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I. Description of Monitoring Authority and Focused Monitoring

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), (20 U.S.C. 1400 (c)(1)), provides federal funds to assist states in the education of children with disabilities and requires each participating state to ensure that school districts and other publicly-funded educational agencies in the state comply with the legal and regulatory requirements of this federal act. Further, Section 616 of IDEA states that “the primary focus of Federal and State monitoring activities shall be on improving education results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities and ensuring that States meet the program requirements with a particular emphasis on those requirements that are most closely related to improving educational results for students with disabilities.” Illinois state law requires local school districts to provide appropriate special education and related services and requires the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) to establish, monitor, and enforce regulations governing special education programs in the Illinois public schools and all institutions wholly or partly supported by the state. The state has adopted regulations implementing those requirements which are administered by ISBE. ISBE supervises and conducts the general supervision process in furtherance of the state’s obligations under IDEA and Illinois law.

Focused monitoring is an approach to determining compliance with federal and state special education law and regulations while also addressing critical performance areas. It is a shift from a culture of compliance to a culture of accountability. It places the emphasis of a monitoring review on results versus process. The principles of focused monitoring are identified as follows:

- Focused monitoring includes a limited number of priorities chosen by a diverse group of stakeholders.
- Available data are used to select priorities that will improve student educational performance, increase independence for children with disabilities, and lead these students to full participation in society.
- A limited number of indicators are identified within each priority area and are used as the basis for district ranking and selection for on-site reviews.
- A focused monitoring system is data and information based. Data-based information is used to allocate limited resources to the areas of greatest need in order to effect the greatest improvement in student performance.
- There is a relationship between the monitoring process and the corrective actions as the specified solutions are linked to identified areas of concern. Corrective actions are designed to create systemic changes that result in improved student performance. Districts are required to address all identified areas of noncompliance.
- Families have the opportunity to provide information on a continuous basis.

With assistance from stakeholder groups, ISBE identified priority areas and critical performance indicators (CPIs) utilized in determining school districts most at risk for failure to meet performance. Specific indicators for focused monitoring are chosen annually by the Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC). Data submitted by the school district in the Funding and Child
Tracking System (FACTS) are then analyzed by ISBE to identify the district’s educational placement for students with disabilities. Critical Performance Indicator 5A concerns the percentage of students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) who are “served inside the regular class for 80% or more of the school day.” This indicator was selected as the basis for determining the appropriateness of the educational environment of students with disabilities and to determine the school districts most at risk for failing to meet performance (high risk/low performance) standards.

The ISBE focused monitoring district selection process includes dividing districts into similar clusters based upon district type and enrollment size. ISBE utilizes district data from the State’s Special Education Monitoring/Reporting System (SEMRS) to rank and compare school districts on the selected critical performance indicator. In most instances, those districts in each cluster performing lowest on the indicator analysis will receive an on-site review.

The following formula was used to rank districts within the indicator:

Each district with an N size of 30 students with disabilities is ranked on the percent of students with disabilities served under EE code 01 (inside the general education classroom more than 80% of the school day). If there are no districts (or very few districts) within a cluster that meets the N size, districts will be selected randomly from that cluster.

### Educational Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beach Park Community Consolidated School District 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2009-10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Time Inside</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>≥80%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>40-79%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>&lt;40%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Separate Facility</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coop</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Elem Districts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Targets</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In accordance with 34 CFR 300.600(e), "... the State must ensure that when it identifies noncompliance with the requirements of this part by LEAs, the noncompliance is corrected as soon as possible, and in no case later than one year after the State's identification on noncompliance" (December 2008). Furthermore, per the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) in memorandum 09-02, with further clarification provided at the 2010 OSEP Leadership Mega Conference, the required evidence of correction of noncompliance for LEAs must be a two-fold process. First, all instances of identified noncompliance require immediate correction. Second, the LEA is required to provide additional, subsequent data to conclude that the LEA has achieved meaningful
and sustained compliance. The ISBE monitoring system must review further updated data, as appropriate, to ensure the LEA achieves 100% compliance.

II. Focused Monitoring Methodology

The on-site focused monitoring review was conducted with the Beach Park Community Consolidated School District 3 on April 3 - 5, 2013. The team visited three (3) elementary schools and one (1) middle/junior high school in the district. The monitoring team leader reviewed and analyzed the following data in relation to the on-site review.

Data Reviewed

- Special education policies and procedures
- District and School Improvement Plans
- Professional Development Plan
- School Report Card
- Special Education Profile
- Family/school collaboration
- FACTS data

Forum

A public forum was held on April 3, 2013 for parents of students with disabilities and community stakeholders. The district provided documentation of adequate and appropriate public notice advertising the forum. The forum was attended by eleven (11) parents of students with disabilities and four (4) community stakeholders.

On-site Interviews

Interviews were conducted with four (4) administrators, nineteen (19) general education teachers, five (5) special education teachers, and one (1) related service provider.

Record Reviews

Record reviews were conducted for forty (40) students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). Records selected were representative of the students’ primary disabilities, age/grade levels, and special education programs within the district.

Staff Surveys

Surveys were collected from district personnel. Individuals who completed the surveys included thirty-seven (37) general education teachers, fifteen (15) special education teachers, fifteen (15) related service providers, and one (1) administrator.
III. Positive Aspects of the District Related to the Indicator

In relation to the identified critical performance indicator of the educational environment of students with disabilities, the following efforts and/or initiatives have been implemented by the district. These activities have been recognized as positive efforts on the part of the district to initiate improved student outcomes.

- Response to Intervention
- Positive Behavior Intervention Strategies
- Data-driven Decision Making

IV. District Findings Related to the Indicator

Area of Noncompliance - Finding 1

Evidence demonstrates that educational placement decisions for students with disabilities in Beach Park Community Consolidated School District 3 are not made in compliance with federal regulations IDEA, Part B, 34 CFR §300.116, 34 CFR §300.320, and 34 CFR §300.324. Based on the evidence collected and analyzed, placement decisions for students with disabilities do not fully document the consideration of placement in, and removal from, the general education setting and the general curriculum. Evidence indicates a general lack of supports prevents more students from being served in the least restrictive environment in the district.

34 CFR §300.116 Placements, which states,
In determining the educational placement of a child with a disability, including a preschool child with a disability, each public agency must ensure that-
a) The placement decision—
   1) Is made by a group of persons, including the parents, and other persons knowledgeable about the child, the meaning of the evaluation data, and the placement options; and
   d) In selecting the LRE, consideration is given to any potential harmful effect on the child or on the quality of services that he or she needs; and
   e) A child with a disability is not removed from education in age-appropriate regular classrooms solely because of needed modifications in the general education curriculum.

34 CFR §300.320 Definition of individualized education program, which states,
a) General. As used in this part, the term individualized education program or IEP means a written statement for each child with a disability that is developed, reviewed, and revised in a meeting in accordance with §§ 300.320 through 300.324, and that must include-
   1) A statement of the child's present levels of academic achievement and functional performance, including-
      (i) How the child's disability affects the child's involvement and progress in general education curriculum (i.e., the same curriculum as for nondisabled
children);

4) A statement of the special education and related services and supplementary aids and services, based on peer-reviewed research to the extent practicable, to be provided to the child, or on behalf of the child, and a statement of the program modifications or supports for school personnel that will be provided to enable the child-
   i) to advance appropriately toward attaining the annual goals;

5) An explanation of the extent, if any, to which the child will not participate with nondisabled children in the regular class and in the activities described in paragraph (a)(4) of this section.

34 CFR §300.324 Development, review, and revision of IEP, which states,
(a) Development of IEP
   1) General. In developing each child's IEP, the IEP Team must consider--
      (i) The strengths of the child;
      (ii) The concerns of the parents for enhancing the education of their child;
      (iii) The results of the initial or most recent evaluation of the child; and
      (iv) The academic, developmental, and functional needs of the child.
   3) Requirement with respect to regular education teacher. A regular education teacher of a child with a disability, as a member of the IEP Team, must, to the extent appropriate, participate in the development of the IEP of the child, including the determination of—
      (ii) Supplementary aids and services, program modifications, and support for school personnel consistent with Sec. 300.320(a)(4).
   5) Consolidation of IEP Team meetings. To the extent possible, the public agency must encourage the consolidation of reevaluation meetings for the child and other IEP Team meetings for the child.

Supporting Evidence

Data Review
Although the four elementary buildings within the school district have been well above the State's SPP target for the last three years, the middle school has consistently shown a low percentage of students served 80% or more of the day in general education classrooms. This percentage has continued to drop over the last three years.
Educational Environments by Grade Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Time Inside General Classroom</td>
<td>% of Time Inside General Classroom</td>
<td>% of Time Inside General Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 80%</td>
<td>40-79%</td>
<td>&lt;40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPP State Target</td>
<td>&gt;49.3</td>
<td>&lt;19.3</td>
<td>&lt;4.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forum
Public forum participants indicated that parents felt they were not active participants in the IEP decision-making process. Finally, public forum participants reported that they did not feel team decisions were taken into consideration as the final outcome was made by administration.

On-site Interviews
General education teachers reported that they have little knowledge of placement options from the continuum of services available in the district. Many general education teachers had difficulty describing an example of a potential harmful effect for a student with an IEP being provided a placement other than in the general education classroom for 80% or more of the day. General education teachers reported that support/training for school personnel in order to fully implement an IEP is not addressed during the IEP meeting. Finally, general education teachers stated that there is no regularly scheduled time for collaboration between general and special education teachers and little or no professional development activities related to providing services for students with IEPs in the general education environment over the last three years.

Some of the administrators interviewed reported that IEPs are only for the most severe disabilities and their responsibility in the IEP meeting is to make a call against the team’s decision, if needed. Factors cited by administration that interfere with the placement of students with disabilities into less restrictive settings are safety and being able to provide the services needed, with current staff.

Record Reviews
Student record reviews documented that thirty-five (35) of forty (40) files, or 85%, did not adequately document all elements that contribute to the placement decision. Many of the records reviewed had one or more addenda attached, making the IEPs inconsistent and often incomplete.
Student record reviews documented the following:

- 23% did not have an appropriate Parent Guardian Notification of Conference.
- 15% did not have all the appropriate team members present.
- 33% did not have an explanation of the extent the student will not participate with nondisabled students in the general education curriculum.
- 20% were not done annually.
- 48% did not ensure that placement is based on the child's IEP.
- 8% did not include the projected date for the beginning of special education and related services
- 63% did not include a statement of the child's present levels of academic achievement and functional performance.
- 50% did not give consideration to any potential harmful effect on the child.
- 8% did not demonstrate that parent input and concerns were considered.
- 10% did not address the need for supports for school personnel on behalf of the student with disabilities.
- 38% did not address the need for supplementary aids, accommodations and modifications, and special factors.
- 5% did not contain an explanation of the extent to which the student will not participate with nondisabled students in the general curriculum and/or extracurricular and other nonacademic activities.

Staff Surveys
Surveys were completed by 61 district personnel and indicated the following:

- 8/34 or 24% of general educators stated that they always or often have an active role in explaining how the student's disability affects their involvement and progress in the general education curriculum.
- 8/34 or 24% of general educators stated that they always or often have an active role in determining the amount of special education and related services provided to students with disabilities;
- 11/34 or 32% of general educators stated that they always or often have an active role in determining what supports the general education teachers need to assist students with disabilities to be successful in school.
- 13/34 or 38% of general educators stated they always or often have an active role in determining what accommodations and/or modifications a student with a disability needs to be successful in school.
- 8/34 or 24% of general educators stated they always or often have an active role in determining the extent to which a student with a disability will participate in the general education classroom.
- 4/34 or 12% of general educators stated that they always or often have an active role in determining the extent to which a student with a disability will participate in extracurricular activities and nonacademic activities.
- 9/38 or 24% of general educators stated that they always or often have regularly scheduled time to collaborate with teachers who provide services to the same students with disabilities they teach.
Summary of Evidence
Evidence gathered during the public forum, staff surveys, and interviews supports that parents, general education teachers, and special education teachers do not feel they are equal members of the IEP team when making placement decisions. Additionally, record reviews, general educator interviews, and staff surveys illustrate that general educators are not knowledgeable in the areas of supports, accommodations, and modifications.

Corrective Action
The district must address all areas of supporting evidence to ensure that placement decisions for students with disabilities are made in compliance with state and federal regulations. The district improvement plan should address the following areas:

- Encourage parent participation and take into consideration the parent's input in the IEP decision-making process.
- Ensure that general educators are an equal part of the IEP decision-making process.
- Make necessary programming changes to ensure that placement decisions for students with disabilities are based on student needs versus availability of options and supports.
- Increase communication between staff and administration and parents and administration, especially when discussing placement decisions for students who may need an IEP.
- In order to facilitate change in serving students with disabilities, ongoing leadership or coaching should be identified in the plan for professional development activities to assist all teachers in supporting students with disabilities in the general education setting.
- The district should explore co-teaching opportunities and other inclusive practices within the district to allow for more students with disabilities to be integrated into the general education environment.
- Annual and three-year IEP meetings should be more inclusive for all areas that are necessary in order to meet the student's educational needs. This will eliminate unclear and incomplete IEP paperwork.

Required Evidence of Correction - Immediate
Correction of student files must be made to address the following issues:

- Parent/guardian notification of conference completed and sent 10 days prior to meeting.
- Appropriate team members are present at the IEP meeting.
- Placement is determined at least annually.
- Parent concerns are documented and addressed.
- IEP contains a statement of the child's present levels of academic achievement and functional performance.
IEP addresses the need for supplementary aids, program modifications, and special factors.
IEP addresses supports for school personnel.
The IEP includes the projected date for the beginning of the special education and related services; the supplementary aids and modifications provided to the child; and the anticipated frequency, location, and duration of those services and modifications.
IEP contains an explanation of extent student will not participate with nondisabled peers in the general education classroom.
IEP contains an explanation of the extent student will not participate with nondisabled peers in extracurricular and other nonacademic activities.
Consideration is given to any potential harmful effects on the child
Placement is based on the student’s IEP.

By July 18, 2013, the district must demonstrate correction of each individual case of noncompliance. The documentation in 100% of the following records must be corrected to demonstrate the required evidence of immediate correction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues with Citation</th>
<th>% of IEPs with Identified Noncompliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An appropriate Parent/Guardian Notification of Conference was completed and sent 10 days prior to the date of the meeting. 34 CFR 300.503; 34 CFR 300.321(b)(1) 23 IAC 226.520</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific IEPs with Identified Noncompliance: BP25 BP26 BP28 BP36</td>
<td>BP15 BP18 BP19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The appropriate team members were present at the IEP meeting, verified on the Conference Summary Report (minimum participants: parent, LEA representative, special educator, and general educator, and any other person responsible for implementing a portion of the IEP). 34 CFR 300.116(a)(1); 34 CFR 300.321(a); 34 CFR 300.322(c)(d)(1)(2)(3); 23 IAC 226.210</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific IEPs with Identified Noncompliance: BP34</td>
<td>BP15 BP24 BP28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When determining placement, the IEP team ensured that the placement is determined at least annually. 34 CFR 300.116(b)(1)</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific IEPs with Identified Noncompliance: BP21 BP25 BP35</td>
<td>BP4 BP8 BP15 BP24 BP28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In developing each child’s IEP, the IEP Team must consider the concerns of the parents for enhancing the education of their child. 34 CFR 300.324(a)(1)(ii)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific IEPs with Identified Noncompliance: BP4 BP15 BP35</td>
<td>BP4 BP8 BP15 BP24 BP28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The IEP includes a statement of the child’s present levels of academic achievement and functional performance, including how the child’s disability affects the child’s involvement and progress in the general education curriculum (i.e., the same curriculum as for disabled children). 34 CFR 300.320(a)(1)(ii)</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific IEPs with Identified Noncompliance: BP8 BP11 BP14 BP15 BP16 BP18 BP19 BP21 BP22 BP24</td>
<td>BP4 BP6 BP7 BP35 BP37 BP39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The IEP addresses the need for supplementary aids, program modifications, and special factors. If needed, there is a statement of the program modifications and supplementary aids.  
34 CFR 300.320(a)(4); CFR 300.324(a)(2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific IEPs with Identified Noncompliance</th>
<th>BP1</th>
<th>BP4</th>
<th>BP6</th>
<th>BP8</th>
<th>BP14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BP15</td>
<td>BP16</td>
<td>BP19</td>
<td>BP21</td>
<td>BP24</td>
<td>BP25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The IEP contains a statement of supports for school personnel that will be provided to enable the child to be educated and participate with other children and nondisabled children.  
34 CFR 300.320(a)(4); 34 CFR 300.320(4)(iii)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific IEPs with Identified Noncompliance</th>
<th>BP3</th>
<th>BP4</th>
<th>BP15</th>
<th>BP33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BP17</td>
<td>BP18</td>
<td>BP20</td>
<td>BP22</td>
<td>BP24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The IEP includes the projected date for the beginning of the special education and related services; the supplementary aids and modifications provided to the child; and the anticipated frequency, location, and duration of those services and modifications. 34 CFR 300.3209(a)(7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific IEPs with Identified Noncompliance</th>
<th>BP2</th>
<th>BP24</th>
<th>BP26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BP2</td>
<td>BP26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The IEP contains an explanation of the extent, if any, to which the student will not participate with nondisabled students in the general education curriculum. 34 CFR 300.320(a)(5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific IEPs with Identified Noncompliance</th>
<th>BP2</th>
<th>BP6</th>
<th>BP8</th>
<th>BP11</th>
<th>BP14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BP16</td>
<td>BP19</td>
<td>BP22</td>
<td>BP24</td>
<td>BP25</td>
<td>BP26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The IEP contains an explanation of the extent, if any, to which the student will not participate with nondisabled students in extracurricular and other nonacademic activities 34 CFR 300.320(a)(4)(ii); 34 CFR 300.320(a)(5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific IEPs with Identified Noncompliance</th>
<th>BP26</th>
<th>BP27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In selecting the LRE, consideration is given to any potential harmful effects on the child or on the quality of services that he or she needs. 34 CFR 300.116(b)(2)(d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific IEPs with Identified Noncompliance</th>
<th>BP1</th>
<th>BP5</th>
<th>BP6</th>
<th>BP8</th>
<th>BP9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BP12</td>
<td>BP14</td>
<td>BP16</td>
<td>BP17</td>
<td>BP19</td>
<td>BP21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP30</td>
<td>BP33</td>
<td>BP34</td>
<td>BP38</td>
<td>BP39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When determining educational placement of a child with a disability, the IEP team ensured that the placement is based on the child’s IEP and with the development of the IEP, the IEP team must consider the strengths of the child. 34 CFR 300.116(b)(2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific IEPs with Identified Noncompliance</th>
<th>BP1</th>
<th>BP2</th>
<th>BP3</th>
<th>BP4</th>
<th>BP6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BP7</td>
<td>BP8</td>
<td>BP18</td>
<td>BP19</td>
<td>BP21</td>
<td>BP24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP33</td>
<td>BP34</td>
<td>BP35</td>
<td>BP37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Appendix A for student identifier information for each IEP

**Required Evidence of Correction - Subsequent**

To ensure that the district is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, the team leader must review updated data. On or before May 5, 2014, the ISBE team leader will randomly select twenty (20) records for review. The documentation in 100% of the records will include evidence of the following IEP components:

- An appropriate parent/guardian notification of conference completed and sent ten (10) days prior to meeting.
Appropriate team members are present at the IEP meeting.
Placement is determined at least annually.
Parent input and concerns are documented and addressed.
IEP includes a statement of the child's present levels of academic achievement and functional performance.
IEP addresses the need for supplementary aids, program modifications, and special factors.
IEP addresses supports for school personnel.
The IEP includes the projected date for the beginning of the special education and related services; the supplementary aids and modifications provided to the child; and the anticipated frequency, location, and duration of those services and modifications.
IEP contains an explanation of extent student will not participate with nondisabled peers in the general education classroom.
IEP contains an explanation of the extent student will not participate with nondisabled peers in extracurricular and other nonacademic activities.
Consideration is given to any potential harmful effects on the child.
Placement is based on the student's IEP.

Required Evidence of Change

The district must provide the following evidence of change specific to the identified findings of noncompliance. The evidence of change is designed to ensure that modifications have been made within the district that have ultimately led to improved performance on the indicator as reflected in the district's data. The verified Educational Environment (EE) data for the 2011-2012 school year identifies that 47.9% of students with disabilities are served 80% or more of the time in the general education setting (EE 01); the district data must improve in this area by 4.1 percentage points, to 52%.

V. Areas Needing Further Action

- The district might consider scheduling collaboration time between special education and general education staff on ways to meet the requirements for serving students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment.

- The district is encouraged to request updated training and professional development on the Response to Intervention (RTI) initiative. Many district staff stated that RTI was being overused in instances where students required a more individualized program.

- The district is urged to look at compliance regulations for students who move into the district with an IEP already established. While not verified, it was reported that the district's policy is to start these students with RTI placement first rather than follow the IEP currently in place.

- The district is urged to consider expanding co-teaching and other inclusionary programs. This is an area that was mentioned by staff members numerous times.
as a way for the district to increase the amount of time students with IEPs have in the general education environment.

VI. Improvement Plan Process

Upon receiving this final report, Beach Park Community Consolidated School District 3 is required to use the District Improvement Plan (DIP) template in the Illinois Interactive Report Card (IIRC) website to develop and submit a proposed improvement plan to ISBE within a period of 45 calendar days from the date of the final report. The improvement plan will be submitted electronically through the DIP process. This template is found at http://iirc.niu.edu/. The school district superintendent may access the template by entering the district password, which is managed by the district superintendent. The DIP for special education focused monitoring must address all four sections of the template: data and analysis; action plan; plan development, review and implementation; and board action. If the school district has an existing DIP, strategies and activities related to special education must be incorporated into the existing plan to ensure alignment with current district initiatives.

After the district receives the final report, the ISBE team leader will contact the district to begin the improvement plan process. In order to ensure that the improvement plan is comprehensive, interdisciplinary, and district-wide, the plan must be developed by a team. Depending upon the issues of noncompliance, the team should include the district superintendent (or another general education administrator who has the authority to commit district time and resources), the special education director or another special education administrator, a Regional Office of Education (ROE) representative, a general education teacher, a special education teacher, a related services staff member, the professional development coordinator, the curriculum coordinator, parents, and others, as necessary. This plan must not be a uniquely special education response developed in isolation from other district initiatives. The ISBE team leader is available to participate in the initial meeting of the improvement plan team to provide technical assistance. The team leader is not typically the provider of trainings or professional development activities; however, the team leader may have suggestions regarding training or professional development providers.

The team leader will work with the district to make any necessary revisions. When all revisions are completed, the district will submit the final version to ISBE for approval by the team leader. Final approval of the improvement plan must be made within 60 calendar days from the date of the final report and the district will be issued an approval letter. The approval letter will also outline the schedule for reporting the district’s progress to ISBE.

Progress Reports

Upon receipt of each progress report and any required documentation, the ISBE team leader will review the report to ensure that the district is monitoring its own progress. Once any needed clarification is received, an approval letter will be issued. If it becomes evident that the district is not making progress that is likely to lead to the expected
evidence of change within the required timeline, the team leader will schedule a meeting with the district to discuss the improvement plan.

**Evidence of Correction Review**

The evidence of correction review is a two-fold approach to ensure that the district has corrected all instances of noncompliance and is able to demonstrate evidence that will result in sustained compliance. In order for the LEA to demonstrate evidence of correction, immediate correction and subsequent correction must be verified by ISBE to show 100% compliance. Immediate correction will be verified within 60 days of the identification of noncompliance and the subsequent evidence of correction review will take place at the end of the first year of the focused monitoring process. This final report is the district's written notification of noncompliance and the date of this report begins the timelines for evidence of correction. Based on the results of the review, ISBE will make one of two determinations:

- the district has met the standards required for evidence of correction and officially close the section of the focused monitoring process, or
- the district has not met the standards required and additional time will be permitted for the district to continue to work on their required evidence of correction. In the latter instance, the team leader will continue to provide technical assistance to the district.

**VII. Closing the Focused Monitoring Process**

Focused monitoring is a two year process. In order for districts to conclude this process, they must complete the requirements as specified in this final report for evidence of correction and evidence of change. The requirements for evidence of correction are addressed and monitored through the improvement plan process as discussed previously. The evidence of correction review takes place at the end of the first year of the focused monitoring process.

**Evidence of Change Review**

The evidence of change review takes place at the end of the second year of the focused monitoring process. Evidence of change is designed to ensure that modifications have been made within the district that have ultimately led to improved performance on the indicator as reflected in the district's data. Two years after the date of this final report, the focused monitoring team leader will review the district's data to determine the degree of change in the data. The expected change in data is stated in this document. After review of the data, the team leader will submit a letter informing the district of the results of this data review. If the expected change is achieved, an approval letter will be submitted to the district which will close the focused monitoring process. If, however, the district does not achieve the expected change in data, the district will be informed in writing that further action is necessary. The team leader will continue to work with the district to determine the further action that will need to be carried out before the focused monitoring process can be officially closed.
In summary, the team leader will be available to participate in the initial meeting of the improvement plan process, as well as to provide or facilitate on-going technical assistance regarding the activities identified in this report. The team leader will verify immediate and subsequent corrective action as identified in this report. Throughout the first year after the final report, the district's progress reports will be reviewed by the team leader to ensure improvements are being made in the district to promote improved performance on the placement decisions for students with disabilities. At the end of the first year, the subsequent evidence of correction review will occur with the district to determine whether or not the district is able to demonstrate 100% compliance to the specific regulatory requirements through updated data. At the end of the second year, an evidence of change review will occur to ensure that the activities and modifications made by the district have resulted in improved performance as reflected in the district's data.

If you have any questions, you may contact Joy Battagliotti at 217/782-5589 or mbakerba@isbe.net.
May 23, 2013

Dr. Robert Divirgilio
Superintendent
Beach Park Community Consolidated School District 3
11315 W Wadsworth Rd
Beach Park, IL 60099

Dear Dr. Divirgilio:

The Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) wishes to communicate to you a change in the timelines for correction established in the final report of your focused monitoring review which was conducted April 03-05, 2013. Due to the fact the final report is being issued directly before the Beach Park Community Consolidated School District 3 summer break, ISBE is granting an extension for the district to meet the timelines specified in the final report dated May 23, 2013. The specific timelines that are being extended are the District Improvement Plan and immediate correction requirements. This extension permits the district to submit the District Improvement Plan to the team leader for approval no later than September 16, 2013; additionally, the immediate correction timeline is being extended to September 16, 2013. If you have questions regarding this correspondence, please feel free to contact your assigned team leader, Joy Battagliotti at 217/782-5589 or mbakerba@isbe.net.

Sincerely,

David Andel
Division Administrator
Special Education Services