

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

**For reporting on
FFY 2020**

Illinois



PART B DUE February 1, 2022

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Introduction

Instructions

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

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

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

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) continued to effect schools, districts, and families across the state in FFY 2020. The Governor of Illinois originally suspended in-person instruction effective March 17, 2020. The suspension was eventually extended through the end of the 2019-20 school year. On July 24, 2020, the Governor issued an Executive Order allowing all public and nonpublic schools to open for in-person educational purposes following the completion of the regular 2019-20 school term. Schools and districts were strongly encouraged to transition back to in-person instruction and learning while following Illinois Department of Public Health (IDPH) requirements related to the health and safety of students. However, schools and districts that were unable to adhere to IDPH requirements were allowed to implement Blended Remote Learning Days, which were authorized by PA 101-0643. During these days, schools and districts utilized hybrid models of in-person and remote instruction.

The ISBE COVID-19 team that was established in 2020 continued to address the multiple educational challenges in Illinois due to the pandemic. ISBE posted numerous resources to the ISBE COVID-19 webpage (<https://www.isbe.net/coronavirus>), including Executive Orders from the Governor, emergency rulemaking, U.S. Department of Education updates and guidance, Office of the Attorney General guidance, CDC updates and guidance, Department of Children and Family Services and Children's Advocacy Centers of Illinois resources, messages from the State Superintendent, Illinois Department of Public Health supplemental resources, program resources, CARES Act information, PPE and cleaning supplies information, transition considerations, staffing information, general guidance, and additional resources. ISBE staff also responded to education questions regarding COVID-19 from school districts, families, and other stakeholders. The specific impact of the global pandemic and transition back to in-person instruction and learning in Illinois is discussed within each SPP Indicator as applicable.

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

852

General Supervision System:

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

Each State Education Agency (SEA) is responsible for ensuring the general supervision of all educational programs for children with disabilities in the state. ISBE is the SEA responsible for enforcing the requirements of IDEA Part B and ensuring continuous improvement via Local Education Agencies (LEAs). ISBE carries out its general supervisory responsibilities to ensure that children with disabilities receive a free appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE).

A system of general supervision can be characterized by any number of operational components. It is intended to improve educational results and functional outcomes for children with disabilities. It is designed to identify noncompliance in a timely manner using its different components and ensure correction of identified noncompliance in a timely manner. These components are interrelated, and function in such a manner to form a comprehensive system. The following components make up ISBE's system of general supervision.

Policies and Procedures for Effective IDEA Implementation

SEAs are required to establish an operational way for ensuring that LEAs follow state policies and procedures and implement effective practices. ISBE's policies and procedures describe the methods used to identify and correct noncompliance. ISBE addresses effective implementation of practices through program improvement, which includes planning, coordination, incentives, follow up, and sanctions. Please see <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/Special-Education-Regulations-Legislation.aspx> for additional information.

Fiscal Management System

Fiscal management includes distributing funds in accordance with federal requirements. It also involves oversight in the distribution and use of IDEA Part B funds to ensure that funds are used in accordance with federal and state requirements. It involves procedures to direct fiscal resources to areas needing improvement. Please see <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/IDEA-Part-B-Grant-Program-Information.aspx> for additional information.

State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Reports (APRs)

The SPP functions as an accountability mechanism and the actual plan for systems change. It documents quantifiable indications of performance in the priority areas of FAPE in the LRE, disproportionality, and effective general supervision. Measurable and rigorous targets are set for each SPP indicator with the intention of leading to improved results for children and youth with disabilities. ISBE's progress toward meeting its targets on each SPP indicator must be reported each year in the APR. Stakeholder involvement remains key to the development and implementation of the SPP. Please see <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-Data-and-Accountability.aspx> for additional information.

Integrated Monitoring Activities

Integrated monitoring activities include the continuous examination of performance for compliance, program improvement, and results. Multiple data sources and methods are used to monitor LEAs. Data sources include the ISBE Student Information System (SIS), the IEP Student Tracking and Reporting System (I-Star) state database, and the Special Education Monitoring System (SEMS). Methods used to monitor LEAs may include examining data from statewide databases; conducting onsite and virtual LEA reviews; reviewing LEA policies, procedures, and practices; reviewing relevant documentation, such as student records and IEPs; interviewing LEA and special education cooperative personnel; interviewing individuals knowledgeable about the issue(s) in question; conducting public forums for parents and community stakeholders; reviewing LEA self-assessments; and

conducting data verification/desk audit activities. Findings of noncompliance are issued based on the following elements of the general supervision system: state complaints, due process hearings, and SPP Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13. ISBE uses current data and trend data to determine the level of technical assistance needed to support correction of noncompliance and program improvement in LEAs through the Illinois Special Education Accountability and Support System. The system is designed to:

- Maintain a high level of compliance with IDEA federal regulations and Illinois Administrative Rules for special education.
- Support LEAs in the process of self-assessment, root cause analysis, evaluation, and improvement of compliance and results-focused efforts.
- Establish a continuous and meaningful process focused on improving academic results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities by connecting local data to improvement efforts.
- Connect system improvement activities with multi-year planning and supports.

The Illinois Special Education Accountability and Support System is designed to identify potential district risk through the LEA Determinations process and to assist ISBE in effectively utilizing its resources to provide tiered monitoring and support to its LEAs. It focuses on monitoring for compliance and results, and uses the resulting information to provide targeted, evidence-based technical assistance and professional development to LEAs. It addresses district-specific needs in the areas of results, compliance, and fiscal by differentiating levels and types of monitoring and support based on each LEA's unique strengths, progress, and challenges identified through the LEA Determinations process. Please see <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-Data-and-Accountability.aspx> for additional information.

Effective Dispute Resolution System

This component deals with the implementation of the dispute resolution requirements of IDEA and includes addressing timely resolution, tracking issues for patterns or trends, and evaluating effectiveness and sustainability. Dispute resolution options include state complaints, facilitated IEPs, mediation, resolutions sessions, and due process hearings. Detailed information regarding each of these options can be found on the ISBE website at: <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/Special-Education-Effective-Dispute-Resolution.aspx>.

Data System to Gather Data on Processes and Results

The collection, verification, examination, analysis, reporting, status determination, and improvement of data is encompassed under this general supervision component. Timeliness and accuracy of data are emphasized. Data are used to identify patterns or trends, evaluate the performance of LEAs, select LEAs for onsite monitoring activities, determine the status of each LEA, improve programs, measure progress, design technical assistance activities, etc. An example of one of ISBE's data systems used for this purpose can be found at: <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/istar.aspx>.

Strategies for Improvement, Correction, Incentives and Sanctions

Supporting improvement and enforcing regulations, policies, and procedures is addressed under this general supervision component. Corrective action planning and follow up tracking of correction and improvement are addressed by the SEA. Ensuring correction of noncompliance and meeting state targets through incentives and sanctions is also part of this component. ISBE utilizes a range of sanctions to enforce correction as necessary. ISBE also determines the status of each LEA on an annual basis. Please see <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/Accountability-Support-System.aspx> for additional information.

Technical Assistance System:

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

ISBE's technical assistance system addresses both the timely correction of noncompliance and improved results for students with disabilities through an array of modalities and graduated levels of intensity, from consultation to ongoing coaching and support from ISBE staff and technical assistance providers. Technical assistance centers around a coaching and support network model, focused on systems change, which supports sustainable implementation of evidence-based practices and employs data collection and analysis for ongoing progress monitoring and data-based decision making. Evidence of correction of noncompliance and evidence of change results in compliance, improved outcomes, and improved capacity and sustainability at the LEA level.

ISBE's technical assistance system includes the Illinois State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG), entitled, "Illinois Elevating Special Educators," or IESE. The IESE Network is a statewide system of professional learning that uses a comprehensive regional delivery system to serve all districts through differentiated, research-based professional learning and supportive services. The IESE Network provides training, technical assistance, mentoring, and coaching to staff who support students with disabilities with the goal of building seamless, sustainable delivery systems for specialized populations of learners and improving outcomes for students with disabilities. IESE also focuses on engaging families as partners in the educational process and decision making. The IESE Network partners with Illinois Institutes of Higher Education, Parent Training and Information Centers, the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education, the Illinois Association of Regional Superintendents of Schools, and the Special Education Leadership Academy to meet its objectives. The IESE Network provides a multi-tiered delivery approach to LEAs based upon multiple measures, including the State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators, special education vacancies, and survey data. Additional information regarding the IESE Network can be found at: <https://www.iesenetwork.org/>.

Technical assistance is also provided by the Harrisburg Project, a contract funded by IDEA Part B discretionary funds to support technical assistance for special education data collection, including the accurate and timely submission of indicator data. The Harrisburg project maintains a website which provides live webinar events, recorded training webinars, help snippet videos, user guides, handouts, and the dissemination of ISBE guidance to districts and special education cooperatives. The Harrisburg Project provides training and support on LEA determinations, SPP Indicators and possible indicator findings, and other special education data included in the state's data collection system called I-Star. Additional information regarding the Harrisburg Project can be found at: <https://www.hbug.k12.il.us/>.

In addition, ISBE funds technical assistance projects related to assistive technology, students who are deaf or hard of hearing, students with deaf-blindness, transition, early childhood, and collaborative family and community partnerships. ISBE staff also provide technical assistance to the field in all areas of general supervision. ISBE's technical assistance systems provide professional guidance and targeted consulting to assist school personnel in making use of available tools to build the capacity of their school districts to improve compliance and outcomes.

Professional Development System:

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

ISBE staff provide professional development related to the SPP indicators through online resources, webinars, and in-person trainings. ISBE's professional development system is implemented primarily through its funded technical assistance and training projects. These projects funded by IDEA Part D State Personnel Development Grants, Part B Discretionary grants, or State funds include the Illinois Elevating Special Educators Network (IESE), the Illinois Special Education Leadership Academy (ISELA), the Assistive Technology Technical Assistance, Training, and Resources Project (ATTATR), the Autism Training and Technical Assistance Project (ATTA), the Autism Learning and Support Project (A+), the Illinois Service Resource Center (ISRC), Project Reach, the Illinois Center for Transition and Work (ICTW), Starnet, Early CHOICES, and the IEP Tutorial Project (IEPQ).

- IESE is a statewide system of professional learning that focuses on enhancing the effectiveness of staff who support students with disabilities through

research-based professional development, delivering mentoring to increase the retention of early career special education teachers and professional learning to support pipeline recruitment efforts to address the Illinois special education teacher shortage, increasing the engagement of families as partners in the educational process and decision making, and delivering professional learning and technical assistance to build seamless and sustainable delivery systems for specialized populations of learners.

- ISELA provides advanced professional learning opportunities aligned to the needs of leaders of special services and offers one-to-one mentoring, coaching, and resources to support new and current leaders navigating the ongoing changes in the field of special education.
- ATTATR provides guided and intensive training to educators, administrators, paraprofessionals and parents on use of assistive technology to support attainment of IEP goals and knowledge of the principles of universal design for learning to promote differentiated instructional strategies.
- ATTA provides training on meeting the post-secondary transition needs of students with autism spectrum disorder.
- A+ provides professional learning and coaching to behavior teams to support students with autism spectrum disorder exhibiting significant behavioral challenges.
- ISRC provides professional learning and coaching for schools and families working with students who are deaf or hard of hearing or visually impaired with significant behavioral challenges.
- Project Reach provides professional learning and coaching for schools and families working with students with deaf-blindness.
- ICTW provides targeted technical assistance to schools to develop effective transition programming for students with the most significant disabilities. They also provide a wealth of transition resources and offer professional learning for schools working with transition-age youth.
- Starnet provides professional development on a variety of topics to support the programming of early childhood students with disabilities.
- Early CHOICES provides professional development to support inclusive practices in early childhood.
- IEPQ provides an online resource and professional learning opportunities on how to develop well-designed Individualized Education Programs aligned to state standards.

These various technical assistance and training projects, combined with professional development, resources, and support by ISBE staff, provide a comprehensive professional development system to ensure service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities. ISBE's professional development system ensures that training opportunities meet educator and administrator needs, range from early childhood through secondary transition, cover multiple special populations such as autism and deaf-blindness, and address the writing of quality IEPs and the implementation of IEP services through trainings related to areas such as assistive technology, and focus on academic and behavior needs of students with disabilities.

Broad Stakeholder Input:

The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

ISBE has ongoing communication regarding the SPP/APR with its primary stakeholder group, the Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC) through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. The role of ISAC is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. ISAC functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Services Department. ISAC is comprised of members who represent individuals with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, students with disabilities, teachers of students with disabilities, private providers, public charter schools, special education directors, regional superintendents, district superintendents, higher education personnel, vocational/community/business organization providers of transition services to students with disabilities, the Illinois Department of Human Services, the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, the Illinois Department of Corrections/Department of Juvenile Justice, and the general public. ISBE staff have discussions with ISAC multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, and improvement strategies with ISAC as necessary. ISAC assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising SPP targets for many of the indicators.

In addition to ISAC, ISBE collaborates with many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. Such stakeholder groups have included the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group, the Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium, the Harrisburg Project, the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE), the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA), the Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support Network Advisory Council, the Illinois Elevating Special Educators Advisory Group, Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs), Regional Offices of Education (ROEs), the Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois think tank, and the Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET) project. ISBE shares SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences, regional professional development opportunities, and task force meetings. Comments and suggestions from the stakeholder groups are incorporated into the SPP/APR.

ISBE collected stakeholder feedback on its proposed SPP targets in multiple ways. Beginning in June 2021, ISBE's Special Education Department initiated a series of stakeholder meetings to establish targets for the new six-year cycle of the SPP. These meetings were held virtually over a two-month period to maximize participation and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds. The following existing stakeholder groups participated in feedback sessions with ISBE:

- Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium
- Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education

Stakeholders included professional development providers, school district representatives, educational advocates, Illinois Early Learning Project representatives, Chicago Public Schools representatives, Parent Training and Information Center representatives, parent members of ISAC, early intervention representatives, inclusion support specialists, individuals with disabilities, students with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, parents from advisory committees, general public representatives, higher education representatives, Department of Corrections representatives, Illinois Service Resource Center representatives, directors of special education, assistant directors of special education, special education supervisors, special education coordinators, directors of innovative learning and technology, special education cooperative governing board members, regional superintendents, assistant regional superintendents, school business officials, and special education attorneys. In addition, the Illinois MTSS director, ISBE State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) coordinator, ISBE director of Special Education, ISBE SPP/State Systemic Improvement Plan coordinator, and ISBE Section 619 coordinator participated in one or more stakeholder meetings. A total of 121 stakeholder group members chose to participate in these six feedback sessions.

All stakeholder meetings were organized and facilitated by ISBE, with the assistance of group leaders. The meetings provided information on the SPP indicators to apprise stakeholders of the history and data trends so that they could make informed recommendations. The presentations included an introductory section on the SPP as well as information regarding goals for stakeholder input. Information about setting new baselines and targets was also provided. Then details about the importance of each indicator and how specific indicators are defined, measured, and calculated were shared.

National and state trend data were explained, average rates of change were discussed, and comparisons to similar states were provided for some indicators. Each session sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable.

These six stakeholder groups provided input on proposed targets for one or more of the following SPP indicators: 1, 2, 3, 4A, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, and 17. At the conclusion of the stakeholder group meetings, the proposed targets for SPP indicators 1, 2, 3, 4A, 7, 15, and 16 were determined reasonable and achievable. However, after several stakeholder group meetings, the proposed targets for SPP indicators 5, 6, 8, and 14 were reexamined and revised based on state and national trend data and stakeholder feedback. These revisions were made prior to the release of the SPP proposed target web modules and online survey for additional stakeholder feedback on June 9. ISBE recorded 16 separate SPP modules and posted them on the website. The introduction module provided general information that applied to all SPP indicators. Each of the SPP modules shared information specific to the indicator(s) being addressed, such as state and national trend data, measurements, and proposed SPP targets for the FFY 2020-25 SPP cycle. Each module sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable by requesting that the participant complete a survey. The survey was open for over two months to gather stakeholder input. Prior to initiating the module recordings and survey, ISBE advertised broadly via state bulletins, listservs, Parent Training and Information Center publications, other state technical assistance resource centers, and the six stakeholder groups mentioned previously. These efforts resulted in 180 stakeholders completing SPP surveys. These stakeholders represented a variety of regions of the state and races/ethnicities. Survey completers identified themselves as community members, educators, administrators, and other stakeholders. After these meetings were convened and survey data was compiled, ISBE engaged in an internal review of stakeholder feedback.

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

YES

Number of Parent Members:

17

Parent Members Engagement:

Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

Seventeen parent representatives had the opportunity to engage in data analysis, progress evaluation, and target setting through virtual meetings as members of the six existing stakeholder groups mentioned above. Parent representatives included parent members of ISAC, parent training center staff, parents from various advisory committees, and individual parents. These parents also had the opportunity to suggest ideas for improvement for specific SPP Indicators. Progress on the new SPP targets will be evaluated beginning next year as the new SPP cycle gets underway. Parent representatives on these six stakeholder groups had the same opportunities as other group members to provide feedback to ISBE. In addition, every individual parent of a child with a disability aged 3-21 in the state of Illinois had the opportunity to listen to recorded modules for specific SPP Indicators and to complete SPP Indicator surveys as a means of providing feedback to ISBE on proposed targets and suggestions for improvement. The survey was open for over two months to gather stakeholder input. Prior to initiating the survey and corresponding SPP module recordings, ISBE advertised broadly via state bulletins, listservs, Parent Training and Information Center publications, other state technical assistance resource centers, and the six stakeholder groups mentioned previously.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

In order to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents engaging in activities designed to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, every parent of a child with a disability aged 3-21 in the state of Illinois had the opportunity to listen to recorded modules for specific SPP Indicators and to complete SPP Indicator surveys as a means of providing feedback to ISBE. The survey was open for over two months to gather stakeholder input. Prior to initiating the survey and corresponding SPP module recordings, ISBE advertised broadly via state bulletins, listservs, Parent Training and Information Center publications, other state technical assistance resource centers, and the six stakeholder groups mentioned previously. The survey collected demographic information regarding primary role, race/ethnicity, and geographic region of the state. Stakeholders represented a variety of regions of the state and races/ethnicities. Survey completers identified themselves as community members, educators, administrators, and other stakeholders. A summary of stakeholder input is available on the ISBE website: <https://www.isbe.net/Documents/SH-Survey-Summary.pdf>. After reviewing the survey responses, ISBE would have preferred greater survey participation, especially from parents. However, after internal department discussions, general feelings of "COVID-19 fatigue" and survey oversaturation were thought to be factors in the lower than expected response rate. Families, community members, and districts were consumed with keeping children healthy and safe. Therefore, ISBE did not aggressively pursue outreach to any particular group of parents for SPP feedback. ISBE will examine future means of increasing parent engagement for improving outcomes for children with disabilities.

Soliciting Public Input:

The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

Beginning in June 2021, ISBE's Special Education Department initiated a series of stakeholder meetings to establish targets for the new six-year cycle of the SPP. These meetings were held virtually over a two-month period to maximize participation and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds. The following existing stakeholder groups participated in feedback sessions with ISBE:

- Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium
- Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education

Stakeholders included professional development providers, school district representatives, educational advocates, Illinois Early Learning Project representatives, Chicago Public Schools representatives, Parent Training and Information Center representatives, early intervention representatives, inclusion support specialists, individuals with disabilities, students with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, general public representatives, higher education representatives, Department of Corrections representatives, Illinois Service Resource Center representatives, directors of special education, assistant directors of special education, special education supervisors, special education coordinators, directors of innovative learning and technology, special education cooperative governing board members, regional superintendents, assistant regional superintendents, school business officials, and special education attorneys. In addition, the Illinois MTSS director, ISBE State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) coordinator, ISBE director of Special Education, ISBE SPP/State Systemic Improvement Plan coordinator, and ISBE Section 619 coordinator participated in one or more stakeholder meetings. A total of 121 stakeholder group members chose to participate in these six feedback sessions.

All stakeholder meetings were organized and facilitated by ISBE, with the assistance of group leaders. The meetings provided information on the SPP indicators to apprise stakeholders of the history and data trends so that they could make informed recommendations. The presentations included an introductory section on the SPP as well as information regarding goals for stakeholder input. Information about setting new baselines and targets was also provided. Then details about the importance of each indicator and how specific indicators are defined, measured, and calculated were shared. National and state trend data were explained, average rates of change were discussed, and comparisons to similar states were provided for some indicators. Each session sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable.

These six stakeholder groups provided input on proposed targets for one or more of the following SPP indicators: 1, 2, 3, 4A, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, and 17. After several stakeholder group meetings, SPP 5, 6, 8, and 14 proposed targets were reexamined and updated based on state and national trend data and stakeholder feedback prior to the release of the SPP proposed target web modules and online survey for stakeholder feedback on June 9. ISBE recorded 16 separate SPP modules and posted them on the website. The introduction module provided general information that applied to all SPP indicators. Each of the SPP modules shared information specific to the indicator(s) being addressed, such as state and national trend data, measurements, and proposed SPP targets for the FFY 2020-25 SPP cycle. Each module sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable by requesting that the participant complete a survey. The survey was open for over two months to gather stakeholder input. Prior to initiating the module recordings and survey, ISBE advertised broadly via state bulletins, listservs, Parent Training and Information Center publications, other state technical assistance resource centers, and the six stakeholder groups mentioned previously. These efforts resulted in 180 stakeholders completing SPP surveys. These stakeholders represented a variety of regions of the state and races/ethnicities. Survey completers identified themselves as community members, educators, administrators, and other stakeholders. After these meetings were convened and survey data was compiled, ISBE engaged in an internal review of stakeholder feedback.

In terms of developing improvement strategies and evaluating progress, ISBE meets with its primary stakeholder group, the Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, four times a year. At least once during the year, ISBE shares SPP outcomes data with the group and discusses progress and slippage as compared to previous years. Stakeholders have the opportunity to discuss any and all SPP indicators at that time to address improvement strategies and progress. In addition, the ISBE director of special education meets regularly throughout the year with the two Parent Training and Information Centers in the state to discuss pertinent issues, including SPP progress. Directors of these centers have the opportunity to provide feedback regarding improvement during these meetings. Progress is also monitored and evaluated through individual online LEA Profiles that display a district's progress toward the SPP targets. District progress toward SPP targets is also monitored and evaluated through the Illinois Special Education Accountability and Support System, of which individual LEA Determinations are a part. The stakeholder group associated with the accountability system assists in evaluating district progress and revising system components as necessary based on district outcome data. Finally, progress for several SPP Indicators is aligned to the Illinois State Personnel Development Grant. The grant's advisory council assists the state leadership team with progress evaluation toward the grant objectives.

Making Results Available to the Public:

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

Stakeholder meetings and surveys were completed by September 2021. After stakeholder meetings were convened and survey data was compiled, ISBE engaged in an internal review of stakeholder feedback. The results of the stakeholder feedback were used to finalize SPP Indicator targets in late September. Summaries of stakeholder feedback were shared with several of the stakeholder groups. In addition, a summary of stakeholder input was posted in October 2021 on the ISBE website: <https://www.isbe.net/Documents/SH-Survey-Summary.pdf>. The summary remains on the ISBE website for public review.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2019 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.

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

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Intro - OSEP Response

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data¹

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	82.57%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	84.00%	84.00%	71.80%	73.00%	74.20%
Data	70.52%	70.52%	71.18%	71.64%	69.9% ²

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	82.60%	82.60%	82.60%	82.60%	82.60%	84.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ISBE has ongoing communication regarding the SPP/APR with its primary stakeholder group, the Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC) through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. The role of ISAC is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. ISAC functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Services Department. ISAC is comprised of members who represent individuals with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, students with disabilities, teachers of students with disabilities, private providers, public charter schools, special education directors, regional superintendents, district superintendents, higher education personnel, vocational/community/business organization providers of transition services to students with disabilities, the Illinois Department of Human Services, the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, the Illinois Department of Corrections/Department of Juvenile Justice, and the general public. ISBE staff have discussions with ISAC multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, and improvement strategies with ISAC as necessary. ISAC assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising SPP targets for many of the indicators.

In addition to ISAC, ISBE collaborates with many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. Such stakeholder groups have included the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group, the Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium, the Harrisburg Project, the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE), the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA), the Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support Network Advisory Council, the Illinois Elevating Special Educators Advisory Group, Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs), Regional Offices of Education (ROEs), the Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois think tank, and the Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET) project. ISBE shares SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences, regional professional development opportunities, and task force meetings. Comments and suggestions from the stakeholder groups are incorporated into the SPP/APR.

ISBE collected stakeholder feedback on its proposed SPP targets in multiple ways. Beginning in June 2021, ISBE's Special Education Department initiated a series of stakeholder meetings to establish targets for the new six-year cycle of the SPP. These meetings were held virtually over a two-month period to maximize participation and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds. The following existing stakeholder groups

¹ Prior to the FFY 2020 submission, the State used a different data source to report data under this indicator.

² Percentage blurred due to privacy protection

participated in feedback sessions with ISBE:

- Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium
- Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education

Stakeholders included professional development providers, school district representatives, educational advocates, Illinois Early Learning Project representatives, Chicago Public Schools representatives, Parent Training and Information Center representatives, parent members of ISAC, early intervention representatives, inclusion support specialists, individuals with disabilities, students with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, parents from advisory committees, general public representatives, higher education representatives, Department of Corrections representatives, Illinois Service Resource Center representatives, directors of special education, assistant directors of special education, special education supervisors, special education coordinators, directors of innovative learning and technology, special education cooperative governing board members, regional superintendents, assistant regional superintendents, school business officials, and special education attorneys. In addition, the Illinois MTSS director, ISBE State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) coordinator, ISBE director of Special Education, ISBE SPP/State Systemic Improvement Plan coordinator, and ISBE Section 619 coordinator participated in one or more stakeholder meetings. A total of 121 stakeholder group members chose to participate in these six feedback sessions.

All stakeholder meetings were organized and facilitated by ISBE, with the assistance of group leaders. The meetings provided information on the SPP indicators to apprise stakeholders of the history and data trends so that they could make informed recommendations. The presentations included an introductory section on the SPP as well as information regarding goals for stakeholder input. Information about setting new baselines and targets was also provided. Then details about the importance of each indicator and how specific indicators are defined, measured, and calculated were shared. National and state trend data were explained, average rates of change were discussed, and comparisons to similar states were provided for some indicators. Each session sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable.

These six stakeholder groups provided input on proposed targets for one or more of the following SPP indicators: 1, 2, 3, 4A, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, and 17. At the conclusion of the stakeholder group meetings, the proposed targets for SPP indicators 1, 2, 3, 4A, 7, 15, and 16 were determined reasonable and achievable. However, after several stakeholder group meetings, the proposed targets for SPP indicators 5, 6, 8, and 14 were reexamined and revised based on state and national trend data and stakeholder feedback. These revisions were made prior to the release of the SPP proposed target web modules and online survey for additional stakeholder feedback on June 9. ISBE recorded 16 separate SPP modules and posted them on the website. The introduction module provided general information that applied to all SPP indicators. Each of the SPP modules shared information specific to the indicator(s) being addressed, such as state and national trend data, measurements, and proposed SPP targets for the FFY 2020-25 SPP cycle. Each module sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable by requesting that the participant complete a survey. The survey was open for over two months to gather stakeholder input. Prior to initiating the module recordings and survey, ISBE advertised broadly via state bulletins, listservs, Parent Training and Information Center publications, other state technical assistance resource centers, and the six stakeholder groups mentioned previously. These efforts resulted in 180 stakeholders completing SPP surveys. These stakeholders represented a variety of regions of the state and races/ethnicities. Survey completers identified themselves as community members, educators, administrators, and other stakeholders. After these meetings were convened and survey data was compiled, ISBE engaged in an internal review of stakeholder feedback.

A new baseline year and new targets were set for SPP Indicator 1 due to the data source change at the federal level. Please see the additional information section below for further details regarding the changes to baseline and targets for SPP Indicator 1.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	15,784
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	294
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	365
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	1,610

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
15,784	18,053	69.9% ³	82.60%	87.43%	Met target	N/A

Graduation Conditions

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

At the State level, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are the same as those for youth without IEPs. Per the Illinois School Code, in addition to other course requirements, each pupil entering the 9th grade must successfully complete the following courses to graduate with a standard high school diploma: four years of language arts; two years of writing intensive courses, one of which must be English and the other of which may be English or any other subject; three years of mathematics, one of which must be Algebra I and one of which must include geometry content; two years of science; two years of social studies, of which at least one year must be history of the United States or a combination of history of the United States and American government, and at least one semester must be civics; and one year chosen from (A) music, (B) art, (C) foreign language, which shall be deemed to include American Sign Language or (D) vocational education. Curriculum and credit requirements are the same for students with disabilities as they are for students without disabilities with the exception of those determined by the local IEP team to be inappropriate. Decisions regarding the issuance of a diploma for students whose course of study is guided by an IEP are made at the LEA level, based upon State requirements for the issuance of a high school diploma. Graduates include only students who were awarded regular high school diplomas. Students who are awarded GEDs or certificates of completion are considered non-graduates.

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

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The baseline year for SPP Indicator 1 was changed to FFY 2019 since the data source changed at the federal level for this reporting period. OSEP now requires States to use the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009. New targets were also developed with stakeholder input since the measurement at the federal level is no longer a comparison between students with and without disabilities. The measurement now examines a percentage of exiters with IEPs in a single year. ISBE met with multiple stakeholder groups to review national trend data and Illinois trend data for SPP Indicator 1. The potential impact of other factors that could have affected the data was also discussed with stakeholders when determining the most appropriate baseline year and reasonable, but achievable, targets. SPP Indicator 1 stakeholder meeting polling results showed 80% agreement and 10% disagreement with the SPP Indicator 1 proposed targets. No reasons or alternative targets were given by stakeholders for the "no" responses. Online surveys showed 93% agreement with proposed targets for SPP Indicator 1.

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using Section 618 data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

1 - Required Actions

³ Percentage blurred due to privacy protection

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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

Measurement

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target.

With the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, States may use either option 1 or 2. States using Option 2 must provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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

OPTION 2:

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

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

Options 1 and 2:

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, States must report data using Option 1 (i.e., the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA). Option 2 will not be available beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data⁴

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	13.73%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	4.80%	4.70%	4.60%	4.50%	4.50%
Data	3.58%	3.39%	3.54%	3.22%	2.89%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	13.70%	13.70%	13.70%	13.70%	13.70%	13.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ISBE has ongoing communication regarding the SPP/APR with its primary stakeholder group, the Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC) through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. The role of ISAC is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. ISAC functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Services Department. ISAC is comprised of members who represent individuals with disabilities,

⁴ Prior to the FFY 2020 submission, the State used a different data source to report data under this indicator.

parents of children with disabilities, students with disabilities, teachers of students with disabilities, private providers, public charter schools, special education directors, regional superintendents, district superintendents, higher education personnel, vocational/community/business organization providers of transition services to students with disabilities, the Illinois Department of Human Services, the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, the Illinois Department of Corrections/Department of Juvenile Justice, and the general public. ISBE staff have discussions with ISAC multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, and improvement strategies with ISAC as necessary. ISAC assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising SPP targets for many of the indicators.

In addition to ISAC, ISBE collaborates with many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. Such stakeholder groups have included the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group, the Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium, the Harrisburg Project, the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE), the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA), the Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support Network Advisory Council, the Illinois Elevating Special Educators Advisory Group, Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs), Regional Offices of Education (ROEs), the Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois think tank, and the Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET) project. ISBE shares SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences, regional professional development opportunities, and task force meetings. Comments and suggestions from the stakeholder groups are incorporated into the SPP/APR.

ISBE collected stakeholder feedback on its proposed SPP targets in multiple ways. Beginning in June 2021, ISBE's Special Education Department initiated a series of stakeholder meetings to establish targets for the new six-year cycle of the SPP. These meetings were held virtually over a two-month period to maximize participation and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds. The following existing stakeholder groups participated in feedback sessions with ISBE:

- Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium
- Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education

Stakeholders included professional development providers, school district representatives, educational advocates, Illinois Early Learning Project representatives, Chicago Public Schools representatives, Parent Training and Information Center representatives, parent members of ISAC, early intervention representatives, inclusion support specialists, individuals with disabilities, students with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, parents from advisory committees, general public representatives, higher education representatives, Department of Corrections representatives, Illinois Service Resource Center representatives, directors of special education, assistant directors of special education, special education supervisors, special education coordinators, directors of innovative learning and technology, special education cooperative governing board members, regional superintendents, assistant regional superintendents, school business officials, and special education attorneys. In addition, the Illinois MTSS director, ISBE State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) coordinator, ISBE director of Special Education, ISBE SPP/State Systemic Improvement Plan coordinator, and ISBE Section 619 coordinator participated in one or more stakeholder meetings. A total of 121 stakeholder group members chose to participate in these six feedback sessions.

All stakeholder meetings were organized and facilitated by ISBE, with the assistance of group leaders. The meetings provided information on the SPP indicators to apprise stakeholders of the history and data trends so that they could make informed recommendations. The presentations included an introductory section on the SPP as well as information regarding goals for stakeholder input. Information about setting new baselines and targets was also provided. Then details about the importance of each indicator and how specific indicators are defined, measured, and calculated were shared. National and state trend data were explained, average rates of change were discussed, and comparisons to similar states were provided for some indicators. Each session sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable.

These six stakeholder groups provided input on proposed targets for one or more of the following SPP indicators: 1, 2, 3, 4A, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, and 17. At the conclusion of the stakeholder group meetings, the proposed targets for SPP indicators 1, 2, 3, 4A, 7, 15, and 16 were determined reasonable and achievable. However, after several stakeholder group meetings, the proposed targets for SPP indicators 5, 6, 8, and 14 were reexamined and revised based on state and national trend data and stakeholder feedback. These revisions were made prior to the release of the SPP proposed target web modules and online survey for additional stakeholder feedback on June 9. ISBE recorded 16 separate SPP modules and posted them on the website. The introduction module provided general information that applied to all SPP indicators. Each of the SPP modules shared information specific to the indicator(s) being addressed, such as state and national trend data, measurements, and proposed SPP targets for the FFY 2020-25 SPP cycle. Each module sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable by requesting that the participant complete a survey. The survey was open for over two months to gather stakeholder input. Prior to initiating the module recordings and survey, ISBE advertised broadly via state bulletins, listservs, Parent Training and Information Center publications, other state technical assistance resource centers, and the six stakeholder groups mentioned previously. These efforts resulted in 180 stakeholders completing SPP surveys. These stakeholders represented a variety of regions of the state and races/ethnicities. Survey completers identified themselves as community members, educators, administrators, and other stakeholders. After these meetings were convened and survey data was compiled, ISBE engaged in an internal review of stakeholder feedback.

The baseline year for SPP Indicator 2 was changed to FFY 2019 to align with SPP Indicator 1 since the data source for SPP Indicator 1 changed at the federal level for this reporting period. The data source change at the federal level for SPP Indicator 2 was optional for States for this reporting year and will be required in FFY 2021 for SPP Indicator 2. Please see the additional information section below for further details regarding the changes to baseline and targets for SPP Indicator 2.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 1

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	15,784

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	294
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	365
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	1,610

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
1,610	18,053	2.89%	13.70%	8.92%	Met target	N/A

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

A dropout is defined as any child enrolled in grades 9 through 12 whose name has been removed from the LEA enrollment roster for any reason other than the student's death, extended illness, removal for medical non-compliance, expulsion, aging out, graduation or completion of a program of study, and who has not transferred to another public or private school, and is not known to be home schooled by parents or guardians or continuing school in another country. The calculation used to determine the dropout rate for youth with IEPs is the total number of high school dropouts with IEPs for the subgroup as reported in the statewide Student Information System (SIS) divided by the total high school enrollment of youth with IEPs as reported in SIS.

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

NO

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The baseline year for SPP Indicator 2 was changed to FFY 2019 to align with SPP Indicator 1, since the data source changed at the federal level for this reporting period for SPP Indicator 1. OSEP now requires States to use the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009 For SPP Indicator 1. This same data source change at the federal level for SPP Indicator 2 was optional for States this year but will be required in FFY 2021 for SPP Indicator 2. New targets were also developed with stakeholder input since the measurement at the federal level is no longer a comparison between students with and without disabilities. The measurement now examines a percentage of exiters with IEPs in a single year. ISBE met with multiple stakeholder groups to review national trend data and Illinois trend data for SPP Indicator 2. The potential impact of other factors that could have affected the data was also discussed with stakeholders when determining the most appropriate baseline year and reasonable, but achievable, targets. SPP Indicator 2 stakeholder meeting polling results showed 80% agreement and 20% disagreement with the SPP Indicator 2 proposed targets. No reasons or alternative targets were given by stakeholders for the "no" responses. Online surveys showed 93% agreement with proposed targets for SPP Indicator 2.

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using Section 618 data from FFY 2019 and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2018	98.16%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2018	96.93%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2018	95.19%
Math	A	Grade 4	2018	97.99%
Math	B	Grade 8	2018	96.45%
Math	C	Grade HS	2018	95.17%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ISBE has ongoing communication regarding the SPP/APR with its primary stakeholder group, the Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC) through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. The role of ISAC is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. ISAC functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Services Department. ISAC is comprised of members who represent individuals with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, students with disabilities, teachers of students with disabilities, private providers, public charter schools, special education directors, regional superintendents, district superintendents, higher education personnel, vocational/community/business organization providers of transition services to students with disabilities, the Illinois Department of Human Services, the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, the Illinois Department of Corrections/Department of Juvenile Justice, and the general public. ISBE staff have discussions with ISAC multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, and improvement strategies with ISAC as necessary. ISAC assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising SPP targets for many of the indicators.

In addition to ISAC, ISBE collaborates with many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. Such stakeholder groups have included the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group, the Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium, the Harrisburg Project, the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE), the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA), the Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support Network Advisory Council, the Illinois Elevating Special Educators Advisory Group, Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs), Regional Offices of Education (ROEs), the Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois think tank, and the Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET) project. ISBE shares SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences, regional professional development opportunities, and task force meetings. Comments and suggestions from the stakeholder groups are incorporated into the SPP/APR.

ISBE collected stakeholder feedback on its proposed SPP targets in multiple ways. Beginning in June 2021, ISBE's Special Education Department initiated a series of stakeholder meetings to establish targets for the new six-year cycle of the SPP. These meetings were held virtually over a two-month period to maximize participation and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds. The following existing stakeholder groups participated in feedback sessions with ISBE:

- Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium
- Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education

Stakeholders included professional development providers, school district representatives, educational advocates, Illinois Early Learning Project representatives, Chicago Public Schools representatives, Parent Training and Information Center representatives, parent members of ISAC, early intervention representatives, inclusion support specialists, individuals with disabilities, students with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, parents from advisory committees, general public representatives, higher education representatives, Department of Corrections representatives, Illinois Service Resource Center representatives, directors of special education, assistant directors of special education, special education supervisors, special education coordinators, directors of innovative learning and technology, special education cooperative governing board members, regional superintendents, assistant regional superintendents, school business officials, and special education attorneys. In addition, the Illinois MTSS director, ISBE State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) coordinator, ISBE director of Special Education, ISBE SPP/State Systemic Improvement Plan coordinator, and ISBE Section 619 coordinator participated in one or more stakeholder meetings. A total of 121 stakeholder group members chose to participate in these six feedback sessions.

All stakeholder meetings were organized and facilitated by ISBE, with the assistance of group leaders. The meetings provided information on the SPP indicators to apprise stakeholders of the history and data trends so that they could make informed recommendations. The presentations included an introductory section on the SPP as well as information regarding goals for stakeholder input. Information about setting new baselines and targets was also provided. Then details about the importance of each indicator and how specific indicators are defined, measured, and calculated were shared. National and state trend data were explained, average rates of change were discussed, and comparisons to similar states were provided for some indicators. Each session sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable.

These six stakeholder groups provided input on proposed targets for one or more of the following SPP indicators: 1, 2, 3, 4A, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, and 17. At the conclusion of the stakeholder group meetings, the proposed targets for SPP indicators 1, 2, 3, 4A, 7, 15, and 16 were determined reasonable and achievable. However, after several stakeholder group meetings, the proposed targets for SPP indicators 5, 6, 8, and 14 were reexamined and revised based on state and national trend data and stakeholder feedback. These revisions were made prior to the release of the SPP proposed target web modules and online survey for additional stakeholder feedback on June 9. ISBE recorded 16 separate SPP modules and posted them on the website. The introduction module provided general information that applied to all SPP indicators. Each of the SPP modules shared information specific to the indicator(s) being addressed, such as state and national trend data, measurements, and proposed SPP targets for the FFY 2020-25 SPP cycle. Each module sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable by requesting that the participant complete a survey. The survey was open for over two months to gather stakeholder input. Prior to initiating the module recordings and survey, ISBE advertised broadly via state bulletins, listservs, Parent Training and Information Center publications, other state technical assistance resource centers, and the six stakeholder groups mentioned previously. These efforts resulted in 180 stakeholders completing SPP surveys. These stakeholders represented a variety of regions of the state and races/ethnicities. Survey completers identified themselves as community members, educators, administrators, and other stakeholders. After these meetings were convened and survey data was compiled, ISBE engaged in an internal review of stakeholder feedback.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

03/30/2022

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	19,292	20,406	20,902
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	13,089	12,259	16,067
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	130	123	121
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1,048	1,052	1,805

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

03/30/2022

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	19,296	20,401	20,894
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	12,931	12,011	16,067
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	127	123	121
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1,045	1,041	1,797

*The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	14,267	19,292		95.00%	73.95%	Did not meet target	N/A
B	Grade 8	13,434	20,406		95.00%	65.83%	Did not meet target	N/A
C	Grade HS	17,993	20,902		95.00%	86.08%	Did not meet target	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	14,103	19,296		95.00%	73.09%	Did not meet target	N/A
B	Grade 8	13,175	20,401		95.00%	64.58%	Did not meet target	N/A
C	Grade HS	17,985	20,894		95.00%	86.08%	Did not meet target	N/A

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

Public reports of assessment results can be found via the links below.

The Illinois State Report Card for reporting assessment data for students with and without disabilities is available under the Academic Progress section at the following link:

<https://www.isbe.net/ilreportcard>.

The Illinois State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report, Part B provides assessment data for students with disabilities at the following link:

<https://www.isbe.net/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-Data-and-Accountability.aspx>

The Assessment Participation Report required by OSEP can be found under the second to last bullet point in the Resources section at the following link:

<https://www.isbe.net/Pages/Assessment.aspx>.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Because assessment flexibility was offered by the U.S. Department of Education (USDE), ISBE offered districts a choice between spring 2021 or fall 2021 assessments. The spring 2021 Illinois Assessment of Readiness (IAR) testing window was March 15, 2021 to May 28, 2021. The fall 2021 IAR testing window was August 9, 2021 to October 8, 2021. Ninety-five percent of districts chose to administer the IAR in the spring of 2021 while five percent elected to administer the IAR in the fall of 2021. The SAT had a spring 2021 assessment testing window of April 13-27, 2021 and a fall 2021 assessment testing window of October 13-26, 2021. Ninety-eight percent of districts chose to administer the SAT in the spring of 2021 while two percent elected to administer the SAT in the fall of 2021. The spring 2021 Dynamic Learning Maps-Alternate Assessment (DLM-AA) testing window was March 15, 2021 to June 30, 2021. The fall 2021 DLM-AA testing window was August 9, 2021 to September 30, 2021. Ninety-one percent of districts chose to administer the DLM-AA in the spring of 2021 while four percent elected to administer the DLM-AA in the fall of 2021. Three percent of districts chose to administer the DLM-AA in both the spring and fall of 2021. One percent of districts did not administer the DLM-AA. Therefore, the 2021 Report Card for Illinois has three data releases. The initial release of the Report Card took place on October 29, 2021 and included all metrics that do not rely on assessment data. Having both spring and fall testing windows for the 2021 school year meant assessment data would be released during the second or third release of the Report Card (as applicable by district). On December 2, 2021, preliminary IAR and SAT data was released to the Report Card for districts that completed spring assessment testing. This data is only reported on the Report Card at the school and district levels. No state-level data for these metrics was released on the Report Card during this time. On April 27, 2022, finalized IAR, SAT, and DLM-AA data will be released to the Report Card for districts that completed spring and/or fall assessment testing. This data will be reported at the school, district, and state levels. The SPP 3 assessment data was prepopulated for states in the SPP on March 30, 2022. Illinois resubmitted assessment data to USDE on April 25, 2022. Therefore, the assessment data currently populated in the SPP is not the final assessment data for Illinois as explained above.

ISBE experienced effects due to the global pandemic that most likely contributed to the significant decrease in assessment participation. The statewide data used in the measurement of this indicator appear to be complete, valid, and reliable. Therefore, the decrease in FFY 2020 is not attributed to any identified data quality issues. In addition, COVID-19 did not appear to impact ISBE's ability to collect data. However, COVID-19 did affect the percentage of students who participated in statewide assessments. For districts that were providing remote learning and instruction, parents had to volunteer to send their children to school in order to participate in the state assessments. This significantly affected the percent of students participating in state assessments.

ISBE acknowledges that districts struggled to adjust to the challenges surrounding decision making regarding how to complete statewide assessments during a global pandemic. ISBE also recognizes that some families did not feel comfortable with in-person assessments due to COVID-19. To mitigate the impact of COVID-19, ISBE published numerous guidance documents throughout the pandemic and posted them to the ISBE COVID-19 webpage: <https://www.isbe.net/coronavirus>. Resources were also posted on the assessment webpage: <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/Assessment.aspx>. ISBE staff also manned a COVID-19 team that responded to questions from school districts and families.

ISBE and its stakeholders established a new baseline for Indicator 3 using data from the 2018-19 school year, FFY 2018, test administration since there were changes to the measurements and new components added to the measurement table at the federal level. Targets were also updated to align with the new requirements. Stakeholders considered state assessment trend data related to participation rate when determining whether proposed targets were reasonable, yet achievable. Participation rate was calculated, as required by the measurement table, as the number of students with IEPs participating in an assessment divided by the total number of students with IEPs enrolled during the testing window. Trend data included assessment participation data for grades 4, 8, and 11 in reading and math for the 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19 school years (the past 3 tested years). No data was available for the 2019-20 school year due to the pandemic. School year 2020-21 data was also unavailable for consideration during stakeholder meetings as ISBE offered districts a choice between spring 2021 or fall 2021 assessments based on the assessment flexibility that was offered by the U.S. Department of Education. Therefore, testing windows for the IAR did not end until May 28, 2021 for the spring 2021 administration and October 8, 2021 for the fall 2021 administration. SAT testing windows ended April 27, 2021 for the spring 2021 administration and October 26, 2021 for the fall administration. DLM-AA testing windows did not end until June 30, 2021 for the spring 2021 administration and September 30, 2021 for the fall 2021 administration. Such timeframes did not allow for the collection and subsequent data analyses for all assessment data prior to stakeholder meetings. Stakeholders chose to use the 2018-19 school year data for baseline as it was the most recent, stable data available that was not impacted by COVID-19. Stakeholder online survey results indicated 92% agreement with the proposed targets for SPP Indicator 3A.

Updated April 2022 participation rate data for reading are 4th grade (72.37%), 8th grade (64.32%), and 11th grade (83.15%). Updated participation rates for math are 4th grade (71.50%), 8th grade (63.05%), and 11th grade (82.50%).

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State resubmitted assessment data to the Department on April 25, 2022; however, the assessment data prefilled in the Indicator is as of March 30, 2022. Therefore, the assessment data in the APR Reporting Tool is not the most recent assessment data submitted by the State.

3A - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2018	9.97%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2018	6.92%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2018	7.46%
Math	A	Grade 4	2018	10.80%
Math	B	Grade 8	2018	5.34%
Math	C	Grade HS	2018	6.29%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	11.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	7.00%	7.00%	7.00%	7.00%	7.00%	8.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	8.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	11.00%	11.00%	11.00%	11.00%	11.00%	12.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	5.50%	5.50%	5.50%	5.50%	5.50%	6.50%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	6.50%	6.50%	6.50%	6.50%	6.50%	7.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ISBE has ongoing communication regarding the SPP/APR with its primary stakeholder group, the Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC) through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. The role of ISAC is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. ISAC functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Services Department. ISAC is comprised of members who represent individuals with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, students with disabilities, teachers of students with disabilities, private providers, public charter schools, special education directors, regional superintendents, district superintendents, higher education personnel, vocational/community/business organization providers of transition services to students with disabilities, the Illinois Department of Human Services, the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, the Illinois Department of Corrections/Department of Juvenile Justice, and the general public. ISBE staff have discussions with ISAC multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, and improvement strategies with ISAC as necessary. ISAC assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising SPP targets for many of the indicators.

In addition to ISAC, ISBE collaborates with many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. Such stakeholder groups have included the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group, the Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium, the Harrisburg Project, the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE), the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA), the Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support Network Advisory Council, the Illinois Elevating Special Educators Advisory Group, Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs), Regional Offices of Education (ROEs), the Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois think tank, and the Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET) project. ISBE shares SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences, regional professional development opportunities, and task force meetings. Comments and suggestions from the stakeholder groups are incorporated into the SPP/APR.

ISBE collected stakeholder feedback on its proposed SPP targets in multiple ways. Beginning in June 2021, ISBE's Special Education Department initiated a series of stakeholder meetings to establish targets for the new six-year cycle of the SPP. These meetings were held virtually over a two-month period to maximize participation and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds. The following existing stakeholder groups participated in feedback sessions with ISBE:

- Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium
- Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education

Stakeholders included professional development providers, school district representatives, educational advocates, Illinois Early Learning Project representatives, Chicago Public Schools representatives, Parent Training and Information Center representatives, parent members of ISAC, early intervention representatives, inclusion support specialists, individuals with disabilities, students with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, parents from advisory committees, general public representatives, higher education representatives, Department of Corrections representatives, Illinois Service Resource Center representatives, directors of special education, assistant directors of special education, special education supervisors, special education coordinators, directors of innovative learning and technology, special education cooperative governing board members, regional superintendents, assistant regional superintendents, school business officials, and special education attorneys. In addition, the Illinois MTSS director, ISBE State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) coordinator, ISBE director of Special Education, ISBE SPP/State Systemic Improvement Plan coordinator, and ISBE Section 619 coordinator participated in one or more stakeholder meetings. A total of 121 stakeholder group members chose to participate in these six feedback sessions.

All stakeholder meetings were organized and facilitated by ISBE, with the assistance of group leaders. The meetings provided information on the SPP indicators to apprise stakeholders of the history and data trends so that they could make informed recommendations. The presentations included an introductory section on the SPP as well as information regarding goals for stakeholder input. Information about setting new baselines and targets was also provided. Then details about the importance of each indicator and how specific indicators are defined, measured, and calculated were shared. National and state trend data were explained, average rates of change were discussed, and comparisons to similar states were provided for some indicators. Each session sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable.

These six stakeholder groups provided input on proposed targets for one or more of the following SPP indicators: 1, 2, 3, 4A, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, and 17. At the conclusion of the stakeholder group meetings, the proposed targets for SPP indicators 1, 2, 3, 4A, 7, 15, and 16 were determined reasonable and achievable. However, after several stakeholder group meetings, the proposed targets for SPP indicators 5, 6, 8, and 14 were reexamined and revised based on state and national trend data and stakeholder feedback. These revisions were made prior to the release of the SPP proposed target web modules and online survey for additional stakeholder feedback on June 9. ISBE recorded 16 separate SPP modules and posted them on the website. The introduction module provided general information that applied to all SPP indicators. Each of the SPP modules shared information specific to the indicator(s) being addressed, such as state and national trend data, measurements, and proposed SPP targets for the FFY 2020-25 SPP cycle. Each module sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable by requesting that the participant complete a survey. The survey was open for over two months to gather stakeholder input. Prior to initiating the module recordings and survey, ISBE advertised broadly via state bulletins, listservs, Parent Training and Information Center publications, other state technical assistance resource centers, and the six stakeholder groups mentioned previously. These efforts resulted in 180 stakeholders completing SPP surveys. These stakeholders represented a variety of regions of the state and races/ethnicities. Survey completers identified themselves as community members, educators, administrators, and other stakeholders. After these meetings were convened and survey data was compiled, ISBE engaged in an internal review of stakeholder feedback.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	13,209	12,350	16,070
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	966	610	996

c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	18	28	23
---	----	----	----

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	13,044	12,109	16,070
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,058	492	731
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	19	20	17

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	984	13,209		10.00%	7.45%	Did not meet target	N/A
B	Grade 8	638	12,350		7.00%	5.17%	Did not meet target	N/A
C	Grade HS	1,019	16,070		7.50%	6.34%	Did not meet target	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,077	13,044		11.00%	8.26%	Did not meet target	N/A
B	Grade 8	512	12,109		5.50%	4.23%	Did not meet target	N/A
C	Grade HS	748	16,070		6.50%	4.65%	Did not meet target	N/A

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

Public reports of assessment results can be found via the links below.

The Illinois State Report Card for reporting assessment data for students with and without disabilities is available under the Academic Progress section at the following link:

<https://www.isbe.net/ilreportcard>.

The Illinois State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report, Part B provides assessment data for students with disabilities at the following link:

<https://www.isbe.net/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-Data-and-Accountability.aspx>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Because assessment flexibility was offered by the U.S. Department of Education (USDE), ISBE offered districts a choice between spring 2021 or fall 2021 assessments. The spring 2021 Illinois Assessment of Readiness (IAR) testing window was March 15, 2021 to May 28, 2021. The fall 2021 IAR testing window was August 9, 2021 to October 8, 2021. Ninety-five percent of districts chose to administer the IAR in the spring of 2021 while five percent elected to administer the IAR in the fall of 2021. The SAT had a spring 2021 assessment testing window of April 13-27, 2021 and a fall 2021 assessment testing window of October 13-26, 2021. Ninety-eight percent of districts chose to administer the SAT in the spring of 2021 while two percent elected to administer the SAT in the fall of 2021. Therefore, the 2021 Report Card for Illinois has three data releases. The initial release of the Report Card took place on October 29, 2021 and included all metrics that do not rely on assessment data. Having both spring and fall testing windows for the 2021 school year meant assessment data would be released during the second or third release of the Report Card (as applicable by district). On December 2, 2021, preliminary IAR and SAT data was released to the Report Card for districts that completed spring assessment testing. This data is only reported on the Report Card at the school and district levels. No state-level data for these metrics was released on the Report Card during this time. On April 27, 2022, finalized IAR, SAT, and DLM-AA data will be released to the Report Card for districts that completed spring and/or fall assessment testing. This data will be reported at the school, district, and state levels. The SPP 3 assessment data was prepopulated for states in the SPP on March 30, 2022. Illinois resubmitted assessment data to USDE on April 25, 2022. Therefore, the assessment data currently populated in the SPP is not the final assessment data for Illinois as explained above.

ISBE and its stakeholders established a new baseline for Indicator 3 using data from the 2018-19 school year, FFY 2018, test administration since there were changes to the measurements and new components added to the measurement table at the federal level. Targets were also updated to align with the new requirements. Stakeholders considered state assessment trend data related to proficiency rate against grade level academic achievement standards when determining whether proposed targets were reasonable, yet achievable. Proficiency rate against grade level academic achievement standards data was calculated, as required by the measurement table, as the number of students with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards divided by the total number of students with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment. Trend data included assessment performance data on the IAR and SAT for grades 4, 8, and 11 in reading and math for the 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19 school years (the past 3 tested years). No data was available for the 2019-20 school year due to the pandemic. School year 2020-21 data was also unavailable for consideration during stakeholder meetings as ISBE offered districts a choice between spring 2021 or fall 2021 assessments based on the assessment flexibility that was offered by the U.S. Department of Education. Therefore, testing windows for the IAR did not end until May 28, 2021 for the spring 2021 administration and October 8, 2021 for the fall 2021 administration. SAT testing windows ended April 27, 2021 for spring 2021 administration and October 26, 2021 for fall administration. Such timeframes did not allow for the collection and subsequent data analyses for all assessment data prior to stakeholder meetings. Stakeholders chose to use the 2018-19 school year data for baseline as it was the most recent, stable data available that was not impacted by COVID-19. Stakeholder online survey results indicated 93% agreement with the proposed targets for SPP 3B.

Updated April 2022 data regarding proficiency rates against grade level standards for reading are 4th grade (7.96%), 8th grade (6.70%), and 11th grade (8.32%). Updated proficiency rates against grade level standards for math are 4th grade (10.06%), 8th grade (4.54%), and 11th grade (6.60%).

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State resubmitted assessment data to the Department on April 25, 2022; however, the assessment data prefilled in the Indicator is as of March 30, 2022. Therefore, the assessment data in the APR Reporting Tool is not the most recent assessment data submitted by the State.

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = $[(\# \text{ of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment})]$. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2018	13.60%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2018	22.08%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2018	21.50%
Math	A	Grade 4	2018	19.45%
Math	B	Grade 8	2018	4.18%
Math	C	Grade HS	2018	3.44%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	14.00%	14.00%	14.00%	14.00%	14.00%	15.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	22.50%	22.50%	22.50%	22.50%	22.50%	23.50%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	22.00%	22.00%	22.00%	22.00%	22.00%	22.50%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	19.50%	19.50%	19.50%	19.50%	19.50%	20.50%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	4.50%	4.50%	4.50%	4.50%	4.50%	5.50%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	3.50%	3.50%	3.50%	3.50%	3.50%	4.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ISBE has ongoing communication regarding the SPP/APR with its primary stakeholder group, the Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC) through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. The role of ISAC is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. ISAC functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Services Department. ISAC is comprised of members who represent individuals with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, students with disabilities, teachers of students with disabilities, private providers, public charter schools, special education directors, regional superintendents, district superintendents, higher education personnel, vocational/community/business organization providers of transition services to students with disabilities, the Illinois Department of Human Services, the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, the Illinois Department of Corrections/Department of Juvenile Justice, and the general public. ISBE staff have discussions with ISAC multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, and improvement strategies with ISAC as necessary. ISAC assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising SPP targets for many of the indicators.

In addition to ISAC, ISBE collaborates with many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. Such stakeholder groups have included the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group, the Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium, the Harrisburg Project, the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE), the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA), the Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support Network Advisory Council, the Illinois Elevating Special Educators Advisory Group, Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs), Regional Offices of Education (ROEs), the Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois think tank, and the Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET) project. ISBE shares SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences, regional professional development opportunities, and task force meetings. Comments and suggestions from the stakeholder groups are incorporated into the SPP/APR.

ISBE collected stakeholder feedback on its proposed SPP targets in multiple ways. Beginning in June 2021, ISBE's Special Education Department initiated a series of stakeholder meetings to establish targets for the new six-year cycle of the SPP. These meetings were held virtually over a two-month period to maximize participation and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds. The following existing stakeholder groups participated in feedback sessions with ISBE:

- Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium
- Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education

Stakeholders included professional development providers, school district representatives, educational advocates, Illinois Early Learning Project representatives, Chicago Public Schools representatives, Parent Training and Information Center representatives, parent members of ISAC, early intervention representatives, inclusion support specialists, individuals with disabilities, students with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, parents from advisory committees, general public representatives, higher education representatives, Department of Corrections representatives, Illinois Service Resource Center representatives, directors of special education, assistant directors of special education, special education supervisors, special education coordinators, directors of innovative learning and technology, special education cooperative governing board members, regional superintendents, assistant regional superintendents, school business officials, and special education attorneys. In addition, the Illinois MTSS director, ISBE State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) coordinator, ISBE director of Special Education, ISBE SPP/State Systemic Improvement Plan coordinator, and ISBE Section 619 coordinator participated in one or more stakeholder meetings. A total of 121 stakeholder group members chose to participate in these six feedback sessions.

All stakeholder meetings were organized and facilitated by ISBE, with the assistance of group leaders. The meetings provided information on the SPP indicators to apprise stakeholders of the history and data trends so that they could make informed recommendations. The presentations included an introductory section on the SPP as well as information regarding goals for stakeholder input. Information about setting new baselines and targets was also provided. Then details about the importance of each indicator and how specific indicators are defined, measured, and calculated were shared. National and state trend data were explained, average rates of change were discussed, and comparisons to similar states were provided for some indicators. Each session sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable.

These six stakeholder groups provided input on proposed targets for one or more of the following SPP indicators: 1, 2, 3, 4A, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, and 17. At the conclusion of the stakeholder group meetings, the proposed targets for SPP indicators 1, 2, 3, 4A, 7, 15, and 16 were determined reasonable and achievable. However, after several stakeholder group meetings, the proposed targets for SPP indicators 5, 6, 8, and 14 were reexamined and revised based on state and national trend data and stakeholder feedback. These revisions were made prior to the release of the SPP proposed target web modules and online survey for additional stakeholder feedback on June 9. ISBE recorded 16 separate SPP modules and posted them on the website. The introduction module provided general information that applied to all SPP indicators. Each of the SPP modules shared information specific to the indicator(s) being addressed, such as state and national trend data, measurements, and proposed SPP targets for the FFY 2020-25 SPP cycle. Each module sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable by requesting that the participant complete a survey. The survey was open for over two months to gather stakeholder input. Prior to initiating the module recordings and survey, ISBE advertised broadly via state bulletins, listservs, Parent Training and Information Center publications, other state technical assistance resource centers, and the six stakeholder groups mentioned previously. These efforts resulted in 180 stakeholders completing SPP surveys. These stakeholders represented a variety of regions of the state and races/ethnicities. Survey completers identified themselves as community members, educators, administrators, and other stakeholders. After these meetings were convened and survey data was compiled, ISBE engaged in an internal review of stakeholder feedback.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	1,049	1,053	1,779
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	141	158	448

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	1,046	1,042	1,770
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	337	61	417

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	141	1,049		14.00%	13.44%	Did not meet target	N/A
B	Grade 8	158	1,053		22.50%	15.00%	Did not meet target	N/A
C	Grade HS	448	1,779		22.00%	25.18%	Met target	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	337	1,046		19.50%	32.22%	Met target	N/A
B	Grade 8	61	1,042		4.50%	5.85%	Met target	N/A
C	Grade HS	417	1,770		3.50%	23.56%	Met target	N/A

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with

disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

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

Public reports of assessment results can be found via the links below.

The Illinois State Report Card for reporting assessment data for students with and without disabilities is available under the Academic Progress section at the following link:

<https://www.isbe.net/ilreportcard>.

The Illinois State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report, Part B provides assessment data for students with disabilities at the following link:

<https://www.isbe.net/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-Data-and-Accountability.aspx>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Because assessment flexibility was offered by the U.S. Department of Education (USDE), ISBE offered districts a choice between spring 2021 or fall 2021 assessments. The spring 2021 Dynamic Learning Maps-Alternate Assessment (DLM-AA) testing window was March 15, 2021 to June 30, 2021. The fall 2021 DLM-AA testing window was August 9, 2021 to September 30, 2021. Ninety-one percent of districts chose to administer the DLM-AA in the spring of 2021 while four percent elected to administer the DLM-AA in the fall of 2021. Three percent of districts chose to administer the DLM-AA in both the spring and fall of 2021. One percent of districts did not administer the DLM-AA. Therefore, the 2021 Report Card for Illinois has three data releases. The initial release of the Report Card took place on October 29, 2021 and included all metrics that do not rely on assessment data. Having both spring and fall testing windows for the 2021 school year meant assessment data would be released during the second or third release of the Report Card (as applicable by district). On December 2, 2021, preliminary IAR and SAT data was released to the Report Card for districts that completed spring assessment testing. This data is only reported on the Report Card at the school and district levels. No state-level data for these metrics was released on the Report Card during this time. On April 27, 2022, finalized IAR, SAT, and DLM-AA data will be released to the Report Card for districts that completed spring and/or fall assessment testing. This data will be reported at the school, district, and state levels. The SPP 3 assessment data was prepopulated for states in the SPP on March 30, 2022. Illinois resubmitted assessment data to USDE on April 25, 2022. Therefore, the assessment data currently populated in the SPP is not the final assessment data for Illinois as explained above.

ISBE and its stakeholders established a new baseline for Indicator 3 using data from the 2018-19 school year, FFY 2018, test administration since there were changes to the measurements and new components added to the measurement table at the federal level. Targets were also updated to align with the new requirements. Stakeholders considered state assessment trend data related to proficiency rate against alternate academic achievement standards when determining whether proposed targets were reasonable, yet achievable. Proficiency rate against alternate academic achievement standards data was calculated, as required by the measurement table, as the number of students with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards divided by the total number of students with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment. Trend data included assessment performance data on the DLM-AA for grades 4, 8, and 11 in reading and math for the 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19 school years (the past 3 tested years). No data was available for the 2019-20 school year due to the pandemic. School year 2020-21 data was also unavailable for consideration during stakeholder meetings as ISBE offered districts a choice between spring 2021 or fall 2021 assessments based on the assessment flexibility that was offered by the U.S. Department of Education. Therefore, testing windows for the DLM-AA did not end until June 30, 2021 for the spring 2021 administration and September 30, 2021 for the fall 2021 administration. Such timeframes did not allow for the collection and subsequent data analyses for all assessment data prior to stakeholder meetings. Stakeholders chose to use the 2018-19 school year data for baseline as it was the most recent, stable data available that was not impacted by COVID-19. Stakeholder online survey results indicated 92% agreement with the proposed targets for SPP Indicator 3C.

Updated April 2022 data regarding proficiency rates against alternate standards for reading are 4th grade (13.38%), 8th grade (15.37%), and 11th grade (25.51%). Updated proficiency rates against alternate standards for math are 4th grade (31.78%), 8th grade (5.88%), and 11th grade (24.38%).

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State resubmitted assessment data to the Department on April 25, 2022; however, the assessment data prefilled in the Indicator is as of March 30, 2022. Therefore, the assessment data in the APR Reporting Tool is not the most recent assessment data submitted by the State.

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2018	26.77
Reading	B	Grade 8	2018	32.68
Reading	C	Grade HS	2018	29.17
Math	A	Grade 4	2018	22.69
Math	B	Grade 8	2018	27.25
Math	C	Grade HS	2018	28.54

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	26.50	26.50	26.50	26.50	26.50	25.50
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	32.50	32.50	32.50	32.50	32.50	31.50
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	29.00	29.00	29.00	29.00	29.00	28.00
Math	A <=	Grade 4	22.50	22.50	22.50	22.50	22.50	21.50
Math	B <=	Grade 8	27.00	27.00	27.00	27.00	27.00	26.00
Math	C <=	Grade HS	28.50	28.50	28.50	28.50	28.50	27.50

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ISBE has ongoing communication regarding the SPP/APR with its primary stakeholder group, the Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC) through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. The role of ISAC is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. ISAC functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Services Department. ISAC is comprised of members who represent individuals with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, students with disabilities, teachers of students with disabilities, private providers, public charter schools, special education directors, regional superintendents, district superintendents, higher education personnel, vocational/community/business organization providers of transition services to students with disabilities, the Illinois Department of Human Services, the Illinois Department of Children and Family

Services, the Illinois Department of Corrections/Department of Juvenile Justice, and the general public. ISBE staff have discussions with ISAC multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, and improvement strategies with ISAC as necessary. ISAC assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising SPP targets for many of the indicators.

In addition to ISAC, ISBE collaborates with many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. Such stakeholder groups have included the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group, the Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium, the Harrisburg Project, the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE), the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA), the Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support Network Advisory Council, the Illinois Elevating Special Educators Advisory Group, Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs), Regional Offices of Education (ROEs), the Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois think tank, and the Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET) project. ISBE shares SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences, regional professional development opportunities, and task force meetings. Comments and suggestions from the stakeholder groups are incorporated into the SPP/APR.

ISBE collected stakeholder feedback on its proposed SPP targets in multiple ways. Beginning in June 2021, ISBE's Special Education Department initiated a series of stakeholder meetings to establish targets for the new six-year cycle of the SPP. These meetings were held virtually over a two-month period to maximize participation and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds. The following existing stakeholder groups participated in feedback sessions with ISBE:

- Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium
- Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education

Stakeholders included professional development providers, school district representatives, educational advocates, Illinois Early Learning Project representatives, Chicago Public Schools representatives, Parent Training and Information Center representatives, parent members of ISAC, early intervention representatives, inclusion support specialists, individuals with disabilities, students with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, parents from advisory committees, general public representatives, higher education representatives, Department of Corrections representatives, Illinois Service Resource Center representatives, directors of special education, assistant directors of special education, special education supervisors, special education coordinators, directors of innovative learning and technology, special education cooperative governing board members, regional superintendents, assistant regional superintendents, school business officials, and special education attorneys. In addition, the Illinois MTSS director, ISBE State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) coordinator, ISBE director of Special Education, ISBE SPP/State Systemic Improvement Plan coordinator, and ISBE Section 619 coordinator participated in one or more stakeholder meetings. A total of 121 stakeholder group members chose to participate in these six feedback sessions.

All stakeholder meetings were organized and facilitated by ISBE, with the assistance of group leaders. The meetings provided information on the SPP indicators to apprise stakeholders of the history and data trends so that they could make informed recommendations. The presentations included an introductory section on the SPP as well as information regarding goals for stakeholder input. Information about setting new baselines and targets was also provided. Then details about the importance of each indicator and how specific indicators are defined, measured, and calculated were shared. National and state trend data were explained, average rates of change were discussed, and comparisons to similar states were provided for some indicators. Each session sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable.

These six stakeholder groups provided input on proposed targets for one or more of the following SPP indicators: 1, 2, 3, 4A, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, and 17. At the conclusion of the stakeholder group meetings, the proposed targets for SPP indicators 1, 2, 3, 4A, 7, 15, and 16 were determined reasonable and achievable. However, after several stakeholder group meetings, the proposed targets for SPP indicators 5, 6, 8, and 14 were reexamined and revised based on state and national trend data and stakeholder feedback. These revisions were made prior to the release of the SPP proposed target web modules and online survey for additional stakeholder feedback on June 9. ISBE recorded 16 separate SPP modules and posted them on the website. The introduction module provided general information that applied to all SPP indicators. Each of the SPP modules shared information specific to the indicator(s) being addressed, such as state and national trend data, measurements, and proposed SPP targets for the FFY 2020-25 SPP cycle. Each module sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable by requesting that the participant complete a survey. The survey was open for over two months to gather stakeholder input. Prior to initiating the module recordings and survey, ISBE advertised broadly via state bulletins, listservs, Parent Training and Information Center publications, other state technical assistance resource centers, and the six stakeholder groups mentioned previously. These efforts resulted in 180 stakeholders completing SPP surveys. These stakeholders represented a variety of regions of the state and races/ethnicities. Survey completers identified themselves as community members, educators, administrators, and other stakeholders. After these meetings were convened and survey data was compiled, ISBE engaged in an internal review of stakeholder feedback.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	93,824	93,456	138,666

b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	13,209	12,350	16,070
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	25,566	30,992	41,886
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	761	1,306	3,057
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	966	610	996
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	18	28	23

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	92,975	91,829	138,666
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	13,044	12,109	16,070
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	21,140	23,078	37,053
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	725	1,150	2,529
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,058	492	731
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	19	20	17

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	7.45%	28.06%		26.50	20.61	Met target	N/A
B	Grade 8	5.17%	34.56%		32.50	29.39	Met target	N/A
C	Grade HS	6.34%	32.41%		29.00	26.07	Met target	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	8.26%	23.52%		22.50	15.26	Met target	N/A
B	Grade 8	4.23%	26.38%		27.00	22.16	Met target	N/A
C	Grade HS	4.65%	28.54%		28.50	23.89	Met target	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Because assessment flexibility was offered by the U.S. Department of Education (USDE), ISBE offered districts a choice between spring 2021 or fall 2021 assessments. The spring 2021 Illinois Assessment of Readiness (IAR) testing window was March 15, 2021 to May 28, 2021. The fall 2021 IAR testing window was August 9, 2021 to October 8, 2021. Ninety-five percent of districts chose to administer the IAR in the spring of 2021 while five percent elected to administer the IAR in the fall of 2021. The SAT had a spring 2021 assessment testing window of April 13-27, 2021 and a fall 2021 assessment testing window of October 13-26, 2021. Ninety-eight percent of districts chose to administer the SAT in the spring of 2021 while two percent elected to administer the SAT in the fall of 2021. Therefore, the 2021 Report Card for Illinois has three data releases. The initial release of the Report Card took place on October 29, 2021 and included all metrics that do not rely on assessment data. Having both spring and fall testing windows for the 2021 school year meant assessment data would be released during the second or third release of the Report Card (as applicable by district). On December 2, 2021, preliminary IAR and SAT data was released to the Report Card for districts that completed spring assessment testing. This data is only reported on the Report Card at the school and district levels. No state-level data for these metrics was released on the Report Card during this time. On April 27, 2022, finalized IAR, SAT, and DLM-AA data will be released to the Report Card for districts that completed spring and/or fall assessment testing. This data will be reported at the school, district, and state levels. The SPP 3 assessment data was prepopulated for states in the SPP on March 30, 2022. Illinois resubmitted assessment data to USDE on April 25, 2022. Therefore, the assessment data currently populated in the SPP is not the final assessment data for Illinois as explained above.

ISBE and its stakeholders established a new baseline for Indicator 3 using data from the 2018-19 school year, FFY 2018, test administration since there were changes to the measurements and new components added to the measurement table at the federal level. Targets were also updated to align with the new requirements. Stakeholders considered state assessment trend data related to the gap when determining whether proposed targets were reasonable, yet achievable. Assessment gap data was calculated, as required by the measurement table, as the proficiency rate for students with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards (OSEP groups [(e + f) / b]) subtracted from the proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards (OSEP groups [(c + d) / a]). Trend data included assessment performance gap data on the IAR and SAT for grades 4, 8, and 11 in reading and math for the 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19 school years (the past 3 tested years). No data was available for the 2019-20 school year due to the pandemic. School year 2020-21 data was also unavailable for consideration during stakeholder meetings as ISBE offered districts a choice between spring 2021 or fall 2021 assessments based on the assessment flexibility that was offered by the U.S. Department of Education. Therefore, testing windows for the IAR did not end until May 28, 2021 for the spring 2021 administration and October 8, 2021 for the fall 2021 administration. SAT testing windows ended April 27, 2021 for spring 2021 administration and October 26, 2021 for fall administration. Such timeframes did not allow for the collection and subsequent data analyses for all assessment data prior to stakeholder meetings. Stakeholders chose to use the 2018-19 school year data for baseline as it was the most recent, stable data available that was not impacted by COVID-19. Stakeholder online survey results indicated 100% agreement with the proposed targets for SPP 3D.

Updated April 2022 data regarding gaps in proficiency rates for reading are 4th grade (20.75%), 8th grade (28.67%), and 11th grade (25.71%). Updated proficiency rates against grade level standards for math are 4th grade (15.56%), 8th grade (21.96%), and 11th grade (23.54%).

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

The State has established the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that baseline.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State resubmitted assessment data to the Department on April 25, 2022; however, the assessment data prefilled in the Indicator is as of March 30, 2022. Therefore, the assessment data in the APR Reporting Tool is not the most recent assessment data submitted by the State.

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n and/or cell size requirement, if applicable).

If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	3.87%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	4.40%	4.20%	4.00%	3.80%	3.80%
Data	2.81%	2.35%	1.64%	1.53%	1.18%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target ≤	3.80%	3.60%	3.40%	3.20%	3.20%	3.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ISBE has ongoing communication regarding the SPP/APR with its primary stakeholder group, the Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC) through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. The role of ISAC is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. ISAC functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Services Department. ISAC is comprised of members who represent individuals with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, students with disabilities, teachers of students with disabilities, private providers, public charter schools, special education directors, regional superintendents, district superintendents, higher education personnel, vocational/community/business organization providers of transition services to students with disabilities, the Illinois Department of Human Services, the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, the Illinois Department of Corrections/Department of Juvenile Justice, and the general public. ISBE staff have discussions with ISAC multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, and improvement strategies with ISAC as necessary. ISAC assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising SPP targets for many of the indicators.

In addition to ISAC, ISBE collaborates with many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. Such stakeholder groups have included the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group, the Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium, the Harrisburg Project, the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE), the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA), the Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support Network Advisory Council, the Illinois Elevating Special Educators Advisory Group, Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs), Regional Offices of Education (ROEs), the Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois think tank, and the Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET) project. ISBE shares SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences, regional professional development opportunities, and task force meetings. Comments and suggestions from the stakeholder groups are incorporated into the SPP/APR.

ISBE collected stakeholder feedback on its proposed SPP targets in multiple ways. Beginning in June 2021, ISBE's Special Education Department initiated a series of stakeholder meetings to establish targets for the new six-year cycle of the SPP. These meetings were held virtually over a two-month period to maximize participation and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds. The following existing stakeholder groups participated in feedback sessions with ISBE:

- Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium
- Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education

Stakeholders included professional development providers, school district representatives, educational advocates, Illinois Early Learning Project representatives, Chicago Public Schools representatives, Parent Training and Information Center representatives, parent members of ISAC, early intervention representatives, inclusion support specialists, individuals with disabilities, students with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, parents from advisory committees, general public representatives, higher education representatives, Department of Corrections representatives, Illinois Service Resource Center representatives, directors of special education, assistant directors of special education, special education supervisors, special education coordinators, directors of innovative learning and technology, special education cooperative governing board members, regional superintendents, assistant regional superintendents, school business officials, and special education attorneys. In addition, the Illinois MTSS director, ISBE State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) coordinator, ISBE director of Special Education, ISBE SPP/State Systemic Improvement Plan coordinator, and ISBE Section 619 coordinator participated in one or more stakeholder meetings. A total of 121 stakeholder group members chose to participate in these six feedback sessions.

All stakeholder meetings were organized and facilitated by ISBE, with the assistance of group leaders. The meetings provided information on the SPP indicators to apprise stakeholders of the history and data trends so that they could make informed recommendations. The presentations included an introductory section on the SPP as well as information regarding goals for stakeholder input. Information about setting new baselines and targets was also provided. Then details about the importance of each indicator and how specific indicators are defined, measured, and calculated were shared. National and state trend data were explained, average rates of change were discussed, and comparisons to similar states were provided for some indicators. Each session sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable.

These six stakeholder groups provided input on proposed targets for one or more of the following SPP indicators: 1, 2, 3, 4A, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, and 17. At the conclusion of the stakeholder group meetings, the proposed targets for SPP indicators 1, 2, 3, 4A, 7, 15, and 16 were determined reasonable and achievable. However, after several stakeholder group meetings, the proposed targets for SPP indicators 5, 6, 8, and 14 were reexamined and revised based on state and national trend data and stakeholder feedback. These revisions were made prior to the release of the SPP proposed target web modules and online survey for additional stakeholder feedback on June 9. ISBE recorded 16 separate SPP modules and posted them on the website. The introduction module provided general information that applied to all SPP indicators. Each of the SPP modules shared information specific to the indicator(s) being addressed, such as state and national trend data, measurements, and proposed SPP targets for the FFY 2020-25 SPP cycle. Each module sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable by requesting that the participant complete a survey. The survey was open for over two months to gather stakeholder input. Prior to initiating the module recordings and survey, ISBE advertised broadly via state bulletins, listservs, Parent Training and Information Center publications, other state technical assistance resource centers, and the six stakeholder groups mentioned previously. These efforts resulted in 180 stakeholders completing SPP surveys. These stakeholders represented a variety of regions of the state and races/ethnicities. Survey completers identified themselves as community members, educators, administrators, and other stakeholders. After these meetings were convened and survey data was compiled, ISBE engaged in an internal review of stakeholder feedback.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

0

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
11	851	1.18%	3.80%	1.29%	Met target	No Slippage

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

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

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The Student Information System (SIS) is the mechanism utilized by the ISBE Data Strategies and Analytics Department to collect student-level data regarding suspension and expulsion for all students. In Illinois, significant discrepancy for Indicator 4A is determined as follows:

1. A Suspension/Expulsion Rate is calculated for each LEA with at least five students with IEPs as follows: $((\# \text{ of students with IEPs suspended or expelled for more than 10 days}) / (\# \text{ of students with IEPs})) * 100$
 2. A State Suspension/Expulsion Rate is calculated in the same manner by using the total number of students with IEPs suspended or expelled for more than 10 days in the entire state, and the total number of students with IEPs in the entire state.
 3. A standard deviation from the State Suspension/Expulsion Rate is then calculated.
 4. A LEA is determined to have a significant discrepancy if:
 - a. its Suspension/Expulsion Rate is greater than the State Suspension/Expulsion Rate plus one standard deviation for three consecutive years, AND
 - b. the LEA had at least five students with IEPs suspended or expelled more than 10 days for three consecutive years.
- For FFY20, ISBE examined suspension/expulsion data for students with IEPs for all 851 LEAs in the State. In total, 851 / 851 districts met the minimum n-size requirement of at least five students with IEPs. A total of 741 of the 851 LEAs that met the minimum n-size requirement documented at least one student discipline event for the school year being monitored. Of the 741 LEAs with documented discipline events for students with IEPs, 128 LEAs suspended or expelled at least one student with an IEP for more than 10 days. After applying the significant discrepancy criteria listed above, a total of 11 LEAs met the State's criteria for significant discrepancy. These LEAs were notified of their status and the requirement to complete a review of their policies, procedures, and practices related to suspension/expulsion of students with IEPs.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 data)

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

Each of the 11 LEAs identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities was required to review and analyze student data at the district and individual building levels, and to complete a self-assessment using a template provided by ISBE. The purpose of the self-assessment is to examine policies, procedures, and practices that may impact the development and implementation of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards that may result in discrepant rates of suspension/expulsion. The self-assessment tool provided by ISBE requires districts to examine disaggregated discipline data, analyze current policies and procedures, assess local practices, and draw conclusions regarding the reasons a discrepancy exists. Based upon the information collected, LEAs are required to identify the immediate actions they will take in order to address the discrepant rates of suspension/expulsion of children with disabilities for more than ten days in a school year. Such actions could include methods for improving data collection to track patterns of student behavior; additional training and professional development for teachers and administrators; and implementation of research-based behavior interventions. After reviewing the completed LEA self-assessments, the State determines which LEAs do not meet the requirements of 34 CFR 300.170(b) and any other relevant disciplinary regulations. These LEAs are then notified of their finding of noncompliance, requiring timely correction as soon as possible, but in no case longer than one year from the date of the finding.

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	0.70%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.12%	0.00%	0.12%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

0

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
10	0	851	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The Student Information System (SIS) is the mechanism utilized by the ISBE Data Strategies and Analytics Department to collect student-level data regarding suspension and expulsion for all students. In Illinois, significant discrepancy for Indicator 4A is determined as follows:

1. A Suspension/Expulsion Rate is calculated for each LEA with at least five students with IEPs as follows: ((# of students with IEPs suspended or expelled for more than 10 days) / (# of students with IEPs)) * 100

2. A State Suspension/Expulsion Rate is calculated in the same manner by using the total number of students with IEPs suspended or expelled for more than 10 days in the entire state, and the total number of students with IEPs in the entire state.

3. A standard deviation from the State Suspension/Expulsion Rate is then calculated.

4. A LEA is determined to have a significant discrepancy if:

- a. its Suspension/Expulsion Rate is greater than the State Suspension/Expulsion Rate plus one standard deviation for three consecutive years, AND
- b. the LEA had at least five students with IEPs suspended or expelled more than 10 days for three consecutive years.

For FFY20, ISBE examined suspension/expulsion data for students with IEPs for all 851 LEAs in the State. In total, 851 / 851 districts met the minimum n-size requirement of at least five students with IEPs. A total of 741 of the 851 LEAs that met the minimum n-size requirement documented at least one student discipline event for the school year being monitored. Of the 741 LEAs with documented discipline events for students with IEPs, 128 LEAs suspended or expelled at least one student with an IEP for more than 10 days. After applying the significant discrepancy criteria listed above, a total of 10 LEAs met the State's criteria for significant discrepancy. These LEAs were notified of their status and the requirement to complete a review of their policies, procedures, and practices related to suspension/expulsion of students with IEPs.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 data)

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

Each of the 10 LEAs identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities was required to review and analyze student data at the district and individual building levels, and to complete a self-assessment using a template provided by ISBE. The purpose of the self-assessment is to examine policies, procedures, and practices that may impact the development and implementation of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards that may result in discrepant rates of

suspension/expulsion. The self-assessment tool provided by ISBE requires districts to examine disaggregated discipline data, analyze current policies and procedures, assess local practices, and draw conclusions regarding the reasons a discrepancy exists. Based upon the information collected, LEAs are required to identify the immediate actions they will take in order to address the discrepant rates of suspension/expulsion of children with disabilities for more than ten days in a school year. Such actions could include methods for improving data collection to track patterns of student behavior; additional training and professional development for teachers and administrators; and implementation of research-based behavior interventions. After reviewing the completed LEA self-assessments, the State determines which LEAs do not meet the requirements of 34 CFR 300.170(b) and any other relevant disciplinary regulations. These LEAs are then notified of their finding of noncompliance, requiring timely correction as soon as possible, but in no case longer than one year from the date of the finding.

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6. Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

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

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2019	Target >=	55.00%	56.00%	57.00%	58.00%	58.00%
A	50.44%	Data	52.65%	52.51%	52.53%	52.79%	52.70%
B	2019	Target <=	17.00%	16.50%	16.00%	15.50%	15.50%
B	12.37%	Data	13.29%	13.44%	13.22%	13.05%	12.92%
C	2019	Target <=	3.90%	3.90%	3.90%	3.90%	3.90%
C	6.39%	Data	6.20%	6.23%	6.33%	6.50%	6.68%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	52.70%	52.90%	53.10%	53.30%	53.50%	53.70%
Target B <=	12.37%	12.35%	12.33%	12.31%	12.29%	12.27%
Target C <=	6.39%	6.38%	6.37%	6.36%	6.35%	6.34%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ISBE has ongoing communication regarding the SPP/APR with its primary stakeholder group, the Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC) through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. The role of ISAC is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. ISAC functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Services Department. ISAC is comprised of members who represent individuals with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, students with disabilities, teachers of students with disabilities, private providers, public charter schools, special education directors, regional superintendents, district superintendents, higher education personnel, vocational/community/business organization providers of transition services to students with disabilities, the Illinois Department of Human Services, the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, the Illinois Department of Corrections/Department of Juvenile Justice, and the general public. ISBE staff have discussions with ISAC multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, and improvement strategies with ISAC as necessary. ISAC assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising SPP targets for many of the indicators.

In addition to ISAC, ISBE collaborates with many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. Such stakeholder groups have included the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group, the Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium, the Harrisburg Project, the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE), the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA), the Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support Network Advisory Council, the Illinois Elevating Special Educators Advisory Group, Parent Training and

Information Centers (PTIs), Regional Offices of Education (ROEs), the Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois think tank, and the Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET) project. ISBE shares SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences, regional professional development opportunities, and task force meetings. Comments and suggestions from the stakeholder groups are incorporated into the SPP/APR.

ISBE collected stakeholder feedback on its proposed SPP targets in multiple ways. Beginning in June 2021, ISBE's Special Education Department initiated a series of stakeholder meetings to establish targets for the new six-year cycle of the SPP. These meetings were held virtually over a two-month period to maximize participation and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds. The following existing stakeholder groups participated in feedback sessions with ISBE:

- Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium
- Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education

Stakeholders included professional development providers, school district representatives, educational advocates, Illinois Early Learning Project representatives, Chicago Public Schools representatives, Parent Training and Information Center representatives, parent members of ISAC, early intervention representatives, inclusion support specialists, individuals with disabilities, students with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, parents from advisory committees, general public representatives, higher education representatives, Department of Corrections representatives, Illinois Service Resource Center representatives, directors of special education, assistant directors of special education, special education supervisors, special education coordinators, directors of innovative learning and technology, special education cooperative governing board members, regional superintendents, assistant regional superintendents, school business officials, and special education attorneys. In addition, the Illinois MTSS director, ISBE State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) coordinator, ISBE director of Special Education, ISBE SPP/State Systemic Improvement Plan coordinator, and ISBE Section 619 coordinator participated in one or more stakeholder meetings. A total of 121 stakeholder group members chose to participate in these six feedback sessions.

All stakeholder meetings were organized and facilitated by ISBE, with the assistance of group leaders. The meetings provided information on the SPP indicators to apprise stakeholders of the history and data trends so that they could make informed recommendations. The presentations included an introductory section on the SPP as well as information regarding goals for stakeholder input. Information about setting new baselines and targets was also provided. Then details about the importance of each indicator and how specific indicators are defined, measured, and calculated were shared. National and state trend data were explained, average rates of change were discussed, and comparisons to similar states were provided for some indicators. Each session sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable.

These six stakeholder groups provided input on proposed targets for one or more of the following SPP indicators: 1, 2, 3, 4A, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, and 17. At the conclusion of the stakeholder group meetings, the proposed targets for SPP indicators 1, 2, 3, 4A, 7, 15, and 16 were determined reasonable and achievable. However, after several stakeholder group meetings, the proposed targets for SPP indicators 5, 6, 8, and 14 were reexamined and revised based on state and national trend data and stakeholder feedback. These revisions were made prior to the release of the SPP proposed target web modules and online survey for additional stakeholder feedback on June 9. ISBE recorded 16 separate SPP modules and posted them on the website. The introduction module provided general information that applied to all SPP indicators. Each of the SPP modules shared information specific to the indicator(s) being addressed, such as state and national trend data, measurements, and proposed SPP targets for the FFY 2020-25 SPP cycle. Each module sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable by requesting that the participant complete a survey. The survey was open for over two months to gather stakeholder input. Prior to initiating the module recordings and survey, ISBE advertised broadly via state bulletins, listservs, Parent Training and Information Center publications, other state technical assistance resource centers, and the six stakeholder groups mentioned previously. These efforts resulted in 180 stakeholders completing SPP surveys. These stakeholders represented a variety of regions of the state and races/ethnicities. Survey completers identified themselves as community members, educators, administrators, and other stakeholders. After these meetings were convened and survey data was compiled, ISBE engaged in an internal review of stakeholder feedback.

A new baseline and new targets were set for Indicator 5 due to the change in measurement requirements. Please see the additional information section below for further details regarding the changes to baseline and targets for SPP 5.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	268,467
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	143,194
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	35,154
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	16,076

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	487
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	299

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

NO

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	143,194	268,467	52.70%	52.70%	53.34%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	35,154	268,467	12.92%	12.37%	13.09%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	16,862	268,467	6.68%	6.39%	6.28%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Due to the change in measurement requirements, ISBE and its stakeholders established a new baseline and new targets for Indicator 5 using FFY 2019 educational environment data that included five-year-old kindergartners and students aged 6-21. OSEP now requires five-year-old kindergartners to be included in the school-age child count data. Therefore, ISBE met with multiple stakeholder groups to review national trend data, Illinois trend and comparison data, and data from states with child counts comparable to Illinois. FFY 2019 data was recalculated to include five-year-old kindergartners consistent with new OSEP measurement table requirements. FFY 2019 Illinois educational environment comparisons with and without five-year-old kindergartners included in the data showed slight differences for each of the indicators (5A, 5B, and 5C). National trend data showed that the mean for Indicator 5A has only risen 1.24% over a five-year period, which is an average rate of change of only 0.21% each year. Therefore, it was decided that having ISBE's Indicator 5A targets increase by 1% each year between FFY 2011 and FFY 2019 had been an unrealistic goal. Stakeholders discussed the difficulty in moving percentages in a state with such a large student population. The potential impact of COVID-19 on data was also brought up as a concern with stakeholders when determining the level of rigor for Indicator 5A. Similarly, national trend data showed that the mean for Indicator 5C has only decreased 0.21% over a five-year period, which is an average rate of change of only 0.04% each year. Indicator 5C actual data has consistently been around 6% since FFY 2006 so the target has never been met. Therefore, it was decided that having an Indicator 5C target of 3.90% from FFY 2010 to FFY 2019 had been an unrealistic goal. Stakeholders discussed increased student mental health needs, increased challenging behaviors, the shortage of experienced educators to deal with such issues, and changing rules on the use of restraint and seclusion when considering the proposed target for Indicator 5C. The potential impact of COVID-19 on data was also brought up as a concern with stakeholders when determining the level of rigor for Indicator 5C. In contrast, ISBE had met the target for Indicator 5B since FFY 2006. After discussing the available data, stakeholders agreed that the proposed targets for Indicator 5B were reasonable even though they were more rigorous than those in the previous SPP cycle. Stakeholders were comfortable using FFY 2019 as the baseline year for Indicator 5 since it was pre-pandemic and considered stable. Therefore, after analyzing data with multiple stakeholder groups and reviewing stakeholder survey results regarding the proposed Indicator 5 targets, ISBE finalized targets for Indicator 5B that were more rigorous than past targets. Targets for Indicators 5A and 5C remained rigorous but were more realistic than previous targets based on data and stakeholder input. As previously stated, baselines and targets were based on the recalculated data with five-year old kindergartners included.

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.
- C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

- A. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program)}}{\text{(total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$.
- B. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility)}}{\text{(total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$.
- C. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home)}}{\text{(total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$.

Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%). Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

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

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data – 6A, 6B

Part	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	Target >=	32.60%	32.70%	32.80%	32.90%	32.90%
A	Data	37.98%	40.00%	40.76%	44.82%	45.42%
B	Target <=	30.80%	30.70%	30.60%	30.50%	30.50%
B	Data	28.21%	26.76%	24.94%	23.49%	23.02%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ISBE has ongoing communication regarding the SPP/APR with its primary stakeholder group, the Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC) through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. The role of ISAC is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. ISAC functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Services Department. ISAC is comprised of members who represent individuals with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, students with disabilities, teachers of students with disabilities, private providers, public charter schools, special education directors, regional superintendents, district superintendents, higher education personnel, vocational/community/business organization providers of transition services to students with disabilities, the Illinois Department of Human Services, the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, the Illinois Department of Corrections/Department of Juvenile Justice, and the general public. ISBE staff have discussions with ISAC multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, and improvement strategies with ISAC as necessary. ISAC assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising SPP targets for many of the indicators.

In addition to ISAC, ISBE collaborates with many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. Such stakeholder groups have included the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group, the Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium, the Harrisburg Project, the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE), the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA), the Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support Network Advisory Council, the Illinois Elevating Special Educators Advisory Group, Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs), Regional Offices of Education (ROEs), the Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois think tank,

and the Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET) project. ISBE shares SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences, regional professional development opportunities, and task force meetings. Comments and suggestions from the stakeholder groups are incorporated into the SPP/APR.

ISBE collected stakeholder feedback on its proposed SPP targets in multiple ways. Beginning in June 2021, ISBE's Special Education Department initiated a series of stakeholder meetings to establish targets for the new six-year cycle of the SPP. These meetings were held virtually over a two-month period to maximize participation and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds. The following existing stakeholder groups participated in feedback sessions with ISBE:

- Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium
- Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education

Stakeholders included professional development providers, school district representatives, educational advocates, Illinois Early Learning Project representatives, Chicago Public Schools representatives, Parent Training and Information Center representatives, parent members of ISAC, early intervention representatives, inclusion support specialists, individuals with disabilities, students with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, parents from advisory committees, general public representatives, higher education representatives, Department of Corrections representatives, Illinois Service Resource Center representatives, directors of special education, assistant directors of special education, special education supervisors, special education coordinators, directors of innovative learning and technology, special education cooperative governing board members, regional superintendents, assistant regional superintendents, school business officials, and special education attorneys. In addition, the Illinois MTSS director, ISBE State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) coordinator, ISBE director of Special Education, ISBE SPP/State Systemic Improvement Plan coordinator, and ISBE Section 619 coordinator participated in one or more stakeholder meetings. A total of 121 stakeholder group members chose to participate in these six feedback sessions.

All stakeholder meetings were organized and facilitated by ISBE, with the assistance of group leaders. The meetings provided information on the SPP indicators to apprise stakeholders of the history and data trends so that they could make informed recommendations. The presentations included an introductory section on the SPP as well as information regarding goals for stakeholder input. Information about setting new baselines and targets was also provided. Then details about the importance of each indicator and how specific indicators are defined, measured, and calculated were shared. National and state trend data were explained, average rates of change were discussed, and comparisons to similar states were provided for some indicators. Each session sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable.

These six stakeholder groups provided input on proposed targets for one or more of the following SPP indicators: 1, 2, 3, 4A, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, and 17. At the conclusion of the stakeholder group meetings, the proposed targets for SPP indicators 1, 2, 3, 4A, 7, 15, and 16 were determined reasonable and achievable. However, after several stakeholder group meetings, the proposed targets for SPP indicators 5, 6, 8, and 14 were reexamined and revised based on state and national trend data and stakeholder feedback. These revisions were made prior to the release of the SPP proposed target web modules and online survey for additional stakeholder feedback on June 9. ISBE recorded 16 separate SPP modules and posted them on the website. The introduction module provided general information that applied to all SPP indicators. Each of the SPP modules shared information specific to the indicator(s) being addressed, such as state and national trend data, measurements, and proposed SPP targets for the FFY 2020-25 SPP cycle. Each module sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable by requesting that the participant complete a survey. The survey was open for over two months to gather stakeholder input. Prior to initiating the module recordings and survey, ISBE advertised broadly via state bulletins, listservs, Parent Training and Information Center publications, other state technical assistance resource centers, and the six stakeholder groups mentioned previously. These efforts resulted in 180 stakeholders completing SPP surveys. These stakeholders represented a variety of regions of the state and races/ethnicities. Survey completers identified themselves as community members, educators, administrators, and other stakeholders. After these meetings were convened and survey data was compiled, ISBE engaged in an internal review of stakeholder feedback.

Targets

Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.

Inclusive Targets

Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.

Target Range not used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2019	45.91%
B	2019	26.32%
C	2019	0.28%

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	46.00%	46.50%	47.00%	47.50%	48.00%	48.50%

Target B <=	26.30%	26.04%	25.78%	25.52%	25.26%	25.00%
-------------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	0.28%	0.27%	0.26%	0.25%	0.24%	0.23%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

07/07/2021

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	7,048	12,120	3,736	22,904
a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	3,082	5,994	1,934	11,010
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	1,919	2,697	715	5,331
b2. Number of children attending separate school	216	354	114	684
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	1	1	2
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	26	35	13	74

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

NO

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	11,010	22,904	45.42%	46.00%	48.07%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	6,017	22,904	23.02%	26.30%	26.27%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Home	74	22,904		0.28%	0.32%	Did not meet target	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Due to the change in measurement requirements, ISBE and its stakeholders established a new baseline and new targets for Indicator 6 using FFY 2019 educational environment data that excluded five-year-old kindergartners and included preschool children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and 5. OSEP now requires five-year-old kindergartners to be included in the school-age child count data instead of the aged 3 through 5 data. In addition, a new component was added to Indicator 6 at the federal level (Indicator 6C – Home). ISBE met with multiple stakeholder groups to review national trend data, Illinois trend and comparison data, and data from states with child counts comparable to Illinois. ISBE and its stakeholders also considered other factors that could have potentially impacted the data. FFY2019 data was recalculated to exclude five-year-old kindergartners consistent with new OSEP measurement table requirements. FFY 2019 Illinois educational environment comparisons with and without five-year-old kindergartners included in the data showed slight differences for each of the indicators (6A, 6B, and 6C). Proposed targets were updated after several stakeholder meetings were held to incorporate stakeholder feedback prior to the SPP modules and online stakeholder input survey being made public on the ISBE website. After

incorporating stakeholder feedback and revising proposed SPP Indicator 6 targets, online stakeholder surveys showed 100% agreement with the newly proposed targets for SPP Indicator 6. As previously stated, baselines and targets were based on the recalculated data with five-year old kindergartners excluded.

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for Indicator 6A and 6B, using data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State established baseline for Indicator 6C, using data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts the baseline.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A1	2019	Target >=	85.90%	86.10%	86.20%	86.30%	86.30%
A1	83.93%	Data	57.97%	76.99%	83.73%	84.38%	83.93%
A2	2019	Target >=	55.30%	55.40%	55.50%	55.60%	55.60%

A2	47.11%	Data	37.09%	47.20%	50.35%	50.08%	47.11%
B1	2019	Target >=	86.70%	86.80%	86.90%	87.00%	87.00%
B1	84.09%	Data	59.24%	77.91%	83.51%	84.24%	84.09%
B2	2019	Target >=	53.60%	53.70%	53.80%	53.90%	53.90%
B2	45.07%	Data	34.96%	45.54%	48.35%	47.95%	45.07%
C1	2019	Target >=	87.80%	87.90%	88.00%	88.10%	88.10%
C1	85.77%	Data	59.69%	78.70%	85.13%	86.39%	85.77%
C2	2019	Target >=	64.00%	64.10%	64.20%	64.30%	64.30%
C2	53.32%	Data	43.97%	54.62%	57.66%	57.14%	53.32%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	83.95%	83.95%	83.95%	83.95%	83.95%	84.00%
Target A2 >=	47.20%	47.20%	47.20%	47.20%	47.20%	47.50%
Target B1 >=	84.10%	84.10%	84.10%	84.10%	84.10%	84.50%
Target B2 >=	45.10%	45.10%	45.10%	45.10%	45.10%	45.50%
Target C1 >=	85.80%	85.80%	85.80%	85.80%	85.80%	86.00%
Target C2 >=	53.40%	53.40%	53.40%	53.40%	53.40%	53.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ISBE has ongoing communication regarding the SPP/APR with its primary stakeholder group, the Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC) through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. The role of ISAC is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. ISAC functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Services Department. ISAC is comprised of members who represent individuals with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, students with disabilities, teachers of students with disabilities, private providers, public charter schools, special education directors, regional superintendents, district superintendents, higher education personnel, vocational/community/business organization providers of transition services to students with disabilities, the Illinois Department of Human Services, the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, the Illinois Department of Corrections/Department of Juvenile Justice, and the general public. ISBE staff have discussions with ISAC multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, and improvement strategies with ISAC as necessary. ISAC assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising SPP targets for many of the indicators.

In addition to ISAC, ISBE collaborates with many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. Such stakeholder groups have included the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group, the Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium, the Harrisburg Project, the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE), the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA), the Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support Network Advisory Council, the Illinois Elevating Special Educators Advisory Group, Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs), Regional Offices of Education (ROEs), the Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois think tank, and the Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET) project. ISBE shares SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences, regional professional development opportunities, and task force meetings. Comments and suggestions from the stakeholder groups are incorporated into the SPP/APR.

ISBE collected stakeholder feedback on its proposed SPP targets in multiple ways. Beginning in June 2021, ISBE's Special Education Department initiated a series of stakeholder meetings to establish targets for the new six-year cycle of the SPP. These meetings were held virtually over a two-month period to maximize participation and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds. The following existing stakeholder groups participated in feedback sessions with ISBE:

- Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium
- Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education

Stakeholders included professional development providers, school district representatives, educational advocates, Illinois Early Learning Project representatives, Chicago Public Schools representatives, Parent Training and Information Center representatives, parent members of ISAC, early intervention representatives, inclusion support specialists, individuals with disabilities, students with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, parents from advisory committees, general public representatives, higher education representatives, Department of Corrections representatives, Illinois Service Resource Center representatives, directors of special education, assistant directors of special education, special education supervisors, special education coordinators, directors of innovative learning and technology, special education cooperative governing board members, regional

superintendents, assistant regional superintendents, school business officials, and special education attorneys. In addition, the Illinois MTSS director, ISBE State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) coordinator, ISBE director of Special Education, ISBE SPP/State Systemic Improvement Plan coordinator, and ISBE Section 619 coordinator participated in one or more stakeholder meetings. A total of 121 stakeholder group members chose to participate in these six feedback sessions.

All stakeholder meetings were organized and facilitated by ISBE, with the assistance of group leaders. The meetings provided information on the SPP indicators to apprise stakeholders of the history and data trends so that they could make informed recommendations. The presentations included an introductory section on the SPP as well as information regarding goals for stakeholder input. Information about setting new baselines and targets was also provided. Then details about the importance of each indicator and how specific indicators are defined, measured, and calculated were shared. National and state trend data were explained, average rates of change were discussed, and comparisons to similar states were provided for some indicators. Each session sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable.

These six stakeholder groups provided input on proposed targets for one or more of the following SPP indicators: 1, 2, 3, 4A, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, and 17. At the conclusion of the stakeholder group meetings, the proposed targets for SPP indicators 1, 2, 3, 4A, 7, 15, and 16 were determined reasonable and achievable. However, after several stakeholder group meetings, the proposed targets for SPP indicators 5, 6, 8, and 14 were reexamined and revised based on state and national trend data and stakeholder feedback. These revisions were made prior to the release of the SPP proposed target web modules and online survey for additional stakeholder feedback on June 9. ISBE recorded 16 separate SPP modules and posted them on the website. The introduction module provided general information that applied to all SPP indicators. Each of the SPP modules shared information specific to the indicator(s) being addressed, such as state and national trend data, measurements, and proposed SPP targets for the FFY 2020-25 SPP cycle. Each module sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable by requesting that the participant complete a survey. The survey was open for over two months to gather stakeholder input. Prior to initiating the module recordings and survey, ISBE advertised broadly via state bulletins, listservs, Parent Training and Information Center publications, other state technical assistance resource centers, and the six stakeholder groups mentioned previously. These efforts resulted in 180 stakeholders completing SPP surveys. These stakeholders represented a variety of regions of the state and races/ethnicities. Survey completers identified themselves as community members, educators, administrators, and other stakeholders. After these meetings were convened and survey data was compiled, ISBE engaged in an internal review of stakeholder feedback.

A new baseline and new targets were set for SPP Indicator 7 since ISBE and its stakeholders determined that baseline data was no longer representative of the indicator after early childhood outcomes data collection training tools and resources were updated. Please see the additional information section below for further details regarding the changes to baseline and targets for SPP Indicator 7.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

10,353

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	179	1.73%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,951	18.84%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	3,856	37.25%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,456	33.38%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	911	8.80%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	7,312	9,442	83.93%	83.95%	77.44%	Did not meet target	Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	4,367	10,353	47.11%	47.20%	42.18%	Did not meet target	Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	494	4.77%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,615	15.60%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	4,166	40.24%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,388	32.72%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	690	6.66%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	7,554	9,663	84.09%	84.10%	78.17%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	4,078	10,353	45.07%	45.10%	39.39%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	600	5.80%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,387	13.40%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	3,466	33.48%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,895	37.62%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,005	9.71%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	7,361	9,348	85.77%	85.80%	78.74%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6	4,900	10,353	53.32%	53.40%	47.33%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$							

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	<p>ISBE attributes part of the slippage to an updated training on early childhood outcomes. The Early Childhood Outcomes in Illinois module was developed by Early CHOICES, a professional development project funded by ISBE. This module reviews the three Early Childhood Outcomes that are used to help measure the impact early childhood intervention has on a child's ability to have positive social relationships, acquire and use knowledge and skills, and take appropriate action to meet their needs. This module was released in October 2018. In the 2018-19 school year, 300 participants viewed the module, completed activities aligned to the module sections, and accessed tools and resources discussed in the module. That number was 244 participants in the 2019-20 school year and 91 participants in the 2020-21 school year. The module can be found at https://www.ecire.org/good-to-know/ec-outcomes/. It is likely that the updated training module, along with the increase in people receiving training on early childhood outcomes, has led to more accurate reporting, resulting in a slip in the data. This tracks closely with historical data, which appeared to peak around FFY 2018. ISBE also provided ongoing technical assistance and support on the data collection to LEAs throughout the school year via phone calls and emails.</p> <p>In addition to the updated training impacting slippage for SPP Indicator 7, ISBE, its school districts, and their children and families experienced effects due to the global pandemic that most likely contributed to the slippage. SPP Indicator 7 statewide data does not show evidence of negative consequences regarding completeness, validity, or reliability. In addition, COVID-19 did not appear to impact ISBE's ability to collect data. The FFY20 SPP Indicator 7 denominators for A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, and C2 are within expectations. Rather, it is ISBE's belief that COVID-19 impacted the rate of learning for preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs, negatively affecting both the number and percentage of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. ISBE recognizes and acknowledges that districts struggled to adjust to the mandatory emergency shut down of in-person instruction statewide, along with the challenges surrounding decision making regarding use of assessment tools and providing ratings for students during a global pandemic. District schedules and service delivery options fluctuated throughout the year due to the pandemic. Some districts operated on reduced schedules, some remained virtual, and other functioned as they would in a typical school year. Quarantines caused students to miss school or schools to be closed for a period of time. Districts varied greatly in terms of what kind of services were provided to students during this time; therefore, some students may have plateaued in terms of growth and retention. Some students may have experienced a loss in learning due to challenging educational conditions, further contributing to slippage in child outcome ratings. To mitigate the impact of COVID-19, ISBE published numerous guidance documents throughout the pandemic and posted them to the ISBE COVID-19 webpage. These resources, along with others, can be found at https://www.isbe.net/Pages/covid19.aspx. ISBE staff also manned a COVID-19 team that responded to questions from school districts and families.</p>
A2	<p>ISBE attributes part of the slippage to an updated training on early childhood outcomes. The Early Childhood Outcomes in Illinois module was developed by Early CHOICES, a professional development project funded by ISBE. This module reviews the three Early Childhood Outcomes that are used to help measure the impact early childhood intervention has on a child's ability to have positive social relationships, acquire and use knowledge and skills, and take appropriate action to meet their needs. This module was released in October 2018. In the 2018-19 school year, 300 participants viewed the module, completed activities aligned to the module sections, and accessed tools and resources discussed in the module. That number was 244 participants in the 2019-20 school year and 91 participants in the 2020-21 school year. The module can be found at https://www.ecire.org/good-to-know/ec-outcomes/. It is likely that the updated training module, along with the increase in people receiving training on early childhood outcomes, has led to more accurate reporting, resulting in a slip in the data. This tracks closely with historical data, which appeared to peak around FFY 2018. ISBE also provided ongoing technical assistance and support on the data collection to LEAs throughout the school year via phone calls and emails.</p> <p>In addition to the updated training impacting slippage for SPP Indicator 7, ISBE, its school districts, and their children and families experienced effects due to the global pandemic that most likely contributed to the slippage. SPP Indicator 7 statewide data does not show evidence of negative consequences regarding completeness, validity, or reliability. In addition, COVID-19 did not appear to impact ISBE's ability to collect data. The FFY20 SPP Indicator 7 denominators for A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, and C2 are within expectations. Rather, it is ISBE's belief that COVID-19 impacted the rate of learning for preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs, negatively affecting both the number and percentage of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. ISBE recognizes and acknowledges that districts struggled to adjust to the mandatory emergency shut down of in-person instruction statewide, along with the challenges surrounding decision making regarding use of assessment tools and providing ratings for students during a global pandemic. District schedules and service delivery options fluctuated throughout the year due to the pandemic. Some districts operated on reduced schedules, some remained virtual, and other functioned as they would in a typical school year. Quarantines caused students to miss school or schools to be closed for a period of time. Districts varied greatly in terms of what kind of services were provided to students during this time; therefore, some students may have plateaued in terms of growth and retention. Some students may have experienced a loss in learning due to challenging educational conditions, further contributing to slippage in child outcome ratings. To mitigate the impact of COVID-19, ISBE published numerous guidance documents throughout the pandemic and posted them to the ISBE COVID-19 webpage. These resources, along with others, can be found at https://www.isbe.net/Pages/covid19.aspx. ISBE staff also manned a COVID-19 team that responded to questions from school districts and families.</p>
B1	<p>ISBE attributes part of the slippage to an updated training on early childhood outcomes. The Early Childhood Outcomes in Illinois module was developed by Early CHOICES, a professional development project funded by ISBE. This module reviews the three Early Childhood Outcomes that are used to help measure the impact early childhood intervention has on a child's ability to have positive social relationships, acquire and use knowledge and skills, and take appropriate action to meet their needs. This module was released in October 2018. In the 2018-19 school year, 300 participants viewed the module, completed activities aligned to the module sections, and accessed tools and resources discussed in the module. That number was 244 participants in the 2019-20 school year and 91 participants in the 2020-21 school year. The module can be found at https://www.ecire.org/good-to-know/ec-outcomes/. It is likely that the updated training module, along with the increase in people receiving training on early childhood outcomes, has led to more accurate reporting, resulting in a slip in the data. This tracks closely with historical data, which appeared to peak around FFY 2018. ISBE also provided</p>

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	<p>ongoing technical assistance and support on the data collection to LEAs throughout the school year via phone calls and emails.</p> <p>In addition to the updated training impacting slippage for SPP Indicator 7, ISBE, its school districts, and their children and families experienced effects due to the global pandemic that most likely contributed to the slippage. SPP Indicator 7 statewide data does not show evidence of negative consequences regarding completeness, validity, or reliability. In addition, COVID-19 did not appear to impact ISBE's ability to collect data. The FFY20 SPP Indicator 7 denominators for A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, and C2 are within expectations. Rather, it is ISBE's belief that COVID-19 impacted the rate of learning for preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs, negatively affecting both the number and percentage of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. ISBE recognizes and acknowledges that districts struggled to adjust to the mandatory emergency shut down of in-person instruction statewide, along with the challenges surrounding decision making regarding use of assessment tools and providing ratings for students during a global pandemic. District schedules and service delivery options fluctuated throughout the year due to the pandemic. Some districts operated on reduced schedules, some remained virtual, and other functioned as they would in a typical school year. Quarantines caused students to miss school or schools to be closed for a period of time. Districts varied greatly in terms of what kind of services were provided to students during this time; therefore, some students may have plateaued in terms of growth and retention. Some students may have experienced a loss in learning due to challenging educational conditions, further contributing to slippage in child outcome ratings. To mitigate the impact of COVID-19, ISBE published numerous guidance documents throughout the pandemic and posted them to the ISBE COVID-19 webpage. These resources, along with others, can be found at https://www.isbe.net/Pages/covid19.aspx. ISBE staff also manned a COVID-19 team that responded to questions from school districts and families.</p>
B2	<p>ISBE attributes part of the slippage to an updated training on early childhood outcomes. The Early Childhood Outcomes in Illinois module was developed by Early CHOICES, a professional development project funded by ISBE. This module reviews the three Early Childhood Outcomes that are used to help measure the impact early childhood intervention has on a child's ability to have positive social relationships, acquire and use knowledge and skills, and take appropriate action to meet their needs. This module was released in October 2018. In the 2018-19 school year, 300 participants viewed the module, completed activities aligned to the module sections, and accessed tools and resources discussed in the module. That number was 244 participants in the 2019-20 school year and 91 participants in the 2020-21 school year. The module can be found at https://www.ecfre.org/good-to-know/ec-outcomes/. It is likely that the updated training module, along with the increase in people receiving training on early childhood outcomes, has led to more accurate reporting, resulting in a slip in the data. This tracks closely with historical data, which appeared to peak around FFY 2018. ISBE also provided ongoing technical assistance and support on the data collection to LEAs throughout the school year via phone calls and emails.</p> <p>In addition to the updated training impacting slippage for SPP Indicator 7, ISBE, its school districts, and their children and families experienced effects due to the global pandemic that most likely contributed to the slippage. SPP Indicator 7 statewide data does not show evidence of negative consequences regarding completeness, validity, or reliability. In addition, COVID-19 did not appear to impact ISBE's ability to collect data. The FFY20 SPP Indicator 7 denominators for A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, and C2 are within expectations. Rather, it is ISBE's belief that COVID-19 impacted the rate of learning for preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs, negatively affecting both the number and percentage of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. ISBE recognizes and acknowledges that districts struggled to adjust to the mandatory emergency shut down of in-person instruction statewide, along with the challenges surrounding decision making regarding use of assessment tools and providing ratings for students during a global pandemic. District schedules and service delivery options fluctuated throughout the year due to the pandemic. Some districts operated on reduced schedules, some remained virtual, and other functioned as they would in a typical school year. Quarantines caused students to miss school or schools to be closed for a period of time. Districts varied greatly in terms of what kind of services were provided to students during this time; therefore, some students may have plateaued in terms of growth and retention. Some students may have experienced a loss in learning due to challenging educational conditions, further contributing to slippage in child outcome ratings. To mitigate the impact of COVID-19, ISBE published numerous guidance documents throughout the pandemic and posted them to the ISBE COVID-19 webpage. These resources, along with others, can be found at https://www.isbe.net/Pages/covid19.aspx. ISBE staff also manned a COVID-19 team that responded to questions from school districts and families.</p>
C1	<p>ISBE attributes part of the slippage to an updated training on early childhood outcomes. The Early Childhood Outcomes in Illinois module was developed by Early CHOICES, a professional development project funded by ISBE. This module reviews the three Early Childhood Outcomes that are used to help measure the impact early childhood intervention has on a child's ability to have positive social relationships, acquire and use knowledge and skills, and take appropriate action to meet their needs. This module was released in October 2018. In the 2018-19 school year, 300 participants viewed the module, completed activities aligned to the module sections, and accessed tools and resources discussed in the module. That number was 244 participants in the 2019-20 school year and 91 participants in the 2020-21 school year. The module can be found at https://www.ecfre.org/good-to-know/ec-outcomes/. It is likely that the updated training module, along with the increase in people receiving training on early childhood outcomes, has led to more accurate reporting, resulting in a slip in the data. This tracks closely with historical data, which appeared to peak around FFY 2018. ISBE also provided ongoing technical assistance and support on the data collection to LEAs throughout the school year via phone calls and emails.</p> <p>In addition to the updated training impacting slippage for SPP Indicator 7, ISBE, its school districts, and their children and families experienced effects due to the global pandemic that most likely contributed to the slippage. SPP Indicator 7 statewide data does not show evidence of negative consequences regarding completeness, validity, or reliability. In addition, COVID-19 did not appear to impact ISBE's ability to collect data. The FFY20 SPP Indicator 7 denominators for A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, and C2 are within expectations. Rather, it is ISBE's belief that COVID-19 impacted the rate of learning for preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs, negatively affecting both the number and percentage of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. ISBE recognizes and acknowledges that districts struggled to adjust to the mandatory emergency shut down of in-person instruction statewide, along with the challenges surrounding decision making regarding use of assessment tools and providing ratings for students during a global pandemic. District schedules and service delivery options fluctuated throughout the year due to the pandemic. Some districts operated on reduced schedules, some remained virtual, and other functioned as they would in a typical school year. Quarantines caused students to miss school or schools to be closed for a period of time. Districts varied greatly in terms of what kind of services were provided to students during this time; therefore, some students may have plateaued in terms of growth and retention. Some students may have experienced a loss in learning due to challenging educational conditions, further contributing to slippage in child outcome ratings. To mitigate the impact of COVID-19, ISBE published numerous guidance documents throughout the pandemic and posted them to the ISBE COVID-19 webpage. These resources, along with others, can be found at</p>

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	https://www.isbe.net/Pages/covid19.aspx . ISBE staff also manned a COVID-19 team that responded to questions from school districts and families.
C2	<p>ISBE attributes part of the slippage to an updated training on early childhood outcomes. The Early Childhood Outcomes in Illinois module was developed by Early CHOICES, a professional development project funded by ISBE. This module reviews the three Early Childhood Outcomes that are used to help measure the impact early childhood intervention has on a child's ability to have positive social relationships, acquire and use knowledge and skills, and take appropriate action to meet their needs. This module was released in October 2018. In the 2018-19 school year, 300 participants viewed the module, completed activities aligned to the module sections, and accessed tools and resources discussed in the module. That number was 244 participants in the 2019-20 school year and 91 participants in the 2020-21 school year. The module can be found at https://www.ecre.org/good-to-know/ec-outcomes/. It is likely that the updated training module, along with the increase in people receiving training on early childhood outcomes, has led to more accurate reporting, resulting in a slip in the data. This tracks closely with historical data, which appeared to peak around FFY 2018. ISBE also provided ongoing technical assistance and support on the data collection to LEAs throughout the school year via phone calls and emails.</p> <p>In addition to the updated training impacting slippage for SPP Indicator 7, ISBE, its school districts, and their children and families experienced effects due to the global pandemic that most likely contributed to the slippage. SPP Indicator 7 statewide data does not show evidence of negative consequences regarding completeness, validity, or reliability. In addition, COVID-19 did not appear to impact ISBE's ability to collect data. The FFY20 SPP Indicator 7 denominators for A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, and C2 are within expectations. Rather, it is ISBE's belief that COVID-19 impacted the rate of learning for preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs, negatively affecting both the number and percentage of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. ISBE recognizes and acknowledges that districts struggled to adjust to the mandatory emergency shut down of in-person instruction statewide, along with the challenges surrounding decision making regarding use of assessment tools and providing ratings for students during a global pandemic. District schedules and service delivery options fluctuated throughout the year due to the pandemic. Some districts operated on reduced schedules, some remained virtual, and other functioned as they would in a typical school year. Quarantines caused students to miss school or schools to be closed for a period of time. Districts varied greatly in terms of what kind of services were provided to students during this time; therefore, some students may have plateaued in terms of growth and retention. Some students may have experienced a loss in learning due to challenging educational conditions, further contributing to slippage in child outcome ratings. To mitigate the impact of COVID-19, ISBE published numerous guidance documents throughout the pandemic and posted them to the ISBE COVID-19 webpage. These resources, along with others, can be found at https://www.isbe.net/Pages/covid19.aspx. ISBE staff also manned a COVID-19 team that responded to questions from school districts and families.</p>

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

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

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

- 1) Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming Systems (AEPS)
- 2) Carolina Curriculum for Infants and Toddlers/Preschoolers with Special Needs
- 3) High Scope Child Observation Record (COR)
- 4) Hawaii Early Learning Profile (HELP)
- 5) Teaching Strategies GOLD
- 6) Work Sampling System Illinois (WSS-IL)
- 7) My Teaching Strategies GOLD
- 8) Early Learning Scales
- 9) Ages and Stages Questionnaire
- 10) Desired Results Developmental Profile (DRDP)

Upon exit, LEAs are required to choose the curriculum-based assessment used with the child from the ten possible primary assessments. In addition, ISBE utilizes the ECO Child Outcomes Summary (COS) and adds the relevant Illinois Early Learning and Development Standards (IELDS) as "sub-areas" in the 3 required outcome areas. The Overall Summary Rating for each one of the 3 outcomes is linked to "sub-areas" that reflect the IELDS. Including the IELDS in the COS assists teams in rating the child comparable to same-aged peers and increases the validity and reliability of the ratings. The criterion that defines "comparable to same-aged peers" is a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

Illinois uses a team process to complete the developmental ratings on each child. The team is comprised of 2 or more persons who meet to complete the rating scale and select the outcome rating. This team includes parents. The team considers information from those familiar with the child in a variety of contexts and uses a systematic process for making decisions. The team process is supported by having individuals who have knowledge of typical child development, regular monitoring of child progress, multiple sources of information and a structure for coming to team consensus. The team bases their ratings on existing child data, including evaluations and information provided by the parents of the child, current classroom-based assessments and observations, and observations by teachers and related service providers to determine the ratings in each of the three outcome areas.

Children aged 3 through 5 who entered early childhood special education services and exited with at least 6 months of service are included in the assessment and reporting process. The following validations are made prior to programs submitting data:

- One Early Childhood Outcomes "Entry Rating" is mandatory before the student's enrollment is exited;
- Upon exiting a student's enrollment, an Early Childhood Outcomes Progress Rating is required if the last rating is more than 6 months old or if the student is exited during the time frame of February 1-July 31, an updated ECO rating must be done during that time frame;
- Impossible rating combinations are not allowed; and

- The entry rating date must be prior to the progress rating date.

The outcome ratings from entrance into the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) program are matched to exit outcome ratings for individual children. At the LEA and state levels, analyses of matched scores yield the following for each of the three outcomes:

1. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning
2. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers
3. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same aged peers but did not reach it
4. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same aged peers
5. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

A new baseline and new targets were set for SPP Indicator 7 since ISBE and its stakeholders determined that baseline data was no longer representative of the indicator after early childhood outcomes data collection training tools and resources were updated. The Early Childhood Outcomes in Illinois module was developed by Early CHOICES, a professional development project funded by ISBE. This module reviews the three Early Childhood Outcomes that are used to help measure the impact early childhood intervention has on a child's ability to have positive social relationships, acquire and use knowledge and skills, and take appropriate action to meet their needs. This module was released in October 2018. In the 2018-19 school year, 300 participants viewed the module, completed activities aligned to the module sections, and accessed tools and resources discussed in the module. That number was 244 participants in the 2019-20 school year and 91 participants in the 2020-21 school year. ISBE and its stakeholders determined that the updated training module, along with the increase in people receiving training on early childhood outcomes, has led to more accurate reporting, resulting in baseline data that are no longer representative as well as lower percentages for each sub-indicator. ISBE examined state and national trend data when setting targets for SPP Indicator 7. ISBE and its stakeholders also considered other factors that could have potentially impacted the data. State trend data show that Illinois exceeds the national trend data percentages for SPP Indicators 7A1, 7B1, and 7C1. Conversely, Illinois has been consistently below the national trend data percentages for SPP Indicators 7A2, 7B2, and 7C2. However, national data declined 1% from 2017 to 2018 for SPP Indicators 7A2, 7B2, and 7C2. Such data was taken into consideration when setting the new Illinois baseline and targets. ISBE and its stakeholders chose to set FFY 2019 as the baseline year for SPP Indicator 7 since the consensus was that data was more accurate after the updated trainings. Online stakeholder survey responses for the new SPP Indicator 7 baseline year and targets showed 100% agreement.

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

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

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

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

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

8 - Indicator Data

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ISBE has ongoing communication regarding the SPP/APR with its primary stakeholder group, the Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC) through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. The role of ISAC is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. ISAC functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Services Department. ISAC is comprised of members who represent individuals with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, students with disabilities, teachers of students with disabilities, private providers, public charter schools, special education directors, regional superintendents, district superintendents, higher education personnel, vocational/community/business organization providers of transition services to students with disabilities, the Illinois Department of Human Services, the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, the Illinois Department of Corrections/Department of Juvenile Justice, and the general public. ISBE staff have discussions with ISAC multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, and improvement strategies with ISAC as necessary. ISAC assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising SPP targets for many of the indicators.

In addition to ISAC, ISBE collaborates with many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. Such stakeholder groups have included the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group, the Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium, the Harrisburg Project, the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE), the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA), the Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support Network Advisory Council, the Illinois Elevating Special Educators Advisory Group, Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs), Regional Offices of Education (ROEs), the Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois think tank, and the Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET) project. ISBE shares SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences, regional professional development opportunities, and task force meetings. Comments and suggestions from the stakeholder groups are incorporated into the SPP/APR.

ISBE collected stakeholder feedback on its proposed SPP targets in multiple ways. Beginning in June 2021, ISBE's Special Education Department initiated a series of stakeholder meetings to establish targets for the new six-year cycle of the SPP. These meetings were held virtually over a two-month period to maximize participation and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds. The following existing stakeholder groups participated in feedback sessions with ISBE:

- Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium
- Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education

Stakeholders included professional development providers, school district representatives, educational advocates, Illinois Early Learning Project representatives, Chicago Public Schools representatives, Parent Training and Information Center representatives, parent members of ISAC, early intervention representatives, inclusion support specialists, individuals with disabilities, students with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, parents from advisory committees, general public representatives, higher education representatives, Department of Corrections representatives, Illinois Service Resource Center representatives, directors of special education, assistant directors of special education, special education supervisors, special education coordinators, directors of innovative learning and technology, special education cooperative governing board members, regional superintendents, assistant regional superintendents, school business officials, and special education attorneys. In addition, the Illinois MTSS director, ISBE State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) coordinator, ISBE director of Special Education, ISBE SPP/State Systemic Improvement Plan coordinator, and ISBE Section 619 coordinator participated in one or more stakeholder meetings. A total of 121 stakeholder group members chose to participate in these six feedback sessions.

All stakeholder meetings were organized and facilitated by ISBE, with the assistance of group leaders. The meetings provided information on the SPP indicators to apprise stakeholders of the history and data trends so that they could make informed recommendations. The presentations included an introductory section on the SPP as well as information regarding goals for stakeholder input. Information about setting new baselines and targets was also provided. Then details about the importance of each indicator and how specific indicators are defined, measured, and calculated were shared. National and state trend data were explained, average rates of change were discussed, and comparisons to similar states were provided for some indicators. Each session sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable.

These six stakeholder groups provided input on proposed targets for one or more of the following SPP indicators: 1, 2, 3, 4A, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, and 17. At the conclusion of the stakeholder group meetings, the proposed targets for SPP indicators 1, 2, 3, 4A, 7, 15, and 16 were determined reasonable and achievable. However, after several stakeholder group meetings, the proposed targets for SPP indicators 5, 6, 8, and 14 were reexamined and revised based on state and national trend data and stakeholder feedback. These revisions were made prior to the release of the SPP proposed target web modules and online survey for additional stakeholder feedback on June 9. ISBE recorded 16 separate SPP modules and posted them on the website. The introduction module provided general information that applied to all SPP indicators. Each of the SPP modules shared information specific to the indicator(s) being addressed, such as state and national trend data, measurements, and proposed SPP targets for the FFY 2020-25 SPP cycle. Each module sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable by requesting that the participant complete a survey. The survey was open for over two months to gather stakeholder input. Prior to initiating the module recordings and survey, ISBE advertised broadly via state bulletins, listservs, Parent Training and Information Center publications, other state technical assistance resource centers, and the six stakeholder groups mentioned previously. These efforts resulted in 180 stakeholders completing SPP surveys. These stakeholders represented a variety of regions of the state and races/ethnicities. Survey completers identified themselves as community members, educators, administrators, and other stakeholders. After these meetings were convened and survey data was compiled, ISBE engaged in an internal review of stakeholder feedback.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	53.80%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	59.00%	60.00%	60.00%	61.00%	61.00%
Data	67.81%	68.75%	67.04%	70.00%	73.91%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	70.50%	71.00%	71.50%	72.00%	72.50%	73.00%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
2,649	3,742	73.91%	70.50%	70.79%	Met target	No Slippage

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

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

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

45,954

Percentage of respondent parents

8.14%

Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	8.50%	8.14%

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

ISBE currently encourages LEAs to implement two or more of the following activities to maximize the number of surveys completed and increase the response rate: post the survey information and link on the district website, mail flyers home to parents that have a child with a disability, email parents the survey information and link, use the district/school automated phone system to increase parent awareness, notify parent groups to assist in disseminating survey information, utilize text messaging to increase parent awareness, and have parents complete the survey at the conclusion of their annual IEP meeting. Beginning with the FFY20 survey, ISBE's vendor sent a questionnaire to districts in the current year's survey cycle to determine the specific activities being implemented by each district to maximize the number of surveys completed. The questionnaire is designed to promote awareness of the parent survey and encourage districts to reach out to parents and families within their boundaries regarding survey completion, especially parents and families that may be underrepresented. ISBE will work with the survey vendor to identify which districts have fewer than 25% of their surveyed families responding in order to address low response rates and underrepresentation within individual districts.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

Because ISBE encourages LEAs to implement a variety of activities to maximize the number of surveys completed and increase the response rate, nonresponse bias was not identified. Districts are encouraged to use multiple types of technology to reach diverse parent groups, such as the district website, email, text messaging, and the district/school automated phone system. Districts are also encouraged to mail flyers home to parents, notify parent groups that could assist in disseminating survey information, and make the survey available for parent completion at the conclusion of the annual IEP meeting for parents who are less likely to rely on technology for information. ISBE has also revised its survey notification to parents over the years to keep its message short and simple and to let parents know what they can expect from the survey. ISBE mails the survey and now provides information about the survey on the ISBE website <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPP-APR-Indicator-8.aspx>. ISBE has both English and Spanish versions of the survey and provides an email address and toll-free number if parents need assistance completing the survey. Finally, ISBE is working with the survey vendor to identify which districts have fewer than 25% of their surveyed families responding so those parents can receive survey reminders and be encouraged to complete the survey.

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

The demographic representation of FFY 2020 survey respondents was examined by student age, gender, race/ethnicity, disability, and English language learner status. Given that the overall survey sample was representative of the population of students with disabilities ages 3-21 in the state, an examination of the response rate by subgroup sheds light on whether the survey responses were also representative of the state population.

The results of the analysis indicated that student age, gender, and English language learner status were not significant predictors of survey completion by parents. Therefore, the sample of parents who responded to the survey is representative of the statewide population of parents with children receiving special education services in terms of age, gender, and English language learner status. While the overall sample of parents who responded to the survey is representative of the statewide population of parents with children receiving special education services in multiple racial/ethnic groups and disability categories, survey result analyses indicated some statistically significant differences between families that did and did not respond to the survey in terms of race/ethnicity and primary disability category.

The sample of parents with preschool children aged 3-5 receiving special education services is representative of five racial/ethnic groups and not representative of two groups. Specifically, families identifying as Black were less likely to complete the survey. Students identifying as Black made up 11.60% of the survey group and 6.19% of the survey responses (a -5.41% difference). In contrast, families identifying as White were more likely to complete the survey. Students identifying as White made up 52.04% of the survey group and 58.76% of the survey responses (a +6.72% difference). The sample of parents with school-aged children receiving special education services is representative of four racial/ethnic groups and not representative of three groups. Specifically, families identifying as Black or Hispanic were less likely to complete the survey. Students identifying as Black made up 20.10% of the survey group and 11.18% of the survey responses (a -8.92% difference). Students identifying as Hispanic made up 27.40% of the survey group and 23.35% of the survey responses (a -4.05% difference). In contrast, families identifying as White were more likely to complete the survey. Students identifying as White made up 45.43% of the survey group and 56.35% of the survey responses (a +10.92% difference).

The sample of parents with preschool children aged 3-5 receiving special education services is representative of all fourteen disability categories while the sample of parents with school-aged children receiving special education services is representative of 12 of the 14 disability categories. Specifically, families of students identified with Specific Learning Disabilities were less likely to complete the survey. Students identified with Specific Learning Disabilities made up 36.13% of the survey group and 29.82% of the survey responses (a -6.31% difference). In contrast, families of students identified

with Autism Spectrum Disorders were more likely to complete the survey. Students identified with Autism made up 10.04% of the survey group and 14.67% of the survey responses (a +4.63% difference).

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)

NO

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

ISBE will work with its survey vendor and the school districts in the current year's survey cycle to complete follow up activities with families who are less likely to complete the survey. For example, districts will be strongly encouraged to utilize electronic survey invitations, reminder emails, reminder text messages, recorded phone messages, live phone calls, and support from local parent groups to reach underrepresented families for survey completion. ISBE's survey vendor will compile survey response data at regular intervals during the survey timeframe to determine which districts and families will be targeted for follow up communications regarding survey completion.

ISBE will continue to include resources for parents, families, and districts on its SPP Indicator 8 webpage at: <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPP-APR-Indicator-8.aspx>. To support parents and families, an example of the survey will be posted along with the informational flyers that were distributed at the local level. Information regarding accessibility to language assistance, including a Spanish translation, and contact information for support from ISBE's vendor will be made available to parents via the website. To support districts, correspondence to districts will be posted. Individual response rate percentages will be shared with districts at specific intervals during the survey window so districts can encourage parent participation if necessary.

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

The metric used to determine representativeness was +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders as compared to the target group.

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

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

ISBE continued to use the first 25 items from the Parent Survey developed by the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) to measure the percentage of parents who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. ISBE continued to use a six-year cycle for LEAs selected to ensure that every LEA is included in the data collection over the span of the State Performance Plan. The six-year survey cycle for FFY 2020-25 is based on the December 1 child count for school year 2020-21. This six-year cycle has been carefully developed to ensure the sample of families selected for the survey annually is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in terms of primary disability and race/ethnicity. ISBE mails the Illinois Parent Involvement Survey to a representative sample of parents of students with disabilities within the LEA during the year the LEA has been selected for the survey, except for the Chicago Public Schools (CPS) District 299. CPS has been selected every year of the six-year cycle, and ISBE ensures that a proportionate representation of parents of students with disabilities from the LEA receive the survey annually. Parents have the option to return a paper version of the survey by mail or to complete the survey online. English and Spanish versions of the survey are available to parents.

Of the 45,954 parents of students with disabilities in Illinois who were selected to participate in the 2020-21 Illinois Parent Involvement Survey, 3,742 parents responded, yielding an 8.14% response rate. This FFY20 response rate decreased 0.36% from a response rate of 8.50% in FFY19. FFY19 data show that 5,102 respondents completed the survey. The response rate of 8.14% is calculated using the total number of surveys received (3,742) divided by the total number of surveys mailed (45,954). However, 2,202 surveys were undeliverable and were returned to the sender. Therefore, the response rate based on the total number of surveys received (3,742) divided by the total number of surveys assumed delivered (43,752) is 8.55%.

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Although the previously approved sampling plan has not changed, it was submitted to the Illinois Part B OSEP contact via email.

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

The State reported on the representativeness of the data in the SPP 8 section entitled, "Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services." The results of the analysis indicated that student age, gender, and English language learner status were not significant predictors of survey completion by parents. Survey result analyses also indicated that families identifying as Black and Hispanic were less likely to complete the survey, as were families of students identified with Specific Learning Disabilities. In contrast, families identifying as White were more likely to complete the survey, as were families of students identified with Autism Spectrum Disorders.

The State reported on the actions it is taking to address representativeness in the SPP 8 section entitled, "Describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics." In order to ensure that future response data are more representative, ISBE continues to work with its survey vendor and the school districts in the current year's survey cycle to complete follow up activities

with families who are less likely to complete the survey. ISBE's survey vendor will continue to compile survey response data at regular intervals during the survey timeframe to determine which districts and families will be targeted for follow up communications regarding survey completion. ISBE also includes resources for parents, families, and districts on its SPP Indicator 8 webpage in an effort to increase representativeness.

8 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State submitted its sampling plan for this indicator with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR. OSEP will follow up with the State under separate cover regarding the submission.

8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2021 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

6

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	846	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

Disproportionate representation (or disproportionality) of racial/ethnic groups in special education is currently defined as students in a particular racial/ethnic group (i.e., Asian, Black, Hispanic, Native American, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, Two or More Races or White) being at a considerably greater risk of being identified as eligible for special education and related services than all other racial/ethnic groups enrolled either in the LEA or in the state (depending on the type of risk ratio calculation applied, as discussed below). ISBE uses a risk ratio to determine state risk for racial/ethnic disproportionality. To determine LEA risk for racial/ethnic disproportionality, ISBE uses a weighted risk ratio for LEAs in which there are at least 10 students in the racial/ethnic group and at least 10 students in the comparison group (all students in the racial/ethnic group enrolled in the LEA), and an alternate risk ratio for LEAs in which there are at least 10 students in the racial/ethnic group but fewer than 10 students in the comparison group enrolled in the LEA. The State utilized data from annual Fall Enrollment Counts from the Student Information System, or SIS, (for all students, grades 1-12) and December Child Count (for students with IEPs, ages 6-21), which is the same data reported to OSEP on Table 1 (Child Count) of Information Collection 1820-0043 (Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education under Part B of the IDEA, as amended).

ISBE examines data in the given school year to determine the number of LEAs that had at least 10 students with IEPs ages 6 – 21 for the past three school years to determine how many LEAs met the minimum "n" size for further analysis.

ISBE uses a two-step process to determine the existence of disproportionality based on race and ethnicity in special education that is the result of inappropriate identification. First, ISBE calculates a weighted or alternate risk ratio for every LEA in the state with regard to overall special education eligibility. Such risk ratios are calculated for each racial/ethnic group enrolled in a LEA. ISBE's criteria for determining overrepresentation based on race/ethnicity is a calculated weighted or alternate risk ratio of 3.0 or higher for three consecutive years for a particular racial/ ethnic group in which there are at least ten students in the special education population.

Second, in order to verify whether the disproportionality is the result of inappropriate identification in those LEAs with a risk ratio of 3.0 or higher, ISBE requires the identified LEAs to conduct self-assessment activities, including data verification and a review of policies, practices and procedures related to curriculum and instruction, child find, evaluations, eligibility determinations and IEPs. This occurs through one of the following:

- Completing a Special Education Disproportionality District Self-Assessment (for newly identified LEAs and those LEAs for which 2015-2016 was the fourth year in a row being identified as having disproportionality),
- Completing a Status Report (for continuing LEAs with the same area of disproportionality two or three years in a row), or
- Completing a Status Report with Self-Assessment Update (for continuing LEAs with the same area of disproportionality two or three years in a row plus, one or more different areas than the previous year).
- Completing a Self-Assessment Update (for continuing LEAs with disproportionality two or three years in a row, but in one or more different areas than the preceding year).

The LEAs submit the results of the self-assessment activities to ISBE. Upon receipt, ISBE reviews the documentation (which includes information resulting from the LEA's review of policies, practices and procedures) and, combined with the LEA data, determines whether or not the disproportionality is, in fact, the result of inappropriate identification of students. For those LEAs found to have disproportionate representation two or more years in a row, the LEA and State examine district processes, including a review of any new policies or procedures that went into effect since the prior year's review.

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

As described in detail above, ISBE utilizes a LEA self-assessment process to determine whether the disproportionate representation it identified was the result of inappropriate identification. The LEAs submit their self-assessments to ISBE, and the ISBE disproportionality team evaluates the self-assessments using its Disproportionality Self-Assessment Review Checklist/Rubric. ISBE staff use the Checklist/Rubric to score the five identified focus areas: curriculum and instruction; child find; initial evaluation and re-evaluation; eligibility determination; and individualized education program. The questions under each of the five focus areas are aligned to federal and state regulations. ISBE staff determine the extent to which the documentation provided demonstrates compliance with the regulations. The self-assessment also contains sections that address conclusions, next steps, and the revision of policies, procedures, and practices. ISBE staff score the Checklists/Rubrics and use the results to determine whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification.

In FFY20, 846 / 852 LEAs met the minimum n-size requirement and 6 / 852 LEAs did not meet the minimum n-size requirement for further analysis under SPP 9. However, none of the 846 LEAs met the criteria for overrepresentation based on race/ethnicity set by ISBE. Therefore, no LEAs were required to conduct self-assessment activities for FFY20.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The baseline year for Indicator 9 was updated to FFY 2020 due to the change in measurement requirements and revisions to the measurement table. OSEP now requires states to provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged five who are enrolled in kindergarten in addition to those aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. ISBE wanted to use FFY 2019 as the baseline year to align with the baseline year for SPP Indicator 5. However, ISBE was unable to obtain the necessary FFY 2019 data for SPP Indicator 9 that included 5-year-old kindergartners. Therefore, FFY 2020 was selected as the baseline year for SPP Indicator 9.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2020, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size.

Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

100

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
50	0	752	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

Disproportionate representation (or disproportionality) of racial/ethnic groups in special education is currently defined as students in a particular racial/ethnic group (i.e., Asian, Black, Hispanic, Native American, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, Two or More Races or White) being at a considerably greater risk of being identified as eligible for special education and related services than all other racial/ethnic groups enrolled either in the LEA or in the state (depending on the type of risk ratio calculation applied, as discussed below). ISBE uses a risk ratio to determine state risk for racial/ethnic disproportionality. To determine LEA risk for racial/ethnic disproportionality, ISBE uses a weighted risk ratio for LEAs in which there are at least 10 students in the racial/ethnic group and at least 10 students in the comparison group (all students in the racial/ethnic group enrolled in the LEA), and an alternate risk ratio for LEAs in which there are at least 10 students in the racial/ethnic group but fewer than 10 students in the comparison group enrolled in the LEA. The State utilized data from annual Fall Enrollment Counts from the Student Information System, or SIS, (for all students, grades 1-12) and December Child Count (for students with IEPs, ages 6-21), which is the same data reported to OSEP on Table 1 (Child Count) of Information Collection 1820-0043 (Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education under Part B of the IDEA, as amended).

ISBE examines data in the given school year to determine the number of LEAs that had at least 10 students with IEPs ages 6 – 21 for the past three school years to determine how many LEAs met the minimum “n” size for further analysis.

ISBE uses a two-step process to determine the existence of disproportionality based on race and ethnicity in special education that is the result of inappropriate identification. First, ISBE calculates a weighted or alternate risk ratio for every LEA in the state with regard to overall special education eligibility. Such risk ratios are calculated for each racial/ethnic group enrolled in a LEA. ISBE's criteria for determining overrepresentation based on race/ethnicity is a calculated weighted or alternate risk ratio of 3.0 or higher for three consecutive years for a particular racial/ ethnic group in which there are at least ten students in the special education population.

Second, in order to verify whether the disproportionality is the result of inappropriate identification in those LEAs with a risk ratio of 3.0 or higher, ISBE requires the identified LEAs to conduct self-assessment activities, including data verification and a review of policies, practices and procedures related to curriculum and instruction, child find, evaluations, eligibility determinations and IEPs. This occurs through one of the following:

- Completing a Special Education Disproportionality District Self-Assessment (for newly identified LEAs and those LEAs for which 2015-2016 was the fourth year in a row being identified as having disproportionality),
- Completing a Status Report (for continuing LEAs with the same area of disproportionality two or three years in a row), or
- Completing a Status Report with Self-Assessment Update (for continuing LEAs with the same area of disproportionality two or three years in a row plus, one or more different areas than the previous year).
- Completing a Self-Assessment Update (for continuing LEAs with disproportionality two or three years in a row, but in one or more different areas than the preceding year).

The LEAs submit the results of the self-assessment activities to ISBE. Upon receipt, ISBE reviews the documentation (which includes information resulting from the LEA's review of policies, practices and procedures) and, combined with the LEA data, determines whether or not the disproportionality is, in fact, the result of inappropriate identification of students. For those LEAs found to have disproportionate representation two or more years in a row, the LEA and State examine district processes, including a review of any new policies or procedures that went into effect since the prior year's review.

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

As described in detail above, ISBE utilizes a LEA self-assessment process to determine whether the disproportionate representation it identified was the result of inappropriate identification. The LEAs submit their self-assessments to ISBE, and the ISBE disproportionality team evaluates the self-assessments using its Disproportionality Self-Assessment Review Checklist/Rubric. ISBE staff use the Checklist/Rubric to score the five identified focus areas: curriculum and instruction; child find; initial evaluation and re-evaluation; eligibility determination; and individualized education program. The questions under each of the five focus areas are aligned to federal and state regulations. ISBE staff determine the extent to which the documentation provided demonstrates compliance with the regulations. The self-assessment also contains sections that address conclusions, next steps, and the revision of policies, procedures, and practices. ISBE staff score the Checklists/Rubrics and use the results to determine whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification.

In FFY20, 752 / 852 LEAs met the minimum n-size requirement. Fifty (50) of the 752 LEAs that met the minimum n-size requirement also met the criteria for overrepresentation based on race/ethnicity in specific disability categories set by ISBE. Therefore, these 50 LEAs were required to conduct self-assessment activities for FFY20. After a thorough review of LEA self-assessments and status reports, none of the 50 LEAs were found to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The baseline year for Indicator 10 was updated to FFY 2020 due to the change in measurement requirements and revisions to the measurement table. OSEP now requires states to provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged five who are enrolled in kindergarten in addition to those aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. ISBE wanted to use FFY 2019 as the baseline year to align with the baseline year for SPP Indicator 5. However, ISBE was unable to obtain the necessary FFY 2019 data for SPP Indicator 10 that included 5-year-old kindergartners. Therefore, FFY 2020 was selected as the baseline year for SPP Indicator 10.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	64.20%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.74%	98.92%	99.20%	99.42%	99.61%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
27,512	26,173	99.61%	100%	95.13%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage

ISBE experienced effects due to the global pandemic that most likely contributed to the slippage. The statewide data used in the measurement of this indicator appear to be complete, valid, and reliable. Therefore, the slippage in FFY 2020 is not attributed to any identified data quality issues. In addition, COVID-19 did not appear to impact ISBE's ability to collect data. ISBE is reporting 27,512 children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received in FFY20 as compared to 28,690 in FFY19. However, COVID-19 did impact the timeliness of initial evaluations. The number of delays beyond the 60 school-day timeline went from 113 in FFY19 to 1,339 in FFY20. Upon examination of the delays, approximately 98% were within the timeframe of school closures due to the pandemic, as parental consent for the initial evaluation occurred prior to the Executive Order issued by the Governor allowing all public and nonpublic schools to open for in-person instruction for the fall of 2020.

ISBE acknowledges that districts struggled to adjust to the mandatory emergency shut down of in-person instruction statewide, along with the challenges surrounding decision making regarding how to complete evaluations in a timely manner during a global pandemic. ISBE also recognizes that some families did not feel comfortable with virtual evaluations or, as the pandemic progressed, in-person evaluations, which delayed the completion of initial evaluations in some cases. To mitigate the impact of COVID-19, ISBE published numerous guidance documents throughout the pandemic and posted them to the ISBE COVID-19 webpage. Specifically, ISBE released a "Frequently Asked Questions for Special Education on the Transition to In-Person Instruction" document dated June 30, 2020. This document indicated that districts would be allowed to use a particular timeline exception delay code only for evaluation extensions during the COVID-19 pandemic for which written, mutually agreed upon extensions of the evaluation had been secured. These resources, along with others, can be found at <https://www.isbe.net/coronavirus>. ISBE staff also manned a COVID-19 team that responded to questions from school districts and families.

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

1,339

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

In FFY20 there were 1,339 students out of 27,512 students (4.87%) whose evaluations were completed beyond the 60 school-day timeline. The number of days beyond the timeline ranged from 1 day to 286 days. Twenty of the 1,339 evaluations (1.49%) were completed 1-10 days beyond the timeline. Seventeen of the 1,339 evaluations (1.27%) were completed 11-20 days beyond the timeline. Fifteen of the 1,339 evaluations (1.12%) were completed 21-30 days beyond the timeline, and 1,287 of the 1,339 evaluations (96.12%) were completed more than 30 days beyond the timeline. Reported reasons for exceeding the 60 school-day timeline included procedures/practices not timely (93.50%), lack of personnel resources (3.36%), summer issues (2.47%) and hearing/vision/medical issues (0.67%).

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

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

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

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

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
41	41	0	0

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

ISBE verified that LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY19 were correctly implementing 34 CFR 300.301(c)(1) through several specific actions. ISBE made several resources available to assist LEAs with reviewing and revising their policies, procedures, and/or practices related to the identified noncompliance and developing improvement activities to address noncompliance. These resources are located on the ISBE website: <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPP-APR-Indicator-11.aspx>. To ensure that noncompliance was corrected to 100%, and to document that LEAs were correctly implementing 34 CFR 300.301(c)(1), LEAs were required to submit a corrective action plan to ISBE that detailed their review process, including data analysis, root cause determination, revisions to policies, procedures, and/or practices to support future compliance, and activities to support future compliance (with corresponding timelines, persons responsible, and materials used as evidence of activity completion). Once the corrective action plan was accepted, ISBE examined new and updated data from the statewide database as a means of verifying correction.

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

The State reported that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) and has corrected each individual case of noncompliance in the SPP 11 section entitled, "FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected." To ensure that noncompliance was corrected to 100%, and to document that LEAs were correctly implementing 34 CFR 300.301(c)(1), ISBE made resources available on its website for LEAs to support their corrective action plan development and implementation. LEA corrective action plans included data analysis, root cause determination, revisions to policies, procedures, and/or practices to support future compliance, and activities to support future compliance (with corresponding timelines, persons responsible, and materials used as evidence of activity completion). Once the corrective action plan was accepted, ISBE examined new and updated data from the statewide database as a means of verifying correction. Individual correction was verified through updated data from the statewide database.

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	83.40%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.67%	97.17%	96.90%	99.03%	97.75%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	7,045
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	851

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	5,351
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	325
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	29
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	5,351	5,840	97.75%	100%	91.63%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

ISBE attributes part of the slippage to updates in the agency statewide data system for SPP Indicator 12. In 2018-2019, the system was initially developed and implemented. As data was collected, ISBE staff were able to identify areas where the system could be more fully developed to obtain the most accurate data. During 2019-2020 ISBE was able to refine the data collection process by further clarifying delay code descriptions and removing unnecessary codes. During 2020-2021 ISBE continued to enhance the data system by adding edits for district staff related to data reporting. These corrections have likely contributed to more accurate reporting, resulting in a slip in the data. To prepare the LEAs for the updates, ISBE updated the Q&A document, which is available on the ISBE website at: <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPP-APR-Indicator-12.aspx>. ISBE provided ongoing technical assistance and support on the data collection system to LEAs throughout the school year via phone calls and emails. In addition, ISBE provided in-person training to staff at the state's largest school district at the onset of system implementation and continues to work with district staff to ensure timely and accurate data collection. Ongoing technical assistance and support has been provided to special education and data staff at this LEA via emails, phone calls, and meetings. ISBE continues to work with the state's largest district to address issues that arise related to inputting data into the data collection and reporting system. ISBE will continue to monitor and refine the system as necessary to continuously improve statewide data collection and reporting for SPP Indicator 12.

In addition to updates to the data collection system impacting slippage for SPP Indicator 12, ISBE experienced effects due to the global pandemic that most likely contributed to the slippage. The statewide data used in the measurement of this indicator appear to be complete, valid, and reliable. Therefore, the slippage in FFY 2020 is not attributed to any identified data quality issues. In addition, COVID-19 did not appear to impact ISBE's ability to collect data. ISBE is reporting 7,045 children who were served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination in FFY20 as compared to 7,969 in FFY19. Rather, COVID-19 impacted the timeliness of IEP development and implementation by children's' third birthdays. The number of delays beyond the third birthday went from 146 delays in FFY19 to 489 delays in FFY20. Upon examination of the 489 delays beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, approximately 30% of the school district delays were within the timeframe of school closures due to the pandemic, as student birthdays occurred prior to the Executive Order issued by the Governor allowing all public and nonpublic schools to open for in-person instruction for the fall of 2020. LEAs reported receiving referrals and paperwork from Early Intervention later than usual as well as difficulty connecting early intervention providers, which could have contributed to the slippage.

ISBE acknowledges that districts struggled to adjust to the mandatory emergency shut down of in-person instruction statewide, along with the challenges surrounding decision making regarding how to complete evaluations in a timely manner during a global pandemic. ISBE also recognizes that some families did not feel comfortable with virtual evaluations or, as the pandemic progressed, in-person evaluations, which delayed transitions from Part C to Part B. To mitigate the impact of COVID-19, ISBE published numerous guidance documents throughout the pandemic and posted them to the ISBE COVID-19 webpage, including a joint guidance statement with the Department of Human Services (the state agency that houses Early Intervention) that clarified transition during the pandemic. ISBE staff provided technical assistance to districts, specifically supporting their questions regarding appropriate delay code selections during COVID-19. ISBE also jointly produced an accompanying family document regarding transition during the pandemic. These resources, along with others, can be found at <https://www.isbe.net/coronavirus>. ISBE staff also manned a COVID-19 team that responded to questions from school districts and families.

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

489

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

There were 489 students who were included in (a) but not included in b, c, d, or e above. The number of days beyond the timeline ranged from 1-218. Two hundred forty-five students (50.10%) were 1-30 days beyond the timeline, one hundred fifty-four students (31.49%) were 31-60 days beyond the timeline, fifty students (10.22%) were 61-90 days beyond the timeline, and forty students (8.18%) were 90+ days beyond the timeline. In terms of reasons for the delays, 7% were attributed to the CFC not notifying the school district at least 90 days prior to the child's third birthday, and 93% were attributed to the school districts not completing the evaluation process and developing the IEP by the child's third birthday. In addition, approximately 30% of the school district delays were within the timeframe of school closures due to the pandemic, as student birthdays occurred prior to the Executive Order issued by the Governor allowing all public and nonpublic schools to open for in-person instruction for the fall of 2020.

Attach PDF table (optional)

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
28	28	0	0

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

ISBE verified that LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY19 were correctly implementing 34 CFR 300.124(b) through several specific actions. ISBE made several resources available to assist LEAs with reviewing and revising their policies, procedures, and/or practices related to the identified noncompliance and developing improvement activities to address noncompliance. These resources and tools are located on the ISBE website: <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPP-APR-Indicator-12.aspx>. To ensure that noncompliance was corrected to 100%, and to document that LEAs were correctly implementing 34 CFR 300.124(b), LEAs were required to submit a corrective action plan to ISBE that detailed their review process, including data analysis, root cause determination, revisions to policies, procedures, and/or practices to support future compliance, and activities to support future compliance (with corresponding timelines, persons responsible, and materials used as evidence of activity completion). Once the corrective action plan was accepted, ISBE examined new and updated data from the statewide database as a means of verifying correction.

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

ISBE verified that 100% of the children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who were found eligible for Part B, had an IEP developed and implemented, although late, through the statewide database. Consistent with OSEP Memorandum #09-02, ISBE verified correction of each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, through a review of updated data via the statewide data system.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

The State reported that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) and has corrected each individual case of noncompliance in the SPP 12 section entitled, "FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected." To ensure that noncompliance was corrected to 100%, and to document that LEAs were correctly implementing 34 CFR 300.124(b), ISBE made resources available on its website for LEAs to support their corrective action plan development and implementation. LEA corrective action plans included data analysis, root cause determination, revisions to policies, procedures, and/or practices to support future compliance, and activities to support future compliance (with corresponding timelines, persons responsible, and materials used as evidence of activity completion). Once the corrective action plan was accepted, ISBE examined new and updated data from the statewide database as a means of verifying correction. Individual correction was verified through updated data from the statewide database.

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	79.20%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.50%	98.63%	99.17%	99.57%	99.70%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
69,415	69,623	99.70%	100%	99.70%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

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

If no, please explain

The OSEP Part B SPP and APR Indicator Measurement Table for FFY20 indicates that a State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

ISBE continued to report students aged 16 and above in the new SPP/APR cycle without including its youth aged 14 ½ to 16. The consistent reporting of the percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above for this indicator allows ISBE and its stakeholders to continue monitoring trend data from the original baseline data in order to inform decision making around SPP Indicator 13 improvement efforts. ISBE and its stakeholders chose to retain the original baseline for SPP Indicator 13 for this reason.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
6	6	0	0

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

ISBE verified that all LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY19 were correctly implementing 34 CFR 300.320(b) and 300.321(b) through several specific actions. ISBE made multiple resources available to assist LEAs with reviewing and revising their policies, procedures, and/or practices related to the identified noncompliance and developing improvement activities to address noncompliance. These resources are located on the ISBE website: <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPP-APR-Indicator-13.aspx>. To ensure that noncompliance was corrected to 100%, and to document that LEAs were correctly implementing 34 CFR 300.320(b) and 300.321(b), LEAs were required to submit a corrective action plan to ISBE that detailed their review process, including data analysis, root cause determination, revisions to policies, procedures, and/or practices to support future compliance, and activities to support future compliance (with corresponding timelines, persons responsible, and materials used as evidence of activity completion). Once the corrective action plan was accepted, ISBE examined new and updated data, such as IEPs and other pertinent secondary transition documentation, as a means of verifying correction. ISBE staff used the Illinois State Performance Plan Indicator 13 Scoring Rubric as a tool to assist with verification of correction. The Rubric can be found on the ISBE website: <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPP-APR-Indicator-13.aspx>.

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

ISBE verified that 100% of youth aged 16 and above had IEPs that contained each of the required components for secondary transition through a review of updated data including previously noncompliant individual student IEPs and other pertinent secondary transition documentation for each student. ISBE staff used the Illinois State Performance Plan Indicator 13 Scoring Rubric as an evaluation tool to assist with the review of amended individual student IEPs, secondary transition documentation for each student, and verification of correction. The ISBE Scoring Rubric addresses eight required areas related to secondary transition and SPP Indicator 13 requirements. ISBE adapted the Rubric from the NSTTAC Indicator 13 checklist prepared by the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC). The ISBE Scoring Rubric is available on the ISBE website for districts to use in collecting data to meet the regulatory requirements of SPP Indicator 13. The Rubric can be found on the ISBE website: <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPP-APR-Indicator-13.aspx>. Consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, ISBE verified correction of each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, through updated data from previously noncompliant files.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved

100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

The State reported that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) and has corrected each individual case of noncompliance in the SPP Indicator 13 section entitled, "FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected." To ensure that noncompliance was corrected to 100%, and to document that LEAs were correctly implementing 34 CFR 300.320(b) and 300.321(b), ISBE made resources available on its website for LEAs to support their corrective action plan development and implementation. LEA corrective action plans included data analysis, root cause determination, revisions to policies, procedures, and/or practices to support future compliance, and activities to support future compliance (with corresponding timelines, persons responsible, and materials used as evidence of activity completion). Once the corrective action plan was accepted, ISBE examined new and updated data from IEPs and other pertinent secondary transition documentation as a means of verifying correction. Individual correction was verified through updated data from previously noncompliant student records. The Illinois State Performance Plan Indicator 13 Scoring Rubric was used to evaluate amended individual student IEPs, secondary transition documentation for each student, and verification of correction.

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

Collect data by September 2021 on students who left school during 2019-2020, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2019-2020 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

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

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment”:

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

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

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

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

II. Data Reporting

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

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

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

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also

happen to be employed. Likewise, "leavers" who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

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

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

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

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

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

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

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due Feb. 1, 2023, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of respondents are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2017	Target >=	35.00%	35.00%	35.00%	35.00%	35.10%
A	29.59%	Data	27.54%	32.07%	29.59%	29.58%	29.55%
B	2017	Target >=	56.90%	57.00%	57.00%	57.00%	57.00%
B	63.46%	Data	63.19%	64.22%	63.46%	60.88%	66.90%
C	2017	Target >=	72.50%	73.00%	74.00%	75.00%	75.00%
C	75.74%	Data	73.33%	76.09%	75.74%	71.79%	77.62%

FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	29.60%	29.60%	29.60%	29.60%	29.60%	30.00%
Target B >=	63.50%	63.50%	63.50%	63.50%	63.50%	66.00%
Target C >=	75.75%	75.75%	75.75%	75.75%	75.75%	78.25%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ISBE has ongoing communication regarding the SPP/APR with its primary stakeholder group, the Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC) through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. The role of ISAC is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. ISAC functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Services Department. ISAC is comprised of members who represent individuals with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, students with disabilities, teachers of students with disabilities, private providers, public charter schools, special education directors, regional superintendents, district superintendents, higher education personnel, vocational/community/business organization providers of transition services to students with disabilities, the Illinois Department of Human Services, the Illinois Department of Children and Family

Services, the Illinois Department of Corrections/Department of Juvenile Justice, and the general public. ISBE staff have discussions with ISAC multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, and improvement strategies with ISAC as necessary. ISAC assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising SPP targets for many of the indicators.

In addition to ISAC, ISBE collaborates with many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. Such stakeholder groups have included the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group, the Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium, the Harrisburg Project, the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE), the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA), the Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support Network Advisory Council, the Illinois Elevating Special Educators Advisory Group, Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs), Regional Offices of Education (ROEs), the Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois think tank, and the Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET) project. ISBE shares SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences, regional professional development opportunities, and task force meetings. Comments and suggestions from the stakeholder groups are incorporated into the SPP/APR.

ISBE collected stakeholder feedback on its proposed SPP targets in multiple ways. Beginning in June 2021, ISBE's Special Education Department initiated a series of stakeholder meetings to establish targets for the new six-year cycle of the SPP. These meetings were held virtually over a two-month period to maximize participation and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds. The following existing stakeholder groups participated in feedback sessions with ISBE:

- Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium
- Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education

Stakeholders included professional development providers, school district representatives, educational advocates, Illinois Early Learning Project representatives, Chicago Public Schools representatives, Parent Training and Information Center representatives, parent members of ISAC, early intervention representatives, inclusion support specialists, individuals with disabilities, students with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, parents from advisory committees, general public representatives, higher education representatives, Department of Corrections representatives, Illinois Service Resource Center representatives, directors of special education, assistant directors of special education, special education supervisors, special education coordinators, directors of innovative learning and technology, special education cooperative governing board members, regional superintendents, assistant regional superintendents, school business officials, and special education attorneys. In addition, the Illinois MTSS director, ISBE State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) coordinator, ISBE director of Special Education, ISBE SPP/State Systemic Improvement Plan coordinator, and ISBE Section 619 coordinator participated in one or more stakeholder meetings. A total of 121 stakeholder group members chose to participate in these six feedback sessions.

All stakeholder meetings were organized and facilitated by ISBE, with the assistance of group leaders. The meetings provided information on the SPP indicators to apprise stakeholders of the history and data trends so that they could make informed recommendations. The presentations included an introductory section on the SPP as well as information regarding goals for stakeholder input. Information about setting new baselines and targets was also provided. Then details about the importance of each indicator and how specific indicators are defined, measured, and calculated were shared. National and state trend data were explained, average rates of change were discussed, and comparisons to similar states were provided for some indicators. Each session sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable.

These six stakeholder groups provided input on proposed targets for one or more of the following SPP indicators: 1, 2, 3, 4A, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, and 17. At the conclusion of the stakeholder group meetings, the proposed targets for SPP indicators 1, 2, 3, 4A, 7, 15, and 16 were determined reasonable and achievable. However, after several stakeholder group meetings, the proposed targets for SPP indicators 5, 6, 8, and 14 were reexamined and revised based on state and national trend data and stakeholder feedback. These revisions were made prior to the release of the SPP proposed target web modules and online survey for additional stakeholder feedback on June 9. ISBE recorded 16 separate SPP modules and posted them on the website. The introduction module provided general information that applied to all SPP indicators. Each of the SPP modules shared information specific to the indicator(s) being addressed, such as state and national trend data, measurements, and proposed SPP targets for the FFY 2020-25 SPP cycle. Each module sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable by requesting that the participant complete a survey. The survey was open for over two months to gather stakeholder input. Prior to initiating the module recordings and survey, ISBE advertised broadly via state bulletins, listservs, Parent Training and Information Center publications, other state technical assistance resource centers, and the six stakeholder groups mentioned previously. These efforts resulted in 180 stakeholders completing SPP surveys. These stakeholders represented a variety of regions of the state and races/ethnicities. Survey completers identified themselves as community members, educators, administrators, and other stakeholders. After these meetings were convened and survey data was compiled, ISBE engaged in an internal review of stakeholder feedback.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	2,250
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	1,060
Response Rate	47.11%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	235
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	415
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	51
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	75

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	235	1,060	29.55%	29.60%	22.17%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	650	1,060	66.90%	63.50%	61.32%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	776	1,060	77.62%	75.75%	73.21%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	ISBE analyzed SPP Indicator 14 data to determine reasons for the slippage. It was determined that the percentage of students in higher education brought down numbers in SPP Indicator 14A, but also in 14B and 14C. The slippage represented in the data provided by the respondents for SPP Indicator 14A mirrors the enrollment trend at the State's universities and community colleges for all students during the same period. According to data collected by the Illinois Board of Higher Education, fall 2020 enrollment data overall was down 7.2% among undergraduate students from fall 2019. This data includes students enrolled in public and private four-year universities, and community colleges. That data is consistent with the decline in higher education participation among the Indicator 14 survey respondents. The enrollment rate for community colleges alone was down 13.7% from 2019. It is hypothesized that COVID-19 factors may have contributed to the decline in enrollment data overall. However, no data analysis related to COVID-19 was discussed in the Illinois Board of Higher Education report.
B	ISBE analyzed SPP Indicator 14 data to determine reasons for the slippage. It was determined that the percentage of students in higher education brought down numbers in SPP Indicator 14A, but also in 14B and 14C. The slippage represented in the data provided by the respondents for SPP Indicator 14A mirrors the enrollment trend at the State's universities and community colleges for all students during the same period. According to data collected by the Illinois Board of Higher Education, fall 2020 enrollment data overall was down 7.2% among undergraduate students from fall 2019. This data includes students enrolled in public and private four-year universities, and community colleges. That data is consistent with the decline in higher education participation among the Indicator 14 survey respondents. The enrollment rate for community colleges alone was down 13.7% from 2019. It is hypothesized that COVID-19 factors may have contributed to the decline in enrollment data overall. However, no data analysis related to COVID-19 was discussed in the Illinois Board of Higher Education report.

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
C	ISBE analyzed SPP Indicator 14 data to determine reasons for the slippage. It was determined that the percentage of students in higher education brought down numbers in SPP Indicator 14A, but also in 14B and 14C. The slippage represented in the data provided by the respondents for SPP Indicator 14A mirrors the enrollment trend at the State's universities and community colleges for all students during the same period. According to data collected by the Illinois Board of Higher Education, fall 2020 enrollment data overall was down 7.2% among undergraduate students from fall 2019. This data includes students enrolled in public and private four-year universities, and community colleges. That data is consistent with the decline in higher education participation among the Indicator 14 survey respondents. The enrollment rate for community colleges alone was down 13.7% from 2019. It is hypothesized that COVID-19 factors may have contributed to the decline in enrollment data overall. However, no data analysis related to COVID-19 was discussed in the Illinois Board of Higher Education report.

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

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

Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	29.73%	47.11%

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

Although ISBE was pleased with the increase in the response rate from FFY19 to FFY20, the ISBE Special Education Department staff will continue to collaborate with the Information Technology Department staff at the agency to determine the feasibility and logistics of including an electronic version of the survey as an option for school leavers as a means to increase the response rate. This prospect was discussed last year but was deemed not feasible at that time due to multiple factors. Agency staff will also continue to explore the possibility of compiling response data at regular intervals during the survey timeframe to determine which districts and students/families will be targeted for follow up communications regarding survey completion. District response rate percentages would be shared with districts at specific intervals during the survey window so they could encourage participation if necessary. Another ISBE SPP Indicator 14 team member has been added to assist with this activity.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Because ISBE encourages LEAs to implement a variety of activities to maximize the number of surveys completed and increase the response rate, nonresponse bias was not identified. ISBE provides information about the survey on the SPP 14 webpage: <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPP-APR-Indicator-14.aspx>. ISBE has both English and Spanish versions of the sample letter to former students and the survey interview questions and interviewer script. Districts are strongly encouraged to utilize multiple types of technology to reach diverse student leavers, such as electronic survey invitations, reminder emails, reminder text messages, recorded phone messages, and live phone calls. Districts are also encouraged to garner support from local parent groups to reach school leavers who are less likely to rely on technology. Districts are strongly encouraged to send a sample letter to each selected student/family prior to administering the survey to notify them of the survey and its purpose. Districts are also instructed to ensure students/families have access to language assistance, including Spanish-language interpreters if needed. Finally, ISBE is exploring the possibility of compiling response data at regular intervals during the survey timeframe to determine which districts and students/families will be targeted for follow up reminders regarding survey completion.

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

The demographic representation of FFY 2020 survey respondents was examined by gender, race/ethnicity, exit reason, and disability category. Given that the overall survey sample was representative of the state's youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, an examination of the response rate by subgroup sheds light on whether the survey responses were also representative of this state population.

The results of the analysis indicated that student gender status and exit reason were not significant predictors of survey completion. Therefore, the sample of students who responded to the survey is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school in terms of gender and exit reason. While the overall sample of students who responded to the survey is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school in multiple racial/ethnic groups and disability categories, survey result analyses indicated some statistically significant differences between students who did and did not respond to the survey in terms of race/ethnicity and primary disability category. Specifically, school leavers identifying as Hispanic were less likely to complete the survey, as were youth identified with Specific Learning Disabilities. Youth identifying as Hispanic who were no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school made up 34.67% of the survey group and 19.91% of the survey responses (-14.76% difference). Youth identifying as Black who were no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school made up 33.64% of the survey group and 24.15% of the survey responses (-9.49% difference). Youth identified with Specific Learning Disabilities made up 57.60% of the survey group and 47.83% of the responses (-9.77% difference). In contrast, school leavers identifying as White were more likely to complete the survey, as were youth identified with a primary disability of Other Health Impairments. Youth identifying as White who were no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school made up 27.87% of the survey group and 49.81% of the survey responses (+21.94% difference). Youth identified with Other Health Impairments made up 13.24% of the survey group and 16.70% of the survey responses (+3.46% difference).

The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)

NO

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

In an effort to ensure that future response data are representative, ISBE maintains resources for parents, students, and districts on its SPP Indicator 14 webpage: <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPP-APR-Indicator-14.aspx> and includes the weblink in multiple documents to increase awareness of its existence. For example, a link to the SPP 14 webpage is provided as a resource in the web application that local school districts are required to use to access the SPP Indicator 14 survey. The notification letter LEAs received regarding the SPP Indicator 14 survey includes a link to the SPP Indicator 14

webpage as well. In terms of resources available on the webpage, ISBE has two documents from the National Post-School Outcomes Center to help improve the representativeness of survey respondents (Collecting Post-School Outcome Data: Strategies for Increasing Response Rates and Contacting Hard-to-Find Youth: Strategies for the Post-School Survey). ISBE also loads these National Post-School Outcomes Center resources directly into the SPP Indicator 14 district web application for the survey. LEAs are strongly encouraged to use the strategies listed in these documents to improve response rate and representativeness. In addition, ISBE will work with the school districts in the 2022 survey cycle to complete follow up activities with students or families who are less likely to complete the survey. For example, districts will be strongly encouraged to utilize electronic survey invitations, reminder emails, reminder text messages, recorded phone messages, live phone calls, and support from local parent groups to reach underrepresented students and families for survey completion. Districts will be strongly encouraged to send a sample letter to each selected student/family prior to administering the survey to notify them of the survey and its purpose. Districts will also be instructed to ensure students/families have access to language assistance, including Spanish-language interpreters if needed.

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

The metric used to determine representativeness was +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders as compared to the target group.

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

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

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

A new baseline and new targets were set for SPP Indicator 14 due to the change in data collection method in FFY 2017. Prior to FFY 2017 cohorts for SPP Indicator 14 were organized by district size (small, medium, large) or district type (HS, Chicago Public Schools) and were sampled separately by cohort. ISBE and its stakeholders reviewed annual data and provided feedback that they felt this data collection method skewed results based on cohort size. Therefore, in the spring of 2016 ISBE updated the cohort selection process to include 25% of each of the cohorts 1, 2, 3, and 4 and 20% of cohort 5 (Chicago Public Schools) vs. sampling each cohort separately. Data became more stable once the new cohort selection process was implemented in 2017. However, based on actual data, ISBE should have adjusted the baseline and targets to align with the new data collection method as the SPP Indicator 14A targets for the last 3 years were not met and the SPP Indicator 14C target for FFY 2018 was not met. As ISBE discussed the new SPP cycle with its stakeholders this past spring and summer, feedback was provided that previous SPP Indicator 14 baseline data was no longer representative due to the data collection method change in FFY 2017. Since the baseline and targets were not adjusted for FFY 2017 to coincide with the new data collection method, ISBE and its stakeholders chose to align them now as the new SPP cycle begins. New targets were based on state and national trend data for SPP Indicator 14. ISBE and its stakeholders also considered other factors that could have potentially impacted the data. National SPP Indicator 14A data decreased 1% (0.2% average rate of change) over 5 years. Since Illinois data already exceeded national data, the targets for SPP Indicator 14A show reasonable growth based on state data. National SPP Indicator 14B data increased by 2.7% over 5 years (0.54% average rate of change). Therefore, the final targets for SPP Indicator 14B show growth of 2.5% from the FFY20 target. National SPP Indicator 14C data also increased by 2.7% over 5 years. Therefore, the final targets for SPP Indicator 14C show growth of 2.5% from the FFY20 target. Online stakeholder survey responses for the new SPP Indicator 14 baseline year and targets showed 100% agreement.

Finally, although the previously approved sampling plan has not changed, it was submitted to the Illinois Part B OSEP contact via email.

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

The State reported on the representativeness of the data in the SPP Indicator 14 section entitled, "Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school." The results of the analysis indicated that student gender status and exit reason were not significant predictors of survey completion. Survey result analyses also indicated that school leavers identifying as Hispanic or Black were less likely to complete the survey, as were youth identified with Specific Learning Disabilities. In contrast, school leavers identifying as White were more likely to complete the survey, as were youth identified with a primary disability of Other Health Impairments.

The State reported on the actions it is taking to address representativeness in the SPP Indicator 14 section entitled, "Describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics." In order to ensure that future response data are more representative, ISBE added NTACTION resource documents to the SPP 14 webpage and provided the link to the SPP Indicator 14 webpage in the

SPP Indicator 14 survey application and the LEA survey notification letter. ISBE will load these resources directly into the SPP Indicator 14 application for the 2021-2022 survey.

14 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2017 and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State submitted its sampling plan for this indicator with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR. OSEP will follow up with the State under separate cover regarding the submission.

14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2021 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	12
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ISBE has ongoing communication regarding the SPP/APR with its primary stakeholder group, the Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC) through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. The role of ISAC is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. ISAC functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Services Department. ISAC is comprised of members who represent individuals with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, students with disabilities, teachers of students with disabilities, private providers, public charter schools, special education directors, regional superintendents, district superintendents, higher education personnel, vocational/community/business organization providers of transition services to students with disabilities, the Illinois Department of Human Services, the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, the Illinois Department of Corrections/Department of Juvenile Justice, and the general public. ISBE staff have discussions with ISAC multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, and improvement strategies with ISAC as necessary. ISAC assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising SPP targets for many of the indicators.

In addition to ISAC, ISBE collaborates with many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. Such stakeholder groups have included the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group, the Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium, the Harrisburg Project, the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE), the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA), the Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support Network Advisory Council, the Illinois Elevating Special Educators Advisory Group, Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs), Regional Offices of Education (ROEs), the Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois think tank, and the Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET) project. ISBE shares SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences, regional professional development opportunities, and task force meetings. Comments and suggestions from the stakeholder groups are incorporated into the SPP/APR.

ISBE collected stakeholder feedback on its proposed SPP targets in multiple ways. Beginning in June 2021, ISBE's Special Education Department initiated a series of stakeholder meetings to establish targets for the new six-year cycle of the SPP. These meetings were held virtually over a two-month period to maximize participation and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds. The following existing stakeholder groups participated in feedback sessions with ISBE:

- Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium
- Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council

- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education

Stakeholders included professional development providers, school district representatives, educational advocates, Illinois Early Learning Project representatives, Chicago Public Schools representatives, Parent Training and Information Center representatives, parent members of ISAC, early intervention representatives, inclusion support specialists, individuals with disabilities, students with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, parents from advisory committees, general public representatives, higher education representatives, Department of Corrections representatives, Illinois Service Resource Center representatives, directors of special education, assistant directors of special education, special education supervisors, special education coordinators, directors of innovative learning and technology, special education cooperative governing board members, regional superintendents, assistant regional superintendents, school business officials, and special education attorneys. In addition, the Illinois MTSS director, ISBE State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) coordinator, ISBE director of Special Education, ISBE SPP/State Systemic Improvement Plan coordinator, and ISBE Section 619 coordinator participated in one or more stakeholder meetings. A total of 121 stakeholder group members chose to participate in these six feedback sessions.

All stakeholder meetings were organized and facilitated by ISBE, with the assistance of group leaders. The meetings provided information on the SPP indicators to apprise stakeholders of the history and data trends so that they could make informed recommendations. The presentations included an introductory section on the SPP as well as information regarding goals for stakeholder input. Information about setting new baselines and targets was also provided. Then details about the importance of each indicator and how specific indicators are defined, measured, and calculated were shared. National and state trend data were explained, average rates of change were discussed, and comparisons to similar states were provided for some indicators. Each session sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable.

These six stakeholder groups provided input on proposed targets for one or more of the following SPP indicators: 1, 2, 3, 4A, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, and 17. At the conclusion of the stakeholder group meetings, the proposed targets for SPP indicators 1, 2, 3, 4A, 7, 15, and 16 were determined reasonable and achievable. However, after several stakeholder group meetings, the proposed targets for SPP indicators 5, 6, 8, and 14 were reexamined and revised based on state and national trend data and stakeholder feedback. These revisions were made prior to the release of the SPP proposed target web modules and online survey for additional stakeholder feedback on June 9. ISBE recorded 16 separate SPP modules and posted them on the website. The introduction module provided general information that applied to all SPP indicators. Each of the SPP modules shared information specific to the indicator(s) being addressed, such as state and national trend data, measurements, and proposed SPP targets for the FFY 2020-25 SPP cycle. Each module sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable by requesting that the participant complete a survey. The survey was open for over two months to gather stakeholder input. Prior to initiating the module recordings and survey, ISBE advertised broadly via state bulletins, listservs, Parent Training and Information Center publications, other state technical assistance resource centers, and the six stakeholder groups mentioned previously. These efforts resulted in 180 stakeholders completing SPP surveys. These stakeholders represented a variety of regions of the state and races/ethnicities. Survey completers identified themselves as community members, educators, administrators, and other stakeholders. After these meetings were convened and survey data was compiled, ISBE engaged in an internal review of stakeholder feedback.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2012	26.67%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	25.00% - 35.00%	25.00% - 35.00%	25.00% - 35.00%	25.00% - 35.00%	25.10%-35.10%
Data	36.36%	42.50%	32.43%	37.04%	16.67%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	25.10%	25.10%	25.10%	25.10%	25.10%	25.10%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
3	12	16.67%	25.10%	25.00%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1 Mediations held	186
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	44
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	49

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ISBE has ongoing communication regarding the SPP/APR with its primary stakeholder group, the Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC) through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. The role of ISAC is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. ISAC functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Services Department. ISAC is comprised of members who represent individuals with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, students with disabilities, teachers of students with disabilities, private providers, public charter schools, special education directors, regional superintendents, district superintendents, higher education personnel, vocational/community/business organization providers of transition services to students with disabilities, the Illinois Department of Human Services, the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, the Illinois Department of Corrections/Department of Juvenile Justice, and the general public. ISBE staff have discussions with ISAC multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, and improvement strategies with ISAC as necessary. ISAC assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising SPP targets for many of the indicators.

In addition to ISAC, ISBE collaborates with many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. Such stakeholder groups have included the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group, the Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium, the Harrisburg Project, the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE), the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA), the Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support Network Advisory Council, the Illinois Elevating Special Educators Advisory Group, Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs), Regional Offices of Education (ROEs), the Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois think tank, and the Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET) project. ISBE shares SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences, regional professional development opportunities, and task force meetings. Comments and suggestions from the stakeholder groups are incorporated into the SPP/APR.

ISBE collected stakeholder feedback on its proposed SPP targets in multiple ways. Beginning in June 2021, ISBE's Special Education Department initiated a series of stakeholder meetings to establish targets for the new six-year cycle of the SPP. These meetings were held virtually over a two-month period to maximize participation and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds. The following existing stakeholder groups participated in feedback sessions with ISBE:

- Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium
- Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities

- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education

Stakeholders included professional development providers, school district representatives, educational advocates, Illinois Early Learning Project representatives, Chicago Public Schools representatives, Parent Training and Information Center representatives, parent members of ISAC, early intervention representatives, inclusion support specialists, individuals with disabilities, students with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, parents from advisory committees, general public representatives, higher education representatives, Department of Corrections representatives, Illinois Service Resource Center representatives, directors of special education, assistant directors of special education, special education supervisors, special education coordinators, directors of innovative learning and technology, special education cooperative governing board members, regional superintendents, assistant regional superintendents, school business officials, and special education attorneys. In addition, the Illinois MTSS director, ISBE State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) coordinator, ISBE director of Special Education, ISBE SPP/State Systemic Improvement Plan coordinator, and ISBE Section 619 coordinator participated in one or more stakeholder meetings. A total of 121 stakeholder group members chose to participate in these six feedback sessions.

All stakeholder meetings were organized and facilitated by ISBE, with the assistance of group leaders. The meetings provided information on the SPP indicators to apprise stakeholders of the history and data trends so that they could make informed recommendations. The presentations included an introductory section on the SPP as well as information regarding goals for stakeholder input. Information about setting new baselines and targets was also provided. Then details about the importance of each indicator and how specific indicators are defined, measured, and calculated were shared. National and state trend data were explained, average rates of change were discussed, and comparisons to similar states were provided for some indicators. Each session sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable.

These six stakeholder groups provided input on proposed targets for one or more of the following SPP indicators: 1, 2, 3, 4A, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, and 17. At the conclusion of the stakeholder group meetings, the proposed targets for SPP indicators 1, 2, 3, 4A, 7, 15, and 16 were determined reasonable and achievable. However, after several stakeholder group meetings, the proposed targets for SPP indicators 5, 6, 8, and 14 were reexamined and revised based on state and national trend data and stakeholder feedback. These revisions were made prior to the release of the SPP proposed target web modules and online survey for additional stakeholder feedback on June 9. ISBE recorded 16 separate SPP modules and posted them on the website. The introduction module provided general information that applied to all SPP indicators. Each of the SPP modules shared information specific to the indicator(s) being addressed, such as state and national trend data, measurements, and proposed SPP targets for the FFY 2020-25 SPP cycle. Each module sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable by requesting that the participant complete a survey. The survey was open for over two months to gather stakeholder input. Prior to initiating the module recordings and survey, ISBE advertised broadly via state bulletins, listservs, Parent Training and Information Center publications, other state technical assistance resource centers, and the six stakeholder groups mentioned previously. These efforts resulted in 180 stakeholders completing SPP surveys. These stakeholders represented a variety of regions of the state and races/ethnicities. Survey completers identified themselves as community members, educators, administrators, and other stakeholders. After these meetings were convened and survey data was compiled, ISBE engaged in an internal review of stakeholder feedback.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2012	66.67%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	66.00%	66.00%	66.00%	67.00%	67.00%
Data	64.52%	72.73%	59.11%	62.37%	66.67%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	67.00%	67.00%	67.00%	67.00%	67.00%	67.00%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
44	49	186	66.67%	67.00%	50.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

ISBE attributes part of the slippage to the increase in the intensity of the conflict resolution experience for both parties and the increased perception that one or both parties had unrealistic demands and expectations. This is particularly true for cases related to due process complaints, as they resulted in approximately 10% fewer agreements during this timeframe. Educational services and placement issues for students with intensive needs who were

being served in more restrictive placements, such as therapeutic day placements and residential placements, often resulted in no mediation agreement. In addition, ISBE experienced effects due to the global pandemic that may have contributed to the slippage. The statewide data used in the measurement of this indicator appear to be complete, valid, and reliable. Therefore, the slippage in FFY 2020 is not attributed to any identified data quality issues. In addition, COVID-19 did not appear to impact ISBE's ability to collect data. Rather, it is ISBE's belief that COVID-19 added stress to situations that were already stressful by impacting the mediators' ability to hold face-to-face sessions with both parties. One hundred percent of mediations were held virtually during FFY20 due to the pandemic. Some mediators felt that the inability for both parties to meet face-to-face in the same room may have had an impact on relationship building and reaching compromise.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Targets: In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2, 2022, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2021). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

The percentage of 4th grade students with disabilities who are proficient or above the grade level standard on the state English-language arts assessment will increase.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

YES

Please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action.

As discussed in the FFY 2019 State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) report, while stakeholders were pleased with the progress on SSIP strategies and activities with the cohorts of SSIP districts, they continued to encourage ISBE to scale up its SSIP efforts to support more districts. In order for ISBE to have the capacity to scale up SSIP efforts statewide, the SSIP was absorbed into the new 2020 Illinois State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) for the SPP FFY20-25 cycle. The SPDG, entitled, "Illinois Elevating Special Educators," or IESE, is a statewide system of professional learning funded by IDEA Part D SPDG dollars. The overall SPDG has four objectives:

1. To enhance the effectiveness of staff who support students with disabilities through research-based professional development.
2. To deliver mentoring to increase the retention of early career special education teachers and professional learning to support pipeline and recruitment efforts to address the Illinois special education teacher shortage.
3. To increase engagement of families as partners in the educational process and decision making.
4. To deliver professional learning and technical assistance to build seamless and sustainable delivery systems for specialized populations of learners.

The SSIP improvement strategy, activities, and corresponding outcomes fall under the umbrella of the first and the fourth objectives of the SPDG. The SSIP is also encompassed in one of the five program measures of the SPDG: Projects improve outcomes for children with disabilities. Therefore, the data included in this report addresses only the SPDG objectives directly related to the SSIP.

IESE is a statewide system of professional learning that uses a comprehensive regional delivery system to serve all districts through differentiated, research-based professional learning and supportive services. IESE provides training, technical assistance, mentoring, and coaching to staff who support students with disabilities with the goal of building seamless, sustainable delivery systems for specialized populations of learners and improving outcomes for students with disabilities. Therefore, the Theory of Action root cause was enhanced to highlight sustainable, research-based professional learning opportunities to help educators support the needs of their students with disabilities versus solely focusing on Multi-tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) framework implementation as the reason for low reading performance. Theory of Action improvement strategies were reworded to reflect further alignment with the SPDG objectives. While no new improvement strategies were developed, the past SSIP improvement strategies were combined into one. The single improvement strategy continues to address the previous SSIP areas of systems, data, and practice through differentiated professional learning activities that are being provided for educators, including trainings, technical assistance, mentoring, and coaching. Infrastructure improvement strategy rewording highlights the continued SSIP emphasis on literacy, social-emotional learning, and systems development and improvement under the 2020 SPDG. Past SSIP infrastructure improvement activities focused on the broad areas of systems, data, and practice through the same types of professional learning activities provided through the new SPDG. While the SSIP does not focus on data specifically as an improvement activity in its entirety, professional learning activities related to data continue to be offered by IESE based on district or area need. Short-term and intermediate results were reworded to align with the IESE/SPDG while still addressing the previously identified SSIP need for districts to build and sustain capacity and provide appropriate academic and environmental supports. The long-term result, or SiMR, remained the same apart from changing the grade used as the measure of progress from 3rd to 4th grade to align with federal SPP Indicator 3 measurement requirement changes.

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

The current theory of action is located on the ISBE website: <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPP-APR-Indicator-17.aspx>.

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes.

Because the SSIP was absorbed into the 2020 SPDG for the SPP FFY20-25 cycle to address stakeholder concerns regarding statewide scale up, the wording of the strategies and activities was updated to reflect closer alignment to the SPDG objectives. However, the SPDG/IESE continues to support evidence-based practice and infrastructure improvement strategies and activities associated with the previous SSIP by providing educators with differentiated professional learning activities (trainings, technical assistance, mentoring, and coaching) focused on literacy, social-emotional learning, and systems development and improvement. The implementation of such activities under the 2020 SPDG is similar to the implementation of past professional learning activities under the SSIP.

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	9.97%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target>=	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	11.00%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of 4th Grade Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of 4th Grade Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
963	13,639		10.00%	7.06%	Did not meet target	N/A

Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.

The data source is the same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specification FS178.

State assessments were waived for 2019-20 due to the COVID-19 pandemic, so no data was available for FFY 2019. In addition, ISBE was only able to collect partial assessment data due to COVID-19 concerns as explained below. Therefore, stakeholders agreed that 2018 assessment data was more stable and should be used to inform ISBE's new baseline and targets.

Because assessment flexibility was offered by the U.S. Department of Education, ISBE offered districts a choice between spring 2021 or fall 2021 assessments. Therefore, assessment data currently listed in the SPP is only partial data. The spring 2021 Illinois Assessment of Readiness (IAR) testing window was March 15 to May 28, 2021 for online tests and March 15 to May 14, 2021 for paper tests. The fall 2021 IAR testing window was August 9 to October 8, 2021 for online tests and August 9 to September 24, 2021 for paper tests. Ninety-five percent of districts chose to administer the IAR in the spring of 2021 while five percent elected to administer the IAR in the fall of 2021. Therefore, the 2021 Report Card for Illinois has three data releases. The initial release of the Report Card took place on October 29, 2021 and included all metrics that do not rely on assessment data. Having both spring and fall testing windows for the 2021 school year meant assessment data would be released during the second or third release of the Report Card (as applicable by district). On December 2, 2021, preliminary IAR data was released to the Report Card for districts that completed spring assessment testing. This data is only reported on the Report Card at the school and district levels. No state-level data for these metrics was released on the Report Card during this time. On April 27, 2022, finalized IAR data will be released to the Report Card for districts that completed spring and/or fall assessment testing. This data will be reported at the school, district, and state levels.

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

ISBE utilizes data on all 4th grade children with IEPs from the EDFacts file specification FS 178 to measure progress toward the SiMR. Specifically, ISBE analyzes data from the Illinois Assessment of Readiness (IAR) to determine how many 4th grade children with IEPs scored at or above proficient on this regular assessment. Then ISBE determines whether the current FFY target was met based on the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient as compared to the number of students who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)

YES

Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.

In addition to the primary source of data used to demonstrate progress toward the SiMR (statewide assessment data), ISBE's evaluation plan includes the following additional data collected: Professional development post surveys, Evidence-Based Professional Development Worksheets, Recognizing Effective Special Education Teachers (RESET) Explicit Instruction Rubrics, systems screening tools, State Capacity Assessments, and Regional Capacity Assessments. Professional development post surveys are administered to gather data regarding participant perceptions of the quality of professional development, their own growth in both knowledge and skills, the likelihood of their implementing in their classrooms what was learned, and their overall satisfaction with the professional development. Evidence-based professional development worksheets provide data for clear expectations for the providers and trainers of the professional development; accountability for the quality of the professional development and coaching, the utilization of effective, research-based adult learning methodology, and the collection of data with high fidelity to the objectives. RESET Explicit Instruction Rubrics will provide data on the application of High Leverage Practices in the classroom. Systems screening tools allow the IESE Network and districts to ascertain the needs of districts within each of the identified areas of the state so that the work of the program advisor can target the needs of the districts. State and regional capacity assessments measure the extent to which the state and the region have the capacity to implement the IESE Network, with the expectation that capacity will grow over the years of the SPDG, which includes perceptions about resources, leadership, data systems, and communication. Data that has been collected at this time includes post-professional development surveys, evidence-based professional

development worksheets from May 2021, systems screening tools, and the first State Capacity Assessment completed in September 2021. The RESET Explicit Instruction Rubrics and the Regional Capacity Assessments will begin data collection in February 2022.

Next steps for additional data collection include determining the effects of the differentiated professional learning activities on multiple measures of student achievement and success. These multiple measures include (1) IAR data for students with disabilities, comparing the data of those educators who have participated in IESE Network activities with the statewide averages; and (2) IAR data that examines growth in achievement, comparing data from those students who were in classrooms of educators who participated in the IESE Network and those who were not.

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)

YES

If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.

Illinois experienced several COVID-19 issues that affected data completeness. As previously mentioned, ISBE offered districts a choice between spring 2021 or fall 2021 assessments since assessment flexibility was offered by the U.S. Department of Education. Therefore, the assessment data currently listed in the SPP is only partial data. ISBE chose to have three data releases for the 2021 Report Card to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection. Two of the Report Card data releases were completed in October and December 2021. The third data release will take place in April 2022 when finalized IAR, SAT, and DLM-AA data will be released to the Report Card for districts that completed spring and/or fall assessment testing. This data will be reported at the school, district, and state levels.

In addition to only being able to collect partial assessment data due to COVID-19 concerns, the IESE Network was unable to deliver some professional development as originally planned due to the lack of substitute teachers available to cover classes during professional learning activities. To mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on educators, the IESE Network responded to the inability to provide in-person professional development by offering remote sessions that took place after school hours. The teachers participating in after-school training earned professional development hours. As virtual professional learning activities progressed and IESE Network staff received feedback from participants, IESE Program Advisors and Regional Specialists worked together to improve the quality of remote professional development sessions, particularly in the areas of engagement and participation. Follow-up coaching was also provided for teachers who requested it. The IESE also provided professional learning opportunities through mentoring and coaching. All five IESE Network Area Teams have mentees they meet with, both in-person and remotely. These mentoring meetings include information sharing on Literacy, Social-Emotional Learning, and Systems Improvement. This structure of professional learning allows for individually- designed discussion and coaching to be given to the mentees.

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

The current evaluation plan is located on the ISBE website: <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPP-APR-Indicator-17.aspx>.

Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, provide a description of the changes and updates to the evaluation plan.

Because the SSIP was incorporated into the new 2020 SPDG for the SPP FFY20-25 cycle, the evaluation plan was also updated to reflect closer alignment to the SPDG objectives. SPDG/IESE evaluation tools and assessments replaced previous evaluation measures for the SSIP. However, because the SPDG/IESE continues to support improvement strategies and activities associated with the previous SSIP, the evaluation measures under the SPDG are similar or the same in terms of the actual tools used and their purposes. Examples of such evaluation measures include professional development post surveys and worksheets, teacher observation rubrics, capacity assessments, screening tools, and self-assessments. Minor wording changes were made to other areas of the evaluation plan, such as the outcome descriptions, to further the plan's alignment to the SPDG. Timelines were also adjusted to coincide with SPDG timelines.

If yes, describe a rationale or justification for the changes to the SSIP evaluation plan.

As discussed previously, the SSIP was absorbed into the 2020 SPDG for the SPP FFY20-25 cycle, requiring updates to several documents, including the evaluation plan. These updates were made to strengthen the alignment of the SSIP strategies and activities to the objectives of the SPDG. SPDG evaluation tools were deemed appropriate for measuring SSIP progress since they were similar to the previously utilized tools. Streamlining versus duplication was a goal when incorporating the SSIP more heavily into the SPDG.

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:

The three improvement strategies from the previous SSIP were combined into one strategy when the SSIP was absorbed into the 2020 SPDG. The current SSIP improvement strategy addresses providing educators with differentiated professional learning activities (professional development, technical assistance, mentoring, and coaching) focused on literacy, social-emotional learning, and systems development and improvement. One of the activities associated with the improvement strategy focuses on delivering professional learning activities to build seamless and sustainable delivery systems for specialized populations of learners. In order to attain this goal, the state has been divided into five regions with an IESE Program Advisor leading each of the regions. These Program Advisors utilize a universal screening tool and collaborative analysis guide to identify the needs of each district. Then differentiated supports that target those district needs directly are planned, implemented, and assessed. The IESE universal screening tool focuses on helping districts identify the factors related to the lack of progress for any identified indicator, while the collaborative analysis guide helps facilitate a deeper dive into the root cause of the deficit for each identified indicator. These tools were created by the IESE Network Team to streamline the procedures for supporting districts across the state, while also being able to differentiate the services delivered by the IESE Network Team in each of the five IESE Network Service Areas. These tools provide a systemic way to categorize the level of support as Tier 1 or 2, based on a rubric including data from the State Performance Plan, student assessments, teacher vacancies, and survey results. This infrastructure design allows each area team to identify and plan differentiated professional development and/or mentoring for the districts in their assigned area, based on these Tiers. By using this process in conjunction with the assessment tools, the IESE Network team can gain stakeholder input at the local level as well basing services on statewide data to determine the individual needs of each district.

Districts that require support at the Tier 3 level have been identified as Needs Intervention through the ISBE Special Education Accountability and Support System. Once districts have been identified as Needs Intervention through this system and are assigned an ISBE special education consultant, they have the option to utilize services and supports through the IESE Network. The IESE Network is currently supporting two districts through a Continuous Improvement Plan, providing specific professional development, mentoring, and coaching services as outlined in their ISBE combination corrective action and improvement plan.

As a way to monitor the integrity and implementation of this process, the IESE Grant Coordinator meets with each area team once a week and with the statewide team once a week. During these meetings, IESE Program Advisors and Regional Specialists report on the progress being made in each Continuous Improvement Agreement with districts. The grant evaluator attends these meetings to review area wide and statewide data with the team. She also collaborates with each team as they are creating their Continuous Improvement Plans with districts so data collection procedures and timelines are met. Data from current mentoring sessions and/or professional learning sessions is also reviewed and used to plan future sessions. The ISBE Program Director also attends the statewide IESE Team meetings.

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.

Short-term outcomes focused on increasing knowledge regarding systems development and improvement through professional development. Data for this SPDG is gathered through February and then reported in early May; therefore, at this time, full data is still being collected. For this reporting period, systems improvement training addressed Universal Design for Learning and High Leverage Practices. High Leverage Practices are a set of practices that are fundamental to support student learning while Universal Design for Learning is a framework that guides proactive design of classroom instruction and learning opportunities to make them effective for a broad range of learners. During IESE assessment and planning meetings with districts and areas across the state, the IESE Network Team discovered that systems improvement was a high need. In most of the Continuous Improvement Agreements, professional development in this area was identified as a necessary precursor to early literacy or social-emotional learning training. The IESE Network continues to support effective systems development as the most effective way to deliver high quality instruction in all academic areas. To that end, IESE held sixteen systems trainings serving a total of 474 participants across the state.

Post-professional development surveys were administered to educators to gather data regarding participant perceptions of the quality of professional development, their own growth in both knowledge and skills, the likelihood of their implementing in their classrooms what was learned, and their overall satisfaction with the professional development. Participants indicated whether the survey statements were evident to no extent (1), a small extent (2), some extent (3), or a significant extent (4). As of mid-January, professional development training that occurred indicated that educators perceived they had increased their professional knowledge as a special educator ($M=3.30$, $SD=.75$), increased their understanding of previously known content ($M=3.26$, $SD=.70$), and increased their ability to apply the knowledge to their own teaching ($M=3.28$, $SD=.74$). In addition, educators reported that they will incorporate this knowledge into their own professional work ($M=3.41$, $SD=.64$). They also believe it will increase their students' success ($M=3.42$, $SD=.61$). All of these mean values indicate that educators who participated in this professional development believed that between some extent and a significant extent these goals were met.

In addition, educators were asked to report on their level of knowledge of the content of the professional development prior to participating in the training and then after they participated on a sliding scale between 0-100, with 0 being no knowledge and 100 being complete knowledge. There was a significant increase in perceptions about their level of knowledge prior to the professional development training ($M=62.83$, $SD=21.18$) as compared to after the training ($M=78.15$, $SD=15.38$) ($t(177)=13.879$, $p<.000$). A second comparative question was asked about how well educators thought they were implementing the strategies that the professional development focused upon, with similar results: there was a significant increase in perceptions about their implementation of the content from before the professional development training ($M=63.01$, $SD=21.89$) as compared to after the training ($M=79.38$, $SD=16.30$) ($t(176)=13.97$, $p<.000$). With special educators having increased knowledge, reflecting upon that knowledge to incorporate it into their own practice, applying it into their teaching and professional work, and believing that it will increase their students' success, it is anticipated that this will be reflected in the achievement of the SiMR. The levels of knowledge and implementation into their pedagogy were directly ascribed to their participation in the provided professional development.

Intermediate outcomes focused on the development and implementation of seamless and sustainable delivery systems for specialized populations of learners through professional development and technical assistance. In Summer 2021, IESE Program Advisors were hired and began to learn more about the schools and districts in their assigned areas through the review of state report card data and ISBE-identified tiered level of support. Throughout the fall semester, IESE Program Advisors and Educational Specialists visited schools in their area that indicated the highest levels of need, with the intent of establishing Continuous Improvement Agreements (CIAs) with them and identifying the types of assistance (professional development, mentoring, coaching, and technical assistance) that IESE was able to provide. As these CIAs were established, professional development, mentoring, coaching, and technical assistance was planned in partnership with these schools and districts. These services began in November 2021 and are still being developed, designed, and delivered. IESE Program Advisors utilized the High-Quality Professional Development Checklist in order to plan and deliver professional development. Beginning in February 2022, data will be collected through an outside observational methodology on how well each professional development training is measuring up to these standards. Additionally, the Regional Capacity Assessments, a collaborative data collection methodology, will begin in February 2022 to determine the perceptions of how well each region perceives the leadership, communication, resources, and data contributes to its capacity to implement successfully the goals of the IESE Network.

Intermediate outcomes also focused on enhanced effectiveness of educators who support students with disabilities. The IESE Network emphasizes professional learning in High Leverage Practices and Universal Design for Learning. When all students have access to high quality instruction that includes high engagement, varied representation of information, and differentiated expression of knowledge, they can participate in meaningful and challenging learning opportunities. When teachers know the components of High Leverage Practices, lessons are planned and executed clearly and efficiently, and students can understand the goals of the lessons. Students are also able to gradually become more independent in utilizing newly learned skills. High Leverage Practices allow for differentiation and scaffolding of skill acquisition to build upon previously learned skills.

IESE Network staff are providing professional learning on High Leverage Practices in two ways. First, IESE is hosting professional development sessions at the Tier 1 and 2 levels, that include an overview of High Leverage Practices in special education. IESE mentoring sessions provide another platform to deliver information on High Leverage Practices to the teachers IESE staff are currently meeting with on a regular basis. Some teachers receiving mentoring through IESE meet individually with staff, while others attend district or area wide Professional Learning Communities of early career special educators. During the Professional Learning Communities sessions, High Leverage Practices are discussed and clarified so teachers can put this framework into their daily practice. In order to determine that educators are implementing these High Leverage Practices with fidelity, the RESET Explicit Instruction Rubrics will be utilized in classroom observations, with data being sent to the IESE Project Evaluator. Additionally, mentors and coaches will share qualitative feedback with the educators in order to move toward growth in alignment with the High Leverage Practices. Data from the

RESET Explicit Instruction Rubrics will begin to be collected in February 2022 and will be included in the May 2022 Annual Performance Report to the Office of Special Education Projects.

Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

Next steps for the infrastructure improvement strategy include continuing to collect data to determine the effects of the differentiated professional development upon multiple measures of student achievement and success. These multiple measures include (1) IAR data for student with disabilities, comparing the data of those educators who have participated in IESE Network activities with the statewide averages; (2) IAR data that examines growth in achievement, comparing data from those students who were in classrooms of educators who participated in the IESE Network and those who were not; (3) student attendance data; and (4) student suspension/expulsion data, again examining whether any differences are evident between those who had educators who were participating in the IESE Network as compared to state averages. Such data would help inform whether the SSIP intermediate outcomes of enhanced effectiveness of educators who support students with disabilities and improved outcomes for students with disabilities were met. In addition to student data, data will be gathered on teacher retention, which will compare the retention of teachers who are participating in the IESE Network activities against state averages, with the hypothesis that participating in IESE Network activities increases the likelihood of remaining as a special educator in Illinois. Data will continue to be gathered through post surveys following professional development sessions on the evidence-based practices listed below, as well as data from early educator surveys, and remote mentoring surveys. The main objectives for next steps are for the IESE Network Leadership Team to review the data and its possible influence upon the dependent variables of student success and teacher retention. Data will be reviewed for areas of success and areas that need improvement. As early as possible, these data and recommendations for alterations in the activities of the IESE Network will be shared with the SPDG/IESE Advisory Council. In the several meetings that have already occurred with the SPDG/IESE Advisory Council, there have been numerous suggestions that have been adopted by the IESE Network Leadership Team. Renewed efforts and changes to the IESE Network activities will occur with Advisory Council input, and results will continue to be brought before the Council on a regular basis. The May 2022 SPDG Annual Performance Report to the Office of Special Education Projects will be shared with the Advisory Council, as well.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

The SSIP continued to focus on implementing evidence-based practices in early literacy and social-emotional learning. Educators participated in professional learning activities to increase their knowledge and enhance their effectiveness in the following areas based on district need:

*Early Literacy Instructional Delivery: The Big 5 (phonemic awareness?, ?phonics?, ?fluency?, ?vocabulary?, and ?comprehension)

*Reading and Writing Interventions: IXL, Read 180, Reading Plus, Read Naturally, Lexia Core 5, SPIRE

*Social/Emotional Learning: Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL) Framework

As previously discussed in the infrastructure section, the IESE Network Team discovered that systems improvement was a high need for many of the districts being supported. In most of the districts' Continuous Improvement Agreements, professional development in this area was identified as a necessary precursor to early literacy or social-emotional learning training. Without adequate and effective systems in place, early literacy and social-emotional learning can be negatively impacted. Therefore, fewer trainings to support evidence-based practices in early literacy and social emotional learning took place in the reporting period as compared to systems development and implementation trainings. In addition, the IESE Network team encountered roadblocks to delivering professional development due to teachers not having access to substitutes as was discussed in the COVID-19 section of this report.

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

Early literacy instructional delivery includes addressing foundational skill standards, such as phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. The IESE early literacy training has a specific framework for improving instructional delivery of the foundational skills for learning to read. This training is available in all three tiers of support. At Tier 1, IESE delivered overviews of evidence-based practices in early literacy to small groups of educators, schools, or districts as requested. Participants had already received training on early literacy instruction and needed a general overview of the components. Schools or districts that needed more detailed sessions on parts of early literacy instruction received Tier 2 supports, which often included follow up coaching. Tier 2 support consisted of smaller groups of educators who needed practical feedback on how to implement early literacy instructional strategies. Tier 3 support consists of specific feedback and coaching provided on a scheduled basis. After training has been provided, IESE will conduct observations of teacher implementation. Because of the start date for districts receiving Tier 3 support, observations of implementation have not yet taken place.

Reading and writing interventions are multi-tiered approaches to the early identification and support of students with learning needs in these areas. One training session covering reading and writing interventions was provided during the reporting period. Several instructional techniques were shared in the areas of phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Some of these techniques included Focus on vowels, CVC Words, Word Slide, Sound it out in your head, Nonsense words, Review and Repetition, chunking, visual cues, pattern searching, read to partners, highlighting, think alouds, annotating, and others. Each of these techniques is research based for early literacy and intervention instructional methods.

IESE held two Tier 1 trainings for early literacy and one for reading and writing interventions, serving a total of 21 participants. Of the 21 participants, there were 14 respondents to the post-professional development survey. Respondents indicated that they believed to some or a significant extent that this professional development increased their professional knowledge as a special educator ($M=3.46$, $SD=.88$), increased their ability to apply this knowledge to their classrooms ($M=3.57$, $SD=.85$), and will be incorporated into their teaching ($M=3.36$, $SD=.63$). Overall, these participants were satisfied with the training ($M=3.50$, $SD=.52$) and look forward to future professional development offered through the IESE Network ($M=3.21$, $SD=.43$). Participants also believed they knew the content better after the training ($M=74.43$, $SD=17.38$) as compared to before ($M=60.00$, $SD=16.65$) ($t(13)=4.093$, $p=.001$), as well as that they know better how to plan and implement these literacy elements better after the training ($M=75.79$, $SD=12.77$) than before ($M=63.50$, $SD=18.43$) ($t(13)=3.371$, $p=.005$). The claim can be made that participants' perceptions of their content knowledge growth in literacy pedagogy and their planning and implementing of these strategies have grown as a direct result of the training.

Social-emotional learning (SEL) is a methodology that helps students of all ages better comprehend their emotions, feel those emotions fully, and demonstrate empathy for others. This includes self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision making. Some techniques included in the SEL trainings were for adults to use while others were for students to learn to use. All techniques are based on behavioral science research and taken from universal trainings such as Therapeutic Crisis Intervention, Positive Behavior Facilitation, De-escalation, Active Listening, Emotional Competence, and Effective Interventions for Behaviors (disruptive, aggressive, and violent). Also included in this training is

how to effectively implement an SEL framework in a building or district, which requires a systemic plan that infuses social emotional and academic learning throughout the school day. Much like the tiers of support for literacy, Tier 1 support consisted of overviews of evidence-based practices in SEL to small groups of educators, schools, or districts that requested it. These participants came from districts with an SEL Framework in place and needed a general review of the components. Schools or districts that needed a series of more detailed sessions on SEL instruction received Tier 2 supports, which often included follow up coaching. At this tier, IESE also helped districts analyze discipline data to determine the areas of SEL for training focus. Tier 2 support consisted of smaller groups of educators who needed practical feedback on how to infuse SEL into their academic instruction. Tier 3 support consists of specific feedback and coaching provided on a scheduled basis. After training has been provided for these districts, IESE will conduct observations of teacher implementation. Because of the start date for districts receiving Tier 3 support, observations of implementation have not yet taken place.

IESE held eleven Tier 1 training sessions for SEL, serving a total of 168 participants. These trainings occurred both in person and virtually, with post-training evaluations completed after each one. SEL continues to be identified as a high need for most districts. Post-professional development surveys were distributed for these sessions, and 55 of the participants responded. Participants were asked to report on the extent that the professional development contributed to their growth, with (1) indicating "no extent;" (2) indicating "to a small extent;" (3) indicating "to some extent;" and (4) indicating "to a significant extent." Almost all of the responses indicate that participants increase their professional knowledge as a special educator ($M=3.15$, $SD=.77$), increased their understanding of previously known content ($M=3.19$, $SD=.62$), increased their ability to apply the knowledge to their own teaching ($M=3.28$, $SD=.74$), increased their ability to reflect upon the content and adjust their own teaching ($M=3.32$, $SD=.70$), and committed to incorporating the content into their own teaching ($M=3.43$, $SD=.61$). This last item is most encouraging because moving information from knowledge into practice has the greatest effect upon student learning and growth. In addition, respondents reported that they believed this professional development will increase their students' success ($M=3.43$, $SD=.57$). Participants, overall, were satisfied with the professional development provided ($M=3.53$, $SD=.64$) and are looking forward to future sessions through the IESE Network ($M=3.40$, $SD=.66$). In addition to asking about perceptions of the sessions themselves, participants were asked two questions about their knowledge and implementation of the content prior to participating in the professional development and after. There was significant growth in both content knowledge from before the session ($M=66.74$, $SD=16.80$) to after the session ($M=81.23$) ($t(52)=7.885$, $p<.000$), and perception about implementing the content before the session ($M=67.53$, $SD=16.59$) to after the session ($M=83.36$, $SD=12.85$) ($t(52)=8.407$, $p<.000$).

In addition, one remote mentoring session was devoted to SEL with 26 participants completing the Post-Mentoring Survey. Participants agreed (5) or strongly agreed (6) that they learned new information ($M=5.20$, $SD=1.01$), they learned new skills to address students who might be experiencing trauma ($M=5.13$, $SD=1.16$), and would apply one or more items learned into their teaching context ($M=5.40$, $SD=.74$). Participants also agreed or strongly agreed that they were provided time to interact with others and process how to best meet the needs of students who may be experiencing trauma ($M=5.20$, $SD=.86$).

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.

Early literacy continues to be the main focus of the SSIP. The IESE Network provides differentiated professional learning to educators on early literacy instructional delivery (the Big 5) as well as on reading and writing interventions. This directly relates to one of the short-term objectives of the SSIP: increased educator knowledge regarding literacy. With increased educator knowledge in literacy, positive changes in teacher practice would also be expected. That relates directly to one of the SSIP's intended intermediate outcomes: enhanced effectiveness of educators who support students with disabilities. Early literacy acquisition is vital to learning. When students have access to high quality, evidence-based early literacy instruction, they learn to read in K-2, and by 4th grade, they can transition from learning to read to reading to learn. This directly relates to one of the intermediate outcomes of the SSIP: improved outcomes for students with disabilities from implemented academic evidence-based practices. It also relates to the long-term outcome, or SiMR, which states, "The percentage of 4th grade students with disabilities who are proficient or above the grade level standard on the state English-language arts assessment will increase." Professional development on early literacy has been provided to teachers around the state through Tier 1, district, or area wide meetings. These trainings included presentation of the four foundational skills of early literacy: print concepts, phonological awareness, phonics and word recognition, and fluency. Once the instructional strategies of these basic concepts are understood, training continues to include building comprehension skills. Research from the last decade has repeatedly indicated the need for these foundational concepts, which are vital for early literacy success. In order to measure the effect that the professional development provided above has had upon outcomes for students with disabilities, data on student achievement will need to be collected and reviewed and segregated by whether an educator has participated in the IESE Network activities related to literacy development. The IESE Network Project Evaluator is continuing to partner with the ISBE data team on collecting this information, and it will be available to be reported in next year's report.

Social-emotional learning continues to be a secondary focus of the SSIP. The IESE Network provides differentiated professional learning to educators on social-emotional learning based on the CASEL framework. This directly relates to one of the short-term objectives of the SSIP: increased educator knowledge regarding social-emotional learning. With increased educator knowledge in social-emotional learning, positive changes in teacher practice would also be expected. That relates directly to one of the SSIP's intended intermediate outcomes: enhanced effectiveness of educators who support students with disabilities. CASEL.org cites research indicating when students can self-regulate emotions, this translates into the classroom, which supports them in focusing on academic learning. Hundreds of studies offer consistent evidence that SEL bolsters academic performance. When students have positive self-perceptions, feel connected to the school, and can express their feelings in productive ways, they are more comfortable taking academic risks and accepting feedback on their work. Social-emotional learning supports acquisition of academic skills throughout a student's school career. This directly relates to one of the intermediate outcomes of the SSIP: improved outcomes for students with disabilities from implemented environmental evidence-based practices.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

There are two identified instruments used to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change. The High-Quality Professional Development checklist is used for each of the professional development sessions that are held throughout the IESE Network to ensure that the professional development provided meets the quality standards in Illinois. As stated above, professional development providers were encouraged in November through January to use this checklist in planning and delivering their professional development, in order to familiarize them with the tool and the checklist. In February 2022, this checklist will be formally utilized as an observational rubric, with data being sent to the IESE Project Evaluator. This data will then be shared with the IESE Advisory Council, ISBE, and OSEP.

Second, as professional development focuses upon high leverage practices, the RESET (Recognizing Effective Special Education Teachers) Explicit Instruction Rubrics will be utilized as observational tools in coaching situations to determine the extent to which these practices are being implemented in the classrooms of those teachers who are receiving assistance from the IESE Network. These norm-referenced rubrics were shared by Boise State University and adopted by the National Center on Intensive Intervention at the American Institutes for Research; they are also funded by the U.S. Department of Education Institute for Education Sciences (IES). This data is not currently available because the initial requirement for professional

development in High Leverage Practices has not yet been fully implemented in area schools and districts; Continuous Improvement Agreements are still being formed and professional development is still being developed and initially offered. Data from these rubrics will begin to be collected in February 2022.

Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

For all professional development offered through the IESE Network, a post professional development survey is required. QuickReports are sent each Monday to the IESE Program Advisor who reviews the responses and adjusts future professional development sessions. These are also used for remote mentoring sessions, administrative academies, and cohort mentoring groups that are occurring across the state. The surveys that are distributed include questions about participant perceptions of the professional development content, application to the curriculum or pedagogy of the educator, their intention in implementing it, and their own growth in understanding the content. Questions also are designed to ask about what they knew prior to engaging in professional development and what they know after participation, both about content knowledge and classroom implementation. Finally, some questions that are aligned to the identified performance measures of the SPDG which are also connected to the SiMR: perceptions of how this professional development will affect student achievement, how well it enhanced their ability to connect this information to parents and families, and whether participating in these types of session contributes to the likeliness of their remaining a special educator in the state of Illinois.

While this data is currently being collected, the data collection that encompasses the entire SPDG year is still in progress. Once the data are fully collected and reviewed in April 2022, decisions about the need to address activities of the IESE Network will be made in reviewing the data. A focus will be placed upon the connections between the independent variables (professional development, mentoring, coaching, and technical assistance) and the dependent variable (student IAR data) to determine whether correlations have been found between these two. Second, the data from each of the IESE Network activities will be reviewed considering the strengths and the weaknesses that the data provide, discussing both and why those numbers may be what they are. Particular attention will be paid to the initial baseline data from the fidelity measures of the High-Quality Professional Development Checklist and the RESET Explicit Instruction Rubrics, discussing how these, and possibly other measures, can be utilized more often. Finally, and most important, data will be shared with the IESE Advisory Council, comprised of stakeholders from all contributors to the education process, seeking perspectives that those individuals more closely involved in the IESE Network may not see or identify.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

In April 2022, the data from the post professional development surveys, the State Capacity Assessment Tool, the Regional Capacity Assessment Tool, the RESET Explicit Instruction Rubrics, and the High-Quality Professional Development Checklists will be reviewed to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the IESE Network activities. These data will then be viewed through the lens of the multiple measures of student achievement. Taken together, these will enable the IESE Network to make data-based decisions on the next steps for Year 3 of the SPDG. The post-professional development surveys will enable the IESE Network Leadership Team to determine the extent to which the professional development, the mentoring cohorts, and the remote mentoring sessions have contributed to perceptions of content knowledge gains, applications into classrooms, and further understanding of research-based practices and their effects upon student achievement. The State and Regional Capacity Assessments will enable the IESE Network Leadership Team to determine whether the leadership, communication, data sharing, and resources need changes in order to provide the state team and the regional teams with the capacity to continue to expand the initiatives of the IESE Network across the state of Illinois. Finally, the IESE Advisory Council, comprised of a wide range of stakeholder supporters, will review the data at their regular meetings and provide extensive feedback and direction to the next steps of the IESE Network. The IESE Network is a statewide initiative that involves a great number of people and organizations, each of which has a claim in contributing to the success of the students with disabilities across the state of Illinois. It is the intent and plan of the IESE Network Leadership Team to lean upon these resources to use data in order to make the best decisions possible for Illinois students.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

ISBE has ongoing communication regarding the SPP/APR with its primary stakeholder group, the Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (ISAC) through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. The role of ISAC is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. ISAC functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Services Department. ISAC is comprised of members who represent individuals with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, students with disabilities, teachers of students with disabilities, private providers, public charter schools, special education directors, regional superintendents, district superintendents, higher education personnel, vocational/community/business organization providers of transition services to students with disabilities, the Illinois Department of Human Services, the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, the Illinois Department of Corrections/Department of Juvenile Justice, and the general public. ISBE staff have discussions with ISAC multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, and improvement strategies with ISAC as necessary. ISAC assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising SPP targets for many of the indicators.

In addition to ISAC, ISBE collaborates with many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. Such stakeholder groups have included the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group, the Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium, the Harrisburg Project, the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE), the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA), the Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support Network Advisory Council, the Illinois Elevating Special Educators Advisory Group, Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs), Regional Offices of Education (ROEs), the Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois think tank, and the Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET) project. ISBE shares SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences, regional professional development opportunities, and task force meetings. Comments and suggestions from the stakeholder groups are incorporated into the SPP/APR.

ISBE collected stakeholder feedback on its proposed SPP targets in multiple ways. Beginning in June 2021, ISBE's Special Education Department initiated a series of stakeholder meetings to establish targets for the new six-year cycle of the SPP. These meetings were held virtually over a two-month period to maximize participation and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds. The following existing stakeholder groups participated in feedback sessions with ISBE:

- Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium
- Illinois State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois

- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education

Stakeholders included professional development providers, school district representatives, educational advocates, Illinois Early Learning Project representatives, Chicago Public Schools representatives, Parent Training and Information Center representatives, parent members of ISAC, early intervention representatives, inclusion support specialists, individuals with disabilities, students with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, parents from advisory committees, general public representatives, higher education representatives, Department of Corrections representatives, Illinois Service Resource Center representatives, directors of special education, assistant directors of special education, special education supervisors, special education coordinators, directors of innovative learning and technology, special education cooperative governing board members, regional superintendents, assistant regional superintendents, school business officials, and special education attorneys. In addition, the Illinois MTSS director, ISBE State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) coordinator, ISBE director of Special Education, ISBE SPP/State Systemic Improvement Plan coordinator, and ISBE Section 619 coordinator participated in one or more stakeholder meetings. A total of 121 stakeholder group members chose to participate in these six feedback sessions.

All stakeholder meetings were organized and facilitated by ISBE, with the assistance of group leaders. The meetings provided information on the SPP indicators to apprise stakeholders of the history and data trends so that they could make informed recommendations. The presentations included an introductory section on the SPP as well as information regarding goals for stakeholder input. Information about setting new baselines and targets was also provided. Then details about the importance of each indicator and how specific indicators are defined, measured, and calculated were shared. National and state trend data were explained, average rates of change were discussed, and comparisons to similar states were provided for some indicators. Each session sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable.

These six stakeholder groups provided input on proposed targets for one or more of the following SPP indicators: 1, 2, 3, 4A, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, and 17. At the conclusion of the stakeholder group meetings, the proposed targets for SPP indicators 1, 2, 3, 4A, 7, 15, and 16 were determined reasonable and achievable. However, after several stakeholder group meetings, the proposed targets for SPP indicators 5, 6, 8, and 14 were reexamined and revised based on state and national trend data and stakeholder feedback. These revisions were made prior to the release of the SPP proposed target web modules and online survey for additional stakeholder feedback on June 9. ISBE recorded 16 separate SPP modules and posted them on the website. The introduction module provided general information that applied to all SPP indicators. Each of the SPP modules shared information specific to the indicator(s) being addressed, such as state and national trend data, measurements, and proposed SPP targets for the FFY 2020-25 SPP cycle. Each module sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable by requesting that the participant complete a survey. The survey was open for over two months to gather stakeholder input. Prior to initiating the module recordings and survey, ISBE advertised broadly via state bulletins, listservs, Parent Training and Information Center publications, other state technical assistance resource centers, and the six stakeholder groups mentioned previously. These efforts resulted in 180 stakeholders completing SPP surveys. These stakeholders represented a variety of regions of the state and races/ethnicities. Survey completers identified themselves as community members, educators, administrators, and other stakeholders. After these meetings were convened and survey data was compiled, ISBE engaged in an internal review of stakeholder feedback.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

In June 2021, ISBE held a virtual stakeholder meeting with the Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council to establish Indicator 17 targets for the new six-year cycle of the SPP. Trend data was analyzed, and proposed targets were discussed. Council member consensus was that proposed targets were reasonable and achievable given new 2020 SPDG efforts supporting special educators. One member expressed that the targets were reasonable and achievable due to the level of rigor. ISBE also recorded a SPP 17 module and posted it on the website. The module shared information specific to Indicator 17, such as state and national trend data, measurements, and proposed SPP targets for the FFY 2020-25 SPP cycle. The module sought stakeholder feedback on whether the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable by requesting that participants complete a survey. The results of the stakeholder feedback were used to finalize SPP Indicator targets in late September. A summary of stakeholder input was posted in October 2021 on the ISBE website. After Indicator 17 targets were finalized, ISBE moved its focus to reviewing and revising the SSIP Theory of Action, strategies and activities, and evaluation plan to further align with the new 2020 SPDG. ISBE collaborated with the IESE/SPDG state leadership team in December 2021 as an initial means to collect stakeholder input on proposed revisions to the SSIP components. Proposed revisions will be taken to the SPDG advisory council's next meeting on February 3, 2022 for further stakeholder input and feedback.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

NO

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

N/A

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SIMR.

N/A

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SIMR.

N/A

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

ISBE and its stakeholders established a new baseline for Indicator 17 using 4th grade reading performance data from the 2018-19 school year, FFY 2018, statewide assessment administration since there were changes to the measurements and new components added at the federal level for Indicator 3 (to which Indicator 17 is aligned). Targets were also updated to align with the new requirements. Stakeholders considered state assessment performance trend data related to 4th graders when determining whether proposed targets were reasonable, yet achievable. Assessment performance data was calculated, as required by the measurement table, as the proficiency rate for students with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards divided by the total number of students with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment. Trend data included assessment performance data on the Illinois Assessment of Readiness (IAR) for grade 4 in reading for the 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19 school years (the past 3 tested years). Comparison data for 3rd graders was also provided to

stakeholders so they could see the differences between 3rd and 4th grade data for the same three years. No data was available for the 2019-20 school year due to the pandemic. School year 2020-21 data was also unavailable for consideration during stakeholder meetings as ISBE offered districts a choice between spring 2021 or fall 2021 assessments based on the assessment flexibility that was offered by the U.S. Department of Education. Therefore, testing windows for the IAR did not end until May 28, 2021 for the spring 2021 administration and October 8, 2021 for the fall 2021 administration. Such timeframes did not allow for the collection and subsequent data analyses for all assessment data prior to stakeholder meetings. Stakeholders chose to use the 2018-19 school year 4th grade reading performance data for baseline as it was the most recent, stable data available that was not impacted by COVID-19. Stakeholder meeting consensus was that proposed targets were reasonable and achievable given SPDG efforts. Stakeholder online survey results indicated 100% agreement with the proposed targets for SPP 17.

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018 and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP notes the State reported that it did not revise its State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). However, the SiMR reported in Indicator 17 in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR is not the same as the SiMR reported in the FFY 2019 State Systemic Improvement Plan (Indicator 17). Specifically, the FFY 2019 SiMR was based on 3rd graders, while the FFY 2020 SiMR is based on 4th graders.

17 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

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

Certify

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

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name:

Barbara Moore

Title:

Director of Special Education Department

Email:

bmoore@isbe.net

Phone:

2177825589

Submitted on:

04/27/22 2:54:29 PM

ED Attachments



IL-B-Dispute-Resolu
tion-2020-21.pdf



il-resultsmatrix-202
2b.pdf



IL-2022DataRubricP
artB.xlsx