum. ISBE is currently working on alignment in the middle grades, and they will soon finish up with them, and bring in early childhood teachers.

Lt. Governor Simon thanked Tomlinson and opened the floor for comments and questions.

Miguel del Valle referenced the five working groups and asked where parent training would fit into all of this.

Tomlinson said she is sure they are part of the program standards, but asked Dan Harris to explain a bit more. Harris said that a big part of the application is centered around the Quality Rating Improvement System. A big part of the Quality Rating Improvement System in other states is parent engagement and family partnerships, and they are making sure it is imbedded in the Illinois system as well. Briefly on the structure of the system, if you are a licensed childcare provider, you will be a one star program. If you are unimaginably good, you will be a five star program, and they are working on the graduations in between across different domains.

Del Valle asked if engagement was broadly defined as training parents on how to read to their children. Harris said it is more about home visiting programs and home based programs, but those types of programs are not included in the RRT application. Del Valle says that is a big mistake. We need parent engagements, not just parent training. Harris said there is a different federal effort to increase home visiting programs, which are really parent training programs and they model good parenting behaviors. There will be an additional chunk of change coming to Illinois to support that effort.

Amber Kirchoff said that the Early Learning Council has an infant/toddler committee that is overseeing the design and strategy for reaching parents and present the early learning standards. We can talk about the home visiting program if anyone is interested. It is run out of the Governor’s Department of Early Childhood Development. They got some federal money earlier this year from the health care legislation to help expand that program, and they were also told today that Illinois won a competitive portion, so they will be getting another chunk of money to pilot some programs and further expand those programs.

F— Military Children State Council (Lizanne DeStafano)

Lizanne DeStefano stated that Illinois joined the Interstate Compact on Education Opportunities for Military Children last year. At present there are about 35 states who participate. The purpose of this is to address inequities and mitigate challenges that military families face as they are moved around. Within Illinois we are trying to link activities through the P-20 council. They will be asking superintendents from areas with large numbers of military children, and some others, to join with the Family and Youth Engagement Committee of the P-20 to use that as the council for military children in the state. The first meeting of that will be October 26th.

Lt. Governor Simon added that she is the chair of a committee that works to retain military bases. One of the things that the federal government looks at when it is considering what bases to keep open and what to close as military spending shrinks are quality of life issues around the bases, like education. If we can work with this committee and make sure we are meeting needs there, we can do a lot to keep jobs in Illinois.

G— Funding proposal for the P-20 Council (Lizanne DeStefano)

Lizanne DeStefano put together a funding scenario for the P-20 Council, per the handout in the packet. Agencies have been giving about $100,000 in funds. In addition, the Chicago Community Trust gave $154,000 for start up costs. That funding ended on August 31st. There is about $55,000 left from the State Agency funding for the rest
of the year’s work. At the current level of support, many staffing needs will not be met. The Fry Foundation has given the P-20 a grant of about $45,000. Those funds are dedicated to only fund the committee looking at Teacher and Leader quality. They cannot be used for the general operation of the Council.

She stated that Senario 1 has the minimum amount that the Council will need to run. Scenario 2 shows a more ideal situation. Miguel del Valle said that, as the head of the Council, he believes Scenario 2 is the better of the two, as Senario 1 does not provide for a coordinator, which is needed. A policy analyst, at least on a part-time basis, is also needed to help to keep things moving, as everyone else working with the Council is a volunteer. A coordinator also helps identify additional funding sources. So do we look to agencies to get this funding, go for a line item in the budget, or go for a line item in an agency’s budget?

Lt. Governor Simon said that she agrees we should go with Scenario 2. She asked del Valle on his sense of going with a line item or contribution from individual agencies. Del Valle said that a line item can get a lot more attention, and it can get caught in the crossfire. However, the P-20 Council was created by the General Assembly, and is something worth fighting for during the budget process. He will take funding from the agencies over no funding.

Geoff Obrzut indicated that agency funding was cut last year, and there is not as much flexibility. They haven’t even been able to give their employees raises the last three or four years. The well is running dry. So, we really should go after a line item first.

Lizanne said a line was created in 2007 and eliminated in 2009. Del Valle added that the line was created but never funded.

John Sinsheimer said that given the importance of the P-20 Council in the Governor’s priorities, he is hard-pressed to see why they could not get a line item. Giving out money from the agencies is a way of stepping around the appropriations process, and we should go for a line item first.

Lt. Governor Simon said that she agrees, but she would rather save their advocacy power for the substantive stuff if they do not have to. If we can predict from the beginning that we will never get the money in the budget, then there is no point to lobby for it. Instead we should move forward and try to get substantive things out of the legislature. But if there is a chance, we should go for it, because there is much more accountability. Elaine Johnson and Obrzut agree.

DK Hirner asked if there is a benefit to breaking up the line item in each of the agency budgets opposed to having one lump sum line item. Sinsheimer said that we have to keep in mind that this is not a lot of money that we are asking for. Splitting it up when it is already small makes it more vulnerable.

Lt. Governor Simon asked if everyone could agree then that they will go for one line item and everyone should be prepared to pony up if it doesn’t get through. There was a consensus that yes that is agreeable.

**H— The American Jobs Act and Potential Community College Modernization Funding (Crystal Olsen)**

Crystal Olsen stated that the President Obama’s American Jobs ACT, as proposed, includes 3 major provisions related to educational improvement and educational facility improvement.

She indicated that the first seeks to prevent teacher layoffs and support the creation of additional jobs in public early childhood, elementary, and secondary education during the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 school years. Illinois could potentially get around $1,235,000,000 from this provision.

The second would put $25 billion nationally in school infrastructure that will modernize at least 35,000 elementary and secondary schools. Illinois could receive $1,111,000,000 in funding to support as many as 14,500 jobs.
The third provision proposes $5 billion of investments nationally for facilities modernization needs at community colleges. Illinois could receive about $213,000,000 in funding next fiscal year for its community colleges. It should be noted that funds made available under this section are to be used to supplement, and not supplant, other Federal, State, and local funds that would otherwise be expended to modernize, renovate, or repair existing community college facilities.

I— Other business

Lt. Governor Simon said that at the last meeting the committee discussed priorities for JELC advocacy and what message we want to give when we talk to legislators about the work of the JELC. She and Miguel del Valle got together after the meeting and discussed possibilities. What they came up with the following talking points: a parent component for Early Childhood, teacher and leader mentoring for K-12, and remediation for higher education. Each of those reach from one branch of education to the other. These may start as a good starting point. So for the next meeting people should think about this and decide if they want these talking points to be our team message, because we need to think of ourselves as a unit. More ideas can be brought to the next meeting.

J—Next meeting is Tuesday, October 18

Elaine Johnson brought up that she and Geoff Obrzut will be in Austin for the CCA during the next meeting. Lt. Governor Simon said that we would look into changing the date.

K—Adjournment

Lt. Governor Simon adjourned the meeting.