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# Introduction

**Instructions**

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State’s systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State’s General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

## Intro - Indicator Data

**Executive Summary**

In accordance with 20 U.S.C 1416(b)(2)(C)(ii)(II) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), each February, the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) is required to submit an Annual Performance Report (APR) to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) in Washington, D.C. regarding the State’s overall performance in relation to the 17 State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicators. The SPP includes both results (outcomes) indicators and compliance indicators. Each SPP Indicator incorporates a measurable and rigorous target for each year of the SPP. Results targets are established by Illinois stakeholders while compliance targets are established by OSEP. These targets are used as a basis for analyzing the state's data, and each district’s data, for students with disabilities.

**Additional information related to data collection and reporting**

The Governor of Illinois declared all counties in the state as disaster areas on March 9, 2020 in response to the outbreak of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) and, on March 11, 2020, the World Health Organization characterized the COVID-19 outbreak as a pandemic. Governor Pritzker immediately took measures to protect the public's health by issuing an Executive Order requiring all public and private schools in Illinois serving prekindergarten through 12th grade students to close for educational purposes March 17, 2020 through March 30, 2020. The rapid spread of COVID-19 throughout the state brought about a stay-at-home order from the Governor effective March 21, 2020 through April 7, 2020 and extended the mandatory statewide school closure through April 7, 2020. The suspension of in-person instruction was extended again through the end of the 2019-20 school year. In addition, the requirement to administer statewide assessments was suspended. On July 24, 2020, the Governor issued another Executive Order allowing all public and nonpublic schools to open for in-person educational purposes following the completion of the regular 2019-20 school term.   
  
ISBE formed a COVID-19 team to address the multiple educational challenges in Illinois due to the pandemic. ISBE posted numerous resources to the ISBE COVID-19 webpage (https://www.isbe.net/coronavirus), including Executive Orders from the Governor, emergency rulemaking, U.S. Department of Education updates and guidance, Office of the Attorney General guidance, CDC updates and guidance, Department of Children and Family Services and Children’s Advocacy Centers of Illinois resources, messages from the State Superintendent, Illinois Department of Public Health supplemental resources, program resources, CARES Act information, PPE and cleaning supplies information, transition considerations, staffing information, general guidance, and additional resources. ISBE staff also responded to education questions regarding COVID-19 from school districts, families, and other stakeholders. The specific impact of the global pandemic and suspension of in-person instruction in Illinois is discussed within each SPP Indicator as applicable.

**Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year**

851

**General Supervision System**

**The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.**

Each State Education Agency (SEA) is responsible for ensuring the general supervision of all educational programs for children with disabilities in the state. The Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) is the SEA responsible for enforcing the requirements of IDEA Part B and ensuring continuous improvement via Local Education Agencies (LEAs). ISBE carries out its general supervisory responsibilities to ensure that children with disabilities receive a free appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE).  
  
A system of general supervision can be characterized by any number of operational components. It is intended to improve educational results and functional outcomes for children with disabilities. It is designed to identify noncompliance in a timely manner using its different components and ensure correction of identified noncompliance in a timely manner. These components are interrelated, and function in such a manner to form a comprehensive system. The following components make up ISBE’s system of general supervision.  
  
Policies and Procedures for Effective IDEA Implementation  
SEAs are required to establish an operational way for ensuring that LEAs follow state policies and procedures and implement effective practices. ISBE’s policies and procedures describe the methods used to identify and correct noncompliance. ISBE addresses effective implementation of practices through program improvement, which includes planning, coordination, incentives, and follow up. Please see https://www.isbe.net/Pages/Special-Education-Regulations-Legislation.aspx for additional information.  
  
Fiscal Management System  
Fiscal management includes distributing funds in accordance with federal requirements. It also involves oversight in the distribution and use of IDEA Part B funds to ensure that funds are used in accordance with federal and state requirements. It involves procedures to direct fiscal resources to areas needing improvement. Please see https://www.isbe.net/Pages/IDEA-Part-B-Grant-Program-Information.aspx for additional information.  
  
State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Reports (APRs)  
The SPP functions as an accountability mechanism and the actual plan for systems change. It documents quantifiable indications of performance in the priority areas of FAPE in the LRE, disproportionality, and effective general supervision. Measurable and rigorous targets exist for each SPP indicator with the intention of leading to improved results for children and youth with disabilities. Annual performance reporting is required through the APR to address ISBE’s progress toward meeting its targets. Stakeholder involvement remains key to the development and implementation of the SPP. Please see https://www.isbe.net/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-Data-and-Accountability.aspx for additional information.  
  
Integrated Monitoring Activities  
Integrated monitoring activities include the continuous examination of performance for compliance, program improvement, and results. Multiple data sources and methods are used to monitor LEAs. Data sources include the ISBE Student Information System (SIS), the IEP Student Tracking and Reporting System (I-Star) state database, and the Special Education Monitoring System (SEMS). Methods used to monitor LEAs may include examining data from statewide databases; conducting onsite and virtual LEA reviews; reviewing LEA policies, procedures, and practices; reviewing relevant documentation, such as student records and IEPs; interviewing LEA and special education cooperative personnel; interviewing individuals knowledgeable about the issue(s) in question; conducting public forums for parents and community stakeholders; reviewing LEA self-assessments; and conducting data verification/desk audit activities. Findings of noncompliance are issued through the following elements of the general supervision system: state complaints, due process hearings, and SPP Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13. ISBE uses current data and trend data to determine the level of technical assistance needed to support correction of noncompliance and program improvement in LEAs through the Illinois Special Education Accountability and Support System. The system is designed to:  
  
• Maintain a high level of compliance with IDEA federal regulations and Illinois Administrative Rules for special education.  
• Support local education agencies (LEAs) in the process of self-assessment, root cause analysis, evaluation, and improvement of compliance and results-focused efforts.  
• Establish a continuous and meaningful process focused on improving academic results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities by connecting local data to improvement efforts.  
• Connect system improvement activities with multi-year planning and supports.  
  
The Illinois Special Education Accountability and Support System is designed to identify potential district risk through the LEA Determinations process and to assist ISBE in effectively utilizing its resources to provide tiered monitoring and support to its LEAs. It focuses on monitoring for compliance and results, and uses that information to provide targeted, evidence-based technical assistance and professional development to LEAs. It addresses district-specific needs in the areas of results, compliance, and fiscal by differentiating levels and types of monitoring and support based on each LEA’s unique strengths, progress, and challenges identified through the LEA Determinations process. Please see https://www.isbe.net/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-Data-and-Accountability.aspx for additional information.  
  
Effective Dispute Resolution System  
This component deals with the implementation of the dispute resolution requirements of IDEA and includes addressing timely resolution, tracking issues for patterns or trends, and evaluating effectiveness and sustainability. Dispute resolution options include state complaints, facilitated IEPs, mediation, resolutions sessions, and due process hearings. Detailed information regarding each of these options can be found on the ISBE website at: https://www.isbe.net/Pages/Special-Education-Effective-Dispute-Resolution.aspx.  
  
Data System to Gather Data on Processes and Results  
The collection, verification, examination, analysis, reporting, status determination, and improvement of data is encompassed under this general supervision component. Timeliness and accuracy of data are emphasized. Data are used to identify patterns or trends, evaluate the performance of LEAs, select LEAs for onsite monitoring activities, determine the status of each LEA, improve programs, measure progress, design technical assistance activities, etc. An example of one of ISBE’s data systems used for this purpose can be found at: https://www.isbe.net/Pages/istar.aspx.  
  
Strategies for Improvement, Correction, Incentives and Sanctions  
Supporting improvement and enforcing regulations, policies, and procedures is addressed under this general supervision component. Corrective action planning and follow up tracking of correction and improvement are addressed by the SEA. Ensuring correction of noncompliance and meeting state targets through incentives and sanctions is also part of this component. ISBE utilizes a range of sanctions to enforce correction as necessary. ISBE also determines the status of each LEA on an annual basis. Please see https://www.isbe.net/Pages/Accountability-Support-System.aspx for additional information.

**Technical Assistance System**

**The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.**

ISBE's technical assistance system addresses both the timely correction of noncompliance and improved results for students with disabilities through an array of modalities and graduated levels of intensity, from consultation to ongoing coaching and support from ISBE staff and technical assistance providers. Technical assistance centers around a coaching and support network model, focused on systems change, which supports sustainable implementation of evidence-based practices and employs data collection and analysis for ongoing progress monitoring and data-based decision making. Evidence of correction of noncompliance and evidence of change results in compliance, improved outcomes, and improved capacity and sustainability at the LEA level.   
  
ISBE's technical assistance system includes the Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support Network (IL MTSS-N). The IL MTSS-N is a United States Department of Education State Personnel Development Grant funded initiative that provides integrated technical assistance to LEAs for the purpose of improving outcomes for all students in grades K-12. The IL MTSS-N, which is a collaborative effort combining the previous Illinois Statewide Technical Assistance Collaborative (ISTAC) and the Illinois Response to Intervention Network (RtI Network), is a part of the Statewide System of Support (SSoS). The IL MTSS-N partners with Illinois Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs), Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs), and other ISBE initiatives. The IL MTSS-N provides differentiated technical assistance/coaching to LEAs based upon 1) ISBE classification, 2) State Performance Plan (SPP) findings of noncompliance, and 3) State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) transformation zone status. Such technical assistance takes place after professional development has been accessed and utilizes a graduated continuum. Additional information regarding the IL MTSS-N can be found at: https://ilmtss.net/.  
  
Technical assistance is provided by the Harrisburg Project, a contract funded by IDEA Part B discretionary funds to support technical assistance for special education data collection, including the accurate and timely submission of indicator data. The Harrisburg project maintains a website which provides live webinar events, recorded training webinars, help snippet videos, user guides, handouts, and the dissemination of ISBE guidance to districts and special education cooperatives. The Harrisburg Project provides training and support on LEA determinations, SPP Indicators and possible indicator findings, and other special education data included in the state’s data collection system called ISTAR. From July 2019 to June 2020, the Harrisburg Project responded to 5880 phone calls from LEAs, of which 90% were resolved within 24 hours or less. They received 40,530 emails and sent 365,217 email bursts and hosted 83 trainings with over 1,800 attendees. Additional information regarding the Harrisburg Project can be found at: https://www.hbug.k12.il.us/.  
  
In addition, ISBE funds technical assistance projects related to assistive technology, students who are deaf or hard of hearing, students with deaf-blindness, and collaborative family and community partnerships. ISBE staff also provide technical assistance to the field in all areas of general supervision.

**Professional Development System**

**The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.**

ISBE staff provide professional development related to the SPP indicators through online resources, webinars, and in-person trainings. ISBE's professional development system is implemented primarily through its funded technical assistance and training projects. These projects funded by IDEA Part D State Personnel Development Grants, Part B Discretionary grants, or State funds include the Illinois Multi-Tiered Systems of Support Network (IL MTSS-N), the Illinois Special Education Leadership Academy (ISELA), the Assistive Technology Technical Assistance, Training, and Resources Project (ATTATR), the Autism Training and Technical Assistance Project (ATTA), the Autism Learning and Support Project (A+), the Illinois Service Resource Center (ISRC), Project Reach, and the IEP Tutorial Project (IEPQ).  
  
• IL-MTSS services focus on coaching to support training and technical assistance for district and building leadership teams to establish a multi-tiered system of supports which is a systemic, prevention-focused, and data-informed framework for continuous improvement, providing a continuum of supports for all learners.  
• ISELA provides advanced professional learning opportunities aligned to the needs of leaders of special services and offers one-to-one mentoring, coaching, and resources to support new and current leaders navigating the ongoing changes in the field of special education.  
• ATTATR provides guided and intensive training to educators, administrators, paraprofessionals and parents on use of assistive technology to support attainment of IEP goals and knowledge of the principles of universal design for learning to promote differentiated instructional strategies.  
• ATTA provides training on meeting the post-secondary transition needs of students with autism spectrum disorder.  
• A+ provides professional learning and coaching to behavior teams to support students with autism spectrum disorder exhibiting significant behavioral challenges.  
• ISRC provides professional learning and coaching for schools and families working with students who are deaf or hard of hearing or visually impaired with significant behavioral challenges.  
• Project Reach provides professional learning and coaching for schools and families working with students with deaf-blindness.  
• IEPQ provides an online resource and professional learning opportunities on how to develop well-designed Individualized Education Programs aligned to state standards.  
  
These various technical assistance and training projects, combined with professional development, resources, and support by ISBE staff, provide a comprehensive professional development system to ensure service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

**Stakeholder Involvement**

**The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.**

ISBE has ongoing communication regarding the SPP/APR with its primary stakeholder group, the Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC) through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. The role of ISAC is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. ISAC functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Services Department. ISAC members represent individuals with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, students with disabilities, teachers of students with disabilities, private providers, public charter schools, special education directors, regional superintendents, district superintendents, higher education personnel, vocational/community/business organization providers of transition services to students with disabilities, the Illinois Department of Human Services, the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, the Illinois Department of Corrections/Department of Juvenile Justice, and the general public.   
  
ISBE staff have discussions with ISAC multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, and improvement activities with ISAC as necessary. ISAC assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising targets for the SPP results indicators.  
  
In addition to ISAC, ISBE collaborates with many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. Such stakeholder groups have included Child and Family Connections (CFCs), the Community Residential Services Authority (CRSA), the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group, the Harrisburg Project, the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE), the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA), the Illinois Children's Mental Health Partnership (ICMHP), the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS), the Illinois Department of Human Services (DHS), the Illinois Department of Mental Health (DMH), the Illinois Multi-Tiered Systems of Support Advisory Group, Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs), Regional Offices of Education (ROEs), and Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET). ISBE shares SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences, regional professional development opportunities, and task force meetings. Comments and suggestions from the stakeholder groups are incorporated into the SPP/APR.

**Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)**

YES

**Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY18 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State’s submission of its FFY 2018 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State’s SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2018 APR in 2020, is available.**

The Illinois SPP/APR continues to be available on the ISBE website at https://www.isbe.net/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-Data-and-Accountability.aspx. District Special Education Profiles for school years 2002-2003 through 2015-2016 are also available on the website at http://webprod1.isbe.net/LEAProfile/SearchCriteria1.aspx. These Profiles document the performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR. Beginning with the 2016-2017 school year, special education data were integrated into the Illinois Report Card for each school district and are also available on the ISBE website at https://www.isbe.net/ilreportcard. Special education data are located in the interactive sections of the Report Card as well as in the ISBE Classic PDF Report Card.

## Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP’s coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State’s capacity to improve its SiMR data.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

The State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) data, including SIMR data, will be reported as of the due date (April 1, 2021).

## Intro - OSEP Response

Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State does not have any FFY 2019 data for indicator 17.

## Intro - Required Actions

# Indicator 1: Graduation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

**Measurement**

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

**Instructions**

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

## 1 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2016 | 70.52% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= | 84.00% | 84.00% | 84.00% | 71.80% | 73.00% |
| Data | 71.76% | 70.52% | 70.52% | 71.18% | 71.64% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 74.20% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

ISBE has ongoing communication regarding the SPP/APR with its primary stakeholder group, the Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC) through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. The role of ISAC is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. ISAC functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Services Department. ISAC members represent individuals with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, students with disabilities, teachers of students with disabilities, private providers, public charter schools, special education directors, regional superintendents, district superintendents, higher education personnel, vocational/community/business organization providers of transition services to students with disabilities, the Illinois Department of Human Services, the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, the Illinois Department of Corrections/Department of Juvenile Justice, and the general public.   
  
ISBE staff have discussions with ISAC multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, and improvement activities with ISAC as necessary. ISAC assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising targets for the SPP results indicators.  
  
In addition to ISAC, ISBE collaborates with many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. Such stakeholder groups have included Child and Family Connections (CFCs), the Community Residential Services Authority (CRSA), the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group, the Harrisburg Project, the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE), the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA), the Illinois Children's Mental Health Partnership (ICMHP), the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS), the Illinois Department of Human Services (DHS), the Illinois Department of Mental Health (DMH), the Illinois Multi-Tiered Systems of Support Advisory Group, Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs), Regional Offices of Education (ROEs), and Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET). ISBE shares SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences, regional professional development opportunities, and task force meetings. Comments and suggestions from the stakeholder groups are incorporated into the SPP/APR.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696) | 07/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma | \*[[1]](#footnote-2) |
| SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696) | 07/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate | 16,698 |
| SY 2018-19 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695) | 07/27/2020 | Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table | 69.9%[[2]](#footnote-3) |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs in the current year’s adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma** | **Number of youth with IEPs in the current year’s adjusted cohort eligible to graduate** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| \*1 | 16,698 | 71.64% | 74.20% | 69.9%2 | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

After analyzing Indicator 1 data, ISBE noted that there were 3,806 fewer youth with IEPs eligible to graduate in FFY19 as compared to FFY18. That may have affected the Indicator 1 percentage. In addition, in an effort to improve data quality, ISBE updated its Student Information System (SIS) Data Elements and Validations Exit Enrollment document for the public during this time frame, which may have had a correlational impact on the slippage for Indicator 1. ISBE updated exit definitions and guidance in May of 2018. In November of 2018, ISBE updated exit type code descriptions for three exit codes to clarify language related to students with IEPs: retained in the same grade, aged out, and certificate of completion. ISBE also added entry level edits in the system to strengthen accurate data reporting. For example, a district can no longer enter an exit code of “aged out” for a 16 year old student with an IEP, as that exit code is reserved for students with IEPs who reach the maximum age for special education services (i.e., through the day before their 22nd birthdays).

**Graduation Conditions**

**Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:**

4-year ACGR

**Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain*.***

At the State level, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are the same as those for youth without IEPs. Per the Illinois School Code, in addition to other course requirements, each pupil entering the 9th grade must successfully complete the following courses to graduate with a standard high school diploma: four years of language arts; two years of writing intensive courses, one of which must be English and the other of which may be English or any other subject; three years of mathematics, one of which must be Algebra I and one of which must include geometry content; two years of science; two years of social studies, of which at least one year must be history of the United States or a combination of history of the United States and American government, and at least one semester must be civics; and one year chosen from (A) music, (B) art, (C) foreign language, which shall be deemed to include American Sign Language or (D) vocational education. Curriculum and credit requirements are the same for students with disabilities as they are for students without disabilities with the exception of those determined by the local IEP team to be inappropriate. Decisions regarding the issuance of a diploma for students whose course of study is guided by an IEP are made at the LEA level, based upon State requirements for the issuance of a high school diploma. Graduates include only students who were awarded regular high school diplomas. Students who are awarded GEDs or certificates of completion are considered non-graduates, and are not included in the numerator. The calculation used to determine the graduation rate for all youth, including youth with IEPs, is a cohort rate. The graduation rate is calculated from the statewide Student Information System (SIS) using the following formula:  
  
Number of cohort members who earned a regular high school diploma by the end of the 2018-2019 school year / Number of first-time 9th graders in Fall 2015 (starting cohort) plus students who transfer in, minus students who transfer out, emigrate or die during school years 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18 and 2018-19  
  
This calculation is done for all youth, including youth with IEPs. These data are the same data that are used for reporting to the Department of Education for all students under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

**Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Illinois uses a 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate. The cohort is defined as a group of students who begin as first-time 9th graders in a particular school year and who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less. In this particular manner of calculating graduation rates, the denominator does not address students with disabilities who have the right to receive special education services until the day before their 22nd birthday if it is recommended through the IEP process, thus making it necessary for the student to utilize 5, 6, or 7 years to graduate. Therefore, in addition to reporting the required 4-year graduation rate, Illinois also reports a 5-year and 6-year cohort graduation rate for students with disabilities in the SPP/APR. The extended year follows the same cohort of students for an additional year (or years). The extended year cohort graduation rate accounts for students with IEPs who need to access special education services past the traditional four years of high school. While the percentage of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma in Illinois for this particular cohort was 69.90% for the 4-year graduation rate, that percentage rose to 73.30% for the 5-year graduation rate and 75.30% for the 6-year graduation rate.  
  
For this indicator, states are required to use data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, states are required to use data from the 2018-2019 school year). Therefore, COVID-19 had no impact on this indicator.

## 1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 1 - OSEP Response

## 1 - Required Actions

# Indicator 2: Drop Out

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

**Measurement**

OPTION 1:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

**Instructions**

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2008 | 5.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target <= | 4.90% | 4.80% | 4.70% | 4.60% | 4.50% |
| Data | 3.97% | 3.58% | 3.39% | 3.54% | 3.22% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 4.50% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

ISBE has ongoing communication regarding the SPP/APR with its primary stakeholder group, the Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC) through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. The role of ISAC is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. ISAC functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Services Department. ISAC members represent individuals with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, students with disabilities, teachers of students with disabilities, private providers, public charter schools, special education directors, regional superintendents, district superintendents, higher education personnel, vocational/community/business organization providers of transition services to students with disabilities, the Illinois Department of Human Services, the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, the Illinois Department of Corrections/Department of Juvenile Justice, and the general public.   
  
ISBE staff have discussions with ISAC multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, and improvement activities with ISAC as necessary. ISAC assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising targets for the SPP results indicators.  
  
In addition to ISAC, ISBE collaborates with many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. Such stakeholder groups have included Child and Family Connections (CFCs), the Community Residential Services Authority (CRSA), the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group, the Harrisburg Project, the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE), the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA), the Illinois Children's Mental Health Partnership (ICMHP), the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS), the Illinois Department of Human Services (DHS), the Illinois Department of Mental Health (DMH), the Illinois Multi-Tiered Systems of Support Advisory Group, Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs), Regional Offices of Education (ROEs), and Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET). ISBE shares SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences, regional professional development opportunities, and task force meetings. Comments and suggestions from the stakeholder groups are incorporated into the SPP/APR.

**Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator**

Option 2

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 15,458 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b) | 386 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c) | 306 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d) | 2,570 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e) | 62 |

**Has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012? (yes/no)**

NO

**Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)**

YES

**Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)**

NO

**Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)**

YES

**If use a different calculation methodology is yes, provide an explanation of the different calculation methodology**

The calculation used to determine the dropout rate for youth with IEPs is the total number of high school dropouts with IEPs for the subgroup as reported in the statewide Student Information System (SIS) divided by the total high school enrollment of youth with IEPs as reported in SIS. The dropout definition is the same for youth with and without IEPs. These data are the same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012. There is a data lag of one year for this indicator as States were instructed to describe the results of the data for the year before the reporting year (data from 2018-2019).

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out | Total number of High School Students with IEPs | **FFY** **2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 2,570 | 89,077 | 3.22% | 4.50% | 2.89% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

**Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth**

A dropout is defined as any child enrolled in grades 9 through 12 whose name has been removed from the LEA enrollment roster for any reason other than the student’s death, extended illness, removal for medical non-compliance, expulsion, aging out, graduation, or completion of a program of study, and who has not transferred to another public or private school, and is not known to be home schooled by parents or guardians, or continuing school in another country. The dropout definition is the same for youth with and without IEPs. These data are the same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012. There is a data lag of one year for this indicator as States were instructed to describe the results of the data for the year before the reporting year (data from 2018-2019).

**Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)**

NO

**If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs below.**

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

For this indicator, states are required to use data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, states are required to use data from the 2018-2019 school year). Therefore, COVID-19 had no impact on this indicator.

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 2 - OSEP Response

## 2 - Required Actions

# Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator**: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

A. Indicator 3A – Reserved

B. Participation rate for children with IEPs

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

**Measurement**

B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3B - Indicator Data

**Reporting Group Selection**

**Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Grade 3** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 5** | **Grade 6** | **Grade 7** | **Grade 8** | **Grade 9** | **Grade 10** | **Grade 11** | **Grade 12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Overall | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |

**Historical Data: Reading**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Overall | 2005 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| **A** | Overall | 98.00% | Actual | 93.30% | 96.42% | 97.04% | 96.88% | 97.47% |

**Historical Data: Math**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Overall | 2005 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| **A** | Overall | 98.00% | Actual | 93.40% | 96.23% | 96.65% | 96.78% | 97.18% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2019** |
| Reading | A >= | Overall | 95.10% |
| Math | A >= | Overall | 95.10% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

ISBE has ongoing communication regarding the SPP/APR with its primary stakeholder group, the Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC) through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. The role of ISAC is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. ISAC functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Services Department. ISAC members represent individuals with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, students with disabilities, teachers of students with disabilities, private providers, public charter schools, special education directors, regional superintendents, district superintendents, higher education personnel, vocational/community/business organization providers of transition services to students with disabilities, the Illinois Department of Human Services, the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, the Illinois Department of Corrections/Department of Juvenile Justice, and the general public.   
  
ISBE staff have discussions with ISAC multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, and improvement activities with ISAC as necessary. ISAC assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising targets for the SPP results indicators.  
  
In addition to ISAC, ISBE collaborates with many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. Such stakeholder groups have included Child and Family Connections (CFCs), the Community Residential Services Authority (CRSA), the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group, the Harrisburg Project, the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE), the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA), the Illinois Children's Mental Health Partnership (ICMHP), the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS), the Illinois Department of Human Services (DHS), the Illinois Department of Mental Health (DMH), the Illinois Multi-Tiered Systems of Support Advisory Group, Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs), Regional Offices of Education (ROEs), and Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET). ISBE shares SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences, regional professional development opportunities, and task force meetings. Comments and suggestions from the stakeholder groups are incorporated into the SPP/APR.

**FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)**

YES

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Overall |  |  | 97.47% | 95.10% |  | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Overall |  |  | 97.18% | 95.10% |  | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

**Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.**

Due to the extraordinary circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic and resulting school closures, all states requested and received waivers from the U.S. Department of Education for school year 2019-2020 assessment and accountability requirements under the ESEA. However, data for previous years can be found via the links below.  
  
The Illinois State Report Card for reporting assessment data for students with and without disabilities is available at the following link: https://www.isbe.net/ilreportcard under the Academic Progress section.   
  
The Illinois State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report, Part B provides assessment data for students with disabilities at the following link: https://www.isbe.net/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-Data-and-Accountability.aspx  
  
The Assessment Participation Report required by OSEP can be found at the following link: https://www.isbe.net/Pages/Assessment.aspx under the last bullet point in the "Resources" section.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Due to the extraordinary circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic and resulting school closures, all states requested and received waivers from the U.S. Department of Education for school year 2019-2020 assessment and accountability requirements under the ESEA. Therefore, no statewide assessment data is available for FFY19.

## 3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3B - OSEP Response

The State was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

## 3B - Required Actions

# Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

A. Indicator 3A – Reserved

B. Participation rate for children with IEPs

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 and high school), including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3C - Indicator Data

**Reporting Group Selection**

**Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Grade 3** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 5** | **Grade 6** | **Grade 7** | **Grade 8** | **Grade 9** | **Grade 10** | **Grade 11** | **Grade 12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Overall | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |

**Historical Data: Reading**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Overall | 2018 | Target >= | 42.00% | 42.00% | 42.00% | 16.16% | 23.11% |
| **A** | Overall | 9.21% | Actual | 10.12% | 8.91% | 9.21% | 8.94% | 9.10% |

**Historical Data: Math**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Overall | 2018 | Target >= | 40.00% | 40.00% | 40.00% | 15.67% | 23.16% |
| **A** | Overall | 8.19% | Actual | 8.26% | 8.17% | 8.19% | 7.98% | 8.39% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2019** |
| Reading | A >= | Overall | 23.30% |
| Math | A >= | Overall | 23.60% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

ISBE has ongoing communication regarding the SPP/APR with its primary stakeholder group, the Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC) through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. The role of ISAC is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. ISAC functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Services Department. ISAC members represent individuals with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, students with disabilities, teachers of students with disabilities, private providers, public charter schools, special education directors, regional superintendents, district superintendents, higher education personnel, vocational/community/business organization providers of transition services to students with disabilities, the Illinois Department of Human Services, the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, the Illinois Department of Corrections/Department of Juvenile Justice, and the general public.   
  
ISBE staff have discussions with ISAC multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, and improvement activities with ISAC as necessary. ISAC assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising targets for the SPP results indicators.  
  
In addition to ISAC, ISBE collaborates with many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. Such stakeholder groups have included Child and Family Connections (CFCs), the Community Residential Services Authority (CRSA), the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group, the Harrisburg Project, the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE), the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA), the Illinois Children's Mental Health Partnership (ICMHP), the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS), the Illinois Department of Human Services (DHS), the Illinois Department of Mental Health (DMH), the Illinois Multi-Tiered Systems of Support Advisory Group, Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs), Regional Offices of Education (ROEs), and Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET). ISBE shares SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences, regional professional development opportunities, and task force meetings. Comments and suggestions from the stakeholder groups are incorporated into the SPP/APR.

**FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)**

YES

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

**Reading Proficiency Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

**Math Proficiency Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned** | **Number of Children with IEPs Proficient** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Overall |  |  | 9.10% | 23.30% |  | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned** | **Number of Children with IEPs Proficient** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Overall |  |  | 8.39% | 23.60% |  | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

**Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.**

Due to the extraordinary circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic and resulting school closures, all states requested and received waivers from the U.S. Department of Education for school year 2019-2020 assessment and accountability requirements under the ESEA. However, data for previous years can be found via the links below.  
  
The Illinois State Report Card for reporting assessment data for students with and without disabilities is available at the following link: https://www.isbe.net/ilreportcard under the Academic Progress section.   
  
The Illinois State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report, Part B provides assessment data for students with disabilities at the following link: https://www.isbe.net/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-Data-and-Accountability.aspx  
  
The Assessment Participation Report required by OSEP can be found at the following link: https://www.isbe.net/Pages/Assessment.aspx under the last bullet point in the "Resources" section.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Due to the extraordinary circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic and resulting school closures, all states requested and received waivers from the U.S. Department of Education for school year 2019-2020 assessment and accountability requirements under the ESEA. Therefore, no statewide assessment data is available for FFY19.

## 3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3C - OSEP Response

The State was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

## 3C - Required Actions

# Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

**Data Source**

State discipline data, including State’s analysis of State’s Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons:

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 4A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 3.87% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target <= | 4.60% | 4.40% | 4.20% | 4.00% | 3.80% |
| Data | 2.79% | 2.81% | 2.35% | 1.64% | 1.53% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 3.80% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

ISBE has ongoing communication regarding the SPP/APR with its primary stakeholder group, the Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC) through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. The role of ISAC is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. ISAC functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Services Department. ISAC members represent individuals with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, students with disabilities, teachers of students with disabilities, private providers, public charter schools, special education directors, regional superintendents, district superintendents, higher education personnel, vocational/community/business organization providers of transition services to students with disabilities, the Illinois Department of Human Services, the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, the Illinois Department of Corrections/Department of Juvenile Justice, and the general public.   
  
ISBE staff have discussions with ISAC multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, and improvement activities with ISAC as necessary. ISAC assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising targets for the SPP results indicators.  
  
In addition to ISAC, ISBE collaborates with many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. Such stakeholder groups have included Child and Family Connections (CFCs), the Community Residential Services Authority (CRSA), the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group, the Harrisburg Project, the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE), the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA), the Illinois Children's Mental Health Partnership (ICMHP), the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS), the Illinois Department of Human Services (DHS), the Illinois Department of Mental Health (DMH), the Illinois Multi-Tiered Systems of Support Advisory Group, Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs), Regional Offices of Education (ROEs), and Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET). ISBE shares SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences, regional professional development opportunities, and task force meetings. Comments and suggestions from the stakeholder groups are incorporated into the SPP/APR.

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy** | **Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 10 | 849 | 1.53% | 3.80% | 1.18% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))**

Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State

**State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology**

The Student Information System (SIS) is the mechanism utilized by the ISBE Data Strategies and Analytics Department to collect student-level data regarding suspension and expulsion for all students. In Illinois, significant discrepancy for Indicator 4A is determined as follows:  
  
1. A Suspension/Expulsion Rate is calculated for each LEA with at least five students with IEPs as follows:  
((# of students with IEPs suspended or expelled for more than 10 days) / (# of students with IEPs)) \* 100  
2. A State Suspension/Expulsion Rate is calculated in the same manner by using the total number of students with IEPs suspended or expelled for more than 10 days in the entire state, and the total number of students with IEPs in the entire state.  
3. A standard deviation from the State Suspension/Expulsion Rate is then calculated.  
4. A LEA is determined to have a significant discrepancy if:  
 a. its Suspension/Expulsion Rate is greater than the State Suspension/Expulsion Rate plus one standard deviation for three consecutive years, AND  
 b. the LEA had at least five students with IEPs suspended or expelled more than 10 days for three consecutive years.  
  
For FFY19, ISBE examined suspension/expulsion data for students with IEPs for all 852 LEAs in the State. In total, 852 / 852 districts had at least one student with an IEP, while 849 / 852 LEAs met the minimum n-size requirement of at least five students with IEPs. A total of 624 of the 849 LEAs that met the minimum n-size requirement documented at least one student discipline event for the school year being monitored. Of the 624 LEAs with documented discipline events for students with IEPs, 278 LEAs suspended or expelled at least one student with an IEP for more than 10 days. After applying the significant discrepancy criteria listed above, a total of 10 LEAs met the State's criteria for significant discrepancy. These LEAs were notified of their status and the requirement to complete a review of their policies, procedures, and practices related to suspension/expulsion of students with IEPs.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

For this indicator, states are required to use data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, states are required to use data from the 2018-2019 school year). Therefore, COVID-19 had no impact on this indicator.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 data)**

**Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.**

Each of the 10 LEAs identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities was required to review and analyze student data at the district and individual building levels, and to complete a self-assessment using a template provided by ISBE. The template is posted on the ISBE website at: https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPP-APR-Indicator-4.aspx. The purpose of the self-assessment is to examine policies, procedures, and practices that may impact the development and implementation of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards that may result in discrepant rates of suspension/expulsion. The self-assessment tool provided by ISBE requires districts to examine disaggregated discipline data, analyze current policies and procedures, assess local practices, and draw conclusions regarding the reasons a discrepancy exists. Based upon the information collected, LEAs are required to identify the immediate actions they will take in order to address the discrepant rates of suspension/expulsion of children with disabilities for more than ten days in a school year. Such actions could include methods for improving data collection to track patterns of student behavior; additional training and professional development for teachers and administrators; and implementation of research-based behavior interventions. After reviewing the completed LEA self-assessments, the State determines which LEAs do not meet the requirements of 34 CFR 300.170(b) and any other relevant disciplinary regulations. These LEAs are then notified of their finding of noncompliance, requiring timely correction as soon as possible, but in no case longer than one year from the date of the finding.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4A - OSEP Response

## 4A - Required Actions

# Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Compliance Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

**Data Source**

State discipline data, including State’s analysis of State’s Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

## 4B - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2009 | 0.70% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.12% | 0.12% | 0.00% | 0.12% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

3

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity** | **Number of those districts that have policies procedure, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements** | **Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 8 | 0 | 849 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology**

The Student Information System (SIS) is the mechanism utilized by the ISBE Data Strategies and Analytics Department to collect student-level data regarding suspension and expulsion for all students. In Illinois, significant discrepancy for Indicator 4B is determined as follows:  
  
1. A Suspension/Expulsion Rate is calculated for each LEA with at least five students with IEPs as follows:  
((# of students with IEPs suspended or expelled for more than 10 days) / (# of students with IEPs)) \* 100  
2. A State Suspension/Expulsion Rate is calculated in the same manner by using the total number of students with IEPs suspended or expelled for more than 10 days in the entire state, and the total number of students with IEPs in the entire state.  
3. A standard deviation from the State Suspension/Expulsion Rate is then calculated.  
4. A LEA is determined to have a significant discrepancy if:  
 a. its Suspension/Expulsion Rate by race/ethnicity is greater than the State Suspension/Expulsion Rate plus one standard deviation for three consecutive years, AND  
 b. the LEA had at least five students with IEPs suspended or expelled more than 10 days for three consecutive years.  
  
ISBE examined suspension/expulsion data for students with IEPs for all 852 LEAs in the State. In total, 852 / 852 districts had at least one student with an IEP, while 849 / 852 met the minimum n-size requirement of at least five students with IEPs. A total of 624 of the 849 LEAs that met the minimum n-size requirement documented at least one student discipline event for the school year being monitored. Of the 624 LEAs with documented discipline events for students with IEPs, 278 LEAs suspended or expelled at least one student with an IEP for more than 10 days. After applying the significant discrepancy criteria listed above, a total of 8 LEAs met the State's criteria for significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity. These LEAs were notified of their status and the requirement to complete a review of their policies, procedures, and practices related to suspension/expulsion of students with IEPs.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

For this indicator, states are required to use data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, states are required to use data from the 2018-2019 school year). Therefore, COVID-19 had no impact on this indicator.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 data)**

**Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.**

Each of the 8 LEAs identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities was required to review and analyze student data at the district and individual building levels, and to complete a self-assessment using a template provided by ISBE. The template is posted on the ISBE website at: https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPP-APR-Indicator-4.aspx. The purpose of the self-assessment is to examine policies, procedures, and practices that may impact the development and implementation of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards that may result in discrepant rates of suspension/expulsion. The self-assessment tool provided by ISBE requires districts to examine disaggregated discipline data, analyze current policies and procedures, assess local practices, and draw conclusions regarding the reasons a discrepancy exists. Based upon the information collected, LEAs are required to identify the immediate actions they will take in order to address the discrepant rates of suspension/expulsion of children with disabilities for more than ten days in a school year. Such actions could include methods for improving data collection to track patterns of student behavior; additional training and professional development for teachers and administrators; and implementation of research-based behavior interventions. After reviewing the completed LEA self-assessments, the State determines which LEAs do not meet the requirements of 34 CFR 300.170(b) and any other relevant disciplinary regulations. These LEAs are then notified of their finding of noncompliance, requiring timely correction as soon as possible, but in no case longer than one year from the date of the finding.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

## 4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4B - OSEP Response

## 4B- Required Actions

# Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Education environments (children 6-21): Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;

B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and

C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)]times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

## 5 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A | 2005 | Target >= | 54.00% | 55.00% | 56.00% | 57.00% | 58.00% |
| A | 49.30% | Data | 53.00% | 52.65% | 52.51% | 52.53% | 52.79% |
| B | 2005 | Target <= | 17.50% | 17.00% | 16.50% | 16.00% | 15.50% |
| B | 18.90% | Data | 13.19% | 13.29% | 13.44% | 13.22% | 13.05% |
| C | 2005 | Target <= | 3.90% | 3.90% | 3.90% | 3.90% | 3.90% |
| C | 5.90% | Data | 6.31% | 6.20% | 6.23% | 6.33% | 6.50% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A >= | 58.00% |
| Target B <= | 15.50% |
| Target C <= | 3.90% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

ISBE has ongoing communication regarding the SPP/APR with its primary stakeholder group, the Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC) through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. The role of ISAC is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. ISAC functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Services Department. ISAC members represent individuals with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, students with disabilities, teachers of students with disabilities, private providers, public charter schools, special education directors, regional superintendents, district superintendents, higher education personnel, vocational/community/business organization providers of transition services to students with disabilities, the Illinois Department of Human Services, the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, the Illinois Department of Corrections/Department of Juvenile Justice, and the general public.   
  
ISBE staff have discussions with ISAC multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, and improvement activities with ISAC as necessary. ISAC assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising targets for the SPP results indicators.  
  
In addition to ISAC, ISBE collaborates with many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. Such stakeholder groups have included Child and Family Connections (CFCs), the Community Residential Services Authority (CRSA), the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group, the Harrisburg Project, the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE), the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA), the Illinois Children's Mental Health Partnership (ICMHP), the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS), the Illinois Department of Human Services (DHS), the Illinois Department of Mental Health (DMH), the Illinois Multi-Tiered Systems of Support Advisory Group, Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs), Regional Offices of Education (ROEs), and Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET). ISBE shares SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences, regional professional development opportunities, and task force meetings. Comments and suggestions from the stakeholder groups are incorporated into the SPP/APR.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 | 262,410 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 138,298 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 33,916 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools | 16,622 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities | 497 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements | 406 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Education Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 138,298 | 262,410 | 52.79% | 58.00% | 52.70% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 33,916 | 262,410 | 13.05% | 15.50% | 12.92% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3] | 17,525 | 262,410 | 6.50% | 3.90% | 6.68% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)**

NO

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **C** | ISBE attributes the slippage in SPP 5c to increased student mental health needs, increased challenging behaviors, the shortage of experienced educators to deal with such issues, and changing rules on the use of restraint and seclusion. SPP 5c increased from 6.5% in FFY 2018 to 6.68% in FFY 2019. ISBE analyzed data and noted that this correlates with the increase in the number of students identified under the disability category of Emotional Disturbance in FFY19. There was an increase of 0.77% from school year 2018-19 to school year 2019-20 as an additional 144 students aged 6-21 were identified with a primary disability of Emotional Disturbance. This appeared to carry over into the separate placement educational environment category, as an additional 173 students aged 6-21 identified under the disability category of Emotional Disturbance received their special education and related services in a separate school setting. As more students within the state experience trauma and other mental health needs, the need for more intensive programming has occurred. In addition, in November 2019, December 2019, and April 2020, there were changes to ISBE’s rules on the use of restraint and seclusion. These changes may have led to a greater number of students receiving their special education and related services in separate schools, as public schools had to change their practices in meeting the needs of students who exhibited behavior that was of imminent physical danger to themselves or others. Separate school placements increased 3.94% from FFY18 to FFY19. On a positive note, the percentage of students requiring the receipt of their special education and related services in residential facilities decreased 1.58% from FFY18 to FFY19.   To address the increased mental health needs of students as related to SPP 5c, ISBE provides many mental health resources to schools and families, including trainings and website resources. The ISBE Special Education Department collaborates with the School Wellness Department to support districts with resources and technical assistance related to the physical, social, and emotional health needs of students. Additional information regarding school wellness can be found at: https://www.isbe.net/Pages/School-Wellness.aspx. ISBE also recently formed the Student Care Department to ensure that the collective and individual need of students are met and that districts are responsive to the needs of children and families. The ISBE Special Education Department collaborates with the Student Care Department to support positive and proactive practices and to decrease the use of restrictive interventions. Additional information regarding student care is located at: https://www.isbe.net/Pages/student-care.aspx. |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Indicator 5 data is obtained through the December 1 child count. There is no evidence that COVID-19 had an impact on this indicator.

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 5 - OSEP Response

## 5 - Required Actions

# Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Preschool environments: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and

B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

## 6 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A | 2011 | Target >= | 32.50% | 32.60% | 32.70% | 32.80% | 32.90% |
| A | 32.20% | Data | 35.41% | 37.98% | 40.00% | 40.76% | 44.82% |
| B | 2011 | Target <= | 30.90% | 30.80% | 30.70% | 30.60% | 30.50% |
| B | 31.20% | Data | 29.15% | 28.21% | 26.76% | 24.94% | 23.49% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A >= | 32.90% |
| Target B <= | 30.50% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

ISBE has ongoing communication regarding the SPP/APR with its primary stakeholder group, the Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC) through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. The role of ISAC is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. ISAC functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Services Department. ISAC members represent individuals with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, students with disabilities, teachers of students with disabilities, private providers, public charter schools, special education directors, regional superintendents, district superintendents, higher education personnel, vocational/community/business organization providers of transition services to students with disabilities, the Illinois Department of Human Services, the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, the Illinois Department of Corrections/Department of Juvenile Justice, and the general public.   
  
ISBE staff have discussions with ISAC multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, and improvement activities with ISAC as necessary. ISAC assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising targets for the SPP results indicators.  
  
In addition to ISAC, ISBE collaborates with many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. Such stakeholder groups have included Child and Family Connections (CFCs), the Community Residential Services Authority (CRSA), the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group, the Harrisburg Project, the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE), the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA), the Illinois Children's Mental Health Partnership (ICMHP), the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS), the Illinois Department of Human Services (DHS), the Illinois Department of Mental Health (DMH), the Illinois Multi-Tiered Systems of Support Advisory Group, Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs), Regional Offices of Education (ROEs), and Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET). ISBE shares SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences, regional professional development opportunities, and task force meetings. Comments and suggestions from the stakeholder groups are incorporated into the SPP/APR.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 | 37,946 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program | 17,235 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | b1. Number of children attending separate special education class | 7,774 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | b2. Number of children attending separate school | 955 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | b3. Number of children attending residential facility | 7 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Preschool Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program | 17,235 | 37,946 | 44.82% | 32.90% | 45.42% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 8,736 | 37,946 | 23.49% | 30.50% | 23.02% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Indicator 6 data is obtained through the December 1 child count. There is no evidence that COVID-19 had an impact on this indicator.

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 6 - OSEP Response

## 6 - Required Actions

# Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

Outcomes:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

**Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:**

**Summary Statement 1**: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:** Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

**Summary Statement 2:** The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 2**: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.” If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

## 7 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A1 | 2012 | Target >= | 85.90% | 85.90% | 86.10% | 86.20% | 86.30% |
| A1 | 85.90% | Data | 71.90% | 57.97% | 76.99% | 83.73% | 84.38% |
| A2 | 2012 | Target >= | 55.30% | 55.30% | 55.40% | 55.50% | 55.60% |
| A2 | 55.30% | Data | 47.39% | 37.09% | 47.20% | 50.35% | 50.08% |
| B1 | 2012 | Target >= | 86.70% | 86.70% | 86.80% | 86.90% | 87.00% |
| B1 | 86.70% | Data | 73.44% | 59.24% | 77.91% | 83.51% | 84.24% |
| B2 | 2012 | Target >= | 53.60% | 53.60% | 53.70% | 53.80% | 53.90% |
| B2 | 53.60% | Data | 46.32% | 34.96% | 45.54% | 48.35% | 47.95% |
| C1 | 2012 | Target >= | 87.80% | 87.80% | 87.90% | 88.00% | 88.10% |
| C1 | 87.80% | Data | 74.36% | 59.69% | 78.70% | 85.13% | 86.39% |
| C2 | 2012 | Target >= | 64.00% | 64.00% | 64.10% | 64.20% | 64.30% |
| C2 | 64.00% | Data | 55.61% | 43.97% | 54.62% | 57.66% | 57.14% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A1 >= | 86.30% |
| Target A2 >= | 55.60% |
| Target B1 >= | 87.00% |
| Target B2 >= | 53.90% |
| Target C1 >= | 88.10% |
| Target C2 >= | 64.30% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

ISBE has ongoing communication regarding the SPP/APR with its primary stakeholder group, the Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC) through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. The role of ISAC is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. ISAC functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Services Department. ISAC members represent individuals with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, students with disabilities, teachers of students with disabilities, private providers, public charter schools, special education directors, regional superintendents, district superintendents, higher education personnel, vocational/community/business organization providers of transition services to students with disabilities, the Illinois Department of Human Services, the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, the Illinois Department of Corrections/Department of Juvenile Justice, and the general public.   
  
ISBE staff have discussions with ISAC multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, and improvement activities with ISAC as necessary. ISAC assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising targets for the SPP results indicators.  
  
In addition to ISAC, ISBE collaborates with many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. Such stakeholder groups have included Child and Family Connections (CFCs), the Community Residential Services Authority (CRSA), the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group, the Harrisburg Project, the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE), the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA), the Illinois Children's Mental Health Partnership (ICMHP), the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS), the Illinois Department of Human Services (DHS), the Illinois Department of Mental Health (DMH), the Illinois Multi-Tiered Systems of Support Advisory Group, Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs), Regional Offices of Education (ROEs), and Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET). ISBE shares SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences, regional professional development opportunities, and task force meetings. Comments and suggestions from the stakeholder groups are incorporated into the SPP/APR.

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

**Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed**

10,605

**Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)**

| **Outcome A Progress Category** | **Number of children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 81 | 0.76% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 1,441 | 13.59% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 4,087 | 38.54% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 3,863 | 36.43% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,133 | 10.68% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 7,950 | 9,472 | 84.38% | 86.30% | 83.93% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 4,996 | 10,605 | 50.08% | 55.60% | 47.11% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)**

| **Outcome B Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 59 | 0.56% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 1,503 | 14.17% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 4,263 | 40.20% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 3,990 | 37.62% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 790 | 7.45% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 8,253 | 9,815 | 84.24% | 87.00% | 84.09% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 4,780 | 10,605 | 47.95% | 53.90% | 45.07% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

| **Outcome C Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 64 | 0.60% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 1,273 | 12.00% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 3,613 | 34.07% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 4,446 | 41.92% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,209 | 11.40% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.  *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 8,059 | 9,396 | 86.39% | 88.10% | 85.77% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.  *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 5,655 | 10,605 | 57.14% | 64.30% | 53.32% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **A2** | ISBE attributes part of the slippage to an updated training on early childhood outcomes. The Early Childhood Outcomes in Illinois module was developed by Early CHOICES, a professional development project funded by ISBE. This module reviews the three Early Childhood Outcomes that are used to help measure the impact early childhood intervention has on a child’s ability to have positive social relationships, acquire and use knowledge and skills, and take appropriate action to meet their needs. This module was released in October 2018. In the 2018-2019 school year, 300 participants viewed the module, completed activities aligned to the module sections, and accessed tools and resources discussed in the module. In the 2019-2020 school year, that number was 244 participants. The module can be found at https://www.eclre.org/good-to-know/ec-outcomes/. It is likely that the updated training module, along with the increase in people receiving training on early childhood outcomes, has led to more accurate reporting, resulting in a slip in the data. ISBE also provided ongoing technical assistance and support on the data collection to LEAs throughout the school year via phone calls and emails.   In addition to the updated training impacting slippage for SPP 7, ISBE experienced effects due to the global pandemic that most likely contributed to the slippage. SPP 7 statewide data does not show evidence of negative consequences regarding completeness, validity, or reliability. In addition, COVID-19 did not appear to impact ISBE’s ability to collect data. The FFY19 SPP 7 denominators for A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, and C2 are all larger than the denominators for these outcomes in FFY18. Rather, it is ISBE’s belief that COVID-19 impacted the rate of learning for preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs, negatively affecting both the number and percentage of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. ISBE recognizes and acknowledges that districts struggled to adjust to the mandatory emergency shut down of in-person instruction statewide, along with the challenges surrounding decision making regarding use of assessment tools and providing ratings for students during a global pandemic. In addition to difficulty completing ratings, students did not attend in person mid-March through May. Districts varied greatly in terms of what kind of services were provided to students during this time; therefore, some students may have plateaued in terms of growth and retention. Some students may have experienced a loss in learning due to challenging educational conditions, further contributing to slippage in child outcome ratings. To mitigate the impact of COVID-19, ISBE published numerous guidance documents throughout the pandemic and posted them to the ISBE COVID-19 webpage. These resources, along with others, can be found at Coronavirus (isbe.net). ISBE staff also manned a COVID-19 team that responded to questions from school districts and families. |
| **B2** | ISBE attributes part of the slippage to an updated training on early childhood outcomes. The Early Childhood Outcomes in Illinois module was developed by Early CHOICES, a professional development project funded by ISBE. This module reviews the three Early Childhood Outcomes that are used to help measure the impact early childhood intervention has on a child’s ability to have positive social relationships, acquire and use knowledge and skills, and take appropriate action to meet their needs. This module was released in October 2018. In the 2018-2019 school year, 300 participants viewed the module, completed activities aligned to the module sections, and accessed tools and resources discussed in the module. In the 2019-2020 school year, that number was 244 participants. The module can be found at https://www.eclre.org/good-to-know/ec-outcomes/. It is likely that the updated training module, along with the increase in people receiving training on early childhood outcomes, has led to more accurate reporting, resulting in a slip in the data. ISBE also provided ongoing technical assistance and support on the data collection to LEAs throughout the school year via phone calls and emails.   In addition to the updated training impacting slippage for SPP 7, ISBE experienced effects due to the global pandemic that most likely contributed to the slippage. SPP 7 statewide data does not show evidence of negative consequences regarding completeness, validity, or reliability. In addition, COVID-19 did not appear to impact ISBE’s ability to collect data. The FFY19 SPP 7 denominators for A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, and C2 are all larger than the denominators for these outcomes in FFY18. Rather, it is ISBE’s belief that COVID-19 impacted the rate of learning for preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs, negatively affecting both the number and percentage of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. ISBE recognizes and acknowledges that districts struggled to adjust to the mandatory emergency shut down of in-person instruction statewide, along with the challenges surrounding decision making regarding use of assessment tools and providing ratings for students during a global pandemic. In addition to difficulty completing ratings, students did not attend in person mid-March through May. Districts varied greatly in terms of what kind of services were provided to students during this time; therefore, some students may have plateaued in terms of growth and retention. Some students may have experienced a loss in learning due to challenging educational conditions, further contributing to slippage in child outcome ratings. To mitigate the impact of COVID-19, ISBE published numerous guidance documents throughout the pandemic and posted them to the ISBE COVID-19 webpage. These resources, along with others, can be found at Coronavirus (isbe.net). ISBE staff also manned a COVID-19 team that responded to questions from school districts and families. |
| **C2** | ISBE attributes part of the slippage to an updated training on early childhood outcomes. The Early Childhood Outcomes in Illinois module was developed by Early CHOICES, a professional development project funded by ISBE. This module reviews the three Early Childhood Outcomes that are used to help measure the impact early childhood intervention has on a child’s ability to have positive social relationships, acquire and use knowledge and skills, and take appropriate action to meet their needs. This module was released in October 2018. In the 2018-2019 school year, 300 participants viewed the module, completed activities aligned to the module sections, and accessed tools and resources discussed in the module. In the 2019-2020 school year, that number was 244 participants. The module can be found at https://www.eclre.org/good-to-know/ec-outcomes/. It is likely that the updated training module, along with the increase in people receiving training on early childhood outcomes, has led to more accurate reporting, resulting in a slip in the data. ISBE also provided ongoing technical assistance and support on the data collection to LEAs throughout the school year via phone calls and emails.   In addition to the updated training impacting slippage for SPP 7, ISBE experienced effects due to the global pandemic that most likely contributed to the slippage. SPP 7 statewide data does not show evidence of negative consequences regarding completeness, validity, or reliability. In addition, COVID-19 did not appear to impact ISBE’s ability to collect data. The FFY19 SPP 7 denominators for A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, and C2 are all larger than the denominators for these outcomes in FFY18. Rather, it is ISBE’s belief that COVID-19 impacted the rate of learning for preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs, negatively affecting both the number and percentage of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. ISBE recognizes and acknowledges that districts struggled to adjust to the mandatory emergency shut down of in-person instruction statewide, along with the challenges surrounding decision making regarding use of assessment tools and providing ratings for students during a global pandemic. In addition to difficulty completing ratings, students did not attend in person mid-March through May. Districts varied greatly in terms of what kind of services were provided to students during this time; therefore, some students may have plateaued in terms of growth and retention. Some students may have experienced a loss in learning due to challenging educational conditions, further contributing to slippage in child outcome ratings. To mitigate the impact of COVID-19, ISBE published numerous guidance documents throughout the pandemic and posted them to the ISBE COVID-19 webpage. These resources, along with others, can be found at Coronavirus (isbe.net). ISBE staff also manned a COVID-19 team that responded to questions from school districts and families. |

**Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)**

YES

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | NO |

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)**

YES

**List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.**

LEAs are required to choose from the following assessment tools as the Primary Assessment for Indicator 7:  
  
 1) Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming Systems (AEPS)  
 2) Carolina Curriculum for Infants and Toddlers or Preschoolers with Special Needs   
 3) High Scope Child Observation Record (COR)  
 4) Teaching Strategies GOLD  
 5) Hawaii Early Learning Profile (HELP)  
 6) Work Sampling System Illinois (WSS-IL)  
 7) My Teaching Stratgies GOLD  
 8) Early Learning Scales  
 9) Ages and Stages Questionnaire  
10) Desired Results Developmental Profile (DRDP)   
  
Upon exit, LEAs are required to choose the curriculum-based assessment used with the child from the ten possible primary assessments. In addition, ISBE utilizes the ECO Child Outcomes Summary (COS) and adds the relevant Illinois Early Learning and Development Standards (IELDS) as “sub-areas” in the 3 required outcome areas. The Overall Summary Rating for each one of the 3 outcomes is linked to “sub-areas” that reflect the IELDS. Including the IELDS in the COS assists teams in rating the child comparable to same-aged peers and increases the validity and reliability of the ratings. The criterion that defines “comparable to same-aged peers” is a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.  
  
Illinois uses a team process to complete the developmental ratings on each child. The team is comprised of 2 or more persons who meet to complete the rating scale and select the outcome rating. This team includes parents. The team considers information from those familiar with the child in a variety of contexts and uses a systematic process for making decisions. The team process is supported by having individuals who have knowledge of typical child development, regular monitoring of child progress, multiple sources of information and a structure for coming to team consensus. The team bases their ratings on existing child data, including evaluations and information provided by the parents of the child, current classroom-based assessments and observations, and observations by teachers and related service providers to determine the ratings in each of the three outcome areas.  
  
Children aged 3 through 5 who entered early childhood special education services and exited with at least 6 months of service are included in the assessment and reporting process. The following validations are made prior to programs submitting data:  
  
• One Early Childhood Outcomes “Entry Rating” is mandatory before the student’s enrollment is exited;  
• Upon exiting a student’s enrollment, an Early Childhood Outcomes Progress Rating is required if the last rating is more than 6 months old or if the student is exited during the time frame of February 1-July 31, an updated ECO rating must be done during that time frame;  
• Impossible rating combinations are not allowed; and   
• The entry rating date must be prior to the progress rating date.  
  
The outcome ratings from entrance into the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) program are matched to exit outcome ratings for individual children. At the LEA and state levels, analyses of matched scores yield the following for each of the three outcomes:  
  
1. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning  
2. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers  
3. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same aged peers but did not reach it  
4. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same aged peers  
5. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The impact of COVID-19 on Indicator 7 is discussed under the slippage sections.

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

## 7 - Required Actions

# Indicator 8: Parent involvement

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling **of parents from whom response is requested** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

## 8 - Indicator Data

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? | NO |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

ISBE has ongoing communication regarding the SPP/APR with its primary stakeholder group, the Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC) through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. The role of ISAC is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. ISAC functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Services Department. ISAC members represent individuals with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, students with disabilities, teachers of students with disabilities, private providers, public charter schools, special education directors, regional superintendents, district superintendents, higher education personnel, vocational/community/business organization providers of transition services to students with disabilities, the Illinois Department of Human Services, the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, the Illinois Department of Corrections/Department of Juvenile Justice, and the general public.   
  
ISBE staff have discussions with ISAC multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, and improvement activities with ISAC as necessary. ISAC assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising targets for the SPP results indicators.  
  
In addition to ISAC, ISBE collaborates with many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. Such stakeholder groups have included Child and Family Connections (CFCs), the Community Residential Services Authority (CRSA), the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group, the Harrisburg Project, the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE), the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA), the Illinois Children's Mental Health Partnership (ICMHP), the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS), the Illinois Department of Human Services (DHS), the Illinois Department of Mental Health (DMH), the Illinois Multi-Tiered Systems of Support Advisory Group, Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs), Regional Offices of Education (ROEs), and Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET). ISBE shares SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences, regional professional development opportunities, and task force meetings. Comments and suggestions from the stakeholder groups are incorporated into the SPP/APR.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 53.80% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= | 59.00% | 59.00% | 60.00% | 60.00% | 61.00% |
| Data | 67.84% | 67.81% | 68.75% | 67.04% | 70.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 61.00% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities** | **Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities** | | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3,771 | | 5,102 | 70.00% | 61.00% | 73.91% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.**

60,000

**Percentage of respondent parents**

8.50%

**Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.**

ISBE administers one survey to parents of both preschool and school-aged students with disabilities. ISBE does not administer a different survey to parents of students who are in preschool; therefore, no additional procedures for combining data are required. The survey response data that ISBE receives is disaggregated by age, gender, race/ethnicity, disability category, and English language learners for ages 3-21, with subgroup totals for students ages 3-5 and 6-21. Grouped survey responses are reported to ISBE to provide a big picture of parent perceptions regarding the degree to which schools and districts facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for their children. Individual district data can be accessed by the respective district as well.

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | YES |
| If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? | NO |

**Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.**

ISBE continued to use the first 25 items from the Parent Survey developed by the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) to measure the percentage of parents who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. To ensure a representative sample of the population statewide and from each LEA annually, ISBE uses a sampling calculator to select a sample of LEAs for each school year. ISBE developed a six-year cycle for LEAs selected to ensure that every LEA is included in this data collection over the span of the State Performance Plan. This six-year cycle has been carefully developed to ensure the sample of families selected for the survey annually is representative of the State and each LEA demographically in terms of age, primary disability, race/ethnicity and gender. ISBE mails the Illinois Parent Involvement Survey to a representative sample of parents of students with disabilities within the LEA during the year the LEA has been selected for the survey, except for the Chicago Public Schools (CPS) District 299. CPS has been selected every year of the six-year cycle, and ISBE ensures that a proportionate representation of parents of students with disabilities from the LEA receive the survey annually.  
  
Of the 60,000 parents of students with disabilities in Illinois who were selected to participate in the 2019-2020 Illinois Parent Involvement Survey, 5,102 parents responded, yielding an 8.50% response rate. This FFY19 response rate decreased 0.23% from a response rate of 8.73% in FFY18. FFY18 data show that 5,240 respondents completed the survey. The response rate of 8.50% is calculated using the total number of surveys received (5,102) divided by the total number of surveys mailed (60,000). However, 3,252 surveys were undeliverable and were returned to the sender. Therefore, the response rate based on the total number of surveys received (5,102) divided by the total number of surveys assumed delivered (56,748) is 8.99%.  
  
ISBE currently encourages LEAs to implement two or more of the following activities to maximize the number of surveys completed: post the survey information and link on the district website, mail flyers home to parents that have a child with a disability, email parents the survey information and link, use the district/school automated phone system to increase parent awareness, notify parent groups to assist in disseminating survey information, utilize text messaging to increase parent awareness, and have parents complete the survey at the conclusion of their annual IEP meeting. Beginning with the FFY20 survey, ISBE’s vendor will send a questionnaire to districts in the current year’s survey cycle to determine the specific activities being implemented by each district to maximize the number of surveys completed. The questionnaire is designed to promote awareness of the parent survey and encourage districts to reach out to parents and families within their boundaries regarding survey completion. ISBE will work with the survey vendor to identify which districts have fewer than 25% of their surveyed families responding in order to address low response rates with individual districts. ISBE will extend the survey window by one month to allow for additional survey completion time for parents and families. ISBE will also consider whether a user-friendly redesign of the survey’s appearance would promote increased survey completion.

| **Survey Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was a survey used? | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised survey? | NO |
| The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. | NO |

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

ISBE will work with its survey vendor and the school districts in the current year’s survey cycle to complete follow up activities with families who are less likely to complete the survey. For example, districts will be strongly encouraged to utilize electronic survey invitations, reminder emails, reminder text messages, recorded phone messages, live phone calls, and support from local parent groups to reach underrepresented families for survey completion. ISBE’s survey vendor will compile survey response data at regular intervals during the survey timeframe to determine which districts and families will be targeted for follow up communications regarding survey completion.   
  
ISBE will also add resources for parents, families, and districts to its SPP Indicator 8 webpage at: https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPP-APR-Indicator-8.aspx. To support parents and families, an example of the survey will be posted along with the informational flyers that were distributed at the local level. Information regarding accessibility to language assistance, including a Spanish translation, and contact information for support from ISBE’s vendor will be made available to parents via the website. To support districts, correspondence to districts will be posted. District response rate percentages will be shared at specific intervals during the survey window so districts can encourage parent participation if necessary.

**Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.**

The demographic representation of FFY 2019 survey respondents was examined by age, gender, race/ethnicity, disability category, and English language learner status. Given that the overall survey sample was representative of the population of students with disabilities ages 3-21 in the state, an examination of the response rate by subgroup sheds light on whether the survey responses were also representative of the state population.  
  
The results of the analysis indicated that student age, gender, and English language learner status were not significant predictors of survey completion by parents. Survey result analyses also indicated some statistically significant differences between families that did and did not respond to the survey in terms of race and primary disability. Specifically, families identifying as Black and Hispanic were less likely to complete the survey, as were families of students identified with Specific Learning Disabilities. Students identifying as Black made up 19.55% of the survey group and 11.54% of the survey responses (a -8.01% difference). Students identifying as Hispanic made up 26.58% of the survey group and 20.70% of the survey responses (a -5.88% difference). Students identified with Specific Learning Disabilities made up 33.45% of the survey group and 26.03% of the survey responses (a -7.42% difference). In contrast, families identifying as White were more likely to complete the survey, as were families of students identified with Autism Spectrum Disorders. Students identifying as White made up 46.85% of the survey group and 58.72% of the survey responses (a +11.87% difference). Students identified with Autism made up 9.48% of the survey group and 13.11% of the survey responses (a +3.63% difference).

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

After analyzing data for this indicator, there was insufficient evidence to show that COVID-19 was a contributing factor to the slight drop in survey response rate from 8.73% to 8.50%. In addition, there was insufficient evidence to show that the demographics of the parents responding to the survey was influenced by COVID-19, as ISBE noted similar patterns for survey responses in FFY18.

## 8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2019 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

The State reported on the representativeness of the data in the SPP 8 section entitled, “Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.” The results of the analysis indicated that student age, gender, and English language learner status were not significant predictors of survey completion by parents. Survey result analyses also indicated that families identifying as Black and Hispanic were less likely to complete the survey, as were families of students identified with Specific Learning Disabilities. In contrast, families identifying as White were more likely to complete the survey, as were families of students identified with Autism Spectrum Disorders.  
  
The State reported on the actions it is taking to address representativeness in the SPP 8 section entitled, “Describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.” In order to ensure that future response data are more representative, ISBE will work with its survey vendor and the school districts in the current year’s survey cycle to complete follow up activities with families who are less likely to complete the survey. ISBE’s survey vendor will compile survey response data at regular intervals during the survey timeframe to determine which districts and families will be targeted for follow up communications regarding survey completion. ISBE will also add resources for parents, families, and districts to its SPP Indicator 8 webpage in an effort to increase representativeness.

## 8 - OSEP Response

## 8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2020 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

# Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

**Data Source**

State’s analysis, based on State’s Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 9 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2016 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

10

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services** | **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification** | **Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 1 | 0 | 841 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).**

Disproportionate representation (or disproportionality) of racial/ethnic groups in special education is currently defined as students in a particular racial/ethnic group (i.e., Asian, Black, Hispanic, Native American, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, Two or More Races, or White) being at a considerably greater risk of being identified as eligible for special education and related services than all other racial/ethnic groups enrolled either in the LEA or in the state (depending on the type of risk ratio calculation applied, as discussed below). ISBE uses a risk ratio to determine state risk for racial/ethnic disproportionality. To determine LEA risk for racial/ethnic disproportionality, ISBE uses a weighted risk ratio for LEAs in which there are at least 10 students in the racial/ethnic group and at least 10 students in the comparison group (all students in the racial/ethnic group enrolled in the LEA), and an alternate risk ratio for LEAs in which there are at least 10 students in the racial/ethnic group but fewer than 10 students in the comparison group enrolled in the LEA. The State utilized data from annual Fall Enrollment Counts from the Student Information System, or SIS, (for all students, ages 6-21 served under IDEA) and December Child Count (for students with IEPs, ages 6-21), which is the same data reported to OSEP on Table 1 (Child Count) of Information Collection 1820-0043 (Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education under Part B of the IDEA, as amended).  
  
ISBE examines data in the given school year to determine the number of LEAs that had at least 10 students with IEPs ages 6 – 21 for the past three school years to determine how many LEAs met the minimum “n” size for further analysis. ISBE uses a two-step process to determine the existence of disproportionality based on race and ethnicity in special education that is the result of inappropriate identification. First, ISBE calculates a weighted or alternate risk ratio for every LEA in the state with regard to overall special education eligibility. Such risk ratios are calculated for each racial/ethnic group enrolled in a LEA. ISBE’s criteria for determining over-representation based on race/ethnicity is a calculated weighted or alternate risk ratio of 3.0 or higher for three consecutive years for a particular racial/ ethnic group in which there are at least ten students in the special education population. Second, in order to verify whether the disproportionality is the result of inappropriate identification in those LEAs with a risk ratio of 3.0 or higher, ISBE requires the identified LEAs to conduct self-assessment activities, including data verification and a review of policies, practices, and procedures related to curriculum and instruction, child find, evaluations, eligibility determinations, and IEPs. This occurs through one of the following:  
  
a. Completing a Special Education Disproportionality District Self-Assessment (for newly identified LEAs and those LEAs for which 2018-2019 was the fourth year in a row being identified as having disproportionality),  
b. Completing a Status Report (for continuing LEAs with the same area of disproportionality two or three years in a row), or  
c. Completing a Status Report with Self-Assessment Update (for continuing LEAs with the same area of disproportionality two or three years in a row plus, one or more different areas than the previous year).  
d. Completing a Self-Assessment Update (for continuing LEAs with disproportionality two or three years in a row, but in one or more different areas than the preceding year).  
  
The LEAs submit the results of the self-assessment activities to ISBE. Upon receipt, ISBE reviews the documentation (which includes information resulting from the LEA’s review of policies, practices, and procedures) and, combined with the LEA data, determines whether or not the disproportionality is, in fact, the result of inappropriate identification of students. For those LEAs found to have disproportionate representation two or more years in a row, the LEA and State examine district processes, including a review of any new policies or procedures that went into effect since the prior year's review.

**Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.**

As described in detail above, ISBE utilizes a LEA self-assessment process to determine whether the disproportionate representation identified was the result of inappropriate identification. The self-assessment and status report templates are located on the ISBE website at: https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPP-APR-Indicator-9-10.aspx. The LEAs submit their self-assessments to ISBE, and the ISBE disproportionality team evaluates the self-assessments using its Disproportionality Self-Assessment Review Checklist/Rubric. ISBE staff use the Checklist/Rubric to score the five identified focus areas: curriculum and instruction; child find; initial evaluation and re-evaluation; eligibility determination; and individualized education program. The questions under each of the five focus areas are aligned to federal and state regulations. ISBE staff determine the extent to which the documentation provided demonstrates compliance with the regulations. The self-assessment also contains sections that address conclusions, next steps, and the revision of policies, procedures, and practices. ISBE staff score the Checklists/Rubrics and use the results to determine whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification.  
  
In FFY19, 841 / 851 LEAs met the minimum n-size requirement, while 10 / 851 LEAs did not meet the minimum n-size for further analysis under SPP 9. One of the 841 LEAs met the criteria for over-representation based on race/ethnicity set by ISBE and was required to conduct self-assessment activities for FFY19.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

After analyzing data for this indicator, there was insufficient evidence to show that COVID-19 had an impact on the data.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 9 - OSEP Response

## 9 - Required Actions

# Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

**Data Source**

State’s analysis, based on State’s Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2019, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 10 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2017 | 0.13% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% |  | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

93

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories** | **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification** | **Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 48 | 0 | 758 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).**

Disproportionate representation (or disproportionality) of racial/ethnic groups in special education disability categories is currently defined as students in a particular racial/ethnic group (i.e., Asian, Black, Hispanic, Native American, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, Two or More Races, or White) being at a considerably greater risk of being identified as eligible for special education and related services in a specific disability category (Speech/Language, Specific Learning Disability, Emotional Disturbance, Intellectual Disability, Autism, and Other Health Impairment) than all other racial/ethnic groups enrolled either in the LEA or in the state (depending on the type of risk ratio calculation applied, as discussed below). ISBE uses a risk ratio to determine state risk for racial/ethnic disproportionality. To determine LEA risk for racial/ethnic disproportionality, ISBE uses a weighted risk ratio for LEAs in which there are at least 10 students in the racial/ethnic group and at least 10 students in the comparison group (all students in the racial/ethnic group enrolled in the LEA), and an alternate risk ratio for LEAs in which there are at least 10 students in the racial/ethnic group but fewer than 10 students in the comparison group enrolled in the LEA. The State utilized data from annual Fall Enrollment Counts from the Student Information System, or SIS, (for all students, ages 6-21 served under IDEA) and December Child Count (for students with IEPs, ages 6-21), which is the same data reported to OSEP on Table 1 (Child Count) of Information Collection 1820-0043 (Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education under Part B of the IDEA, as amended).  
  
ISBE examines data for the given school year to determine the number of LEAs that had at least 10 students ages 6 – 21 for the past three school years in one of the six disability categories listed above to determine how many LEAs met the minimum “n” size for further analysis. ISBE uses a two-step process to determine the existence of disproportionality based on race and ethnicity in special education disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. First, ISBE calculates a weighted or alternate risk ratio for every LEA in the state with regard to special education eligibility in the categories listed above. Such risk ratios are calculated for each racial/ethnic group enrolled in a LEA. ISBE’s criteria for determining over-representation based on race/ethnicity is a calculated weighted or alternate risk ratio of 3.0 or higher for three consecutive years for a particular racial/ethnic group in which there are at least ten students in the special education disability category in question.  
  
Second, in order to verify whether the disproportionality is the result of inappropriate identification in those LEAs with a risk ratio of 3.0 or higher, ISBE requires the identified LEAs to conduct self-assessment activities, including data verification and a review of policies, practices, and procedures related to curriculum and instruction, child find, evaluations, eligibility determinations, and IEPs, through one of the following:  
  
a. Completing a Special Education Disproportionality Self-Assessment (for newly identified LEAs and those LEAs for which 2018-2019 was the fourth year in a row being identified as having disproportionality),  
b. Completing a Status Report (for continuing LEAs with the same area of disproportionality two or three years in a row),  
c. Completing a Status Report with Self-Assessment Update (for continuing LEAs with the same area of disproportionality two or three years in a row plus, one or more different areas than the previous year) or  
d. Completing a Self-Assessment Update (for continuing LEAs with disproportionality two or three years in a row, but in one or more different areas than the preceding year).  
  
The LEAs submit the results of the self-assessment activities to ISBE. Upon receipt, ISBE reviews the LEA documentation (which includes information resulting from the LEA’s review of policies, practices, and procedures) and, combined with the LEA data, determines whether the disproportionality is, in fact, the result of inappropriate identification of students. For those LEAs found to have disproportionate representation two or more years in a row, the LEA and State examine district processes, including a review of any new policies or procedures that went into effect since the prior year's review.

**Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.**

As described in detail above, ISBE utilizes a LEA self-assessment process to determine whether the disproportionate representation identified was the result of inappropriate identification. The self-assessment and status report templates are located on the ISBE website at: https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPP-APR-Indicator-9-10.aspx. The LEAs submit their self-assessments to ISBE, and the ISBE disproportionality team evaluates the self-assessments using its Disproportionality Self-Assessment Review Checklist/Rubric. ISBE staff use the Checklist/Rubric to score the five identified focus areas: curriculum and instruction; child find; initial evaluation and re-evaluation; eligibility determination; and individualized education program. The questions under each of the five focus areas are aligned to federal and state regulations. ISBE staff determine the extent to which the documentation provided demonstrates compliance with the regulations. The self-assessment also contains sections that address conclusions, next steps, and the revision of policies, procedures, and practices. ISBE staff score the Checklists/Rubrics and use the results to determine whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification.  
  
In FFY19, 758 / 851 LEAs met the minimum n-size requirement. Forty-eight (48) of the 758 LEAs that met the minimum n-size requirement also met the criteria for over-representation based on race/ethnicity in specific disability categories set by ISBE. Therefore, these 48 LEAs were required to conduct self-assessment activities for FFY19. After a thorough review of LEA self-assessments and status reports, none of the 48 LEAs were found to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

After analyzing data for this indicator, there was insufficient evidence to show that COVID-19 had an impact on the data.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 10 - OSEP Response

## 10 - Required Actions

# Indicator 11: Child Find

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State’s timeline for initial evaluations.

**Measurement**

a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

**Instructions**

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child’s previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 11 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 64.20% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 99.63% | 98.74% | 98.92% | 99.20% | 99.42% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received** | **(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 28,690 | 28,577 | 99.42% | 100% | 99.61% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)**

113

**Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.**

In FFY19 there were 113 students out of 28,690 students (0.39%) whose evaluations were completed beyond the 60 school-day timeline. The number of days beyond the timeline ranged from 1 day to 118 days. Forty-seven of the 113 evaluations (41.59%) were completed 1-10 days beyond the timeline. Twenty of the 113 evaluations (17.70%) were completed 11-20 days beyond the timeline. Thirteen of the 113 evaluations (11.51%) were completed 21-30 days beyond the timeline, and thirty-three of the 113 evaluations (29.20%) were completed more than 30 days beyond the timeline. Reported reasons for exceeding the 60 school-day timeline included procedures/practices not timely (84%), lack of personnel resources (7%), summer issues (7%) and hearing/vision/medical issues (2%).

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used:**

The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted

**What is the State’s timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).**

The State established timeline in Illinois is 60 school days. The State-established timeframe provides for two exceptions through State regulation or policy. The first exception is when a student’s eligibility determination is delayed due to the parent’s unavailability and/or inability to attend the initial eligibility determination meeting when all eligibility assessments were completed within the 60 school-day timeline. Districts are required to maintain documentation at the local level regarding the eligibility assessment completion dates and the attempts made to schedule the eligibility determination meeting with the parent. The second exception is when the timeline is properly extended, in accordance with 34 CFR 300.309(c), by mutual written agreement of the child’s parents and a group of qualified professionals in the determination of a specific learning disability (SLD).

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

ISBE collects the data through a State database (the IEP Student Tracking and Reporting System, or I-Star) that includes data for the entire reporting year. This system gathers the parental consent date and the eligibility determination date and calculates the actual number of school days taken to complete the eligibility determination. The reason code for the timeline delay is recorded, and acceptable timeline exceptions are noted in the system. ISBE then determines noncompliance, examines the data for patterns of noncompliance within LEAs, and addresses such patterns through its system of general supervision.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

After analyzing data for this indicator, there was insufficient evidence to show that COVID-19 was a significantly contributing factor in the decrease in the number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received. ISBE will continue to examine the Indicator 11 data to determine COVID-19 impact between the FFY19 and FFY20 SPP/APR submissions.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 55 | 55 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

ISBE verified that LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY18 were correctly implementing 34 CFR 300.301(c)(1) through several specific actions. ISBE required LEAs to access the state SPP Indicator 11 Resource Guide and an ISBE Indicator 11 technical assistance webinar to assist with reviewing and revising their policies, procedures, and/or practices related to the identified noncompliance. These resources are located on the ISBE website at: https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPP-APR-Indicator-11.aspx. LEAs were then required to submit a corrective action report to ISBE for approval that detailed their review process and any revisions made to policies, procedures, and/or practices to ensure that noncompliance was corrected to 100%, and to document that they were correctly implementing 34 CFR 300.301(c)(1). Once the corrective action report was approved, ISBE examined new and updated data from the statewide database as a means of verifying correction.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

ISBE verified that 100% of the initial evaluations identified as not meeting the 60 school-day timeline were completed, although late, through the statewide database. Consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, ISBE verified correction of each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, through a review of updated data via the statewide database.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 11 - OSEP Response

## 11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.  
  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

# Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priorit**y: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.

b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.

c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.

e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday through a State’s policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

**Instructions**

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 12 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 83.40% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 98.30% | 99.67% | 97.17% | 96.90% | 99.03% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination. | 7,969 |
| b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday. | 1,111 |
| c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. | 6,353 |
| d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied. | 309 |
| e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays. | 50 |
| f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday through a State’s policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option. | 0 |

| **Measure** | **Numerator (c)** | **Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. | 6,353 | 6,499 | 99.03% | 100% | 97.75% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

ISBE attributes part of the slippage to updates in the agency statewide data system for SPP 12. In 2018-2019, the system was initially developed and implemented. As data was collected, ISBE staff were able to identify areas where the system could be more fully developed to obtain the most accurate data. During 2019-2020 ISBE was able to refine the data collection process by further clarifying delay code descriptions and removing unnecessary codes. These corrections have likely contributed to more accurate reporting, resulting in a slip in the data. To prepare the LEAs for the updates, ISBE updated the Q&A document, which is available on the ISBE website at: https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPP-APR-Indicator-12.aspx. ISBE provided ongoing technical assistance and support on the data collection system to LEAs throughout the school year via phone calls and emails. In addition, ISBE provided in-person training to staff at the state’s largest school district at the onset of system implementation and continues to work with district staff to ensure timely and accurate data collection. Ongoing technical assistance and support have been provided to special education and data staff at this LEA via emails, phone calls, and meetings. ISBE continues to work with the state’s largest district to address issues that arise related to inputting data into the new data collection and reporting system. ISBE will continue to monitor and refine the system as necessary to continuously improve statewide data collection and reporting for SPP Indicator 12.  
  
In addition to updates to the data collection system impacting slippage for SPP Indicator 12, ISBE experienced effects due to the global pandemic that most likely contributed to the slippage. SPP 12 statewide data does not show evidence of negative consequences regarding completeness, validity, or reliability. In addition, COVID-19 did not appear to impact ISBE’s ability to collect data. ISBE is reporting 7,969 children who were served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination in FFY19 as compared to 7,195 in FFY18. Rather, COVID-19 impacted the timeliness of IEP development and implementation by children’s’ third birthdays. Upon examination of the 146 delays beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, data showed that 82/146 (56%) of the delays were within the timeframe of school closures due to the pandemic.

**Number of children who served in part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f**

146

**Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.**

There were 146 students who were included in (a) but not included in b, c, d, or e above. The number of days beyond the timeline ranged from 1-123. Seventy-nine (79) students were 1-30 days beyond the timeline, eighteen (18) students were 31-60 days beyond the timeline, twenty (20) students were 61-90 days beyond the timeline, and twenty-nine (29) students were 90+ days beyond the timeline. In terms of reasons for the delays, 30% were attributed to the CFC not notifying the school district at least 90 days prior to the child’s third birthday, and 70% were attributed to the school districts not completing the evaluation process and developing the IEP by the child’s third birthday. In addition, 56% of these delays were within the time frame of school closures due to the pandemic.

**Attach PDF table (optional)**

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

Data collection for Indicator 12 is integrated into the statewide ISBE Student Information System (SIS). Therefore, the source of the data provided is a State database that includes data for the entire reporting year. Indicator 12 specific data elements include: whether the child was served in Early Intervention (EI); whether there was a referral from Child and Family Connections (CFCs); EI number; eligibility determination date; reason for delay in transition; IEP completion date; and date services began.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The impact of COVID-19 on Indicator 12 is discussed under the slippage section.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 13 | 13 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

ISBE verified that all 13 LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY18 were correctly implementing 34 CFR 300.124(b) through several specific actions. ISBE required LEA staff to review and revise policies, procedures, and/or practices as appropriate to ensure that noncompliance was corrected to 100%. LEAs accessed Indicator 12 resources and tools on the ISBE website to assist in the correction and revision process. These resources and tools are located at: https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPP-APR-Indicator-12.aspx. ISBE then examined new and updated data from the statewide database as a means of verifying correction.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

ISBE verified that all 13 LEAs had developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum #09-02. ISBE verified correction of each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, through a review of updated data via the statewide data system.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 12 - OSEP Response

## 12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.  
  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

# Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator**: Secondary transition: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

**Instructions**

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 13 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2009 | 79.20% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 93.07% | 97.50% | 98.63% | 99.17% | 99.57% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition** | **Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 68,700 | 68,908 | 99.57% | 100% | 99.70% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

ISBE collects the data through a State database (the IEP Student Tracking and Reporting System, or I-Star) that includes data for the entire reporting year. Due to requirements in Illinois state rules and regulations, the data submitted to ISBE by school districts is for students 14 ½ years old and older; however, per the Indicator 13 measurement requirements, only students ages 16 and older are included in the calculation. The Students with Disabilities Data Collection and Approval Instructions for use with I-Star provide procedures for file transmission to ISBE.

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Do the State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16? | YES |
| If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age? | NO |

**If no, please explain**

The OSEP Part B SPP and APR Indicator Measurement Table for FFY19 indicates that a State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.  
  
ISBE continued to report students aged 16 and above in the final year of this SPP/APR cycle without including its youth aged 14 ½ to 16. The consistent reporting of the percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above for this indicator allows ISBE and its stakeholders to continue monitoring trend data from the original baseline data in order to inform decision making around Indicator 13 improvement efforts. ISBE and its stakeholders chose to retain the original baseline for SPP Indicator 13 for this reason. ISBE and its stakeholders will consider including youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator under the new SPP/APR cycle, which spans FFY20-25.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

There is no significant evidence that COVID-19 had a negative impact on the data for Indicator 13.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 19 | 19 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

ISBE verified that all LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY18 were correctly implementing 34 CFR 300.320(b) and 300.321(b) based on a review of new and updated data, such as IEPs and other pertinent secondary transition documentation. ISBE staff used the Illinois State Performance Plan Indicator 13 Scoring Rubric as a tool to assist with verification of correction. The Rubric can be found on the ISBE website at: https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPP-APR-Indicator-13.aspx.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

ISBE verified correction of each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, through a review of updated data including previously noncompliant individual student IEPs and other pertinent secondary transition documentation for each student. ISBE staff used the Illinois State Performance Plan Indicator 13 Scoring Rubric as an evaluation tool to assist with the review of amended individual student IEPs, secondary transition documentation for each student, and verification of correction. The ISBE Scoring Rubric addresses eight required areas related to secondary transition and Indicator 13 requirements. ISBE adapted the Rubric from the NSTTAC Indicator 13 checklist prepared by the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC). The ISBE Scoring Rubric is available on the ISBE website for districts to use in collecting data to meet the regulatory requirements of Indicator 13. The Rubric can be found on the ISBE website at: https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPP-APR-Indicator-13.aspx. ISBE reviewed and analyzed updated data and verified that individual cases of previously noncompliant files had been corrected.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 13 - OSEP Response

## 13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.  
  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

# Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Results indicator:** Post-school outcomes: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.

Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling****of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school****is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2020 on students who left school during 2018-2019, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2018-2019 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

**I. *Definitions***

*Enrolled in higher education* as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

*Competitive employment* as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment” in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, due February 2021:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

*Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training* as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

*Some other employment* as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

**II. *Data Reporting***

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;

2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);

3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);

4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

**III. *Reporting on the Measures/Indicators***

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

## 14 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A | 2009 | Target >= | 35.00% | 35.00% | 35.00% | 35.00% | 35.00% |
| A | 29.47% | Data | 39.74% | 27.54% | 32.07% | 29.59% | 29.58% |
| B | 2009 | Target >= | 56.90% | 56.90% | 57.00% | 57.00% | 57.00% |
| B | 56.53% | Data | 69.60% | 63.19% | 64.22% | 63.46% | 60.88% |
| C | 2009 | Target >= | 72.00% | 72.50% | 73.00% | 74.00% | 75.00% |
| C | 69.21% | Data | 79.69% | 73.33% | 76.09% | 75.74% | 71.79% |

**FFY 2019 Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A >= | 35.10% |
| Target B >= | 57.00% |
| Target C >= | 75.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

ISBE has ongoing communication regarding the SPP/APR with its primary stakeholder group, the Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC) through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. The role of ISAC is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. ISAC functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Services Department. ISAC members represent individuals with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, students with disabilities, teachers of students with disabilities, private providers, public charter schools, special education directors, regional superintendents, district superintendents, higher education personnel, vocational/community/business organization providers of transition services to students with disabilities, the Illinois Department of Human Services, the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, the Illinois Department of Corrections/Department of Juvenile Justice, and the general public.   
  
ISBE staff have discussions with ISAC multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, and improvement activities with ISAC as necessary. ISAC assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising targets for the SPP results indicators.  
  
In addition to ISAC, ISBE collaborates with many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. Such stakeholder groups have included Child and Family Connections (CFCs), the Community Residential Services Authority (CRSA), the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group, the Harrisburg Project, the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE), the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA), the Illinois Children's Mental Health Partnership (ICMHP), the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS), the Illinois Department of Human Services (DHS), the Illinois Department of Mental Health (DMH), the Illinois Multi-Tiered Systems of Support Advisory Group, Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs), Regional Offices of Education (ROEs), and Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET). ISBE shares SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences, regional professional development opportunities, and task force meetings. Comments and suggestions from the stakeholder groups are incorporated into the SPP/APR.

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school | 1,269 |
| 1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school | 375 |
| 2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school | 474 |
| 3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed) | 73 |
| 4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed). | 63 |

| **Measure** | **Number of respondent youth** | **Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Enrolled in higher education (1) | 375 | 1,269 | 29.58% | 35.10% | 29.55% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2) | 849 | 1,269 | 60.88% | 57.00% | 66.90% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4) | 985 | 1,269 | 71.79% | 75.00% | 77.62% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Please select the reporting option your State is using:**

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | YES |
| If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? | NO |

**Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.**

ISBE continued to use the data collection tool developed by the National Post-School Outcomes Center (NPSO) to gather post-school outcomes information on school leavers with IEPs. To ensure a representative sample of the population statewide and from each LEA annually, ISBE uses a sampling calculator to determine the number of students to survey in each LEA. All LEAs using sampling are required to survey a minimum of 35 school leavers. A stratified random sampling procedure is used to identify individuals for each of these LEAs. The SEA generates a report to indicate which school leavers need to be surveyed to ensure that the sample is representative of each LEA’s population of school leavers based on exit code, disability, and race/ethnicity. LEAs with 35 or fewer school leavers with IEPs are required to survey all leavers. All LEAs are included in the data collection efforts at least once during the span of this SPP cycle. LEAs must document at least 3 attempts to contact youth regarding the survey, and complete survey data must be submitted to pass edit checks. Edit checks are completed at several levels to ensure that survey data are valid and reliable. The State Performance Plan Data Collection (SPPDC) web application is utilized for data reporting. After this data is collected, the response rate for this survey is compared to the entire population of school leavers across the state of Illinois annually. After the data file is received at ISBE, multiple error checks are run to ensure that survey data are valid and reliable.

| **Survey Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was a survey used? | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised survey? | NO |

**Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.**

The demographic representation of FFY 2019 survey respondents was examined by gender, race/ethnicity, exit reason, and disability category. Given that the overall survey sample was representative of the state’s youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, an examination of the response rate by subgroup sheds light on whether the survey responses were also representative of this state population.  
  
The results of the analysis indicated that student gender status and exit reason were not significant predictors of survey completion. Survey result analyses indicated a few statistically significant differences between youth who did and did not respond to the survey in terms of race/ethnicity and primary disability. Specifically, school leavers identifying as Hispanic were less likely to complete the survey, as were youth identified with Specific Learning Disabilities. Youth identifying as Hispanic who were no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school made up 31.82% of the survey group and 20.33% of the survey responses (an -11.49% difference). Youth identified with Specific Learning Disabilities made up 54.17% of the survey group and 45% of the responses (a -9.17% difference). In contrast, school leavers identifying as White were more likely to complete the survey, as were youth identified with a primary disability of Other Health Impairments. Youth identifying as White who were no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school made up 43.25% of the survey group and 57.13% of the survey responses (a +13.88% difference). Youth identified with Other Health Impairments made up 15.77% of the survey group and 20.09% of the survey responses (a +4.33% difference).

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school? | NO |

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

In an effort to ensure that future response data are representative, ISBE will add resources for parents, students, and districts to its SPP Indicator 14 webpage at: https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPP-APR-Indicator-14.aspx and include the weblink in multiple documents to increase awareness of its existence. For example, a link to the SPP 14 webpage is provided as a resource in the web application that local school districts are required to use to access the SPP Indicator 14 survey. The notification letter LEAs received regarding the SPP 14 survey includes a link to the Indicator 14 webpage as well. In terms of resources available on the webpage, ISBE added two documents from the National Post-School Outcomes Center to the SPP 14 webpage to help improve the representativeness of survey respondents (Collecting Post-School Outcome Data: Strategies for Increasing Response Rates and Contacting Hard-to-Find Youth: Strategies for the Post-School Survey). ISBE will also load these National Post-School Outcomes Center resources directly into the SPP 14 district web application for the 2021 survey. LEAs are strongly encouraged to use the strategies listed in these documents to improve response rate and representativeness. In addition, ISBE will work with the school districts in the 2021 survey cycle to complete follow up activities with students or families who are less likely to complete the survey. For example, districts will be strongly encouraged to utilize electronic survey invitations, reminder emails, reminder text messages, recorded phone messages, live phone calls, and support from local parent groups to reach underrepresented students and families for survey completion. Districts will be strongly encouraged to send a sample letter to each selected student/family prior to administering the survey to notify them of the survey and its purpose. Districts will also be instructed to ensure students/families have access to language assistance, including Spanish-language interpreters if needed.   
  
The ISBE Special Education Department staff will also be scheduling meetings with the Information Technology Department staff at the agency to discuss the feasibility and logistics of including an electronic version of the survey as an option for school leavers as a means to increase the representativeness of survey respondents. Agency staff will also explore the possibility of compiling response data at regular intervals during the survey timeframe to determine which districts and students/families will be targeted for follow up communications regarding survey completion. District response rate percentages would be shared with districts at specific intervals during the survey window so they could encourage parent participation if necessary.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

There is no significant evidence that COVID-19 had a negative impact on the data for Indicator 14, as ISBE noted similar patterns for survey responses in FFY18.

## 14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2019 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

The State reported on the representativeness of the data in the SPP 14 section entitled, “Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.” The results of the analysis indicated that student gender status and exit reason were not significant predictors of survey completion. Survey result analyses also indicated that school leavers identifying as Hispanic were less likely to complete the survey, as were youth identified with Specific Learning Disabilities. In contrast, school leavers identifying as White were more likely to complete the survey, as were youth identified with a primary disability of Other Health Impairments.  
  
The State reported on the actions it is taking to address representativeness in the SPP 14 section entitled, “Describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.” In order to ensure that future response data are more representative, ISBE added NTACT resource documents to the SPP 14 webpage and provided the link to the SPP 14 webpage in the SPP 14 survey application and the LEA survey notification letter. ISBE will load these resources directly into the SPP 14 application for the 2020-2021 survey. ISBE will also be scheduling meetings with the Information Technology Department at the agency to discuss the feasibility and logistics of including an electronic version of the survey as an option for school leavers as a means to increase the representativeness of survey respondents.

## 14 - OSEP Response

## 14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2020 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

# Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Results Indicator:** Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/04/2020 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 18 |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/04/2020 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 3 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

ISBE has ongoing communication regarding the SPP/APR with its primary stakeholder group, the Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC) through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. The role of ISAC is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. ISAC functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Services Department. ISAC members represent individuals with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, students with disabilities, teachers of students with disabilities, private providers, public charter schools, special education directors, regional superintendents, district superintendents, higher education personnel, vocational/community/business organization providers of transition services to students with disabilities, the Illinois Department of Human Services, the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, the Illinois Department of Corrections/Department of Juvenile Justice, and the general public.   
  
ISBE staff have discussions with ISAC multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, and improvement activities with ISAC as necessary. ISAC assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising targets for the SPP results indicators.  
  
In addition to ISAC, ISBE collaborates with many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. Such stakeholder groups have included Child and Family Connections (CFCs), the Community Residential Services Authority (CRSA), the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group, the Harrisburg Project, the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE), the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA), the Illinois Children's Mental Health Partnership (ICMHP), the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS), the Illinois Department of Human Services (DHS), the Illinois Department of Mental Health (DMH), the Illinois Multi-Tiered Systems of Support Advisory Group, Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs), Regional Offices of Education (ROEs), and Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET). ISBE shares SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences, regional professional development opportunities, and task force meetings. Comments and suggestions from the stakeholder groups are incorporated into the SPP/APR.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2012 | 26.67% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= | 25.00% - 35.00% | 25.00% - 35.00% | 25.00% - 35.00% | 25.00% - 35.00% | 25.00% - 35.00% |
| Data | 37.84% | 36.36% | 42.50% | 32.43% | 37.04% |

**Targets**

| **FFY** | **2019 (low)** | **2019 (high)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 25.10% | 35.10% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target (low)** | **FFY 2019 Target (high)** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 18 | 37.04% | 25.10% | 35.10% | 16.67% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

ISBE attributes part of the slippage for SPP 15 to higher rates of success in mediation. In addition to the lower rates of agreement achieved in resolution meetings, ISBE noted a reduction in the total number of actual resolution meetings that occurred, as well as a significant reduction in the total number of due process complaints that were filed during FFY19 (approximately 25% fewer due process complaints were filed in FFY19 as compared to FFY18). Of the 213 due process complaints that were filed for the year, parties opted to use mediation as a substitute for the resolution meeting in 56.34% of the cases (120 out of 213 cases). In those cases where the parties opted to mediate, the parties reached agreement on the issues subject to due process in 64.17% of the mediated matters (77 of 120 cases). ISBE believes that the higher rates of success in mediation are due to the presence of a neutral third party/mediator who was able to maintain party focus on the issues and to identify areas of agreement that might not have been apparent to the parties without the support of a neutral third party in the meeting.  
  
In addition to mediation rates of success impacting slippage for SPP 15, ISBE experienced effects due to the global pandemic that most likely contributed to the slippage. COVID specifically impacted ISBE’s ability to collect data as parties in a number of cases failed to report on the results of resolution meetings. This impacted data completeness, validity, and reliability. ISBE believes that much of this is attributable to effects of the pandemic and the logistical problems created by prohibitions on face-to-face meetings due to mitigation efforts in connection with public health. To mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection, ISBE sent repeated requests to the parties for information regarding the resolution meeting as well as warnings about possible impact on hearing timelines by the hearing officer. As a further measure to increase reporting of resolution results, ISBE began examining the feasibility of utilizing ISBE’s data-tracking system, the Special Education Monitoring System (SEMS), to provide automated reminders and, if necessary, warnings about the necessity of conducting the Resolution Meeting.  
  
To further mitigate the impact of COVID-19, ISBE published numerous guidance documents throughout the pandemic and posted them to the ISBE COVID-19 webpage, including an initial Special Education Frequently Asked Questions document (https://www.isbe.net/Documents/SPED-FAQ-05-08-20.pdf) and a follow up resource entitled, “Frequently Asked Questions for Parents Regarding School Year 2020-21” (https://www.isbe.net/Documents/Special-Education-FAQ-Parents-81420.pdf). These resources, along with others, can be found at https://www.isbe.net/Pages/covid19.aspx. ISBE staff also manned a COVID-19 team that responded to questions from school districts and families. Additional resources on the ISBE website encourage parties to utilize dispute resolution alternatives to due process hearings, such as resolution meetings or mediations, in order to reach mutually acceptable agreements to resolve disputes that may arise between parents and local school districts. Please see Chapter 11 of the most current edition of the Illinois Educational Rights Guide (https://www.isbe.net/Documents/Parent-Guide-Special-Ed-Aug20.pdf). In addition, ISBE continues to encourage parties to keep due process within the larger context of a continuum of resolution options short of the formal process of pursuing a due process hearing (please see: https://www.isbe.net/Pages/Special-Education-Effective-Dispute-Resolution.aspx).  
  
It should be noted, however, that improvements to party participation in the resolution session do not guarantee a settlement agreement. Because of the nature of the resolution meeting, requiring the parties to meet without the “outside influence” of neutral parties (such as the hearing officer or a mediator), ISBE has limited, if any, control over the outcome of the meetings. With this in mind, ISBE continues to provide the parties with information on the resolution process in an initial informational packet that is provided at the outset of each due process case that is opened by ISBE. In addition, local school districts know that they are responsible for convening the resolution meeting with the parent, unless the parties mutually agree to opt for mediation in lieu of the resolution meeting or to waive the resolution meeting in its entirety. ISBE will continue to impress upon the hearing officers the necessity of monitoring the parties’ participation in the resolution process and ensuring that records of the meetings and the outcomes are consistently recorded.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The impact of COVID-19 on Indicator 15 is discussed under the slippage section.

## 15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 15 - OSEP Response

The State reported that the COVID-19 pandemic impacted the data for this indicator. Specifically, the State reported, that "ISBE’s ability to collect data as parties in a number of cases failed to report on the results of resolution meetings. This impacted data completeness, validity, and reliability."

## 15 - Required Actions

# Indicator 16: Mediation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Results indicator:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B))

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1) times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 16 - Indicator Data

**Select yes to use target ranges**

Target Range not used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 2.1 Mediations held | 225 |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 77 |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 73 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

ISBE has ongoing communication regarding the SPP/APR with its primary stakeholder group, the Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC) through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. The role of ISAC is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. ISAC functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Services Department. ISAC members represent individuals with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, students with disabilities, teachers of students with disabilities, private providers, public charter schools, special education directors, regional superintendents, district superintendents, higher education personnel, vocational/community/business organization providers of transition services to students with disabilities, the Illinois Department of Human Services, the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, the Illinois Department of Corrections/Department of Juvenile Justice, and the general public.   
  
ISBE staff have discussions with ISAC multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, and improvement activities with ISAC as necessary. ISAC assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising targets for the SPP results indicators.  
  
In addition to ISAC, ISBE collaborates with many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. Such stakeholder groups have included Child and Family Connections (CFCs), the Community Residential Services Authority (CRSA), the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group, the Harrisburg Project, the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE), the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA), the Illinois Children's Mental Health Partnership (ICMHP), the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS), the Illinois Department of Human Services (DHS), the Illinois Department of Mental Health (DMH), the Illinois Multi-Tiered Systems of Support Advisory Group, Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs), Regional Offices of Education (ROEs), and Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET). ISBE shares SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences, regional professional development opportunities, and task force meetings. Comments and suggestions from the stakeholder groups are incorporated into the SPP/APR.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2012 | 66.67% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= |  |  |  | 66.00% | 67.00% |
| Data | 74.74% | 64.52% | 72.73% | 59.11% | 62.37% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 67.00% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints** | **2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints** | **2.1 Number of mediations held** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 77 | 73 | 225 | 62.37% | 67.00% | 66.67% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

There is no significant evidence that COVID-19 had a negative impact on the data for Indicator 16.

## 16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 16 - OSEP Response

## 16 - Required Actions

# Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan



# Certification

**Instructions**

**Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.**

**Certify**

**I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.**

**Select the certifier’s role:**

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

**Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.**

**Name:**

Barbara Moore

**Title:**

State Director of Special Education

**Email:**

bmoore@isbe.net

**Phone:**

217-622-0804

**Submitted on:**

04/16/21 4:58:21 PM

# Ed Attachments

  

1. Data suppressed due to privacy protection [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Percentage blurred due to privacy protection [↑](#footnote-ref-3)