The Challenge in Illinois: Implementing I.D.E.A.  
( Individuals With Disabilities education Act P.L. 105-17 )

Achieving Results through Goal-setting, Comprehensive Efforts, and Monitoring Data in Our State.
Workgroup Premises

✓ What gets counted gets done.
✓ Attention paid indicates relative importance.
✓ Current federal legislation broadened the emphasis.
✓ We know more than we know.
✓ A Goal that can’t be measured is just a Slogan.
Illinois Challenge: students with disabilities Achieve Results in public education.

Where Do We Stand?
How well do Students Read?

The GAP is increasing

Students w/disabilities taking tests

2001 ISAT 84.7%

Percent of students who meet/exceed the standard.
How well do Students Calculate?

The GAP is increasing

Percent of students who meet/exceed the standard.

2001 ISAT
How well do Students Write?

The GAP is increasing

Percent of students who meet/exceed the standard.

2001 ISAT
Exit with a Diploma

Most Recent Data

22nd Annual Report to Congress

* Greene, 2001
1. Illinois will increase by 4.5 percent per year the number of youth with disabilities who exit school with a standard diploma and employment and/or post-secondary education, as measured by:

- a) the percentage of students ages 17 to 21 with disabilities who exit with a standard diploma;
- b) the percentage of students with disabilities who participate in state-wide assessment;
- c) the percentage of students with disabilities who perform at the acceptable level or above on state-wide assessment.
Rationale for Goal 1

• Standard being considered for students in Illinois is 90% diploma rate (Greene’s rate for IL in ’99 was 82%).

• Rate for IL students with disabilities in ’98 was 63.06% (5 years @ +4.5% = 85.5%)

• IDEA requires “specially designed instruction to meet unique needs” - not a remedial program. Most students with disabilities can and should achieve including a diploma given appropriate instruction and services.

• High expectations are important/essential.
Illinois’ Challenge:

Students with Disabilities receive a free appropriate public education in their least restrictive environment
What are “Class Settings”?

- “Regular” = 20% or less of school day outside of the regular class. At least 80% of day in the regular class.
- “Separate” = 61% or more of the school day outside of the regular class.
- “Resource” = 21% to 60% of school day outside the regular class.

*Now, just use the numbers.*

80%+ v. - 40%
Settings for Five Years

< All Disabilities - Time in Regular Class >

ISBE Data Report
### Table AB2-7

Comparing Percent of Children Ages 6-21 Served in Different Educational Environments Under IDEA, Part B, During the 1996-97 School Year (21st Report)

**ALL DISABILITIES, Sorted by % in Regular Class (lowest to highest)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>REGULAR CLASS</th>
<th>RESOURCE ROOM</th>
<th>SEPAR CLASS</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Lowest to Highest)</td>
<td>(Lowest to Highest)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLINOIS</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENNSYLVANIA</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW YORK</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 STATES, D.C. &amp; P.R.</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data prepared by GLARRC
Trends in Percent of Children Ages 6-21 Served in Different Educational Environments in Illinois Under IDEA, Part B, During the 95-96 to 98-99 School Years

ALL DISABILITIES (20-23rd Reports to Congress)

Data prepared by GLARRC
Goal: Children in Regular Settings

2. Illinois will increase by 4.5 percentage points each year the percentage of students with disabilities who are educated in general education classrooms (80%+ time) in the school they would attend if not disabled, as measured by:

- a. the percentage of students with disabilities (6-21) who are in regular education settings 80%+ time;
- b. a decreasing percentage of students with disabilities who are in general education 40% or less time
Rationale for Goal 2

- There will **always be a continuum of settings available** to meet students’ needs.
- IL is almost 10% below the national average and **2nd last** among the large states in percentage in “Regular Class” (80+%).
- The current goal would project IL reaching the current national average in two years (and moving from 6th to 3rd place among the big states) (36 + 9 = 45 nat. avg. now) (1 in 20 students w/disabilities each year for five years).
- Knowledge and skills are available to make this goal attainable **if it becomes a priority**.
Illinois’ Challenge: Personnel serving students with disabilities should be fully qualified.
Need for Fully-Certified Personnel

4.5% Not Fully-Certified

Actual Numbers of Teachers

Fully Certified ▲

NOT □

Years:
- 1995-96
- 97-98
- 98-99
- 99-00
Illinois Has Qualified Personnel

3. Illinois will increase by 1 percent per year the number of fully-certified or licensed general and special education teachers, administrators, and related services personnel that are prepared to educate all students in the Least Restrictive Environment with individualized supplementary aids and services, as measured by:

a. the percentage of fully-certified general education teachers
b. the percentage of fully certified special education teachers
c. (decrease) the percentage of vacancies in related services positions
Rationale for Goal 3

- The current rate of Not-Fully Certified is 4.5% (at that level for the past three years) (little progress in reduction).
- IDEA requires 100% fully-certified by 00-01.
- 1% improvement = 300 new teachers
- Note: Retirements are expected to increase in the next five years.
- A concentrated effort of +1% per year would eliminate the deficit in five years and achieve compliance.
Illinois’ Challenge:

The families of students with disabilities should be meaningfully involved throughout the educational process.
Family Involvement

• There is little consensus on what constitutes effective measures of meaningful family involvement.
• No systematic state-wide data are collected concerning family involvement.
• There is general consensus that some measures should be developed and used.
Families Are Involved

Illinois will increase the meaningful, effective involvement of families in the educational process of children with disabilities, as measured by analyses of survey data and progress from baselines to be established in 2002-03.
Rationale for Goal 4

- It is unrebuttable that family participation is essential to the success of public education.
- Current “state-level” measures and methodologies are poorly developed to ensure reliable, valid judgments of progress towards the desired goal.
- We can do so much more in this area to improve our performance but we need adequate measures.
Illinois’ Challenge:

The Illinois State Board of Education has a duty to demonstrate administrative supervision over the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and ensure citizens of full compliance.
Monitoring

- NCD has reported a lack of compliance in all states and territories (2000).
- OSEP often cites a state for the same violation over repeated visits.
- Public input reported dissatisfaction with monitoring and enforcement.
- IL is vulnerable to more OSEP citations.
- OSEP is changing its continuous improvement process (manual & criteria for selection) to emphasize data and critical priorities.
Monitoring Supports Improvement

Illinois will have a general supervision and monitoring system that improves student outcomes, as measured by:

a. The percentage of LEAs monitored who are identified in the lower quartile on a goal measure (e.g. data);

b. **Annual progress** of monitored LEAs on the Critical Indicators.
Rationale for goal 5

• Increased emphasis at the federal level and with advocacy groups on state-level monitoring, follow-up, and sanctions.

• IL monitoring and follow-up was judged by the public to be insufficient to comply with federal law.

• What gets measured gets done. Monitoring focused on Illinois goals will support continuous improvement.
Most Important Priorities/goals

1. Students with disabilities achieve results
2. Students learn in their LRE
3. Personnel are fully qualified
4. Families are meaningfully involved
5. Monitoring supports continuous improvement in priorities/goals