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MEMORANDUM

TO: All Interested Parties

FROM: William Kienzle, Chair
Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities

SUBJECT: Annual Report for 2001-2002

On behalf of the Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC), we are pleased to submit this report summarizing the Council’s activities and accomplishments during its 2001-2002 sessions.

Although ISAC has lacked timely appointments and re-appointments to the Council, its members represent most of the geographic regions in the state of Illinois. Members represent parents of children with disabilities, people with disabilities, educators, governmental service providers, and a member at-large. ISAC committees include Bilingual, Comprehensive State Plan, General Supervision/Due Process, Family Communications, Finance, Legislation, Personnel Development, and Rules and Regulations.

ISAC has also been very active in the development of the Illinois’s Continuous State Improvement Plan required by the U. S. Department of Education’s Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). The Council has provided legislative testimonies, public comment on proposed rules and regulation changes, analyzed effects on the students with disabilities regarding the No Child Left Behind initiative, addressed the critical shortage of teachers in special education, the lack of funding to provide adequate special education services, and Illinois’ progress regarding teaching children in the least restrictive environment.

ISAC appreciates your support in making a free and appropriate public education a reality for all students in Illinois. Thank you for your continued attention to maintaining the level of services necessary to sustain every student in reaching his or her IEP goals.
Mission Statement

The role of the Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities is to be a proactive body, advising the Governor, Legislature and State Board of Education on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities, as well as the unmet needs of these children and their families. It is also the responsibility of this Council to encourage new strategies and technologies, while advocating high standards of excellence throughout Illinois.
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Identity and Purpose

Identity

The Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC) is statutorily mandated by state and federal law to provide advice and policy guidance to the Governor, General Assembly, and the State Board of Education with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities and the unmet needs of children with disabilities.

Purpose

The purpose of the Council is to:

1) Provide advice and policy guidance to the Governor, General Assembly, and the Illinois State Board of Education with respect to:

   a) special education and related services for children with disabilities; and
   b) unmet needs of children with disabilities.

2) Advise the State Board of Education regarding:

   a) all rules and regulations related to the education of children with disabilities that are to be promulgated by the Board;
   b) modifications or additions to county or regional comprehensive plans,
   c) qualifications for hearing officers and the rules and procedures for hearings conducted under Section 14-8.02 or Section 14-8.02a.

3) Assist the State Board of Education in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the United States Secretary of Education.

4) Advise the State Board of Education in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in federal monitoring reports pursuant to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

5) Advise State and local education agencies regarding educational programs and materials that may be provided to children with disabilities to enable them to fully exercise their constitutional and legal rights and entitlements as citizens, including those afforded under the Federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973 as amended, and the Illinois Human Rights Act.
6) Advise the State Board of Education in developing and implementing policies relating to the coordination of services for children with disabilities.

7) Comment publicly on rules and regulations proposed by the State regarding the education of children with disabilities and the procedures for distribution of funds.

Council Membership

Membership
The members must be citizens of the United States and of Illinois and are selected on the basis of their knowledge of, or experience in, the education of children with disabilities. Members are to be broadly representative of Illinois' population in regard to developmental, physical and mental disabilities, race, ethnic background, gender, and geographic location.

The membership of the Council is established by statute and includes four (4) ex-officio voting members and twenty-three (23) persons appointed by the Governor:

Governor Appointed
Nine parents of children with disabilities between the ages of 3 and 21 years currently receiving special education services at public expense:
- PAMELA CALDWELL, Chicago
- THERESE DEVINE, Orland Park
- NANCY GRANT, Charleston
- WILLIAM KIENZLE, Chatham
- NORMA LOPEZ-REYNA, Chicago
- SUE OUELLETTE, DeKalb
- VACANT
- VACANT
- VACANT

Five individuals with disabilities, including one student or former student who is at least 18 and no older than 21 years of age at the time of his or her appointment and who is receiving special education services at public expense or received those services at the time his or her high school program terminated.
- MATT ABRAHAMSON, Springfield
- CATHY CONTARINO, Alton
- JAMES McGOVERN, Schaumburg
- VACANT (individual with a disability)
- VACANT (student representative)
One regional superintendent of schools
   HELEN TOLAN, Springfield

One representative of an institution of higher education that prepares special education and related services personnel
   ANGELA PEREZ MILLER, Chicago

One teacher of students with disabilities
   JAN CLEVELAND, Crossville

One superintendent of a public school district
   DONALD FRAILEY, Robinson

One director of special education cooperative or special education administrator from a school district of less than 500,000 population.
   MYRON DAGLEY, Waukegan

One representative of a public charter school
   VENUS AUSTIN, Chicago

One representative of a private school serving children with disabilities
   SHARON CLOUSING, Chicago

One representative of a vocational, community, or business organization that provides transition services to children with disabilities
   MARY ELLEN ABELL, Carterville

One at-large member from the general public
   WILLARD WALLACE, Bethalto

Ex-Officio Members
   SUE GAMM, Chicago Public Schools District 299
   JIMMY GUNNELL, Department of Corrections
   DWIGHT LAMBERT, Department of Children and Family Services
   MARJORIE OLSON, Department of Human Services/ORS

ISBE Staff
   Kathryn Cox, Division Administrator, Special Education Services
   Patricia Koch, Principal Consultant, Special Education Services
   Cathy Pavolko, Private Secretary, Department of Specialized Support
   Jack Shook, Division Administrator, Special Education Compliance
   Anthony Sims, Manager, Department of Specialized Support
   Christopher Koch, Chief Education Officer
Committees

**Standing Committees**
- Executive Committee
- Comprehensive State Plan
- General Supervision
- Finance
- Legislation/Interagency Communications
- Family Communications
- Rules and Regulations
- Bilingual Special Education
- Personnel Development
- Site and Access Committee

**Ad-Hoc Committees**
- By-Laws
- State Improvement Plan
- ISAC Annual Report

Council Meeting Schedule  
2001-2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 13, 2001</td>
<td>2:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Committee of the Whole Business Meeting</td>
<td>Illinois State Board of Education, Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 14, 2001</td>
<td>9:30 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1, 2001</td>
<td>2:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Committee of the Whole Business Meeting</td>
<td>Hyatt Regency Hotel, Schaumburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2, 2001</td>
<td>9:30 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 11, 2002</td>
<td>10:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Special Meeting</td>
<td>Ramada Inn, Bloomington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 6, 2002</td>
<td>2:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Committee of the Whole Business Meeting</td>
<td>Professional Development Center, Bloomington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 7, 2002</td>
<td>9:30 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 18, 2002</td>
<td>2:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Committee of the Whole Business Meeting</td>
<td>Illinois State Library, Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 19, 2002</td>
<td>9:30 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 12, 2002</td>
<td>2:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Committee of the Whole Business Meeting</td>
<td>John A. Logan College, Carterville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 13, 2002</td>
<td>9:30 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Special Activity: Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process**

A key activity in which ISAC representatives participated in 2001-2002 was the development and refinement of the Illinois Continuous Improvement Plan for Special Education. ISBE developed this plan as part of the OSEP Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process in Illinois. As a part of this process, ISBE formed a Steering Committee made up of representatives from all relevant constituencies, including parents of individuals with disabilities, persons with disabilities, teachers, State and local education officials, State agencies and advocacy organizations, and ISAC.

The charge of the Steering Committee was to assist ISBE in completing a Self Study of special education compliance in Illinois and drafting the aforementioned Continuous Improvement Plan. Several ISAC members served on the committee and represented either their constituencies or ISAC itself. This committee completed its work in the fall of 2001.

In November and December 2001, ISBE convened a work group to refine the draft plan and ensure that it delineated data-based activities, including activities required as part of the Corey H. Settlement Agreement, and measurable outcomes. The work group membership included ISAC representatives. Dr. Alan Coulter, a nationally recognized consultant in the area of special education monitoring and compliance and member of the President’s Commission on Excellence in Special Education, facilitated two, three-day meetings of the work group. As a result of these meetings, the work group assisted ISBE in refining the Continuous Improvement Plan, which was subsequently submitted to OSEP within the required timeline.

**Critical Issues Identified for Discussion**

The Council identified the following as critical issues for discussion in 2001-2002:

- Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (Self-study, CIMP plan)
- Alternate Assessment
- Student access to the Prairie State Achievement Exam
- Teacher certification issues arising from Corey H., including personnel certification rules
- Monitoring of ISBE compliance with Corey H.
- Changes in and staffing of the Special Education Center
- Office of Special Education Programs
- Time-Out/Physical Restraint Rules
- Transition
- Federal grant proposals submitted by ISBE
- IDEA reauthorization
- School Code revision (Article 14)
• Translation of special education forms into foreign languages
• Draft rules for Speech Language Pathology Assistant supervision
• ISBE Biennial Performance Report for Part B of IDEA
• Illinois State Improvement Grant
• Legislation affecting special education
• Evaluation of Illinois due process procedures
• Hearing Officer Education Network
• Higher education institutions and teacher/personnel preparation

September 13-14, 2001
• The Council members received an orientation from ISBE staff prior to the Committee of the Whole meeting.
• The Council heard a presentation from Michael Byrne of Kirby School District 140 concerning their withdrawal from the Southwest Cook County Cooperative Association for Special Education.
• The Council heard a presentation from Gail Lieberman, ISBE Federal Relations, on the upcoming reauthorization of IDEA.
• The Council heard a presentation from staff of the Illinois Transition Consortium on transition activities.
• The Council heard presentations from ISBE staff on: the Prairie State Achievement Exam; School Renovation, IDEA and Technology federal grant; alternate assessment; Corey H./certification/monitoring; the Parents’ Alliance for Compliance in Education (PACE); OSEP site visit, and proposed time out and physical restraint rules.
• The Council heard a presentation from Patty Whitten, attorney for Paxton-Buckley-Loda Community Unit District 10 and Gibson City-Melvin-Sibley Community Unit School District 5, regarding the districts’ combined requests to withdraw from the Ford/Iroquois County Special Education Association.

November 1-2, 2001
• The Council heard a presentation from ISBE staff on the procedures for the withdrawal of a school district from a special education joint agreement.
• The Council heard a presentation from staff of the Illinois Transition Consortium on transition activities.

February 1-2, 2002
• The Council heard a presentation from staff of the Illinois Transition Consortium on transition activities being conducted.
• The Council heard a presentation from Chairman Bill Kienzle on the President’s Commission on Excellence in Education.
• The Council heard a presentation from ISBE staff on the translation of special education forms into 10 languages, the Illinois Continuous Improvement Plan and OSEP state visit, a federal grant update, a Request for Proposals for IDEA Part B supplemental funds, the Illinois Alternate Assessment, Corey H., Special Education Department staffing, the LBS-I training sequence, Regional
Safe Schools, special education funding to special education cooperatives, IDEA reauthorization, the Public Officer Prohibitive Activities Act, the February 27 and 28 State Improvement Grant Higher Education Symposium, activities of the School Code Revision Commission, eligibility documents, and a letter received by a parent.

- Sue Gamm, ISAC member from Chicago Public Schools, provided a presentation on temporary special education teacher certification legislation being proposed by Chicago Public Schools.

**April 18-19, 2002**

- The Council received an update on transition activities from staff of the Illinois Transition Consortium.
- The Council heard a presentation from ISBE Special Education Compliance staff on the withdrawal process for districts from a special education cooperative.
- The Council heard a presentation from Diane Gilleland, Board of Higher Education, on teacher shortage issues.
- The Council heard a presentation from ISBE staff on the Prairie State Achievement Exam, translation of special education forms, State Improvement Plan, restructuring of the State Board of Education, the Illinois Alternate Assessment, personnel certification rules, IDEA reauthorization, time out and physical restraint rules, OSEP visit update, and Illinois Purchased Care Review Board rate setting for nonpublic special education facility reimbursements.
- The Council heard a presentation from Bob Fennema, Director of Special Education at Kankakee Area Special Education Cooperative, and Bill Kling on the revisions of Article 14 of the School Code.

**June 12-13, 2002**

- The Council heard a presentation on the due process system from Tom Britton and Brad Caldwell of SIU at Carbondale, the due process training entity for Illinois.
- The Council heard a presentation from staff of the Illinois Transition Consortium on transition activities.
- The Council heard a presentation from ISBE staff on the Illinois Alternate Assessment, draft rules for speech-language pathologist assistant supervision requirements, the Biennial Performance Report for Part B of IDEA, activities of the School Code Revision Commission, the State Improvement Grant, ISBE staff shortages, IDEA reauthorization, and the August 2002 Special Education Director’s Conference.
- The Council heard a presentation from Senator Larry Woolard and Representative Mike Bost on recent changes in the state’s budget, special education finance, and teacher shortages.
Public Participation:

The Council provides an opportunity for public participation at every business meeting. During this period of time, participants sign in and are provided five minutes to present the various issues and concerns they have.

Council Actions

September 14, 2001
- The Council approved sending the survey response and position statement regarding the Education Funding Advisory Board’s solicitation of opinions concerning the funding of Illinois public schools, prepared for the Council by Finance Committee Chair Donald Frailey.

November 2, 2001
- The Council recommended to the State Board of Education that the rules on time out and physical restraint be accepted as published for public comment.
- The Council requested the support of ISBE as needed in the production, dissemination, and compilation of results of the parent survey as prepared by the Family Communications Committee.
- The Council created an Executive Committee that is responsible for receiving and preparing recommendations on items that may come before it at times that require action between regularly scheduled meetings. Any action taken is subject to ratification by the full Council.
- The Council sent out a survey on IDEA Reauthorization 2002 to educational partners and constituents in the development of an Illinois agenda.

February 7, 2002
- The Council requested that the State Superintendent of Education request the Executive Director of the State Board of Higher Education to convene a forum to address the extreme shortages of qualified special education and related service personnel, including bilingual personnel, and recommend approaches to increase and retain qualified personnel.
- The Council acknowledged receipt of a letter received by a parent in the Geneseo School District and discussed options and information that the Council could provide the parent.
- The Council approved the comprehensive plan developed by Kirby District 140 for their request to withdraw from the Southwest Cook County Cooperative Association for Special Education.
- The Council supported SB 1843 for the Temporary Transitional Special Education Certificate.
- The Council recommended that ISBE release information regarding the schedule for providing an on-line program to assist special educators with a LBS-I endorsement in gaining the knowledge and skills necessary to obtain an unlimited designation.
April 19, 2002

- The Council recognized the long and distinguished career of Ms. Judy Pierce upon her retirement from the Illinois Service Resource Center effective August 14, 2002.
- The Council approved the comprehensive plan for the Ford/Iroquois County Special Education Cooperative, which entailed the withdrawal of Paxton-Buckley-Loda Community Unit District 10 and Gibson City-Melvin-Sibley Community Unit School District 5 from the Ford-Iroquois Special Education Cooperative.

June 13, 2002

- The Council approved the meeting dates for 2002-2003 and changed the starting time to 9:00 a.m. for the business meetings. The meeting dates are:
  - September 12-13, 2002 Hilton Hotel, Springfield
  - November 7-9, 2002 Hyatt at University Village, Chicago
  - February 6-7, 2003 Holiday Inn, Normal
  - April 3-4, 2003 Drury Hotel, Springfield
  - June 12-13, 2003 John A. Logan College, Carterville
- The Council supported ISBE’s provision of “bridge funding” for the transition project to support continuation of transition activities until the new federal grant is received.
- The Council supported the nomination of William Kienzle as Chair and Myron Dagley as Vice-Chair of ISAC for 2002-03. These nominations were to be confirmed at the September 2002 meeting.

Other ISAC Activities

- Provided comments on the time out and physical restraint rules (Appendix A).
- Conducted a survey jointly with ISBE to solicit input from Illinois educational partners for the 2002 Reauthorization of IDEA (Appendix B).
- Provided comments on the proposed rule changes regarding requirements for those who supervise speech/language assistants (Appendix C).
- Provided a survey response and position statement to the Education Funding Advisory Board (Appendix D).
- Provided comments to ISBE regarding soliciting data from parents of children with disabilities (Appendix E).
-Acknowledged and responded to specific parental concerns during the public participation session of meetings.
- Provided oral testimony to the Illinois General Assembly in opposition to SB1777 and HB4466 regarding the establishment of categorical special education certificates.
Barriers to Success

- Delay in Council appointments
- Understaffing in ISBE - Special Education Unit
- Staffing changes in ISBE - Special Education Unit
- Finance
- Time sensitive responses

Council Minutes

Copies of approved minutes of the Council meetings from September 13, 2001, through June 13, 2002, are available upon request. Individuals are asked to contact the Executive Secretary to the State Advisory Council, Illinois State Board of Education, 100 North First Street, Springfield, Illinois 62777. Inquiries may be directed to 217/782-5589 (Voice), 217/782-1900 (TTY), or 217/558-2375.
Dr. Chris Koch, Acting Deputy Superintendent
Center for Special Education Services
Illinois State Board of Education
100 N. First Street
Springfield, Illinois 62777

Dear Dr. Koch:

Attached to this letter please find an Executive Summary of the teleconference of the Subcommittee of ISAC on Rules and Regulations of which I am Chair. You will note that these recommendations relevant to the Draft Rules and Regulations on Isolated Time Out and Physical Restraint represent the consensus of our committee, but can not be presented as the official position of ISAC, which body has not met nor officially voted to accept these recommendations.

I ask that these be considered by you, your staff, and the State Board of Education in the context of their August Meeting Agenda. I am presenting these recommendations to the ISAC at its next official meeting scheduled for September, 01.

The ISAC, and more specifically our Rules Committee, expresses concern over the frequency with which we are placed in a position of timing restraint by placement of Rules before the State Board of Education with insufficient notice for the Council as a whole to consider the impact of same and offer official informed advice as required by Illinois Statutes and Federal regulations. We recognize, Chris, that this situation is not of your personal making. You, unfortunately for you, are the conduit through which our hopes, dreams, and increasingly our frustrations are vented. I presume that comes with your “territory”.

We hope these recommendations, although unofficial, are helpful to you and the Board. I look forward to greeting you at the Director’s Conference.

Cordially,

Myron F. Dagley, Chair
ISAC Subcommittee on Rules and Regulations

attachment
cc: Teleconference Participants

Our mission is to provide a quality education through multiple learning experiences within a continuum of services, empowering students to live as productive members of a multicultural society.
On July 24, 2001 at 9:00 A.M. the Rules Subcommittee of ISAC meet via teleconference. Those participating in some portion or all of the conference were:

- Myron T. Dagley, Subcommittee Chair, Vice Chair ISAC
- Ms. Sue Gamm, Committee Member
- Ms. Terry Devine, Committee Member
- Mr. Bill Kienzle, Committee Member, Chair ISAC
- Ms. Jan Cleveland, Committee Member

Those invited to participate, but unable to do so included:

- Mr. James McGovern, Committee Member
- Ms. Cathy Contarino, Committee Member
- Ms. Sue Ouellette, Former Chair ISAC

It must be noted that the views that follow are committee consensus to the best of my ability, but do not represent ISAC positions in that the ISAC has not yet had an opportunity to vote on this collection of recommendations!

To facilitate tracking these recommendations (views) I have paginated a copy of the Draft Rules on Isolated Time Out and Physical Restraint, attached same, and by reference incorporate same into this Executive Summary.

1. The committee recommends that Paragraph (c) page eight be moved to the top of page 5 as Paragraph (c) and that on page 5 the current Paragraph (c) be renumbered Paragraph (d).

   **Rationale:** Section 1.280 commencing on page 4 contains among other items general definitions. The item recommended for relocation serves to delimit conditions under which touching or holding is restraint.

2. The committee recommends that in Section 1.285, page 6 the word safety be inserted in the second line in place of discipline.

   **Rationale:** The general purpose of this set of rules is to assure safe treatment of students within the learning environment, thus rendering the learning environment safe for student presence.

3. The committee feels that the time limits in Paragraph (e) beginning on page 9 are excessive. Most of us feel that these rules will have a very limited applicability to settings, probably alternative settings for BD, and we could not imagine the outside limits established in this section even pertaining in such settings.

   The committee did not make item specific recommends to reduce the time limits established.

4. The committee recommends that in Paragraph (k) on page 11 the reference to subsection (e) in the second line be changed to read subsection (g) of this section as found on page 12.

   **Rationale:** Current wording is in error, we think. Subsection (e) does not address dates and times.
5. The committee recommends that Paragraph 5), page 12 be amended to require that the plan referenced actually be the student's Behavior Implementation Plan (BIP) rather than yet another plan independent from the BIP.

Rationale: This section addresses circumstances under which the time out/physical restraints strategies must be reviewed for appropriateness and effectiveness. It seems to our committee, that such content must be a part of the student’s BIP if it is to be appropriate. We see no reason in having a proliferation of plans and/or locations where behavior strategies are addressed and maintained.

6. The committee recommends that on page 12, Paragraph 2) at the bottom of the page the words isolated time out or not be stricken.

Rationale: The committee feels strongly that notice to parents in both usages must be timely and proximal to the event when the strategy was implemented and by whom. Informed parent awareness and involvement must always be a priority!

7. The committee feels wording on page 13 Paragraph 2) is unclear. Specifically, we are concerned that current wording would require that we bring in from outside sources those who provide the required training. If that is the intent, this would be cost prohibitive for many; and, further, there could easily be an insufficiency of such outside resources qualified and available on a timely basis to provide the training even if funds to purchase same were available.
Dear Colleague:

The Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities and Illinois State Board of Education are jointly soliciting input from Illinois educational partners and constituents in the development of an Illinois agenda for the 2002 reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). This agenda will be presented to Illinois' congressional delegation this winter in an effort to effect changes in IDEA that will benefit students with disabilities, parents, educators, and service providers.

To assist us in this process, we invite you to complete the enclosed survey. In crafting your response please consider what the most significant benefits of the 1997 reauthorization were and what lingering problems remain to be resolved. Please also consider the remarks of Secretary of Education Rod Paige when he addressed the House Committee on Education and the Workforce on October 4, 2001. In his remarks Secretary Paige spoke of the reauthorization of IDEA and the "pillars of reform" that apply to IDEA.

"President Bush and I want to apply the four pillars of reform to the IDEA, just as we did to the ESEA. First, accountability for results is just as important for children with disabilities as for any other children. Second, flexibility and freedom from unnecessary and burdensome federal red tape can help school districts tailor services to the needs of students while preserving students' rights to appropriate services, a task that has often been difficult to achieve under the IDEA. Third, empowering parents to participate more meaningfully in their children's education will improve student performance. Finally, supporting teaching methods and procedures based on scientific research will ensure that we are using what works in teaching our children with disabilities."

Upon completing the survey, please return it no later than December 15, 2001, to the address indicated on the form. Thank you in advance for your participation. By developing a state agenda representing all constituent interests, Illinois can have a greater impact on the reauthorization of IDEA.

Sincerely,

William Kienzle, Chair
Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities

Christopher Koch, Ed.D.
Deputy Superintendent for Special Education

Enclosure

100 North First Street, Springfield, Illinois 62777
IDEA REAUTHORIZATION SURVEY
Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities
Illinois State Board of Education

This survey is designed to solicit input that Illinois can use in formulating a state agenda for the 2002 reauthorization of IDEA. In developing your response please consider the "four pillars of reform" outlined below and the funding levels necessary to implement the reforms in context with the survey questions.

Pillars of Reform (as identified by Secretary of Education Rod Paige)
- Accountability for results
- Flexibility and freedom from red tape
- Empowering parents to participate more meaningfully in their children's education
- Supporting teaching (and learning) based on scientific research

The survey questions are those that have been posed by the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) for use in their Fall 2001 public forums on IDEA reauthorization. Comments should focus on systemic issues and provide short answers, rather than legislative language.

1. What is the problem?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2. Why is it a problem?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

3. What solutions do you propose (to address that problem)?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Name/address (optional)

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Please return your completed survey no later than December 15, 2001, to:
Cathy Pavolko
Illinois State Board of Education
100 North First Street, E-228
Springfield, IL 62777
Fax: 217/558-2375
E-mail: cpavolko@isbe.net
Phone: 217/782-5589
August 23, 2002

Dr. Robert Schiller  
State Superintendent  
Illinois State Board of Education  
100 N. First Street  
Springfield, IL 62777

Dear Dr. Schiller:

On behalf of the members of the Illinois State Advisory Committee on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC), I am submitting the following comments for the proposed Speech/Language rule changes:

- P.A. 92-0510 creates a new type of paraprofessional (Associate Arts Degree) that requires an unusually heavy amount of supervision.

- SLP’s assigned to supervise the new SLP Assistants may only supervise two maximum such assistants and must have a reduced case load of 15% fewer students per assistant supervised. This reduction of case load means fewer students receiving direct service from the supervising SLP. Bachelor’s degree speech/language paraprofessional may continue to be employed without this restrictive supervision model, thus the supervising SLP can carry higher case loads.

- The ISAC believes this new model calls for a more restrictive supervision model that escalates service cost, further restricts access to fully trained SLP’s by students needing service, and ultimately drives higher the cost of service delivery.

- This new model further accentuates the negative consequences of an already taxed short supply of fully certified and available SLP’s to serve students in the public school sector.

Given the above, the Illinois State Advisory Committee on the Education of Children with Disabilities believes this act should not have been signed by the Governor and probably will not be seen by the public school community as an asset to their struggle to provide reasonable cost services to students in need. We cannot imagine a school district employing such individuals given the cost of supervision for same.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on these rules.

Sincerely,

William Kienzle  
Chairperson

100 North First Street, Springfield, Illinois 62777
Education Funding Advisory Board
School Funding Survey

This survey is designed to solicit your organization's opinions concerning the funding of Illinois public schools. Attach additional pages if necessary for elaboration. Please complete the survey no later than August 17, 2001. The survey may be returned by:

Mailing to or FAX

Bill Hinrichs
Illinois State Board of Education
100 North First Street
Springfield, IL 62777-0001

Bill Hinrichs
217/782-4336

If you have questions concerning the survey, please contact Bill Hinrichs or Toni Waggoner at 217/557-1485.

Name of organization: State Advisory Council on the Education of Children With Disabilities

Name of person completing this survey: Dr. Donald Frailey, Chairperson of the Finance Committee for this Council
Daytime Phone: 309.426.2157

I. EQUITY, ADEQUACY and EFFECTIVENESS

"Equity," "Adequacy" and "Effectiveness" are concepts often discussed in regard to school funding. Please respond to the following questions concerning these issues.

EQUITY

1. How does your organization define equity?

Please see our position paper for this response to this question. Everyone knows what equity is especially when they are not allowed to access it. For educational purposes it means providing resources for every individual difference and need so that students have a total opportunity for learning.

2. Is equity in regard to school funding important to your organization?

   X Yes   No.

3. Should equity be a priority in state school funding policy?

   X Yes   No.
4. A funding formula must be provided that stays consistent, predictable, and provides funding under the definitions of “equity” and “adequacy.”

Obviously, a means of increasing revenues must be discovered and utilized. It should be complimentary to the actual cost of education within the state.

The local tax base will always be an important factor to finance equity. If this arrangement continues, there must be a balance struck between local taxes and state financing of school districts. Unit school districts ought to be able to achieve the same tax levels as dual districts (equity!) without a referendum.

Impoverished children and children with special needs should be given appropriate funding to meet their needs.

ADEQUACY

5. How does your organization define adequacy?

An appropriate education for every student in the state should be everyone’s goal. This must be accomplished against standards such as the Education Reform Act of 1985, The Federal New IDEA Laws and local board policy.

6. Does this concept of adequacy include costs associated with facilities and technology? (Please elaborate.)

The concept of adequacy should be broad enough to include all factors affect that a child’s education. School infrastructure, capital development, technology, and life and fire safety are just a few of the criterion.
7. Should adequacy for funding purposes be related to performance or an educational accountability process? (Please elaborate.)

It depends on how you define performance standards. If you try to promote an invalid achievement test that has no norms, as the state is doing now, then, it is impossible to evaluate performance.

If the state was to develop minimum performance standards and a universal statewide curriculum for all districts that could be measured by a valid, normed, achievement instrument, then, yes, funding should be based against the above outlined performance.

EFFECTIVENESS

8. Should school funding be tied to some measure of "effectiveness" i.e., high performance/low spending?

   _X_ Yes.   No.

8a. If yes, please give your organization's views on how "effectiveness" should be defined and measured.

   With the existing indicators of performance, one test score derived from the ISAT does not determine anything. Universal, statewide standards based on a nationally normed achievement test could achieve this. Until this happens, effectiveness measurements are a sham.

9. What could be done to improve the effectiveness of K - 12 education?

   As has been stated:

   a. Development of a universal statewide curriculum that has minimum standards which every school must meet.

   b. Researching a nationally normed achievement test that measures these minimums and making certain these minimums, and the test, don’t change every 3 or 4 years.

   c. Giving schools the time to gear up their respective curricula to meet these minimum standards, and assisting schools that fail to meet these standards by providing diagnosis of the individual’s schools problem/problems and, then, providing resources for staff development to rectify the failure.

   d. Do not water down the school’s income with unfounded mandates and then expect total performance on effectiveness measurements.
II. FORMULA ISSUES

1. Should a regional cost adjustment be applied to the formula foundation level? _____X____Yes.  
   _____No.

1a. If yes, what suggestions does our organization have as to how this should be accomplished?
   Develop or adopt an economic cost index and apply it with equity for all school districts.

2. Should differing educational costs by grade level be accounted for in the formula?
   _____X____Yes____No.

2a. If yes, what suggestions does your organization have as to how this should be accomplished?
   An example would be the inadequacy and inequity of the seven formulas used in funding special education. A Federal Court (Corey H. case) is deciding their legality. Before we develop funding formulas, let’s make sure that we have taken equity and adequacy of funding into account. This will surely keep us out of the courts.

3. The formula currently contains a separate non-equalized calculation to provide additional funding for districts with high concentrations of students from low-income families. Should this continue?
   _____X____Yes, ____No.
   Costs of special education and bilingual education should be given, at the very least, similar consideration.

3a. If yes, which indicator of poverty does your organization recommend be used?
   
   Free Lunch
   Free/Reduced Lunch
   Most Recent Census
   Most Recent Census Update
   Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF)
   Food Stamps

   XX Other (Please specify) Data could be gathered from the factors listed to verify poverty. Census is the poorest factor because socioeconomics change more rapidly than every 10 years.
4. It is possible to adjust the formula pupil count to account for low-income students. Would your organization prefer this approach to the current separate "grant" approach?

   ___X___ Yes. ___No.

5. Should the state consider an enrollment-based formula rather than one based on attendance?

   ___X___ Yes. ___No.

6. What other special student populations should be considered for funding through the formula (i.e., special educator, gifted, bilingual)?

   Special education and bilingual education have both state and federal mandates. Yet, their funding and the needs of this student population have been dramatically underfunded and ignored.

   The state's method for funding gifted students suggests that the state expects bright kids to learn in spite of us, not because of us. A look at the disproportionality of gifted funding over the last ten years supports the previous statement.

   There is no equity nor adequacy for students in any of these three populations. There is an obvious need to find funding solutions for all three groups.
III. PROPERTY TAX ISSUES

1. If the legislature makes changes to the formula, such as a higher foundation level, which requires substantial revenues, which of the following would your organization support? (Check all that apply.)
   ___ X Increased state income tax income tax. This would be the second choice.
   ___ X Increased state sales tax. This is the most progressive of the taxes listed.
   ___ State property tax
   ___ X Other (Please specify) ___ Change the lottery to be used as an additional subsidy rather than a supplement to educational funds as just Gov. Thompson sold it.

2. Does Illinois rely too heavily on local property tax revenues to support elementary and secondary education? ___ X Yes. ___ No.

   This should not be assessed, collected or distributed at the state level. If the committee allows for increases in public education, this must not be at the reduction of a local school district’s ability to tax its local property tax base. Any state-aid formula should require some local tax effort. Tax relief should be provided for people with disabilities and limited incomes. A more uniform tax assessment procedure is needed for equity.

2a. If yes, (a.) through what means should the property tax portion be replaced?
   ___ X Partial abatement
   ___ Complete abatement.

   (b.) which sector of property taxes should be abated? (Check all that apply.)
   ___ X Residential
   Farm
   ___ Commercial
   ___ Industrial

   (c.) for which purposes should property taxes be reduced? (Check all that apply.)
   ___ Operation Levies (Education, Operations & Maintenance, Transportation, etc.)
   ___ Operating Debt (Working Cash and Funding Bonds)
   ___ Capital, Health Life Safety, and Building Repair projects
   ___ X All purposes. Providing that equal alternate revenues be made available to the taxing bodies losing revenue under tax reduction.

   (d.) from which source should replacement revenues be raised? (Check all that apply.)
   ___ State income tax
   ___ State sales tax
   ___ Local option income tax
   ___ X Other (Please specify.) ___ Develop a reliable source
(e.) how should replacement revenues be distributed?

___ Dollar-for-dollar locally

___ Dollar-for-dollar regionally

___ Through a state equalization program

___ X Other (Please specify.) There must be adequate and equitable funding for each school district to educate its students.

3. Property in Cook County is assessed at varying percentages of market value, depending on classification. Recent studies completed by The Civic Federation of Chicago (available through www.mcs.net/~civicfed/reports.html) and workgroups of Cook County Assessor James Houlihan's Tax Policy Forum (December 1998) recommended changes to the Cook County system of assessment. Please provide your organization's beliefs with regard to Cook County property classification.

Any reduction in the real estate assessment for residential property not offset on a one-to-one basis should be eliminated. The prior year EAV provision for Cook County School Districts should be eliminated. Property tax appeal proceedings should be forced to take place quickly by setting time limits on the hearings.

Cook County School Districts should be allowed to participate and receive timely notice of assessment appeals so they can adequately prepare to debate these issues.
4. Tax increment financing, enterprise zones and/or various exemptions are, for many districts, creating impediments to tax base access. Please discuss your organizations thoughts on this matter and indicate possible solutions.

Current changes in the tax increment financial statutes should:
1.) Model adoption procedures as have been established for enterprise zones.
2.) Have procedures for disbanding TIF areas that do not produce anticipated growth.
3.) Requirements that all taxing bodies participate equally should be removed.
4.) TIFs should be reviewed periodically for compliance by the Joint Review Board.
5.) Limits should be established so that the financial impact of a TIF does not exceed twice the average loss of EAV to each taxing body.
6.) TIF use should be curtailed in new residential developments.
7.) Recommendations of the Joint Review Board should be binding.
8.) School districts should have standing to participate in zoning hearings.

5. Does your organization believe some levies should be exempt from tax caps?

   X Yes.  No.

5a. If yes, which ones?

IV. OTHER FUNDING ISSUES

1. Corporate personal property replacement tax (CPPRT) was established in 1978 and replaces the corporate personal property tax which was abolished in the 1970 constitution. It is collected through the corporate income tax and distributed to units of local government including school districts, in the same proportion as in 1978. This distribution does not necessarily reflect location and valuation of today’s industries, Should the distribution of the CPPRT be revised?

   ___Yes. ___No.

1a. If yes, through what means should the distribution be revised?

   ___ update the existing formula to more accurately reflect location and value
   ___ consider CPPRT a state revenue source for distribution through the formula
   ___ other (Please specify.)

2. There are currently 892 regular operating school districts in Illinois, 21 percent of which have less than 400 students. Do you think the state should address the issue of district reorganization?

   ___Yes. ___No.

   If the state limits reorganization to size, geographical population distribution may become a serious problem. Consolidation should only be considered if it can be shown to improve educational quality. There are many small school districts who provide excellent academic quality. They should be as vigorously supported as a larger district that does the same.

2a. If yes, by what means should the issue be studied and recommendations be made? (Check all that apply.)

   ___ formation of a study commission charged with making specific recommendations
   ___ legislative mandate
   ___ expanded state sponsored reorganization incentives
   ___ other (Please specify.)

3. There are currently numerous purposes for which districts may levy taxes (i.e., education, operations and maintenance, transportation, etc.). Should the state consider consolidating some purposes, especially the smaller ones, in order to allow districts more flexibility?

   ___Yes. ___No.

3a. If yes, please make recommendations as to combinations of purposes for consolidation

   There are a multitude of “categorical” programs through which funds are distributed to districts by various methods. Categorical programs are generally those distributed to local education agencies for specific purposes or to serve specific populations. Among the largest of these are special education and transportation. Please provide your organization’s recommendations concerning the streamlining of categorical funding.
4. Should the number of categorical programs be reduced?
   \[ \checkmark \text{Yes. } \_ \text{No.} \]
   As long as the state does not reduce the funding levels of these same categoricals.

5. Should current categorical programs be somehow integrated with the General State Aid formula?
   \_ \text{Yes. } \checkmark \text{No.} 

6. Should current categorical funding be equalized?
   \_ \text{Yes. } \checkmark \text{No.}
7. Would your organization support the formation of several large "block grants" instead of many categorical program?

  X  Yes.  ____No.

As long as the state does not reduce the funding levels of these same categoricals.

7a. If yes, please make recommendations as to how funds should be distributed.

   All distribution should be appropriate to the type of categorical.

Changing the current system of teacher compensation to include skill based pay, performance based pay, and salary differentials for teachers in hard to fill positions and for teachers teaching at risk children is being explored in many parts of the country.

8. Does your organization believe that the current method of teacher compensation in Illinois should be changed?  ____Yes.  X  ____No.

   This is a matter of "local control."

8a. If yes, what would you like to see changed?

8b. What processes should be used to change the teacher compensation system?

   Teacher salaries should be performance based with allowances for type of class and students' past performance. Additionally, an effective rating system must be in place and teachers evaluated.

Please provide your organization's views and recommendations on other school funding issues not covered in this survey. Please attach any position papers your organization has completed on these issues.
Position Statement from the State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities

It seems both redundant and unproductive to get involved in the "never-ending" debate between definitions of equity and adequacy. From a historical perspective, anyone wanting good definitions of these terms could consult the writings of Alan Hickrod and Ben Hubbard, two professors from Illinois State University, who authored the Illinois State Resource Equalizer Formula (1973). The Illinois School Problems Commission then revisited these definitions. A few years later, Governor Jim Thompson formulated a financial study committee and these definitions were addressed again. About ten years ago, the Illinois State board addressed the fact that the state could not afford equity and claimed that it would cost approximately $4800/student to reach adequacy. It is appropriate to point out that we have yet to reach this amount for the students of Illinois. After a narrowly defeated attempt for finance reform legislation to force the state to pay at least 50 percent of the funding cost for education, Governor Jim Edgar formulated the Ikenberry Commission for Finance Reform. Again, the issues of equity and adequacy were debated and defined. If you are seeking definitions, research of these different groups would be appropriate.

Even casual observation regarding definitions of terms over the years reveals that revisiting definitions that are already defined although highly seductive to discussion really does not accomplish too much in the area of solution. Unless the definitions are going to be utilized and kept to the forefront when funding formulas are developed, formulating definitions really becomes an exercise in futility. For example, it is interesting to note that for the second year the state legislature has defined and appropriated funds for impoverished children. In House Bill 3050, the state appropriated the following dollar amounts to help schools address the needs of poverty by percentage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low income Concentration Level</th>
<th>$ per pupil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-35</td>
<td>1190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-50</td>
<td>1333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>1680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 60</td>
<td>2080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If anyone looked at the above treatment of impoverished students, that person would be hard-pressed to perceive how the definitions of equity and adequacy were employed in the formula’s development. Additionally, the author or authors might be equally hard-pressed to define the marked discrepancy in both equity and adequacy from $355 to $2080.
It is equally interesting to note that poverty is not adequately defined or mandated by the state for reimbursement. Yet, it receives funding. By contrast, special education funding is mandated at both the federal and state levels. There are rigid laws and equally rigid rules of implementation as to how these laws will be employed. For years the state has mandated all of this without properly funding any of it.

Additionally, the federal government promised to fund 40% of the excess costs for special education. Statistics show that last year the federal government funded 15% of the cost. This is the best that they have ever done. Special education mandates have been around since the seventies. However, at both the state and federal levels the definitions of equity and adequacy have never been applied or considered when it came to funding.

To further muddy the waters, the Illinois State Board of Education, the City of Chicago, and the State of Illinois are engaged in trying to resolve a federal lawsuit, which among other issues suggests that the funding formulas for special education are not appropriate or legal. Perhaps, this could be the cost for not giving enough thought to equity and adequacy when the special education formulas were developed. Two years ago, the State Board of Education developed a special education task force (There have been a myriad of these!) to study a better way to fund special education. The results of this task force’s study were the development of SB588. After approximately 36 months, this bill is still lying dormant in the Senate. It very well may be that when the federal judge finalizes his ruling on this matter there may be a more inspired motivation on the legislature’s part to revive this bill. Unfortunately, even this bill is not a cure-all. However, it does go a long way to addressing the problem of funding special education.

There are well-researched statistics available that say it costs two and a half times as much to educate a special needs child as it does to educate a mainstream child. It is also common knowledge that the special education population is rising in this state at the rate of 5% for the last two years and is projected to rise by a similar percentage for the next two years. There are school districts on the financial watch list because their costs of special education, after state and federal reimbursement, have placed them in that situation. Many of the issues that are brought to due process are the direct result of the school district trying to preserve funds that it does not have in the first place.

Dr. Leininger, and members of the Education Funding Advisory Board, the State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities strongly urges you not to get hung up on rhetoric or definitions, instead, we urge you to find an equitable and adequate financial solution for special needs students.

If you are unable to accomplish this through formula development or support of SB 588, then please consider introducing and supporting legislation for a local tax that could be levied to help the local school districts recover their losses in the following fiscal year. For example, if a school district incurs a $100,000 debt in their education fund as a result of special education costs after state and federal reimbursement, then, this district would be allowed to levy a local tax to offset this expense under this proposal.
It could be argued that this solution, though simple, is too expensive for local taxpayers to endure. To counter this argument, the local taxpayer is going to be forced by referendum versus school closure to address this issue anyway. Additionally it should be pointed out that local taxpayers would endure some serious expenses, if as a result of this federal lawsuit, it is found that the present funding formulas for special education are illegal. It is a sure bet that when this suit is adjudicated the costs for special education will surely escalate. Obviously, no matter how things shake out the local taxpayers will experience the increases in cost.

Last fall, our council made improving the funding for special needs students in our public schools our number one priority. It is our sincere hope that you will join us in this endeavor, allow special needs students equitable and adequate opportunity, and will develop a solution that will insure this end.

Additionally, the scheduling of state-aid payments for impoverished children by percentage as it is presently in the formula really does not meet any definition of equity. Perhaps, it is at least as inadequate as the state and federal funding of special education. To summarize the original premise, definition of terms is really meaningless, unless the definitions are utilized in the solution.
6 - 7 -01

Dr. Christopher Koch, Acting Deputy Superintendent
Center for Special Education
Illinois State Board of Education
100 N. First Street
Springfield, IL 62777

Dear Chris:

I regret that you got away today before I could speak with you regarding an issue with which our Family Communication Committee is working. Attached is draft copy of a questionnaire our committee has developed for data gathering purposes for ISAC. We understand that the Department Steering Committee on the Federal Compliance Monitoring Visit is also interested in similar data for the Feds.

Our committee is seeking technical assistance in disseminating this questionnaire State wide. Our issues include:

- Funding to support such dissemination.
- Technical Assistance to access hardware and software appropriate to receiving, storing, and analyzing response data.
- Determining a reception point for questionnaire returns which could be seen by parents as an objective secure return point.

On behalf of ISAC and our committee of which I am Chair pro temp, I am asking you to arrange to contact me in the near future to discuss this project and these issues in some depth. We may do that by phone or I will arrange to meet you personally should you prefer.

Our committee is next meeting on 7-30-01 in Schaumburg to review questionnaire content one final time and to examine the results of two pilot administrations which will be done earlier that month by committee member, James McGovern. You, of course, would be welcome to join us should you desire. We want to have in place our dissemination plan in time to announce same at the Director's Conference early August, for we feel currently that Directors need to be prominent in the dissemination process to encourage parent participation.

Chris, after listening to you this morning; I almost feel guilty asking for your assistance. Your plate is very full, we know. The Council is sadly lacking in resources to undertake this type of a badly needed effort and we

Our mission is to provide a quality education through multiple learning experiences within a continuum of services, empowering students to live as productive members of a multicultural society.
feel our effort will be unsuccessful without department assistance.

I look forward to hearing from you in the near future. Please also know of my personal commitment to work with you in addressing any and all issues. I look forward to your leadership and thank you for taking the “bull by the horn” on behalf of so many special needs students who now rely on you and your efforts. Best wishes for an enjoyable summer.

Cordially,

Myron T. Dagley, Deputy Superintendent
Waukegan Community Unit Schools, District 60

attachment
cc: Mrs. Sue Ouellette. Chair ISAC
Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities

My School District No. [ ] My zip code [ ] I am (circle one): male    female

My child’s age (circle one): Birth-2    3-5    6-13    14-18    19-21

I am (circle one): parent    foster parent    surrogate parent    grandparent    guardian    other [  ]

Please circle a number between 1 and 5 to indicate the accuracy of the following statements.

1=total disagreement 5=absolutely agree

1. My school district informs the community about special education services available to students with disabilities........ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

2. My district provided me with written information about procedural safeguards and the rights of my child with a disability to receive a free, appropriate public education under federal and state law. ...................................................... [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

3. My district provided me with the guidance I needed on the steps required to proceed through the special education process. ................................................................. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

4. My district completes initial case study evaluations within sixty school days as required by federal and state special education regulations. .......................................................... [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

5. My district completes re-evaluations of special education students at least once every three years as required by federal and state special education regulations........................ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

6. My district completes an annual review of my child's IEP every school year as required by federal and state special education regulations. .......................................................... [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

7. My district includes me as a valued participant in the development of my child’s Individualized Education Program. ................................................................. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

8. When I make suggestions at scheduled meetings and/or informally throughout the year, other team members genuinely listen to and consider my ideas. ......................... [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

9. I am aware that certain, specialized considerations must be given to my child with an IEP in matters of discipline, suspension, and expulsion. ................................................................. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

10. I am aware that my child may have rights under Section 504... [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

11. My school district issues progress reports for my child with an IEP as often and on the same schedule as it issues report cards to regular education students..................................... [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

12. My school communicates with me: Annually Semi-annually Quarterly Monthly Weekly Daily
13. I know about transition services to assist high school students with special needs in developing and meeting career and life goals after graduation. ........................................

14. My district encourages my child to participate in school clubs, sports, or other extracurricular/recreational activities. ....

15. I know about the state special education complaint process and when it is appropriate to use. ........................................

16. I am aware of and understand my right to a due process hearing if the school district and I are not in agreement regarding special education services and placement. ........

17. My district has provided me with information about the use of mediation as an alternative to a due process hearing to resolve a conflict. ............................................................

18. I have concerns regarding how my school provides services in the following areas:

- Early intervention services .................................................................
- Early childhood services ................................................................
- Case study evaluation ........................................................................
- My child’s IEP ..............................................................................
- My child’s school records ................................................................
- Related services ...........................................................................
- Curriculum adaptations ....................................................................
- Assistive technology ......................................................................
- Regular instruction program ..............................................................
- Use of behavior management plans ......................................................
- Transition services (beginning at age 14 1/2) ................................
- School discipline ...........................................................................
- Appropriate services ......................................................................
- Extended school year ......................................................................
- Other (please specify) ......................................................................

19. I am aware of the parent training and information centers in Illinois. 

20. I am satisfied with the special education program and services that my child receives. 

Please provide pertinent comments regarding your experiences with special education in Illinois (attach additional sheets, if necessary):