

IL Part B

FFY2014 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

In order to ensure consistent data across indicators, provide the number of districts in this field and the data will be loaded into the applicable indicator data tables.

This data will be prepopulated in indicators B3A, B4A, B4B, B9, and B10.

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.

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.

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.

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 Funding and Child Tracking System (FACTS) state database and the Special Education Data System (SEDS). Methods used to monitor LEAs include examining data from statewide databases; conducting onsite 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: focused monitoring (with an emphasis on SPP Indicator 5), state complaints, due process hearings and SPP Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13. Multi-tiered technical assistance is provided to LEAs to support correction of noncompliance and program improvement.

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 (currently preparing to enter the pilot phase), mediation, resolutions sessions and due process hearings. Detailed information regarding these options can be found on the ISBE website at: www.isbe.net/spec-ed.

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.

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.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

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. 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 are collected.

ISBE's technical assistance system is coordinated through the Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support Network (IL MTSS-Network). The IL MTSS-Network is a United States Department of Education State Personnel Development Grant and IDEA Part B Discretionary-funded initiative, providing integrated technical assistance to LEAs for the purpose of improving outcomes for all students in grades K-12. The IL MTSS-Network, which is a collaborative effort combining the previous Illinois Statewide Technical Assistance Collaborative (ISTAC) and the Illinois Response to Intervention Network (Rti-Network), is part of the Statewide System of Support (SSoS). The IL MTSS-Network partners with the Illinois Center for School Improvement

(CSI), Illinois Institutes of Higher Education (IHE), Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs), and other ISBE initiatives.

The IL MTSS-Network provides differentiated technical assistance/coaching to LEAs based upon 1) ISBE classification and 2) State Performance Plan (SPP) findings of noncompliance. Such technical assistance takes place after professional development has been accessed and utilizes a graduated continuum.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

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's professional development system is coordinated through the IL MTSS-Network and is implemented statewide. The professional development system centers on building leadership and educator capacity to improve practice and make a positive impact on student growth and outcomes. Three types of professional development/learning are provided: training, coaching, and technical assistance. These services focus on improving student performance in grades K-12 through the implementation of a multi-tiered system of instruction, intervention, and assessment, including Response to Intervention (RtI), with an emphasis on administrative leadership; scientific, research-based reading, math, and social emotional and behavioral curricula and instruction at grades K-12; data-informed decision making; universal screening and progress monitoring; and parent engagement and involvement. The majority of professional development/professional learning is completed through face-to-face or online offerings. Content is systemic and holistic in nature, with a core of evidence-based/informed practices. Professional development opportunities/trainings are open to any interested parties and offered regionally across the state to ensure equal access by all LEAs. As noted above, the technical assistance and coaching provided to support the professional development/learning content is first made available to those LEAs identified by ISBE as needing additional supports and then made available to other entities based on capacity of the IL MTSS-Network.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Stakeholder Involvement: apply this to all Part B results indicators

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 Division. 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, the Illinois Coordinating Council and the general public. ISAC assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising SPP targets for many of the indicators.

In addition to ISAC, ISBE collaborates with many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. Such stakeholder groups include 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 Children's Mental Health Partnership (ICMHP), the Illinois Department of Children and Family

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Services (DCFS), the Illinois Department of Human Services (DHS), the Illinois Department of Mental Health (DMH), the Illinois Interagency Coordinating Council (IICC), the Illinois Statewide Technical Assistance Collaborative (ISTAC), Parent and Training Information Centers (PTIs), Regional Offices of Education and Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET). ISBE also shares information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences, regional professional development opportunities and task force meetings. Comments and suggestions from our stakeholder groups are incorporated into the State Performance Plan.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2013 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 2013 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 2013 APR in 2015, is available.

The Illinois SPP/APR is available on the ISBE website at <http://www.isbe.net/spec-ed>. LEA special education profiles are also available on the website. These profiles document the performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 1: Graduation

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2008

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥					75.00%	78.00%	80.00%	80.00%	82.00%	84.00%
Data					81.20%	78.10%	78.20%	66.20%	68.90%	70.10%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	84.00%	84.00%	84.00%	84.00%	84.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	12/2/2015	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	14,884	
SY 2013-14 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	12/2/2015	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	20,740	null
SY 2013-14 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	12/2/2015	2012-13 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	71.76%	Calculate <input type="checkbox"/>

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data	FFY 2014 Target	FFY 2014 Data
14,884	20,740	70.10%	84.00%	71.76%

Graduation Conditions Field

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Provide the four-year graduation cohort rate. The four-year graduation rate follows a cohort, or 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. An extended-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for an additional year or years. The cohort is "adjusted" by adding any students transferring into the cohort and by subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during the years covered by the rate.

Under 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(iv), a "regular high school diploma" means the standard high school diploma awarded to students in a State that is fully aligned with the State's academic content standards and does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance, or any alternative award. The term "regular high school diploma" also includes a "higher diploma" that is awarded to students who complete requirements above and beyond what is required for a regular diploma.

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 one year chosen from (A) music, (B) art, (C) foreign language, which shall be deemed to include American Sign Language or (D) vocational education. This does not apply to students with disabilities whose course of study is determined by an IEP. Decisions regarding the issuance of a diploma for students with disabilities whose course of study is determined by an IEP are made at the LEA level. Course requirements are the same for students with disabilities as they are for students without disabilities with the exception of those determined by the IEP team to be inappropriate. 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 graduation rate for all youth and 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 2013-2014 school year

Number of first-time 9th graders in Fall 2010 (starting cohort) plus students who transfer in, minus students who transfer out, emigrate or die during school years 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13 and 2013-14

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 for all students under Title I of the ESEA.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 2: Drop Out

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2008

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤					5.50%	5.50%	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%
Data					5.00%	5.10%	4.30%	4.50%	3.90%	4.10%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	4.90%	4.80%	4.70%	4.60%	4.50%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of high school youth with IEPs	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
3,316	83,455	4.10%	4.90%	3.97%

Use a different calculation methodology

Change numerator description in data table

Change denominator description in data table

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

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. ISBE chose to use Option 2 for this Indicator. Therefore, the calculation used to determine the dropout rate for youth with IEPs was 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 2013-2014).

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

No longer required due to passage of ESSA.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

This indicator is not applicable.

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		98.00%	99.50%	97.90%	98.00%	98.40%	98.20%	98.40%	98.40%	97.48%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		98.00%	99.50%	97.90%	98.00%	98.50%	98.20%	98.30%	98.40%	97.69%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	147,344	137,467	97.48%	95.00%	93.30%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

The way Illinois assesses its students has changed as ISBE has updated state learning standards to ensure college and career readiness for all children. As a part of this process, ISBE determined there was a need for assessments that lined up with the rigor and scope of the higher expectations of the updated Illinois Learning Standards. ISBE also determined that there was a need for assessments that better reflected classroom learning and students’ real-life experiences outside of the classroom. Therefore, in the spring of 2015, Illinois schools completed the first administration of the new Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) assessment in English language arts and math. The exam is aligned to the

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Illinois Learning Standards and focuses on students' mastery of key concepts as well as their critical thinking and writing skills. The PARCC assessment replaced previous assessments, the Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) and the Prairie State Achievement Examination (PSAE). Implementation of the PARCC exam was controversial across the country as well as in Illinois. Complaints about PARCC included the amount of emphasis placed on standardized tests, the number of hours spent on standardized testing, the readiness level for implementation of the exam itself, and the lack of technical capacity at the local level needed to administer the computer-based exam. Even though ISBE made it clear to LEAs that the PARCC was state-mandated and that parents had no right to opt out, parent activists and others advocated for opting out of the test. State test participation rate data show that 3.1% of students were absent during the testing window and 1.1% of students refused to participate in the test during the testing window. Such factors resulted in decreases in the percentages of students who participated in both the reading and math statewide assessments.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	144,671	135,120	97.69%	95.00%	93.40%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

The way Illinois assesses its students has changed as ISBE has updated state learning standards to ensure college and career readiness for all children. As a part of this process, ISBE determined there was a need for assessments that lined up with the rigor and scope of the higher expectations of the updated Illinois Learning Standards. ISBE also determined that there was a need for assessments that better reflected classroom learning and students' real-life experiences outside of the classroom. Therefore, in the spring of 2015, Illinois schools completed the first administration of the new Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) assessment in English language arts and math. The exam is aligned to the Illinois Learning Standards and focuses on students' mastery of key concepts as well as their critical thinking and writing skills. The PARCC assessment replaced previous assessments, the Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) and the Prairie State Achievement Examination (PSAE). Implementation of the PARCC exam was controversial across the country as well as in Illinois. Complaints about PARCC included the amount of emphasis placed on standardized tests, the number of hours spent on standardized testing, the readiness level for implementation of the exam itself, and the lack of technical capacity at the local level needed to administer the computer-based exam. Even though ISBE made it clear to LEAs that the PARCC was state-mandated and that parents had no right to opt out, parent activists and others advocated for opting out of the test. State test participation rate data show that 3.1% of students were absent during the testing window and 1.1% of students refused to participate in the test during the testing window. Such factors resulted in decreases in the percentages of students who participated in both the reading and math statewide assessments.

Public Reporting Information

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

The Illinois State Report Card for reporting assessment data for students with and without disabilities is available at the following link: <http://www.illinoisreportcard.com/State.aspx?source=Trends&source2=Parcc&Stateid=IL>

The Illinois Annual Performance Report, Part B provides assessment data for students with disabilities at the following link: <http://www.isbe.net/spec-ed/default.htm>

The Assessment Participation Report required by OSEP can be found at the following link: <http://www.isbe.net/spec-ed/html/topics.htm>

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			34.00%	36.00%	38.00%	40.00%	42.00%	42.00%	42.00%	42.00%
			Data		30.10%	36.80%	39.80%	41.59%	42.00%	41.20%	40.20%	23.90%	20.75%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			36.00%	37.00%	38.00%	39.00%	40.00%	40.00%	40.00%	40.00%
			Data		34.40%	48.40%	50.30%	52.28%	53.80%	53.20%	52.30%	26.70%	24.53%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	42.00%	42.00%	42.00%	42.00%	42.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	40.00%	40.00%	40.00%	40.00%	40.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	137,438	13,909	20.75%	42.00%	10.12%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

The way Illinois assesses its students has changed as ISBE has updated state learning standards to ensure college and career readiness for all children. As a part of this process, ISBE determined there was a need for assessments that lined up with the rigor and scope of the higher expectations of the updated Illinois Learning Standards. ISBE also determined that there was a

need for assessments that better reflected classroom learning and students' real-life experiences outside of the classroom. Therefore, in the spring of 2015, Illinois schools completed the first administration of the new Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) assessment in English language arts and math. The exam is aligned to the Illinois Learning Standards and focuses on students' mastery of key concepts as well as their critical thinking and writing skills. The PARCC assessment replaced previous assessments, the Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) and the Prairie State Achievement Examination (PSAE). The new PARCC tests used different types of questions to measure students' knowledge and skills. They required students to demonstrate and explain their understanding as opposed to merely reciting facts or selecting the correct answer. They measured deeper knowledge and skills deemed particularly important for students' futures, including problem-solving, writing, and critical thinking. Because the standards are more rigorous, ISBE expected the percent of students who demonstrated proficiency to initially be lower than the percentage of students who were proficient on the previous test(s). A dip should not necessarily be interpreted as a decline in student learning or in educator performance. ISBE expects the short-term decline to reverse as teachers and students become more familiar with the higher standards and better equipped to meet the challenges they present.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	135,121	11,166	24.53%	40.00%	8.26%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

The way Illinois assesses its students has changed as ISBE has updated state learning standards to ensure college and career readiness for all children. As a part of this process, ISBE determined there was a need for assessments that lined up with the rigor and scope of the higher expectations of the updated Illinois Learning Standards. ISBE also determined that there was a need for assessments that better reflected classroom learning and students' real-life experiences outside of the classroom. Therefore, in the spring of 2015, Illinois schools completed the first administration of the new Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) assessment in English language arts and math. The exam is aligned to the Illinois Learning Standards and focuses on students' mastery of key concepts as well as their critical thinking and writing skills. The PARCC assessment replaced previous assessments, the Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) and the Prairie State Achievement Examination (PSAE). The new PARCC tests used different types of questions to measure students' knowledge and skills. They required students to demonstrate and explain their understanding as opposed to merely reciting facts or selecting the correct answer. They measured deeper knowledge and skills deemed particularly important for students' futures, including problem-solving, writing, and critical thinking. Because the standards are more rigorous, ISBE expected the percent of students who demonstrated proficiency to initially be lower than the percentage of students who were proficient on the previous test(s). A dip should not necessarily be interpreted as a decline in student learning or in educator performance. ISBE expects the short-term decline to reverse as teachers and students become more familiar with the higher standards and better equipped to meet the challenges they present.

Public Reporting Information

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

The Illinois State Report Card for reporting assessment data for students with and without disabilities is available at the following link: <http://www.illinoisreportcard.com/State.aspx?source=Trends&source2=Parcc&Stateid=IL>

The Illinois Annual Performance Report, Part B provides assessment data for students with disabilities at the following link: <http://www.isbe.net/spec-ed/default.htm>

The Assessment Participation Report required by OSEP can be found at the following link: <http://www.isbe.net/spec-ed/html/topics.htm>

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

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; and
- 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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤			5.00%	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%	4.80%
Data		3.87%	4.80%	3.90%	2.10%	2.54%	2.30%	2.30%	2.40%	4.40%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	4.60%	4.40%	4.20%	4.00%	3.80%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
24	859	4.40%	4.60%	2.79%

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
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The Student Information System (SIS) is the mechanism utilized by the ISBE Data Analysis and Progress Reporting Division to

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

collect school-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 as follows:
$$\left(\frac{\text{# of students with IEPs suspended or expelled for more than 10 days}}{\text{# of students with IEPs}} \right) * 100$$
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 + one standard deviation for three consecutive years, **AND**
 - b. the LEA had at least five students suspended or expelled more than 10 days.

Of the 273 LEAs that reported at least one student with an IEP with suspensions or expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year, 215 did not have at least five students suspended or expelled more than 10 days in a school year.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2014 using 2013-2014 data)

Description of review

Each LEA identified as having a possible significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities (4A) and/or students with disabilities in a racial/ethnic group (4B) is 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 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)

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

One LEA received a finding of noncompliance as a result of the review required by regulation. The LEA was required to review and revise policies, procedures, and/or practices related to the discipline of students with disabilities by:

- Developing a corrective action plan with assistance from ISBE;
- Developing improvement strategies and activities related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards;
- Publicly reporting any revisions;
- Considering the implementation or expansion of a proactive systems approach for creating and maintaining safe and effective learning environments in schools; and
- Volunteering to participate in the Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) Network in order to develop a framework for continuous improvement based on prevention and informed by data.

The LEA is working with an ISBE consultant to meaningfully implement the corrective action plan.

 The State did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance 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; and
- 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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data						0.70%	0.30%	0.60%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
16	1	859	0%	0%	0.12%

Explanation of Slippage

Sixteen Local Education Agencies (LEAs) were required to complete self-assessments after they met the suspension/expulsion criteria for significant discrepancy. As a result of the ISBE review of these self-assessments, one LEA out of the sixteen was found to have policies/procedures/practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy. The LEA indicated that discipline data are reviewed on an ongoing basis and that positive behavioral interventions are utilized in the district. However, the information provided in the LEA's self-assessment did not support such statements.

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The Student Information System (SIS) is the mechanism utilized by the ISBE Data Analysis and Progress Reporting Division to collect school-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 as follows:

$$\left(\frac{\text{(# of students with IEPs suspended or expelled for more than 10 days)}}{\text{(# of students with IEPs)}} \right) * 100$$
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 + one standard deviation for three consecutive years, **AND**
 - b. the LEA had at least five students (within a particular race/ethnicity) suspended or expelled more than 10 days

Of the 543 LEAs that reported at least one student with an IEP with suspensions or expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year, 472 did not have at least five students within a particular race/ethnicity suspended or expelled more than 10 days in a school year.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2014 using 2013-2014 data)

Description of review

Each LEA identified as having a possible significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities (4A) and/or students with disabilities in a racial/ethnic group (4B) is 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 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)

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

One LEA received a finding of noncompliance as a result of the review required by regulation. The LEA was required to review and revise policies, procedures, and/or practices related to the discipline of students with disabilities by:

- Developing a corrective action plan with assistance from ISBE;
- Developing improvement strategies and activities related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards;
- Publicly reporting any revisions;
- Considering the implementation or expansion of a proactive systems approach for creating and maintaining safe and effective learning environments in schools; and
- Volunteering to participate in the Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) Network in order to develop a framework for continuous improvement based on prevention and informed by data.

The LEA is working with an ISBE consultant to meaningfully implement the corrective action plan.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2005	Target ≥			48.50%	49.00%	49.30%	49.60%	49.90%	51.00%	52.00%	53.00%
		Data		49.30%	49.20%	49.20%	50.43%	51.27%	52.70%	53.20%	53.50%	53.80%
B	2005	Target ≤			20.10%	19.70%	19.30%	18.90%	18.50%	18.50%	18.50%	18.00%
		Data		18.90%	18.40%	18.40%	18.04%	16.97%	15.20%	14.60%	14.60%	13.36%
C	2005	Target ≤			5.24%	4.91%	4.58%	4.25%	3.90%	3.90%	3.90%	3.90%
		Data		5.90%	6.20%	5.90%	5.71%	5.96%	5.90%	6.10%	6.50%	6.43%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	54.00%	55.00%	56.00%	57.00%	58.00%
Target B ≤	17.50%	17.00%	16.50%	16.00%	15.50%
Target C ≤	3.90%	3.90%	3.90%	3.90%	3.90%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	6/4/2015	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	257,317	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	136,390	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	33,952	null

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
C002; Data group 74)				
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	14,662	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	1,162	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	407	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	136,390	257,317	53.80%	54.00%	53.00%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	33,952	257,317	13.36%	17.50%	13.19%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	16,231	257,317	6.43%	3.90%	6.31%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2011	Target ≥									32.30%	32.40%
		Data									32.20%	32.80%
B	2011	Target ≤									31.10%	31.00%
		Data									31.20%	30.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	32.50%	32.60%	32.70%	32.80%	32.90%
Target B ≤	30.90%	30.80%	30.70%	30.60%	30.50%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	37,599	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	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	13,312	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	9,859	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b2. Number of children attending separate school	1,089	null

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	13	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	13,312	37,599	33.74%	32.50%	35.41%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	10,961	37,599	29.24%	30.90%	29.15%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

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))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A1	2012	Target ≥						89.50%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	85.90%
		Data					89.30%	86.90%	85.70%	86.50%	85.90%	67.25%
A2	2012	Target ≥						61.00%	61.50%	61.50%	61.50%	55.30%
		Data					60.40%	55.60%	57.30%	56.50%	55.30%	39.45%
B1	2012	Target ≥						90.00%	90.50%	90.50%	90.50%	86.70%
		Data					89.40%	86.70%	85.90%	86.80%	86.70%	68.12%
B2	2012	Target ≥						61.50%	62.00%	62.00%	62.00%	53.60%
		Data					60.90%	54.50%	56.00%	56.40%	53.60%	36.79%
C1	2012	Target ≥						90.50%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	87.80%
		Data					90.20%	86.40%	86.10%	87.60%	87.80%	69.33%
C2	2012	Target ≥						73.00%	73.50%	73.50%	73.50%	64.00%
		Data					72.50%	64.50%	66.00%	66.30%	64.00%	46.77%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	85.90%	85.90%	86.10%	86.20%	86.30%
Target A2 ≥	55.30%	55.30%	55.40%	55.50%	55.60%
Target B1 ≥	86.70%	86.70%	86.80%	86.90%	87.00%
Target B2 ≥	53.60%	53.60%	53.70%	53.80%	53.90%
Target C1 ≥	87.80%	87.80%	87.90%	88.00%	88.10%
Target C2 ≥	64.00%	64.00%	64.10%	64.20%	64.30%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	10641.00
--	----------

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	1354.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1084.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2691.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3547.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1074.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	6238.00	8676.00	67.25%	85.90%	71.90%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	4621.00	9750.00	39.45%	55.30%	47.39%

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	1329.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1040.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2870.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3679.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	842.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	6549.00	8918.00	68.12%	86.70%	73.44%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	4521.00	9760.00	36.79%	53.60%	46.32%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	1319.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	855.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2163.00

	Number of Children
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	4143.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1290.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	6306.00	8480.00	69.33%	87.80%	74.36%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	5433.00	9770.00	46.77%	64.00%	55.61%

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? Yes

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

LEAs are required to choose from 9 assessment tools as the Primary Assessment for Indicator 7:

- Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming Systems (AEPS)
- Carolina Curriculum for Infants and Toddlers or Preschoolers with Special Needs
- High Scope Child Observation Record (COR)
- Teaching Strategies GOLD
- Hawaii Early Learning Profile (HELP)
- Transdisciplinary Play-Based Assessment (TPBA) - Revised (Toni Linder)
- Work Sampling System Illinois (WSS-IL)
- Early Learning Scales
- Ages and Stages Questionnaire

Upon exit LEAs are required to choose the curriculum-based assessment used with the child from the nine possible primary assessments. In addition, ISBE utilizes the 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.

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 indicator. 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 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

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

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))

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			54.00%	55.00%	56.00%	57.00%	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%
Data		53.80%	56.60%	62.40%	62.30%	63.70%	66.00%	63.70%	67.00%	67.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	59.00%	59.00%	60.00%	60.00%	61.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
3525.00	5196.00	67.00%	59.00%	67.84%

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 does not administer a different survey to parents of students with disabilities who are in preschool; therefore, no additional procedures for combining data are required.

Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

The sample of 60,000 families was selected to ensure representation of student demographics statewide and by LEA. Demographic information collected from returned surveys was analyzed by race/ethnicity, age, gender and disability. The data show that ISBE's sampling efforts were reasonable, the results were adequate to evaluate parent involvement and the

response rate was representative of the population. ISBE found that among families who responded to the survey, those with students identified as Developmental Delay and Autism were slightly overrepresented among the survey respondents, and families with students with Specific Learning Disabilities were underrepresented. ISBE also found that families who were Hispanic and White were slightly overrepresented among sample respondents, while families that were Black/African American were underrepresented among sample respondents. In addition, families with 17 year olds were statistically underrepresented. Families with 3-5 year olds were slightly overrepresented, but still within the margin of error.

Was sampling used? Yes

Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? No



Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State



No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State

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 are 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 2014-2015 Illinois Parent Involvement Survey, 5,196 parents responded, yielding an 8.66% response rate. The FFY15 response rate decreased 0.8% from a response rate of 9.4% in FFY14. FFY14 data show that 5621 respondents completed the survey. ISBE continues to work with stakeholders to improve the response rate for the Indicator 8 Parent Survey.

In order to improve the response rate for the 2016 survey, LEAs will implement two or more of the following activities: 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 awareness, and have parents complete the survey at the conclusion of their annual IEP meeting. LEAs will provide documentation of their awareness activities to the ISBE SPP Indicator 8 team. In addition to the awareness activities, ISBE will continue to improve the usability of electronic modes that support improved survey response rate while maintaining appropriate representation of parents across the State of Illinois.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	NVR

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

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 in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
6	0	859	NVR	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

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 or lesser 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, grades 1-12) 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 all LEAs 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 criterion for determining overrepresentation 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 2013-2014 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 LEAs 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 review processes include a review of any new policies or procedures that went into effect since the prior review.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

ISBE examined data for all LEAs in the 2014-15 school year. Of the 859 LEAs, 820 LEAs had at least 10 students with IEPs ages 6-21 for the past three school years (2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15). Accordingly, 39 LEAs did not meet the minimum "n" size for further analysis under Indicator 9. LEAs that meet the disproportionality criteria for significant discrepancy are required to conduct self-assessment activities to verify whether the disproportionality is the result of inappropriate identification.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

The State did not provide FFY 2013 valid and reliable data, and the State must provide the required valid and reliable data based on the required measurement for FFY 2014 in the FFY 2014 APR.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response, not including correction of findings

OSEP's response indicated that the State did not provide valid and reliable data for this indicator in FFY13 because the State identified districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services, but did not determine if that disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification. As a result, the

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

State had to provide the required valid and reliable data based on the required measurement for FFY 2014 in the FFY 2014 APR. Those data have been submitted in the appropriate sections of this Indicator as required.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0.46%	0%	0%	0%	0.12%	0%	0%	0%	NVR

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

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 in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
34	0	859	NVR	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

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 or lesser 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, grades 1-12) 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 all LEAs in 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 criterion for determining overrepresentation 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 2013-2014 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 LEAs 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 review processes include a review of any new policies or procedures that went into effect since the prior review.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

ISBE examined data for all LEAs in the 2014-15 school year. Of the 859 LEAs, 610 LEAs had at least 10 students ages 6-21 for the past three school years (2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15) in one of the six disability categories listed above. Accordingly, 249 LEAs did not meet the minimum "n" size for further analysis under Indicator 10. LEAs that meet the disproportionality criteria for significant discrepancy are required to conduct self-assessment activities to verify whether the disproportionality is the result of inappropriate identification.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for this indicator because the State identified districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories, but did not determine if that disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification for FFY 2013, as required by the measurement for this indicator. The State must provide the required [data, valid and reliable data based on the required measurement, explanation] for FFY 2014 in the FFY 2014 APR.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response, not including correction of findings

OSEP's response indicated that the State did not provide valid and reliable data for this indicator in FFY13 because the State

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

identified districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories, but did not determine if that disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification. As a result, the State had to provide the required [data, valid and reliable data based on the required measurement, explanation] for FFY 2014 in the FFY 2014 APR. Those data have been submitted in the appropriate sections of this Indicator as required.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Indicator 11: Child Find

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		64.20%	98.10%	98.20%	97.70%	99.30%	99.10%	99.50%	99.60%	99.77%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
45,049	44,882	99.77%	100%	99.63%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	167
---	-----

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 FFY14 there were 167 students out of 45,049 students (0.37%) whose evaluations were completed beyond the 60 school day timeline. The number of days beyond the timeline ranged from 1 day to 200 days. Fifty-eight of the 167 evaluations (34.73%) were completed 1-10 days beyond the timeline. Thirty-eight of the 167 evaluations (22.75%) were completed 11-20 days beyond the timeline. Thirty-two of the 167 evaluations (19.16%) were completed 21-30 days beyond the timeline and thirty-nine of the 167 evaluations (23.35%) were completed more than 30 days beyond the timeline. Reported reasons for exceeding the 60 school day timeline included procedures/practices not timely (35.93%), lack of personnel resources (13.77%), summer issues (43.11%) and hearing/vision/medical issues (7.19%).

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

- The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.
- The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

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

- State monitoring
- 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 these data through a State database (Funding & Child Tracking System) that includes data for the entire reporting year. This system gathers the parental consent date and the eligibility determination date and calculates the 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.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
76	72	4	0

FFY 2013 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 76 LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY13 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. LEAs were then required to submit a 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). One LEA was required to access an increased level of technical assistance from ISBE. This LEA participated in monthly conference calls with an ISBE Principal Consultant to examine the status of all initial evaluations in the district, address any needed revisions to policies/procedures /practices, and document district actions to correct Indicator 11 noncompliance. ISBE then examined 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. ISBE verified correction of each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. This was accomplished through a review of updated data via the statewide database.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: 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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		83.40%	95.11%	98.30%	98.90%	98.40%	98.10%	95.00%	96.20%	98.84%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	13,530
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	2,579
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	10,240
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.	501
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	33

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
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. $[c/(a-b-d-e)] \times 100$	10,240	10,417	98.84%	100%	98.30%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e	177
--	-----

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, or e. 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 177 students who were included in (a) but not included in b, c, e, or e above. The number of days beyond the timeline ranged from 1-214. Ninety-one (91) students were 1-30 days beyond the timeline, forty-eight (48) students were 31-60 days beyond the timeline, twenty-five (25) students were 61-90 days beyond the timeline, and thirteen (13) students were 90+ days beyond the timeline.

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

- State monitoring
- 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.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
14	14	0	0

FFY 2013 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 14 LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY13 were correctly implementing 34 CFR 300.124(b) through several specific actions. ISBE required LEA staff to attend a training regarding transitioning children from early intervention to early childhood. ISBE strongly encouraged the LEAs to include staff from the CFC as part of the team participating in the training. LEAs also reviewed and revised 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. ISBE then examined 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 14 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 Memo 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.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: 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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						79.20%	86.40%	91.20%	91.90%	93.73%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
52,179	56,065	93.73%	100%	93.07%

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

- State monitoring
- 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 these data through a State database (Funding & Child Tracking System) that includes data for the entire reporting year. Due to requirements in Illinois state rules and regulations, these data are submitted for students 14 1/2 years old and older; however, per the Indicator 13 measurement requirements, only students ages 16 and older are included in the calculation. The Special Education FACTS Approval Procedures provide instructions for file transmission to ISBE.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
21	21	0	0

FFY 2013 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 FFY13 were correctly implementing 34 CFR 300.320(b) and 300.321(b) based on a review of 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.

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, 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.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. 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))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2009	Target ≥							35.00%	35.00%	35.00%	35.00%
		Data						29.47%	41.20%	17.30%	22.40%	29.32%
B	2009	Target ≥							56.50%	56.50%	56.60%	56.70%
		Data						56.53%	64.40%	55.70%	56.60%	60.99%
C	2009	Target ≥							69.50%	69.50%	69.50%	71.20%
		Data						69.21%	76.10%	69.60%	71.10%	71.54%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	35.00%	35.00%	35.00%	35.00%	35.00%
Target B ≥	56.90%	56.90%	57.00%	57.00%	57.00%
Target C ≥	72.00%	72.50%	73.00%	74.00%	75.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 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	1832.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	728.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	547.00
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)	88.00
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).	97.00

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	728.00	1832.00	29.32%	35.00%	39.74%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	1275.00	1832.00	60.99%	56.90%	69.60%
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)	1460.00	1832.00	71.54%	72.00%	79.69%

Was sampling used? 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. LEAs with 35 or fewer school leavers with IEPs are required to collect census data. All LEAs are included in the data collection efforts at least once during the span of this SPP. 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 these data are collected, the response rate for this survey is compared to the entire population of school leavers across the state of Illinois annually. While individual years' response rates may differ slightly from the entire population of school leavers across the four variables considered (exit code, ethnicity, gender, and primary disability), the cumulative response rates across the time span of the SPP should be representative across these variables since all LEAs will eventually be included. After the data file is received at ISBE, multiple error checks are run to ensure that survey data are valid and reliable.

The cohorts surveyed for FFY14 included Cohort 4 – High School LEAs and Cohort 5 - Chicago Public Schools (20 % of high schools). Of the 4,064 students in Illinois who were selected to participate in the 2014-2015 post-school outcomes survey through the ISBE Indicator 14 web application, 1,832 of the responses aligned with the NPSO guidance document definition of “respondents,” yielding a 45.08% response rate. Those that did not meet the NPSO criteria either refused to complete the survey or could not be contacted. Demographic information collected from the returned surveys was analyzed by race/ethnicity, gender, disability and exit reason. ISBE found that among youth who responded to the survey, those who were White were overrepresented among sample respondents, while youth that were Black were underrepresented among sample respondents. ISBE also found that youth who exited due to graduating with a diploma were overrepresented. While individual years' response rates may differ slightly from the entire population of school leavers across variables, the cumulative response rates across the time span of the SPP are representative since all LEAs were included in the sample by the end of the SPP cycle.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2012

FFY	2005		2006			2007			2008	
Target	-		45.00%	-	65.00%	45.00%	-	65.00%	45.00%	-
Data	62.50%		50.00%			33.80%			54.00%	

FFY	2009		2010			2011			2012				
Target	45.00%	-	65.00%	45.00%	-	65.00%	45.00%	-	65.00%	45.00%	-	65.00%	25.00%
Data	44.00%		31.25%			38.30%			26.67%				

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014		2015		2016		2017		2018			
Target	25.00%	-	35.00%	25.00%	-	35.00%	25.00%	-	35.00%	25.00%	-	35.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	28	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	74	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
28	74	18.89%	25.00% - 35.00%	37.84%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 16: Mediation

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2012

FFY	2005		2006			2007			2008	
Target	-		75.00%	-	85.00%	75.00%	-	85.00%	75.00%	-
Data	79.00%		79.30%			69.00%			74.00%	

FFY	2009		2010			2011			2012	
Target	75.00%	-	85.00%	75.00%	-	85.00%	75.00%	-	85.00%	
Data	77.61%		71.62%			76.44%			66.67%	

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	66.00%	66.00%	66.00%	66.00%	67.00%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

ISBE staff attended the December 10, 2015 meeting of the Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC) for the purpose of discussing an updated 2018 SPP target for Indicator 16. ISAC functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Services Division. Staff explained to ISAC members that the final SPP target for Indicator 16 needed to be above the updated baseline year percentage in FFY12 of 66.67%. Therefore, ISAC approved a change in the FFY18 Indicator 16 target from 66.00% to 67.00%.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	96	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	49	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1 Mediations held	194	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
96	49	194	76.03%	66.00%	74.74%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014
Target ≥		10.20%
Data	12.90%	4.50%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline
Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	17.14%	24.08%	31.02%	37.96%

Key:

Description of Measure

The Illinois ESEA Waiver calls for all students to be college and career ready. The Illinois SSIP fits into the existing framework of the ESEA Waiver. Therefore, the growth targets set for the SSIP are driven by the ESEA waiver structure, which call for Illinois to decrease by half the number of students overall and in subgroups not meeting or achieving on the state assessment over six years. ISAT trend data show that 12.90% of 3rd grade Black and Hispanic students with disabilities were proficient or above the grade level standard on the state English-language arts assessment for the 2013-14 school year. Illinois anticipates a 2.70% decrease in the percentage of 3rd grade Black and Hispanic students with disabilities who are proficient or above grade level standard on the state English-language arts assessment for the 2014-15 school year based on ISAT trend data after the cut scores were changed. That brings the target for FFY2014 to 10.20%. That equates to 89.80% of the chosen focus group not proficient or above the grade level standard on the state English-language arts assessment. Decreasing the 89.80% by half per the ESEA waiver equals 44.90%. Using 10.20% for baseline year 2014-15, dividing 44.90% equally across the remaining 5 years of the ESEA Waiver requires a 6.94% growth each year through FFY2019. Illinois targets were based on that calculation. As PARCC is implemented during the 2014-15 school year in place of ISAT, Illinois will monitor assessment results to determine whether targets need adjustment.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Overview

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

Please see the Illinois IDEA Part B Profile attachments for SSIP Phase I data analysis information.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

Please see the Illinois IDEA Part B Profile attachments for SSIP Phase I infrastructure analysis information.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Statement

Increase the percentage of 3rd grade Black and Hispanic students with disabilities who are proficient or above the grade level standard on the state English-language arts assessment.

Description

Please see the Illinois IDEA Part B Profile attachments for additional SSIP Phase I SiMR information.

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Please see the Illinois IDEA Part B Profile attachments for SSIP Phase I coherent improvement strategy information.

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change

in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

[Theory of Action Updated](#) Theory of Action Updated

Illustration

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

Supporting Implementation and Building Capacity so Students are College and Career Ready

Coherent Infrastructure/Systems + Quality Data + Effective Practices = Improved Results

Stakeholders identified six major potential root causes that were essential to success as related to the SIMR. ISBE staff examined the six potential root causes and theorized that all six causes circled back to one main root cause: the lack of a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) framework being implemented with fidelity at the school and/or local education agency (LEA) level. Therefore, it was hypothesized that African-American and Hispanic students with disabilities have low reading performance because schools and LEAs have not implemented a MTSS framework with fidelity. It was determined that Illinois should: 1) create and sustain a MTSS framework with fidelity through organizational supports, leadership, and internal capacity building 2)utilize data to inform decision making aruond the implementation of a MTSS framework with fidelity to improve reading performance outcomes; and 3) utilize local models to implement revention- and intervention-focused, evidence-based reading and environmental practices to increase academic, social/emotional, and behavioral competencies. If Illinois implements these strategies it is expected that, on a broader level, improved results would stem from the schools' and LEAs' ability to build and sustain their capacity to provide appropriate academic and environmental supports for students with disabilities through a MTSS framework so all students are college and career ready. It is also expected, as the outcome specific to the SIMR, that the percentage of 3rd grade African-American and Hispanic students with disabilities who are proficient or above the grade level standard on the state English-language arts assessment would increase.

To achieve the SIMR, Illinois must take a comprehensive and coherent approach to school improvement that aligns with the State's ESEA Waiver goal of college and career readiness for all students. By leveraging the Illinois State Board of Education's (ISBE) grant funded MTSS Network with other ISBE Centers' initiatives through the SSIP; the SEA will increase the capacity of its existing infrastructure to directly support LEA's in achieving both the SIMR and ISBE's ESEA Waiver goal.

Increased student outcomes will be achieved through the implementation of an evidence-based MTSS framework. This framework allows for systemic, prevention- focused and data-informed continuous improvement. It also provides a coherent continuum of supports responsive to meet the needs of all learners, which addresses Illinois LEA's overlapping subsystems of Governance and Management, Curriculum and Instruction, and Climate and Culture. While the SSIP is targeted at a specific sub-group, it is anticipated that by implementing a systems approach with fidelity, the coherent improvement strategies developed through the SSIP process will result in all students, both those with and without disabilities, increasing their achievement in alignment with Illinois' goal of college and career readiness for all students.

Infrastructure Development

- (a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- (d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

Please refer to the "Infrastructure Development" and "Timeline" attachments below for information regarding infrastructure development.

Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

- (a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- (c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

Please refer to the "Support for LEA Implementation of EBP," "Logic Model," "Action Plan," "IL MTSS-N Modules," and "IL MTSS-N" attachments below for information regarding support for implementation of evidence-based practices.

Evaluation

- (a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- (c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- (d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

Please refer to the "Evaluation" and "Action Plan" attachments below for information regarding evaluation.

Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

Please refer to the "Evaluation" attachment below for information regarding technical assistance and support.

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

This indicator is not applicable.