

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2022**

Illinois



PART B DUE February 1, 2024

**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

Illinois uses several data systems to collect and report SPP and APR data. The two main systems are the Student Information System (SIS) and the IEP Student Tracking and Reporting System, or I-Star. SIS houses exit, assessment, discipline, enrollment, early childhood transition, and early childhood outcomes data. I-Star houses child count, educational environment, special education exit, child find timelines, and secondary transition data. In addition to SIS and I-Star, the Special Education Monitoring System (SEMS) houses dispute resolution data and LEA Determination data. Other separate data collections include a parent survey and post-school outcomes survey. These data sources are utilized to populate the SPP/APR.

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

852

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that the IDEA Part B requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions).

The systems that are in place to ensure that the IDEA Part B requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions).

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/SPPAPR-Indicators.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; 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: on-site monitoring visits, review of LEAs policies and procedures, review of student records and IEPs, state complaints, due process hearings, fiscal findings, credible allegations 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 local education agencies (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 annual monitoring for compliance and results for each district, 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/Accountability-Support-System.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/General-Supervision.aspx> for additional information.

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidence-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. Support is provided virtually and onsite. 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. ISBE works collaboratively with the IESE Network to support districts with LEA Determination designations of "Needs Assistance for Two or More Consecutive Years" and "Needs Intervention". During the 2023-2024 school year, LEAs designated as "Needs Intervention" will be required to work with the IESE Network. 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. From July 2022 through June 2023, the Harrisburg Project responded to 9,703 phone calls from LEAs, of which 90% were resolved within 24 hours or less. They received 43,210 emails, sent 243,890 email bursts, and hosted 94 trainings with 1,685 attendees. In addition to that, 168 training packets were requested and shipped to clients. 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 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 Specific Learning Disabilities Support Project, the Behavior Assessment Training Project, 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 (A+) Project, the Illinois Service Resource Center (ISRC), Illinois DeafBlind Project (ILDBP), the Illinois Center for Transition and Work (ICTW), STAR NET, Early CHOICES, the Center for Intensive Behavioral Supports (CIBS), and the IEP Tutorial Project (IEPQ).

- The Specific Learning Disabilities Support Project (SLD Project) provides training and resources to all special education personnel to help reduce the achievement gap and to meet the educational needs of all students with specific learning disabilities. It aims to increase reading and math skills and decrease achievement gaps by expanding upon the development of previous training materials to address “specially designed instruction” for students with specific learning disabilities, including, but not limited to, dyslexia. (<https://sldsupports.org/>)
 - The Behavior Assessment Training Project (BAT Project) provides comprehensive, professional learning for special education personnel on culturally responsive Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA) practices and Behavior Intervention Plans (BIPs) for students with disabilities across all grade levels. Districts identified with a disproportionate rate of suspension and expulsion for students with disabilities will receive training and support on FBAs and BIPs. State-level guidelines will be developed, per 105 ILCS5/14-8.05, to address culturally responsive, evidence-based behavior interventions for students across all grade levels. (<https://stemedresearch.siu.edu/behavior-assessment-training/>)
 - The Illinois Elevating Special Educators Network (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 (<https://www.iesenetwork.org/>).
 - The Illinois Special Education Leadership Academy (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 (nsseo.org/sela/).
 - The Assistive Technology Technical Assistance, Training, and Resource Project (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. Illinois has three grant projects under the umbrella of ATTATR that address the use of assistive technology in schools: AT Technical Assistance and Resources (AT-TA), AT Device Loan and Evaluation (AT-LE), and AT Exchange Network (AT-EN). These projects seek to build capacity and awareness of professionals at all levels of education, students, parents and families, and community members around use of Assistive Technology in education. Additionally, these projects increase availability of quality assistive technology devices, computer systems, durable medical equipment, AAC, and other AT items to support students’ access to curriculum throughout the state. (<https://www.isbe.net/Pages/Special-Education-Assistive-Technology.aspx>).
 - The Autism Training and Technical Assistance Project (ATTA) develops and presents resources that assist individuals with autism in their transition from secondary education to postsecondary education or employment. The ATTA also seeks to provide training and support to important stakeholders as they work to provide an equitable experience for individuals with autism (<https://autismcollegeandcareer.com/>).
 - The Autism Professional Learning and Support (A+) Project provides professional learning and individualized coaching to school teams to support the significant behavioral needs of students with autism spectrum disorder and related communication and behavior disorders (<https://autismplusil.org/>).
 - The Illinois Service Resource Center (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 (<https://www.isrc.us/>).
 - Illinois DeafBlind Project (ILDBP) provides professional learning and coaching for schools and families working with students with deaf-blindness (<https://www.philiprockcenter.org/ildbp>).
 - The Illinois Center for Transition and Work (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 (<https://ictw.illinois.edu/>).
 - STAR NET provides professional development on a variety of topics to support the programming of early childhood students with disabilities (<https://www.starnet.org/>).
 - Early CHOICES provides professional development to support inclusive practices in early childhood (<https://www.eclre.org/>).
 - The Center for Intensive Behavioral Supports (CIBS) develops professional learning and resources to reduce the use of physical restraint, time out, and isolated time out. Training focuses on crisis de-escalation, restorative practices, identifying signs of distress during physical restraint and time out, trauma-informed practices, and behavior management practices (<https://www.behavioralsupportsil.org/>).
 - The IEP Quality Project (IEPQ) provides an online resource and professional learning opportunities on how to develop well-designed Individualized Education Programs aligned to state standards (<https://iepquality.illinois.edu/public/about>).
- 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.

Stakeholder Engagement:

The mechanisms for broad stakeholder engagement, including activities carried out to obtain input from, and build the capacity of, a diverse group of parents to support the implementation activities designed to improve outcomes, including target setting and any subsequent revisions to targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

ISBE collected stakeholder feedback on its proposed SPP targets in multiple ways. 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
- Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (formerly ISAC)
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- 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 Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, 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, Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice, 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, regional superintendents, assistant regional superintendents, school business officials, and special education attorneys. In addition, 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. These meetings increased ISBE’s capacity of diverse groups of parents and allowed them to have a voice in the development of targets and activities designed

to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

Each session sought stakeholder feedback on if the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable. The 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. Once the proposed targets for SPP indicators were determined reasonable and achievable, ISBE recorded 16 separate SPP modules and posted them on the website. 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.

ISBE solicits broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR, associated targets, and target revisions through its primary stakeholder group, the Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (formerly known as the Illinois State Advisory Council, or ISAC). ISBE engaged with this stakeholder group, monthly, through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings during FY22. The role of the Council is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. The Council functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Department. It 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 Juvenile Justice, and the general public. ISBE staff have discussions with the Council throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE staff discussed baseline data, targets, current data, and improvement strategies with the Council at the June 2023 meeting. ISBE staff provided an overview of trend data and received feedback from the Council regarding specific indicator progress. Through discussions with the Council at the June 2023 meeting, no target revisions were identified to be made.

In addition to the Council, ISBE solicited input from many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. ISBE staff met with each stakeholder group either monthly or quarterly. These stakeholder groups include:

- Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group
- Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium
- Advancing Preschool Inclusion Advisory Group
- Harrisburg Project
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE)
- Illinois Elevating Special Educators Network Advisory Council
- Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs)
- Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET) project.

ISBE also shared SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences including the IAASE fall and winter conferences as well as the ISBE/Special Education Leadership Academy (SELA) Special Education Directors Conference.

Finally, progress for several of the SPP Indicators is aligned to the Illinois State Personnel Development Grant (IESE). The IESE Advisory Council met quarterly during FY22 to review progress made toward meeting the grant goals and objectives, and to provide council members an opportunity to give feedback to the IESE Network. The council continues to provide broad stakeholder input on the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the SSIP. IESE is comprised of members representing general and special education teachers, individuals with disabilities, Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, parents, PTIs, regular education administrators, related service providers, ROEs, special education administrators, state agency representatives, teacher unions, the Illinois New Teacher Collaborative, and university general and special education departments. ISBE staff met with the IESE Advisory Council multiple times throughout FY22. The IESE Advisory Council assisted ISBE staff with reviewing Indicator 17 trend data. Through these data review discussions, there were no identified revisions that needed to be made to Indicator 17.

Apply stakeholder engagement 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.

During the initial target setting for the new six-year cycle of the SPP, 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 the Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, 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. 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.

Individual parent representatives have the same opportunities as other stakeholder group members to engage in data analysis, progress evaluation, target setting, and revising targets. Any parent of a child with a disability can have input into the SPP/APR. However, specific parent representatives whose input is commonly sought after include parent members of the Advisory Council, parent members of IESE, parent training center staff, parents from various advisory committees, and individual parents. These parents also have the opportunity to suggest ideas for improvement for specific SPP Indicators.

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.

During the original target setting process, ISBE facilitated multiple opportunities 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 for the new six-year cycle of the SPP. 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>

ISBE continues to participate in activities to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. During FY 2022, ISBE staff engaged monthly with representatives from the two OSEP-funded PTIs, the Council, and Equip for Equality, the state's protection and advocacy group. These meetings provided a means for ISBE to collaborate with groups representing and supporting diverse groups of parents by focusing on current issues impacting outcomes for students with disabilities and reviewing each entity's resources and current professional learning opportunities for families. ISBE also met monthly with the Special Education Advocates Coalition of Chicago (SPEACC), a group of advocates from several entities such as Access Living and Equip for Equality. This group focuses on improving outcomes for students with disabilities specifically in the City of Chicago District 299.

Soliciting Public Input:

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

To solicit public input to establish targets for the new six-year cycle of the SPP, ISBE's Special Education Department initiated a series of stakeholder meetings. 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.

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.

ISBE posts the most recent SPP/APR on this webpage: <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/General-Supervision.aspx>. Specific SPP indicator information is available for public review on this webpage, <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPPAPR-Indicators.aspx>, including indicator descriptions, measurements, data sources, targets, and resources. A stakeholder input section on the webpage currently hosts the stakeholder survey summary gathered at the beginning of this SPP cycle.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2021 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 2021 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 revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2021 APR in 2023, is available.

The Illinois SPP/APR continues to be available on the ISBE website at <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/General-Supervision.aspx>. Special education data is integrated into the Illinois Report Card for each school district and is available on the ISBE website at <https://www.isbe.net/ilreportcard>. Special education data for each district is accessed through the IL Interactive Report Card link at <https://www.illinoisreportcard.com/>. After selecting a specific district, choose the custom report card builder button in the upper right hand corner of the district snapshot. Once the custom report card builder button is clicked a window will open. In this window choose the school year data report (e.g.; 2021, 2022, or 2023), next under students choose "Students with IEPs". Once this is completed, click Generate Report and a PDF report for the district will be created. This report can be created for each district within the State.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Intro - OSEP Response

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 ED^{Facts} 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 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

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 Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	82.57%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	71.80%	73.00%	74.20%	82.60%	82.60%
Data	71.18%	71.64%	69.90%	87.43%	86.79%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ISBE collected stakeholder feedback on its proposed SPP targets in multiple ways. 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
- Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (formerly ISAC)
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- 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 Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, 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, Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice, 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, regional superintendents, assistant regional superintendents, school business officials, and special education attorneys. In addition, 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. These meetings increased ISBE’s capacity of diverse groups of parents and allowed them to have a voice in the development of targets and activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

Each session sought stakeholder feedback on if the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable. The 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. Once the proposed targets for SPP indicators were determined reasonable and achievable, ISBE recorded 16 separate SPP modules and posted them on the website. 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.

ISBE solicits broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR, associated targets, and target revisions through its primary stakeholder group, the Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (formerly known as the Illinois State Advisory Council, or ISAC). ISBE engaged with this stakeholder group, monthly, through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings during FY22. The role of the Council is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. The Council functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Department. It 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 Juvenile Justice, and the general public. ISBE staff have discussions with the Council throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE staff discussed baseline data, targets, current data, and improvement strategies with the Council at the June 2023 meeting. ISBE staff provided an overview of trend data and received feedback from the Council regarding specific indicator progress. Through discussions with the Council at the June 2023 meeting, no target revisions were identified to be made.

In addition to the Council, ISBE solicited input from many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. ISBE staff met with each stakeholder group either monthly or quarterly. These stakeholder groups include:

- Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group
- Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium
- Advancing Preschool Inclusion Advisory Group
- Harrisburg Project
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE)
- Illinois Elevating Special Educators Network Advisory Council
- Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs)
- Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET) project.

ISBE also shared SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences including the IAASE fall and winter conferences as well as the ISBE/Special Education Leadership Academy (SELA) Special Education Directors Conference.

Finally, progress for several of the SPP Indicators is aligned to the Illinois State Personnel Development Grant (IESE). The IESE Advisory Council met quarterly during FY22 to review progress made toward meeting the grant goals and objectives, and to provide council members an opportunity to give feedback to the IESE Network. The council continues to provide broad stakeholder input on the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the SSIP. IESE is comprised of members representing general and special education teachers, individuals with disabilities, Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, parents, PTIs, regular education administrators, related service providers, ROEs, special education administrators, state agency representatives, teacher unions, the Illinois New Teacher Collaborative, and university general and special education departments. ISBE staff met with the IESE Advisory Council multiple times throughout FY22. The IESE Advisory Council assisted ISBE staff with reviewing Indicator 17 trend data. Through these data review discussions, there were no identified revisions that needed to be made to Indicator 17.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	16,745
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	348
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	192
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	2,471

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
16,745	19,756	86.79%	82.60%	84.76%	Met target	No Slippage

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)

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response
1 - Required Actions

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

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED*Facts* 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 dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (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 section 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

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 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.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	13.73%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	4.60%	4.50%	4.50%	13.70%	13.70%
Data	3.54%	3.22%	2.89%	8.92%	9.55%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ISBE collected stakeholder feedback on its proposed SPP targets in multiple ways. 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
- Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (formerly ISAC)
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- 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 Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, 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, Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice, 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, regional superintendents, assistant regional superintendents, school business officials, and special education attorneys. In addition, 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. These meetings increased ISBE's capacity of diverse groups of parents and allowed them to have a voice in the development of targets and activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

Each session sought stakeholder feedback on if the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable. The 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. Once the proposed targets for SPP indicators were determined reasonable and achievable, ISBE recorded 16 separate SPP modules and posted them on the website. 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.

ISBE solicits broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR, associated targets, and target revisions through its primary stakeholder group, the Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (formerly known as the Illinois State Advisory Council, or ISAC). ISBE engaged with this stakeholder group, monthly, through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings during FY22. The role of the Council is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. The Council functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Department. It 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 Juvenile Justice, and the general public. ISBE staff have discussions with the Council throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE staff discussed baseline data, targets, current data, and improvement strategies with the Council at the June 2023 meeting. ISBE staff provided an overview of trend data and received feedback from the Council regarding specific indicator progress. Through discussions with the Council at the June 2023 meeting, no target revisions were identified to be made.

In addition to the Council, ISBE solicited input from many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. ISBE staff met with each stakeholder group either monthly or quarterly. These stakeholder groups include:

- Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group
- Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium
- Advancing Preschool Inclusion Advisory Group
- Harrisburg Project
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE)
- Illinois Elevating Special Educators Network Advisory Council
- Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs)
- Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET) project.

ISBE also shared SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences including the IAASE fall and winter conferences as well as the ISBE/Special Education Leadership Academy (SELA) Special Education Directors Conference.

Finally, progress for several of the SPP Indicators is aligned to the Illinois State Personnel Development Grant (IESE). The IESE Advisory Council met quarterly during FY22 to review progress made toward meeting the grant goals and objectives, and to provide council members an opportunity to give feedback to the IESE Network. The council continues to provide broad stakeholder input on the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the SSIP. IESE is comprised of members representing general and special education teachers, individuals with disabilities, Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, parents, PTIs, regular education administrators, related service providers, ROEs, special education administrators, state agency representatives, teacher unions, the Illinois New Teacher Collaborative, and university general and special education departments. ISBE staff met with the IESE Advisory Council multiple times throughout FY22. The IESE Advisory Council assisted ISBE staff with reviewing Indicator 17 trend data. Through these data review discussions, there were no identified revisions that needed to be made to Indicator 17.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	16,745
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	348
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	192
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	2,471

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
2,471	19,756	9.55%	13.70%	12.51%	Met target	No Slippage

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)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

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	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ISBE collected stakeholder feedback on its proposed SPP targets in multiple ways. 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
- Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (formerly ISAC)
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- 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 Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, 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, Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice, 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, regional superintendents, assistant regional superintendents, school business officials, and special education attorneys. In addition, 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. These meetings increased ISBE's capacity of diverse groups of parents and allowed them to have a voice in the development of targets and activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

Each session sought stakeholder feedback on if the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable. The 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. Once the proposed targets for SPP indicators were determined reasonable and achievable, ISBE recorded 16 separate SPP modules and posted them on the website. 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.

ISBE solicits broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR, associated targets, and target revisions through its primary stakeholder group, the Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (formerly known as the Illinois State Advisory Council, or ISAC). ISBE engaged with this stakeholder group, monthly, through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings during FY22. The role of the Council is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. The Council functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Department. It 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 Juvenile Justice, and the general public. ISBE staff have discussions with the Council throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE staff discussed baseline data, targets, current data, and improvement strategies with the Council at the June 2023 meeting. ISBE staff provided an overview of trend data and received feedback from the Council regarding specific indicator progress. Through discussions with the Council at the June 2023 meeting, no target revisions were identified to be made.

In addition to the Council, ISBE solicited input from many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. ISBE staff met with each stakeholder group either monthly or quarterly. These stakeholder groups include:

- Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group
- Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium
- Advancing Preschool Inclusion Advisory Group
- Harrisburg Project
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE)
- Illinois Elevating Special Educators Network Advisory Council
- Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs)
- Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET) project.

ISBE also shared SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences including the IAASE fall and winter conferences as well as the ISBE/Special Education Leadership Academy (SELA) Special Education Directors Conference.

Finally, progress for several of the SPP Indicators is aligned to the Illinois State Personnel Development Grant (IESE). The IESE Advisory Council met quarterly during FY22 to review progress made toward meeting the grant goals and objectives, and to provide council members an opportunity to give feedback to the IESE Network. The council continues to provide broad stakeholder input on the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the SSIP. IESE is comprised of members representing general and special education teachers, individuals with disabilities, Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, parents, PTIs, regular education administrators, related service providers, ROEs, special education administrators, state agency representatives, teacher unions, the Illinois New Teacher Collaborative, and university general and special education departments. ISBE staff met with the IESE Advisory Council multiple times throughout FY22. The IESE Advisory Council assisted ISBE staff with reviewing Indicator 17 trend data. Through these data review discussions, there were no identified revisions that needed to be made to Indicator 17.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	21,147	20,828	20,063
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	1,279	667	2,742
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	17,810	17,916	13,806
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1,583	1,487	1,697

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	21,137	20,820	20,047
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	1,282	662	2,721
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	17,756	17,831	13,693
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1,577	1,486	1,682

(1) The children with IEPs who are English learners and took the ELP in lieu of the regular reading/language arts assessment are not included in the prefilled data in this indicator.

(2) 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.

(3) The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments, as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	20,672	21,147	96.97%	95.00%	97.75%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	20,070	20,828	95.59%	95.00%	96.36%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	18,245	20,063	90.77%	95.00%	90.94%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	20,615	21,137	96.60%	95.00%	97.53%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	19,979	20,820	95.05%	95.00%	95.96%	Met target	No Slippage

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
C	Grade HS	18,096	20,047	89.95%	95.00%	90.27%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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.illinoisreportcard.com/State.aspx>. The FFY 20, FFY 21 and FFY 22 assessment results reports specifically for students with disabilities can be found at the following link <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPP-APR-Indicator-3.aspx>, under the Assessment Results for Students with Disabilities drop down at the bottom of the page.

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/General-Supervision.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)

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

The State did not provide a Web link demonstrating that the State reported publicly on the participation of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported the number of children with disabilities participating in regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) in order to participate in those assessments at the State, district, and school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) is noncompliance.

3A - Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2024 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2022, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2023.

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ISBE collected stakeholder feedback on its proposed SPP targets in multiple ways. 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
- Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (formerly ISAC)
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- 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 Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, 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, Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice, 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, regional superintendents, assistant regional superintendents, school business officials, and special education attorneys. In addition, 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. These meetings increased ISBE's capacity of diverse groups of parents and allowed them to have a voice in the development of targets and activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

Each session sought stakeholder feedback on if the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable. The 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. Once the proposed targets for SPP indicators were determined reasonable and achievable, ISBE recorded 16 separate SPP modules and posted them on the website. 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.

ISBE solicits broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR, associated targets, and target revisions through its primary stakeholder group, the Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (formerly known as the Illinois State Advisory Council, or ISAC). ISBE engaged with this stakeholder group, monthly, through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings during FY22. The role of the Council is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. The Council functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Department. It 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 Juvenile Justice, and the general public. ISBE staff have discussions with the Council throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE staff discussed baseline data, targets, current data, and improvement strategies with the Council at the June 2023 meeting. ISBE staff provided an overview of trend data and received feedback from the Council regarding specific indicator progress. Through discussions with the Council at the June 2023 meeting, no target revisions were identified to be made.

In addition to the Council, ISBE solicited input from many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. ISBE staff met with each stakeholder group either monthly or quarterly. These stakeholder groups include:

- Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group
- Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium
- Advancing Preschool Inclusion Advisory Group
- Harrisburg Project
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE)
- Illinois Elevating Special Educators Network Advisory Council
- Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs)
- Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET) project.

ISBE also shared SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences including the IAASE fall and winter conferences as well as the ISBE/Special Education Leadership Academy (SELA) Special Education Directors Conference.

Finally, progress for several of the SPP Indicators is aligned to the Illinois State Personnel Development Grant (IESE). The IESE Advisory Council met quarterly during FY22 to review progress made toward meeting the grant goals and objectives, and to provide council members an opportunity to give feedback to the IESE Network. The council continues to provide broad stakeholder input on the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the SSIP. IESE is comprised of members representing general and special education teachers, individuals with disabilities, Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, parents, PTIs, regular education administrators, related service providers, ROEs, special education administrators, state agency representatives, teacher unions, the Illinois New Teacher Collaborative, and university general and special education departments. ISBE staff met with the IESE Advisory Council multiple times throughout FY22. The IESE Advisory Council assisted ISBE staff with reviewing Indicator 17 trend data. Through these data review discussions, there were no identified revisions that needed to be made to Indicator 17.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

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	19,089	18,583	16,548
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or	178	108	225

above proficient against grade level			
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,718	1,306	924

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

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	19,038	18,493	16,414
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	163	58	154
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,638	707	571

(1)The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,896	19,089	8.71%	10.00%	9.93%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	1,414	18,583	4.74%	7.00%	7.61%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	1,149	16,548	5.82%	7.50%	6.94%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,801	19,038	8.65%	11.00%	9.46%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	765	18,493	3.52%	5.50%	4.14%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Gr ou p	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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
C	Grade HS	725	16,414	4.21%	6.50%	4.42%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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.illinoisreportcard.com/State.aspx>. The FFY 20, FFY 21 and FFY 22 assessment results reports specifically for students with disabilities can be found at the following link <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPP-APR-Indicator-3.aspx>, under the Assessment Results for Students with Disabilities drop down at the bottom of the page.

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/General-Supervision.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)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

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 = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate 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 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	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	14.00%	14.00%	14.00%	15.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	22.50%	22.50%	22.50%	23.50%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	22.00%	22.00%	22.00%	22.50%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	19.50%	19.50%	19.50%	20.50%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	4.50%	4.50%	4.50%	5.50%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	3.50%	3.50%	3.50%	4.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ISBE collected stakeholder feedback on its proposed SPP targets in multiple ways. 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
- Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (formerly ISAC)
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- 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 Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, 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, Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice, 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, regional superintendents, assistant regional superintendents, school business officials, and special education attorneys. In addition, 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. These meetings increased ISBE's capacity of diverse groups of parents and allowed them to have a voice in the development of targets and activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

Each session sought stakeholder feedback on if the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable. The 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. Once the proposed targets for SPP indicators were determined reasonable and achievable, ISBE recorded 16 separate SPP modules and posted them on the website. 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.

ISBE solicits broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR, associated targets, and target revisions through its primary stakeholder group, the Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (formerly known as the Illinois State Advisory Council, or ISAC). ISBE engaged with this stakeholder group, monthly, through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings during FY22. The role of the Council is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. The Council functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Department. It 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 Juvenile Justice, and the general public. ISBE staff have discussions with the Council throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE staff discussed baseline data, targets, current data, and improvement strategies with the Council at the June 2023 meeting. ISBE staff provided an overview of trend data and received feedback from the Council regarding specific indicator progress. Through discussions with the Council at the June 2023 meeting, no target revisions were identified to be made.

In addition to the Council, ISBE solicited input from many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. ISBE staff met with each stakeholder group either monthly or quarterly. These stakeholder groups include:

- Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group
- Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium
- Advancing Preschool Inclusion Advisory Group
- Harrisburg Project
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE)
- Illinois Elevating Special Educators Network Advisory Council
- Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs)
- Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET) project.

ISBE also shared SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences including the IAASE fall and winter conferences as well as the ISBE/Special Education Leadership Academy (SELA) Special Education Directors Conference.

Finally, progress for several of the SPP Indicators is aligned to the Illinois State Personnel Development Grant (IESE). The IESE Advisory Council met quarterly during FY22 to review progress made toward meeting the grant goals and objectives, and to provide council members an opportunity to give feedback to the IESE Network. The council continues to provide broad stakeholder input on the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the SSIP. IESE is comprised of members representing general and special education teachers, individuals with disabilities, Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, parents, PTIs, regular education administrators, related service providers, ROEs, special education administrators, state agency representatives, teacher unions, the Illinois New Teacher Collaborative, and university general and special education departments. ISBE staff met with the IESE Advisory Council multiple times throughout FY22. The IESE Advisory Council assisted ISBE staff with reviewing Indicator 17 trend data. Through these data review discussions, there were no identified revisions that needed to be made to Indicator 17.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

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	1,583	1,487	1,697
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	147	227	323

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

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	1,577	1,486	1,682
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	476	100	281

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	147	1,583	9.16%	14.00%	9.29%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	227	1,487	15.63%	22.50%	15.27%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	323	1,697	19.35%	22.00%	19.03%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	476	1,577	24.03%	19.50%	30.18%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	100	1,486	5.78%	4.50%	6.73%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	281	1,682	14.60%	3.50%	16.71%	Met target	No Slippage

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.illinoisreportcard.com/State.aspx>. The FFY 20, FFY 21 and FFY 22 assessment results reports specifically for students with disabilities can be found at the following link <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPP-APR-Indicator-3.aspx>, under the Assessment Results for Students with Disabilities drop down at the bottom of the page.

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/General-Supervision.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)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

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 ED*Facts* 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 2022-2023 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 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 2022-2023 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 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	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	26.50	26.50	26.50	25.50
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	32.50	32.50	32.50	31.50
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	29.00	29.00	29.00	28.00
Math	A <=	Grade 4	22.50	22.50	22.50	21.50
Math	B <=	Grade 8	27.00	27.00	27.00	26.00
Math	C <=	Grade HS	28.50	28.50	28.50	27.50

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ISBE collected stakeholder feedback on its proposed SPP targets in multiple ways. 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
- Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (formerly ISAC)
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee

-Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
 -Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
 -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 Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, 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, Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice, 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, regional superintendents, assistant regional superintendents, school business officials, and special education attorneys. In addition, 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. These meetings increased ISBE's capacity of diverse groups of parents and allowed them to have a voice in the development of targets and activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

Each session sought stakeholder feedback on if the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable. The 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. Once the proposed targets for SPP indicators were determined reasonable and achievable, ISBE recorded 16 separate SPP modules and posted them on the website. 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.

ISBE solicits broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR, associated targets, and target revisions through its primary stakeholder group, the Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (formerly known as the Illinois State Advisory Council, or ISAC). ISBE engaged with this stakeholder group, monthly, through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings during FY22. The role of the Council is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. The Council functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Department. It 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 Juvenile Justice, and the general public. ISBE staff have discussions with the Council throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE staff discussed baseline data, targets, current data, and improvement strategies with the Council at the June 2023 meeting. ISBE staff provided an overview of trend data and received feedback from the Council regarding specific indicator progress. Through discussions with the Council at the June 2023 meeting, no target revisions were identified to be made.

In addition to the Council, ISBE solicited input from many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. ISBE staff met with each stakeholder group either monthly or quarterly. These stakeholder groups include:

- Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group
- Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium
- Advancing Preschool Inclusion Advisory Group
- Harrisburg Project
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE)
- Illinois Elevating Special Educators Network Advisory Council
- Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs)
- Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET) project.

ISBE also shared SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences including the IAASE fall and winter conferences as well as the ISBE/Special Education Leadership Academy (SELA) Special Education Directors Conference.

Finally, progress for several of the SPP Indicators is aligned to the Illinois State Personnel Development Grant (IESE). The IESE Advisory Council met quarterly during FY22 to review progress made toward meeting the grant goals and objectives, and to provide council members an opportunity to give feedback to the IESE Network. The council continues to provide broad stakeholder input on the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the SSIP. IESE is comprised of members representing general and special education teachers, individuals with disabilities, Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, parents, PTIs, regular education administrators, related service providers, ROEs, special education administrators, state agency representatives, teacher unions, the Illinois New Teacher Collaborative, and university general and special education departments. ISBE staff met with the IESE Advisory Council multiple times throughout FY22. The IESE Advisory Council assisted ISBE staff with reviewing Indicator 17 trend data. Through these data review discussions, there were no identified revisions that needed to be made to Indicator 17.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	126,891	137,866	137,763

b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	19,089	18,583	16,548
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	41,395	51,618	39,276
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	3,039	3,846	3,948
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	178	108	225
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,718	1,306	924

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	126,751	137,545	137,570
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	19,038	18,493	16,414
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	32,057	32,810	33,472
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,805	2,372	3,020
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	163	58	154
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,638	707	571

(1)The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	9.93%	35.02%	23.90	26.50	25.09	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	7.61%	40.23%	25.55	32.50	32.62	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	6.94%	31.38%	23.89	29.00	24.43	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

ISBE analyzed assessment proficiency data for SY 2022-2023 and compared it to SY 2021-2022 to identify a rationale for slippage for indicator 3D in 8th grade reading. While ISBE saw an increase in the proficiency of 8th grade students with IEPs on the regular reading assessment (+2.87%), ISBE also saw an increase in proficiency for students without IEPs on the regular reading assessment for 8th grade (+9.93%). In contrast, the number of

students with IEPs who took the regular assessment in reading and received a valid score at the 8th grade level did increase by 201 students (+1.08%) while the overall total number of students who took the regular assessment and received a valid score decreased by 2,130 students (-1.54%). ISBE hypothesizes that while students with IEPs and students without IEPs showed gains in proficiency, the rate of proficiency increase was not the same. This coupled a slightly higher percentage of students with IEPs and an overall lower number of students taking the assessment may have caused the slippage in the gap proficiency rate.

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	9.46%	27.50%	17.56	22.50	18.04	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	4.14%	25.58%	19.54	27.00	21.44	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	4.42%	26.53%	24.56	28.50	22.11	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

The State's FFY 2022 data represent slippage from the FFY 2021 data and the State did not meet its FFY 2022 target for this indicator. The State did not, as required, provide the reasons for slippage.

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 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 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), 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 rates of suspensions and expulsions for 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 section 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 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 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 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon LEAs 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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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 QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	4.00%	3.80%	3.80%	3.80%	3.60%
Data	1.64%	1.53%	1.18%	1.29%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target ≤	3.40%	3.20%	3.20%	3.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ISBE collected stakeholder feedback on its proposed SPP targets in multiple ways. 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
- Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (formerly ISAC)
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- 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 Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, 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, Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice, 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, regional superintendents, assistant regional superintendents, school business officials, and special education attorneys. In addition, 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. These meetings increased ISBE's capacity of diverse groups of parents and allowed them to have a voice in the development of targets and activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

Each session sought stakeholder feedback on if the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable. The 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. Once the proposed targets for SPP indicators were determined reasonable and achievable, ISBE recorded 16 separate SPP modules and posted them on the website. 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.

ISBE solicits broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR, associated targets, and target revisions through its primary stakeholder group, the Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (formerly known as the Illinois State Advisory Council, or ISAC). ISBE engaged with this stakeholder group, monthly, through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings during FY22. The role of the Council is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. The Council functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Department. It 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 Juvenile Justice, and the general public. ISBE staff have discussions with the Council throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE staff discussed baseline data, targets, current data, and improvement strategies with the Council at the June 2023 meeting. ISBE staff provided an overview of trend data and received feedback from the Council regarding specific indicator progress. Through discussions with the Council at the June 2023 meeting, no target revisions were identified to be made.

In addition to the Council, ISBE solicited input from many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. ISBE staff met with each stakeholder group either monthly or quarterly. These stakeholder groups include:

- Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group
- Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium
- Advancing Preschool Inclusion Advisory Group
- Harrisburg Project
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE)
- Illinois Elevating Special Educators Network Advisory Council
- Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs)
- Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET) project.

ISBE also shared SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences including the IAASE fall and winter conferences as well as the ISBE/Special Education Leadership Academy (SELA) Special Education Directors Conference.

Finally, progress for several of the SPP Indicators is aligned to the Illinois State Personnel Development Grant (IESE). The IESE Advisory Council met quarterly during FY22 to review progress made toward meeting the grant goals and objectives, and to provide council members an opportunity to give feedback to the IESE Network. The council continues to provide broad stakeholder input on the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the SSIP. IESE is comprised of members representing general and special education teachers, individuals with disabilities, Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, parents, PTIs, regular education administrators, related service providers, ROEs, special education administrators, state agency representatives, teacher unions, the Illinois New Teacher Collaborative, and university general and special education departments. ISBE staff met with the IESE Advisory Council multiple times throughout FY22. The IESE Advisory Council assisted ISBE staff with reviewing Indicator 17 trend data. Through these data review discussions, there were no identified revisions that needed to be made to Indicator 17.

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
0	852	0.00%	3.40%	0.00%	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: ((# 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. An 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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 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.

No LEAs were identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities for FFY 2022. However, in years where LEAs are identified as having a significant discrepancy, each of the LEAs identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities is required to review and analyze student data at the district and individual building levels, and to complete a self-assessment using a template provided by ISBE. The template is posted on the ISBE website: <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPP-APR-Indicator-4.aspx>. 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. Once the LEA completes the self-assessment, they are required to send it back to ISBE for review. 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 Behavior Assessment Training project currently provides universal technical assistance to support all LEAs in the State and targeted technical assistance to support LEAs that have a finding of noncompliance for SPP Indicators 4A and 4B.

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 2021

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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

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 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), 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 the rates of suspensions and expulsions for 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 section 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 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 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 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 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, 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.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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 QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.12%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Not Valid and Reliable

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	852	Not Valid and Reliable	0%	0.00%	Met target	N/A

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

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 4B is determined as follows:

1. A Suspension/Expulsion Rate is calculated for each LEA with at least five students with IEPs in one or more racial/ethnic group 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 by using the total number of students with IEPs suspended or expelled for more than 10 days in the entire state, by 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. An LEA is determined to have a significant discrepancy if:
 - a. its Suspension/Expulsion Rate by race/ethnicity is greater than the overall State Suspension/Expulsion Rate plus one standard deviation for three consecutive years, AND
 - b. the LEA had at least five students with IEPs in one or more racial/ethnic group suspended or expelled more than 10 days for three consecutive years.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 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.

No LEAs were identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities for FFY 2022. However, in years where LEAs are identified as having a significant discrepancy, each of the LEAs identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities is required to review and analyze student data at the district and individual building levels, and to complete a self-assessment using a template provided by ISBE. The template is posted on the ISBE website: <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPP-APR-Indicator-4.aspx>. 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. Once the LEA completes the self-assessment, they are required to send it back to ISBE for review. 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 Behavior Assessment Training project currently provides universal technical assistance to support all LEAs in the State and targeted technical assistance to support LEAs that have a finding of noncompliance for SPP Indicators 4A and 4B.

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 2021

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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2021. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2022 in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR using a methodology that does not result in different thresholds for different racial and ethnic groups.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

ISBE has always and continues to compare each racial/ethnic group to the overall state rate. ISBE recognizes that the revised, through clarifications, description of its methodology was incorrect. ISBE has reviewed data and the policies and procedures for this data collection to ensure there are not different thresholds for different racial and ethnic groups.

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 ED*Facts* 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2019	Target >=	57.00%	58.00%	58.00%	52.70%	52.90%
A	50.44%	Data	52.53%	52.79%	52.70%	53.34%	53.19%
B	2019	Target <=	16.00%	15.50%	15.50%	12.37%	12.35%
B	12.37%	Data	13.22%	13.05%	12.92%	13.09%	13.02%
C	2019	Target <=	3.90%	3.90%	3.90%	6.39%	6.38%
C	6.39%	Data	6.33%	6.50%	6.68%	6.28%	6.17%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	53.10%	53.30%	53.50%	53.70%
Target B <=	12.33%	12.31%	12.29%	12.27%
Target C <=	6.37%	6.36%	6.35%	6.34%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ISBE collected stakeholder feedback on its proposed SPP targets in multiple ways. 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
- Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (formerly ISAC)
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- 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 Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, 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, Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice, 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, regional superintendents, assistant regional superintendents, school business officials, and special education attorneys. In addition, 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. These meetings increased ISBE's capacity of diverse groups of parents and allowed them to have a voice in the development of targets and activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

Each session sought stakeholder feedback on if the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable. The 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. Once the proposed targets for SPP indicators were determined reasonable and achievable, ISBE recorded 16 separate SPP modules and posted them on the website. 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.

ISBE solicits broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR, associated targets, and target revisions through its primary stakeholder group, the Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (formerly known as the Illinois State Advisory Council, or ISAC). ISBE engaged with this stakeholder group, monthly, through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings during FY22. The role of the Council is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. The Council functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Department. It 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 Juvenile Justice, and the general public. ISBE staff have discussions with the Council throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE staff discussed baseline data, targets, current data, and improvement strategies with the Council at the June 2023 meeting. ISBE staff provided an overview of trend data and received feedback from the Council regarding specific indicator progress. Through discussions with the Council at the June 2023 meeting, no target revisions were identified to be made.

In addition to the Council, ISBE solicited input from many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. ISBE staff met with each stakeholder group either monthly or quarterly. These stakeholder groups include:

- Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group
- Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium
- Advancing Preschool Inclusion Advisory Group
- Harrisburg Project
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE)
- Illinois Elevating Special Educators Network Advisory Council
- Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs)
- Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET) project.

ISBE also shared SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences including the IAASE fall and winter conferences as well as the ISBE/Special Education Leadership Academy (SELA) Special Education Directors Conference.

Finally, progress for several of the SPP Indicators is aligned to the Illinois State Personnel Development Grant (IESE). The IESE Advisory Council met quarterly during FY22 to review progress made toward meeting the grant goals and objectives, and to provide council members an opportunity to give feedback to the IESE Network. The council continues to provide broad stakeholder input on the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the SSIP. IESE is comprised of members representing general and special education teachers, individuals with disabilities, Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, parents, PTIs, regular education administrators, related service providers, ROEs, special education administrators, state agency representatives, teacher unions, the Illinois New Teacher Collaborative, and university general and special education departments. ISBE staff met with the IESE Advisory Council multiple times throughout FY22. The IESE Advisory Council assisted ISBE staff with reviewing Indicator 17 trend data. Through these data review discussions, there were no identified revisions that needed to be made to Indicator 17.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	269,925
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	143,631
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	35,198
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	16,239

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	435
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	545

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 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	143,631	269,925	53.19%	53.10%	53.21%	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	35,198	269,925	13.02%	12.33%	13.04%	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]	17,219	269,925	6.17%	6.37%	6.38%	Did not meet target	Slippage
Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable						
C	ISBE completed an analysis of the data for SPP 5c and identified a potential cause for the slippage. ISBE noted that the overall special education population of students in increased by over 3500 students from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022 which could be due to more students returning from homeschool given 2022-2023 was the first year since COVID-19 restrictions were lifted. Additional analysis of data also indicated that while SPP 5c had an overall increase in students, specifically SPP 5c1 increased in the number of students being placed in separate schools, whereas SPP5c3 had a decrease in the number of students placed in homebound/hospital placements. ISBE believes that the combination of a shortage in educators statewide as well as students returning from remote learning with increased mental health needs could be impacting the increase of students being placed in separate schools. ISBE recognizes that while data slippage exists, the FFY 2022 data is only 0.01% higher than the state target. ISBE will continue to monitor data related to SPP 5c to ensure students are receiving their special education services in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE						

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

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 ED*Facts* 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 (Inclusive) – 6A, 6B, 6C

Part	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	Target >=	32.80%	32.90%	32.90%	46.00%	46.50%
A	Data	40.76%	44.82%	45.42%	48.07%	50.38%
B	Target <=	30.60%	30.50%	30.50%	26.30%	26.04%
B	Data	24.94%	23.49%	23.02%	26.27%	25.66%
C	Target <=				0.28%	0.27%
C	Data				0.32%	0.27%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ISBE collected stakeholder feedback on its proposed SPP targets in multiple ways. 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
- Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (formerly ISAC)
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- 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 Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, 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, Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice, 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, regional superintendents, assistant regional superintendents, school business officials, and special education attorneys. In addition, 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. These meetings increased ISBE's capacity of diverse groups of parents and allowed them to have a voice in the development of targets and activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

Each session sought stakeholder feedback on if the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable. The 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. Once the proposed targets for SPP indicators were determined reasonable and achievable, ISBE recorded 16 separate SPP modules and posted them on the website. 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.

ISBE solicits broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR, associated targets, and target revisions through its primary stakeholder group, the Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (formerly known as the Illinois State Advisory Council, or ISAC). ISBE engaged with this stakeholder group, monthly, through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings during FY22. The role of the Council is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. The Council functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Department. It 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 Juvenile Justice, and the general public. ISBE staff have discussions with the Council throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE staff discussed baseline data, targets, current data, and improvement strategies with the Council at the June 2023 meeting. ISBE staff provided an overview of trend data and received feedback from the Council regarding specific indicator progress. Through discussions with the Council at the June 2023 meeting, no target revisions were identified to be made.

In addition to the Council, ISBE solicited input from many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. ISBE staff met with each stakeholder group either monthly or quarterly. These stakeholder groups include:

- Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group
- Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium
- Advancing Preschool Inclusion Advisory Group
- Harrisburg Project
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE)
- Illinois Elevating Special Educators Network Advisory Council
- Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs)
- Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET) project.

ISBE also shared SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences including the IAASE fall and winter conferences as well as the ISBE/Special Education Leadership Academy (SELA) Special Education Directors Conference.

Finally, progress for several of the SPP Indicators is aligned to the Illinois State Personnel Development Grant (IESE). The IESE Advisory Council met quarterly during FY22 to review progress made toward meeting the grant goals and objectives, and to provide council members an opportunity to give feedback to the IESE Network. The council continues to provide broad stakeholder input on the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the SSIP. IESE is comprised of members representing general and special education teachers, individuals with disabilities, Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, parents, PTIs, regular education administrators, related service providers, ROEs, special education administrators, state agency representatives, teacher unions, the Illinois New Teacher Collaborative, and university general and special education departments. ISBE staff met with the IESE Advisory Council multiple times throughout FY22. The IESE Advisory Council assisted ISBE staff with reviewing Indicator 17 trend data. Through these data review discussions, there were no identified revisions that needed to be made to Indicator 17.

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%

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
C	2019	0.28%

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	47.00%	47.50%	48.00%	48.50%
Target B <=	25.78%	25.52%	25.26%	25.00%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	0.26%	0.25%	0.24%	0.23%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

08/30/2023

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	9,416	12,224	3,696	25,336
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	4,382	6,557	2,081	13,020
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	2,551	2,395	621	5,567
b2. Number of children attending separate school	264	340	96	700
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	3	0	0	3
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	13	20	6	39

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 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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	13,020	25,336	50.38%	47.00%	51.39%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	6,270	25,336	25.66%	25.78%	24.75%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Home	39	25,336	0.27%	0.26%	0.15%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

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 3 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A1	2019	Target >=	86.20%	86.30%	86.30%	83.95%	83.95%
A1	83.93%	Data	83.73%	84.38%	83.93%	77.44%	78.98%

A2	2019	Target >=	55.50%	55.60%	55.60%	47.20%	47.20%
A2	47.11%	Data	50.35%	50.08%	47.11%	42.18%	43.15%
B1	2019	Target >=	86.90%	87.00%	87.00%	84.10%	84.10%
B1	84.09%	Data	83.51%	84.24%	84.09%	78.17%	80.35%
B2	2019	Target >=	53.80%	53.90%	53.90%	45.10%	45.10%
B2	45.07%	Data	48.35%	47.95%	45.07%	39.39%	41.57%
C1	2019	Target >=	88.00%	88.10%	88.10%	85.80%	85.80%
C1	85.77%	Data	85.13%	86.39%	85.77%	78.74%	80.64%
C2	2019	Target >=	64.20%	64.30%	64.30%	53.40%	53.40%
C2	53.32%	Data	57.66%	57.14%	53.32%	47.33%	49.01%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ISBE collected stakeholder feedback on its proposed SPP targets in multiple ways. 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
- Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (formerly ISAC)
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- 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 Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, 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, Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice, 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, regional superintendents, assistant regional superintendents, school business officials, and special education attorneys. In addition, 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. These meetings increased ISBE's capacity of diverse groups of parents and allowed them to have a voice in the development of targets and activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

Each session sought stakeholder feedback on if the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable. The 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. Once the proposed targets for SPP indicators were determined reasonable and achievable, ISBE recorded 16 separate SPP modules and posted them on the website. 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.

ISBE solicits broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR, associated targets, and target revisions through its primary stakeholder group, the Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (formerly known as the Illinois State Advisory Council, or ISAC). ISBE engaged with this stakeholder group, monthly, through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings during FY22. The role of the Council is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. The Council functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Department. It 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 Juvenile Justice, and the general public. ISBE staff have discussions with the Council throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE staff discussed baseline data, targets, current data, and improvement strategies with the Council at the June 2023 meeting. ISBE staff provided an overview of trend data and received feedback from the Council regarding specific indicator progress. Through discussions with the Council at the June 2023 meeting, no target revisions were identified to be made.

In addition to the Council, ISBE solicited input from many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. ISBE staff met with each stakeholder group either monthly or quarterly. These stakeholder groups include:

- Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group
- Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium
- Advancing Preschool Inclusion Advisory Group
- Harrisburg Project
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE)
- Illinois Elevating Special Educators Network Advisory Council
- Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs)
- Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET) project.

ISBE also shared SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences including the IAASE fall and winter conferences as well as the ISBE/Special Education Leadership Academy (SELA) Special Education Directors Conference.

Finally, progress for several of the SPP Indicators is aligned to the Illinois State Personnel Development Grant (IESE). The IESE Advisory Council met quarterly during FY22 to review progress made toward meeting the grant goals and objectives, and to provide council members an opportunity to give feedback to the IESE Network. The council continues to provide broad stakeholder input on the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the SSIP. IESE is comprised of members representing general and special education teachers, individuals with disabilities, Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, parents, PTIs, regular education administrators, related service providers, ROEs, special education administrators, state agency representatives, teacher unions, the Illinois New Teacher Collaborative, and university general and special education departments. ISBE staff met with the IESE Advisory Council multiple times throughout FY22. The IESE Advisory Council assisted ISBE staff with reviewing Indicator 17 trend data. Through these data review discussions, there were no identified revisions that needed to be made to Indicator 17.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

10,828

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	165	1.52%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,904	17.58%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	4,406	40.69%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,386	31.27%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	967	8.93%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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>	7,792	9,861	78.98%	83.95%	79.02%	Did not meet target	No 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>	4,353	10,828	43.15%	47.20%	40.20%	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	142	1.31%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,873	17.30%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	4,524	41.78%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,602	33.27%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	687	6.34%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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>	8,126	10,141	80.35%	84.10%	80.13%	Did not meet target	No 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>	4,289	10,828	41.57%	45.10%	39.61%	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	146	1.35%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,786	16.49%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	3,947	36.45%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,887	35.90%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,062	9.81%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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>	7,834	9,766	80.64%	85.80%	80.22%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6	4,949	10,828	49.01%	53.40%	45.71%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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
A2	ISBE attributes the slippage for SPP Indicator 7 to the effects experienced during the COVID-19 pandemic. Beginning in FFY20, ISBE, its school districts and their children and families experienced effects due to the global pandemic that most likely contributed to the slippage. Students exiting preschool programs in FFY22 may have experienced two irregular years due to COVID-19 restrictions that were in place by the Illinois Department of Public Health and one regular school year as COVID-19 restrictions were fully lifted at the end of FFY21. These restrictions likely impacted the rate of learning for preschool students aged 3 through 5 as districts navigated virtual learning, social distancing and masking mandates. Quarantine requirements were also in place during FFY20 and FFY21, which increased the amount of time students were removed from the classroom. Additionally, some schools were forced to implement full school closures due to rising COVID-19 cases. The FFY22 SPP Indicator 7 denominators for A1 and A2 are within expected limits as compared to FFY20. FFY21 did see a small decrease in the denominators from previous years. It is ISBE's belief that the effects due to the COVID-19 pandemic, impacted the rate of learning for preschool students as well as negatively impacted 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.
B2	ISBE attributes the slippage for SPP Indicator 7 to the effects experienced during the COVID-19 pandemic. Beginning in FFY20, ISBE, its school districts and their children and families experienced effects due to the global pandemic that most likely contributed to the slippage. Students exiting preschool programs in FFY22 may have experienced two irregular years due to COVID-19 restrictions that were in place by the Illinois Department of Public Health and one regular school year as COVID-19 restrictions were fully lifted at the end of FFY21. These restrictions likely impacted the rate of learning for preschool students aged 3 through 5 as districts navigated virtual learning, social distancing and masking mandates. Quarantine requirements were also in place during FFY20 and FFY21, which increased the amount of time students were removed from the classroom. Additionally, some schools were forced to implement full school closures due to rising COVID-19 cases. The FFY22 SPP Indicator 7 denominators for B1 and B2 are within expected limits as compared to FFY20. FFY21 did see a small decrease in the denominators from previous years. It is ISBE's belief that the effects due to the COVID-19 pandemic, impacted the rate of learning for preschool students as well as negatively impacted 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.
C2	ISBE attributes the slippage for SPP Indicator 7 to the effects experienced during the COVID-19 pandemic. Beginning in FFY20, ISBE, its school districts and their children and families experienced effects due to the global pandemic that most likely contributed to the slippage. Students exiting preschool programs in FFY22 may have experienced two irregular years due to COVID-19 restrictions that were in place by the Illinois Department of Public Health and one regular school year as COVID-19 restrictions were fully lifted at the end of FFY21. These restrictions likely impacted the rate of learning for preschool students aged 3 through 5 as districts navigated virtual learning, social distancing and masking mandates. Quarantine requirements were also in place during FFY20 and FFY21, which increased the amount of time students were removed from the classroom. Additionally, some schools were forced to implement full school closures due to rising COVID-19 cases. The FFY22 SPP Indicator 7 denominators for C1 and C2 are within expected limits as compared to FFY20. FFY21 did see a small decrease in the denominators from previous years. It is ISBE's belief that the effects due to the COVID-19 pandemic, impacted the rate of learning for preschool students as well as negatively impacted 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.

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 (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) High Scope Child Observation Record (COR)
- 3) Work Sampling System Illinois (WSS-IL)
- 4) My Teaching Strategies GOLD
- 5) Early Learning Scales
- 6) Ages and Stages Questionnaire
- 7) Desired Results Developmental Profile (DRDP)

Upon exit, LEAs are required to choose the curriculum-based assessment used with the child from the seven 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)

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

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 3 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 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 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 must consider race/ethnicity. 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 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.

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 collected stakeholder feedback on its proposed SPP targets in multiple ways. 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
- Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (formerly ISAC)
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- 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 Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, 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, Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice, 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, regional superintendents, assistant regional superintendents, school business officials, and special education attorneys. In addition, 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. These meetings increased ISBE's capacity of diverse groups of parents and allowed them to have a voice in the development of targets and activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

Each session sought stakeholder feedback on if the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable. The 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. Once the proposed targets for SPP indicators

were determined reasonable and achievable, ISBE recorded 16 separate SPP modules and posted them on the website. 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.

ISBE solicits broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR, associated targets, and target revisions through its primary stakeholder group, the Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (formerly known as the Illinois State Advisory Council, or ISAC). ISBE engaged with this stakeholder group, monthly, through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings during FY22. The role of the Council is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. The Council functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Department. It 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 Juvenile Justice, and the general public. ISBE staff have discussions with the Council throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE staff discussed baseline data, targets, current data, and improvement strategies with the Council at the June 2023 meeting. ISBE staff provided an overview of trend data and received feedback from the Council regarding specific indicator progress. Through discussions with the Council at the June 2023 meeting, no target revisions were identified to be made.

In addition to the Council, ISBE solicited input from many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. ISBE staff met with each stakeholder group either monthly or quarterly. These stakeholder groups include:

- Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group
- Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium
- Advancing Preschool Inclusion Advisory Group
- Harrisburg Project
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE)
- Illinois Elevating Special Educators Network Advisory Council
- Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs)
- Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET) project.

ISBE also shared SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences including the IAASE fall and winter conferences as well as the ISBE/Special Education Leadership Academy (SELA) Special Education Directors Conference.

Finally, progress for several of the SPP Indicators is aligned to the Illinois State Personnel Development Grant (IESE). The IESE Advisory Council met quarterly during FY22 to review progress made toward meeting the grant goals and objectives, and to provide council members an opportunity to give feedback to the IESE Network. The council continues to provide broad stakeholder input on the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the SSIP. IESE is comprised of members representing general and special education teachers, individuals with disabilities, Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, parents, PTIs, regular education administrators, related service providers, ROEs, special education administrators, state agency representatives, teacher unions, the Illinois New Teacher Collaborative, and university general and special education departments. ISBE staff met with the IESE Advisory Council multiple times throughout FY22. The IESE Advisory Council assisted ISBE staff with reviewing Indicator 17 trend data. Through these data review discussions, there were no identified revisions that needed to be made to Indicator 17.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	53.80%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	60.00%	61.00%	61.00%	70.50%	71.00%
Data	67.04%	70.00%	73.91%	70.79%	69.17%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	71.50%	72.00%	72.50%	73.00%

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
2,539	3,642	69.17%	71.50%	69.71%	Did not meet 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.

49,815

Percentage of respondent parents

7.31%

Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	7.05%	7.31%

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

+/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group

Include the State's analyses of 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.

The demographic representation of FFY 2022 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 responses by subgroup provides data regarding whether the survey responses were representative of the children receiving special education services in the state.

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 demographics 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 demographics of parents with preschool children aged 3-5 receiving special education services is representative of five racial/ethnic groups and not representative of three groups. Specifically, families identifying as Black and Hispanic were less likely to complete the survey. Students identifying as Black made up 11.99% of the survey group and 8.32% of the survey respondents (a -3.67% difference). Students identifying as Hispanic made up 25.19% of the survey group and 21.7% of the respondents (a -3.49% difference). In contrast, families identifying as White were more likely to complete the survey. Students identifying as White made up 48.74% of the survey group and 53.96% of the survey responses (a +5.22% difference).

The demographics of parents with school-aged children receiving special education services is representative of three 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 18.93% of the survey group and 9.91% of the survey responses (a -9.02% difference). Students identifying as Hispanic made up 27.82% of the survey group and 24.48% of the survey responses (a -5.50% difference). In contrast, families identifying as White were more likely to complete the survey. Students identifying as White made up 45.73% of the survey group and 56.68% of the survey responses (a +10.95% difference).

When the demographics of both parents with preschool and school-aged children receiving special education services, the overall sample is representative of three racial/ethnic groups and not representative of three groups. Students identifying as Black made up 18.22% of the overall survey group and 9.69% of the survey respondents (a -8.53% difference). Students identifying as Hispanic made up 26.26% of the overall survey group and 22.24% of the survey respondents (a -4.02% difference). In contrast, students identifying as White made up 46.04% of the overall survey group and 56.32% of the survey responses (a +10.28% difference).

The demographics of parents with preschool children aged 3-5 receiving special education services is representative of all of the 14 disability categories. The sample of parents with school-aged children receiving special education services is representative in 12 of the 14 disability categories. Families of school aged students identified with Autism Spectrum Disorders were more likely to complete the survey. Students identified with Autism Spectrum Disorders made up 12.05% of the survey group and 16.32% of the survey responses (a +4.27% difference). In contrast, families of students identified with Specific Learning Disabilities were less likely to complete the survey. Students identified with Specific Learning Disabilities made up 35.47% of the survey group and 27.06% of the survey responses (a -8.41% difference).

When the demographics of both parents with preschool and school-aged children receiving special education services, the overall sample is representative of representative of 12 of the 14 disability categories. Students identified with Specific Learning Disabilities made up 31.84% of the overall survey group and 23.39% of the survey responses (a -8.84% difference). In contrast, students identified with Autism Spectrum Disorders made up 11.95% of the overall survey group and 15.79% of the survey respondents (a +3.85% difference).

The demographics of the children for whom parents are 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, social media accounts, and outreach 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's survey vendor implemented a new direct line for parents and district administrators to call to receive TA support with the survey completion. ISBE's vendor will also provide a link for districts to provide to parents if they have lost or can not locate their user ID. They can utilize this link to receive the used ID via email. 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 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 and social media accounts to increase parent awareness, and have parents complete the survey at the conclusion of their annual IEP meeting. 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. ISBE will continue to work with the PTIs to support working with populations of parents who were less likely to respond to the survey specifically parents who have students receiving special education services that identify as black and/or Hispanic as well as parents who have students who are identified to have a Specific Learning Disability. ISBE is currently exploring the use of an electronic survey format to help provide on demand data which will assist with providing increased targeted support for districts and parents who need additional contacts to complete the survey. The electronic survey format may also provide an easier platform for parents to utilize since they would not have mail the survey back which would eliminate a step in receiving the survey results. ISBE will also investigate if any changes to the survey need to be made in regards to the format, questions and packaging to help improve response rates from underrepresented groups, specifically parents who have students receiving special education services that identify as black and/or Hispanic as well as parents who have students who are identified to have a Specific Learning Disability.

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 to reduce the potential for nonresponse bias. 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 continuing to work 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.

ISBE reviewed data related to underrepresented groups completing the survey and found that nonresponse bias data were not significant between the overall survey completers and the two underrepresented groups. The analyses of response rate data for the seven racial/ethnic groups and the fourteen disability categories indicated that three subgroups were less likely to respond. Families identifying as Black and Hispanic were less likely to respond to the survey as were families of students identified with Specific Learning Disabilities. To ensure that nonresponse bias was not the root cause of these discrepancies, a deeper look into the data was completed. Data showed that while families identifying as Black and Hispanic were less likely to respond to the survey, 61.50% of the respondent families identifying as Black reported that the school facilitated parent involvement and 73.2% of respondent families identifying as Hispanic reported that the school facilitated parent involvement. Because these subgroups are underrepresented, there is a risk of nonresponse bias in the data. Statistical weighting was used to adjust the Indicator 8 percentage to reflect the racial/ethnic distribution of Illinois' statewide special education population. The adjusted estimate of overall agreement is 68.87% for families identifying as black, which is 0.79% lower than the unweighted statewide Indicator 8 percentage of 69.66%. In addition, although families of students identified with Specific Learning Disabilities were less likely to respond to the survey, 68.4% of the respondent families of students identified with Specific Learning Disabilities reported that the school facilitated parent involvement as compared to the overall state rate of 69.66%. Because this subgroup is underrepresented, there is a risk of nonresponse bias in the data. Statistical weighting was used to adjust the Indicator 8 percentage to reflect the distribution of disability categories in Illinois' statewide special education population. The adjusted estimate of overall parent agreement is 69.43%, which is 0.23% lower than the unweighted statewide Indicator 8 percentage of 69.66%. Therefore, data showed the discrepancies were not significant enough to identify a nonresponse bias in regards to race/ethnicity and disability category.

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 49,815 parents of students with disabilities in Illinois who were selected to participate in the 2022-23 Illinois Parent Involvement Survey, 3,642 parents responded, yielding an 7.31% response rate. This FFY22 response rate increased 0.26 percentage points from a response rate of 7.05% in FFY21. FFY22 data show that 3,642 respondents completed the survey. The FFY22 response rate of 7.31% was calculated using the total number of

surveys received (3,642) divided by the total number of surveys mailed (49,815). However, 2,005 surveys were undeliverable and were returned to the sender. Therefore, the response rate based on the total number of surveys received (3,642) divided by the total number of surveys assumed delivered (47,810) is 7.62%.

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)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 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 2021 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

8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2023 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 response data 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. 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 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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.

1

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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	851	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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 and related services 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, aged 5 who are enrolled in Kindergarten and aged 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, aged 5 who are enrolled in Kindergarten and aged 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 and related services 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 and/or status report activities, including data verification and a review of policies, practices and procedures related to curriculum and instruction, child find, evaluations, eligibility determinations and IEPs. 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 self-assessment from the LEA in 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 FFY22, 851 / 852 LEAs met the minimum n-size requirement and 1 / 852 LEAs did not meet the minimum n-size requirement for further analysis under SPP 9. One of the 851 LEAs met the criteria for overrepresentation based on race/ethnicity set by ISBE. This LEA was required to conduct self-assessment activities for FFY22. After a thorough review of the LEA's self-assessment, the disproportionate representation identified for racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services in this LEA was not the result of inappropriate identification.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response**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 section 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 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). 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 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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.

46

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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
35	0	806	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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 disability categories is currently defined as students in a particular racial/ethnic group (i.e., Asian, Black, Hispanic, Native American, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, Two or More Races or White) being at a considerably greater risk of being identified as eligible for special education and related services in a specific disability category (Speech/Language, Specific Learning Disability, Emotional Disturbance, Intellectual Disability, Autism, and Other Health Impairment) than all other racial/ethnic groups enrolled either in the LEA or in the state (depending on the type of risk ratio calculation applied, as discussed below). ISBE uses a risk ratio to determine state risk for racial/ethnic disproportionality. To determine LEA risk for racial/ethnic disproportionality, ISBE uses a weighted risk ratio for LEAs in which there are at least 10 students in the racial/ethnic group and at least 10 students in the comparison group (all students in the racial/ethnic group enrolled in the LEA), and an alternate risk ratio for LEAs in which there are at least 10 students in the racial/ethnic group but fewer than 10 students in the comparison group enrolled in the LEA. The State utilized data from annual Fall Enrollment Counts from the Student Information System, or SIS, (for all students, grades 1-12) and December Child Count (for students with IEPs, aged 5 who are enrolled in Kindergarten and aged 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, aged 5 who are enrolled in Kindergarten and aged 6-21, for the past three school years in one of the six disability categories listed above to determine how many LEAs met the minimum “n” size for further analysis.

ISBE uses a two-step process to determine the existence of disproportionality based on race and ethnicity in special education disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. First, ISBE calculates a weighted or alternate risk ratio for every LEA in the state with regard to 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 and/or status report activities, including data verification and a review of policies, practices and procedures related to curriculum and instruction, child find, evaluations, eligibility determinations and IEPs. 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 to score the self-assessment from the LEA 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 FFY22, 806 / 852 LEAs met the minimum n-size requirement. Thirty-five (35) of the 806 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 35 LEAs were required to conduct self-assessment activities for FFY22. After a thorough review of LEA self-assessments and status reports, none of the 35 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)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.20%	99.42%	99.61%	95.13%	99.69%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
40,099	39,919	99.69%	100%	99.55%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

180

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 FFY22 there were 180 students out of 40,099 students (0.45%) whose evaluations were completed beyond the 60 school-day timeline. The number of days beyond the timeline ranged from 2 days to 174 days.

40 evaluations -1-10 days beyond the timeline (22.22%)

26 evaluations-11-20 days beyond the timeline (14.44%)

29 evaluations-21-30 days beyond the timeline (16.11%)

85 evaluations-more than 30 days beyond the timeline (47.22%)

Reported reasons for exceeding the 60 school-day timeline included:

(81.11%)-procedures/practices not timely

(15.56%)-lack of personnel resources

(2.22%)-summer issues

(1.11%)-hearing/vision/medical issues

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 from the date in which parental consent was obtained. 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 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
34	34	0	0

FFY 2021 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 the 34 LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY21 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. ISBE utilizes the data base to create Indicator 11 specific reports for each LEA that was found to have a finding of non-compliance. These reports also provide timeline data to ISBE including the number of days from which parental consent was received and the evaluation was completed, as well as any delay code that might be applicable if the timeline is not met. Through these reports ISBE can identify if student specific noncompliance has been corrected and if continued non-

compliance is identified. After completing this process, ISBE was able to verify that 100% of the 34 districts with previously identified noncompliance were now correctly implementing the regulatory requirements related to Indicator 11 .

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 QA 23-01 , 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. ISBE is able to verify correction of each individual case of noncompliance through the statewide database Indicator 11 reports. These reports also provide timeline data to ISBE including the number of days from which parental consent was received and the evaluation was completed which allows ISBE to ensure that the evaluation was completed even though it was completed late.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 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 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The State reported that it verified that each of the 34 LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY21 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 2021 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. After completing this process, ISBE verified that 100% of the 34 districts with previously identified noncompliance were now correctly implementing the regulatory requirements related to Indicator 11.

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator 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 has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 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 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	96.90%	99.03%	97.75%	91.63%	99.03%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	10,148
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	1,319

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	7,664
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.	216
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	36
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.	784

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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.	7,664	7,793	99.03%	100%	98.34%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

129

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 129 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 1-206.

-68 students-1-30 days beyond the timeline (52.71%)

-40 students-31-60 days beyond the timeline (31.01%)

-8 students-61-90 days beyond the timeline (6.20%)

-13 students were 90+ days beyond the timeline (10.08%)

In terms of reasons for the delays, 80.16% were attributed to the Child and Family Connections (CFC) intake agency for children birth to three not notifying the school district at least 90 days prior to the child's third birthday, and 23.02% were attributed to the school districts not completing the evaluation process and developing the IEP by the child's third birthday.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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

FFY 2021 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 the 14 LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY20 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. ISBE used the statewide data system to create an Indicator 12 report for each of the LEAs who were issued a finding of noncompliance. This report included information about students whose evaluations could potentially be late and therefore noncompliant, noncompliant records with delay codes as well as students who were evaluated and had services in place prior to their 3rd birthday. This report allows ISBE to identify if additional noncompliance has occurred as well as if student centered noncompliance has been corrected. After completing this process, ISBE was able to verify that 100% of the 14 districts with previously identified noncompliance were now correctly implementing the regulatory requirements related to Indicator 12.

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 QA 23-01, 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. ISBE used the statewide data system to create an Indicator 12 report for each of the LEAs who was issued a finding of noncompliance. This report includes information about students whose evaluations could potentially be late and therefore noncompliant, noncompliant records with delay codes as well as students who were evaluated and had services in place prior to their 3rd birthday. This report allows ISBE to identify if additional noncompliance has occurred as well as if student centered noncompliance has been corrected.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 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 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The State reported that it verified that each of the 14 LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY21 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 2021 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. After completing this process, ISBE was able to verify that 100% of the 14 districts with previously identified noncompliance were now correctly implementing the regulatory requirements related to Indicator 12.

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator 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 has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 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 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.17%	99.57%	99.70%	99.70%	98.07%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
68,615	69,539	98.07%	100%	98.67%	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 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

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 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 2021**

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 2021 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 6 LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY21 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>. After completing this process, ISBE was able to verify that 100% of the 6 districts with previously identified noncompliance were now correctly implementing the regulatory requirements related to Indicator 13.

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 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 Indicator 13. The Rubric can be found on the ISBE website: <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPP-APR-Indicator-13.aspx>. Consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, 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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 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 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The State reported that it verified that each of the 6 LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY21 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) and has corrected each individual case of noncompliance in the SPP 13 section entitled, "FFY 2021 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. After completing this process, ISBE was able to verify that 100% of the 6 districts with previously identified noncompliance were now correctly implementing the regulatory requirements related to Indicator 13.

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator 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 has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 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 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

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 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2023 on students who left school during 2021-2022, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2021-2022 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).

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 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 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 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. States must include race/ethnicity in their 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.

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.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2017	Target ≥	35.00%	35.00%	35.10%	29.60%	29.60%
A	29.59%	Data	29.59%	29.58%	29.55%	22.17%	29.11%
B	2017	Target ≥	57.00%	57.00%	57.00%	63.50%	63.50%
B	63.46%	Data	63.46%	60.88%	66.90%	61.32%	68.67%
C	2017	Target ≥	74.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.75%	75.75%
C	75.74%	Data	75.74%	71.79%	77.62%	73.21%	79.01%

FFY 2021 Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A ≥	29.60%	29.60%	29.60%	30.00%
Target B ≥	63.50%	63.50%	63.50%	66.00%
Target C ≥	75.75%	75.75%	75.75%	78.25%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ISBE collected stakeholder feedback on its proposed SPP targets in multiple ways. 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
- Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (formerly ISAC)
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- 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 Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, 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, Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice, 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, regional superintendents, assistant regional superintendents, school business officials, and special education attorneys. In addition, 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. These meetings increased ISBE's capacity of diverse groups of parents and allowed them to have a voice in the development of targets and activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

Each session sought stakeholder feedback on if the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable. The 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. Once the proposed targets for SPP indicators were determined reasonable and achievable, ISBE recorded 16 separate SPP modules and posted them on the website. 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.

ISBE solicits broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR, associated targets, and target revisions through its primary stakeholder group, the Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (formerly known as the Illinois State Advisory Council, or ISAC). ISBE engaged with this stakeholder group, monthly, through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings during FY22. The role of the Council is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. The Council functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Department. It 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 Juvenile Justice, and the general public. ISBE staff have discussions with the Council throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE staff discussed baseline data, targets, current data, and improvement strategies with the Council at the June 2023 meeting. ISBE staff provided an overview of trend data and received feedback from the Council regarding specific indicator progress. Through discussions with the Council at the June 2023 meeting, no target revisions were identified to be made.

In addition to the Council, ISBE solicited input from many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. ISBE staff met with each stakeholder group either monthly or quarterly. These stakeholder groups include:

- Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group
- Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium
- Advancing Preschool Inclusion Advisory Group
- Harrisburg Project
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE)
- Illinois Elevating Special Educators Network Advisory Council
- Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs)
- Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET) project.

ISBE also shared SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences including the IAASE fall and winter conferences as well as the ISBE/Special Education Leadership Academy (SELA) Special Education Directors Conference.

Finally, progress for several of the SPP Indicators is aligned to the Illinois State Personnel Development Grant (IESE). The IESE Advisory Council met quarterly during FY22 to review progress made toward meeting the grant goals and objectives, and to provide council members an opportunity to give feedback to the IESE Network. The council continues to provide broad stakeholder input on the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the SSIP. IESE is comprised of members representing general and special education teachers, individuals with disabilities, Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, parents, PTIs, regular education administrators, related service providers, ROEs, special education administrators, state agency representatives, teacher unions, the Illinois New Teacher Collaborative, and university general and special education departments. ISBE staff met with the IESE Advisory Council multiple times throughout FY22. The IESE Advisory Council assisted ISBE staff with reviewing Indicator 17 trend data. Through these data review discussions, there were no identified revisions that needed to be made to Indicator 17.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	2,589
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	1,021
Response Rate	39.44%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	240
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	463
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)	49
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).	65

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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	240	1,021	29.11%	29.60%	23.51%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	703	1,021	68.67%	63.50%	68.85%	Met target	No 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)	817	1,021	79.01%	75.75%	80.02%	Met target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	ISBE analyzed Indicator 14 data to determine the reasons for slippage. While this year did show an increase in the overall response rate, ISBE believes the slippage for 14A was due to two factors. The first factor that ISBE identified as a reason for slippage was due the largest district in Illinois failing to complete any surveys as mentioned in the 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 section above. The second factor that ISBE identified as a reason for slippage in 14A, was the fact that less students are enrolling in higher education following graduation. According to data collected by the Illinois Board of Higher Education, fall 2022 enrollment data overall was down 0.4% from fall 2021. In the last three years, Illinois has seen decreasing numbers in the students enrolling in higher education following high school completion. In the fall of 2019, 717,119 students were enrolled in higher education settings. In the fall of 2022, that number decreased to 676,156 (a difference of -5.71%). Since the fall of 2019, the enrollment in community college alone is down 17.72%. While the report from the Illinois Board of High Education, does not discuss reasons for this decrease, based on ISBEs 14B and 14C data, it could be hypothesized that students who previously may have enrolled in community college after exiting high school are instead entering the workforce through competitive employment or entering training programs.

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	2021	2022
Response Rate	28.85%	39.44%

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 a +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders as compared to the target group.

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 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.

The demographic representation of FFY 2022 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 was not a significant predictor of survey completion. Male students made up 63.69% of the survey group and 65.33% of the survey responses. Female students made up 36.31% of the survey group and 34.67% of the survey responses. 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. 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 four (4) racial/ethnic groups, three (3) exit types and ten (10) disability categories, survey result analyses indicated some statistically significant differences between students who did and did not respond to the survey in terms of three (3) race/ethnicity, two (2) exit types and two (2) primary disability category. Specifically, school leavers identifying as Black or Hispanic were less likely to complete the survey, as were youth who were identified with Specific Learning Disabilities and youth who Dropped Out. Youth identifying as Black who were no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time, they left school made up 21.05% of the survey group and 12.24% of the survey responses (an -8.81% difference). Youth who identified as Hispanic who were no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time, they left made up 25.83% of the survey group and 15.87% of the survey responses (a -9.96% difference). Youth identified with Specific Learning Disabilities made up 52.00% of the survey group and 46.72% of the responses (a -5.28% difference). Youth who dropped out made up 10.70% of the survey group and 7.05% of the survey group responses (a -3.65% difference). In contrast, school leavers identifying as White, Other Health Impairment and students who graduated with a regular diploma were more likely to complete the survey. Youth identifying as White who were no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time, they left school made up 45.31% of the survey group and 63.27% of the survey responses (a +17.72% difference). Youth who identified as having Other Health Impairment made up 16.53% of the survey group and 19.69% of the responses (a +3.16% difference). Youth who graduated with a regular diploma made up 84.70% of the survey group and 88.25% of the survey responses (a +3.55% difference).

It should be noted that during this year's survey, the largest LEA in the State did not complete any surveys. ISBE worked diligently to provide technical assistance to the district, through virtual meetings, email reminders, extended timelines and additional reminders when meeting with additional staff from the district. Despite ISBE's efforts the LEA, did not complete any surveys. ISBE feels this lack of completion created an impact to the representativeness data. For example, during FFY 2021 reporting students who identified as Hispanic and students who identified as having a Specific Learning Disability were more likely to complete the survey. Hispanic students made up 665 of the surveys that were sent. Of those 665 students who were to be surveyed, 358 (53.83%) were to be surveyed by the LEA. Students who identified as having a Specific Learning Disability made up 1346 of the surveys that were sent out. Of those 1346 students 426 were to be surveyed by the LEA (31.65%). In FFY 2021, students who identified as black were noted as being less likely to complete the survey, however the gap between the total percentage of the survey group and total percentage of survey group responses for students who identified as black increased by almost 2%. A total of 542 students who identified as black were to be surveyed. Of those 542 students who were to be surveyed, 237 (43.72%) were to be surveyed by the LEA.

In order to analyze if the lack of completion of the survey by the largest LEA impacted the representativeness of the survey results, ISBE analyzed the data for all LEAs in the survey with the exception of the largest LEA. Data shows that students who identified as black made up 15.37% of the surveys that were attempted and 12.24% of the survey responses. The statistical difference is -3.13% as compared to -8.81%. Students who identified as Hispanic made up 18.04% of the surveys attempted and 15.87% of the survey responses. The statistical difference is -2.17% compared to -9.96%. Students who identified as having a Specific Learning Disability made up 46.51% of the survey group and 46.72% of the responses. That is a statistical difference of -0.21% compared to -5.28%. Students who were identified as dropped out made up 9.70% of the survey group and 7.05% of the responses. The statistical difference is -2.65% compared to -3.65%. In contrast, white students made up 57.27% of the survey group and 63.27% of the survey responses. The statistical difference is +6.00% compared to +17.72%. Students identified as having Other Health Impairment made up 20.83% of the survey group and 19.69% of the survey responses. The statistical difference is -1.14% compared to +3.16%. Students who graduated high school with a regular diploma made up 90.30% of the survey group and 88.25% of the responses. That is a statistical difference of -2.05% compared to +3.55%.

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 14 survey includes a link to the 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 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 FFY 2023 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 assistance from local parent groups to provide information and outreach to support survey completion for underrepresented students and families. 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. To ensure the largest LEA completes survey activities for the FFY 2023 cycle, ISBE will work directly with the LEA's transition coordinator and team to provide support prior to and during the process. ISBE plans to start working with the transition team for this LEA in early 2024 to ensure the LEA is prepared to administer the survey. ISBE will also analyze the LEAs data closely to identify if there are any issues with the administration of the survey. ISBE staff plan to share the response data at regular intervals.

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 ISBE Special Education Department staff will work with the Information Technology Department to compile a detailed response data report at regular intervals during the survey timeframe to determine which districts, students/families and previously underrepresented subgroups will be targeted for follow up communications regarding survey completion. ISBE Special Education Department staff will continue to partner with the Harrisburg Project on providing email and phone call reminders about the survey, and technical assistance to districts who needed help with the survey completion. ISBE will explore additional technical assistance options, including partnering with special education cooperatives to assist LEAs with the completion of the surveys. ISBE will also work closely with administrators in the largest district in the state, to ensure the surveys for the district are completed for the next cycle. While ISBE continues to have the cycle list of LEAs posted on its website, ISBE will explore notifying LEAs earlier regarding the requirements to complete the survey for the 2023-2024 school year.

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.

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. Given a total statewide population of leavers between 1500 and 2500, ISBE needs approximately 350 respondents to achieve a 95% Confidence level with a plus or minus 5% confidence interval. ISBE has experienced a 40% respondent rate, so the target minimum number of students selected for the survey must be greater than 875. 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 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 detailed 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.

While ISBE ensures that the sample utilized for the survey is representative of leavers who had an IEP in place upon exiting high school, ISBE analyzed response data from underrepresented subgroups to identify if nonresponse bias had occurred. ISBE understands that given the largest LEA did not offer the survey to its students, which has impacted the representativeness of the survey respondents. Given this information ISBE analyzed the data excluding the largest LEA to establish if nonresponse bias did occur outside of the largest LEAs non completion of the survey. ISBE's analysis of this data still identified one underrepresented racial/ethnic group (students who identified as black). This subgroup was the third largest subgroup of the survey. This subgroup was also the third largest response group for the survey and only fell under the +/-3% threshold to be considered underrepresented by -0.13%. The adjusted response rate for this subgroup was 40.98% as compared to the adjusted response rate for the overall survey which was 50.47% (-9.49%). The average adjusted response rate for was 47.90% (-6.92%). The overall adjusted nonresponse rate was 49.53%. Students who identified as black had a nonresponse rate of 59.02% (-9.49%). The average nonresponse rate was 52.11% (-6.91%). Based on this information, ISBE determined that the statistical difference in response/nonresponse rates was not significant enough to identify nonresponse bias for the underrepresented subgroup.

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)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 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 2021 SPP/APR

The State reported on the representativeness of the data in the SPP 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 was not a significant predictor of survey completion. Survey result analyses also indicated that school leavers identifying as Black and Hispanic were less likely to complete the survey, as were youth who were identified with Specific Learning Disabilities and students who had dropped out of school. In contrast, school leavers identifying as White were more likely to complete the survey. As were students who were identified as Other Health Impairment and those who graduated with a diploma.

The State reported on the actions it is taking to address representativeness in the SPP 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." To ensure that future response data are more representative, ISBE includes NTACTION resource documents to the SPP 14 webpage and provides the link to the SPP 14 webpage in the SPP 14 survey application and the LEA survey notification letter. ISBE will load these resources directly into the SPP 14 application for the 2023-2024 survey.

14 - OSEP Response

14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2023 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 ED Facts 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 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	41
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	21

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 collected stakeholder feedback on its proposed SPP targets in multiple ways. 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
- Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (formerly ISAC)
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- 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 Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, 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, Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice, 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, regional superintendents, assistant regional superintendents, school business officials, and special education attorneys. In addition, 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. These meetings increased ISBE's capacity of diverse groups of parents and allowed them to have a voice in the development of targets and activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

Each session sought stakeholder feedback on if the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable. The 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. Once the proposed targets for SPP indicators were determined reasonable and achievable, ISBE recorded 16 separate SPP modules and posted them on the website. 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.

ISBE solicits broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR, associated targets, and target revisions through its primary stakeholder group, the Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (formerly known as the Illinois State Advisory Council, or ISAC). ISBE engaged with this stakeholder group, monthly, through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings during FY22. The role of the Council is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. The Council functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Department. It 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 Juvenile Justice, and the general public. ISBE staff have discussions with the Council throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE staff discussed baseline data, targets, current data, and improvement strategies with the Council at the June 2023 meeting. ISBE staff provided an overview of trend data and received feedback from the Council regarding specific indicator progress. Through discussions with the Council at the June 2023 meeting, no target revisions were identified to be made.

In addition to the Council, ISBE solicited input from many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. ISBE staff met with each stakeholder group either monthly or quarterly. These stakeholder groups include:

- Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group
- Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium
- Advancing Preschool Inclusion Advisory Group
- Harrisburg Project
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE)
- Illinois Elevating Special Educators Network Advisory Council
- Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs)
- Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET) project.

ISBE also shared SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences including the IAASE fall and winter conferences as well as the ISBE/Special Education Leadership Academy (SELA) Special Education Directors Conference.

Finally, progress for several of the SPP Indicators is aligned to the Illinois State Personnel Development Grant (IESE). The IESE Advisory Council met quarterly during FY22 to review progress made toward meeting the grant goals and objectives, and to provide council members an opportunity to give feedback to the IESE Network. The council continues to provide broad stakeholder input on the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the SSIP. IESE is comprised of members representing general and special education teachers, individuals with disabilities, Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, parents, PTIs, regular education administrators, related service providers, ROEs, special education administrators, state agency representatives, teacher unions, the Illinois New Teacher Collaborative, and university general and special education departments. ISBE staff met with the IESE Advisory Council multiple times throughout FY22. The IESE Advisory Council assisted ISBE staff with reviewing Indicator 17 trend data. Through these data review discussions, there were no identified revisions that needed to be made to Indicator 17.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2012	26.67%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	25.00% - 35.00%	25.00% - 35.00%	25.10%-35.10%	25.10%	25.10%
Data	32.43%	37.04%	16.67%	25.00%	10.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
21	41	10.00%	25.10%	51.22%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

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 = $(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i))$ 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 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 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1 Mediations held	313
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	76
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	145

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 collected stakeholder feedback on its proposed SPP targets in multiple ways. 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
- Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (formerly ISAC)
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- 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 Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, 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, Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice, 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, regional superintendents, assistant regional superintendents, school business officials, and special education attorneys. In addition, 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. These meetings increased ISBE's capacity of diverse groups of parents and allowed them to have a voice in the development of targets and activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

Each session sought stakeholder feedback on if the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable. The 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. Once the proposed targets for SPP indicators were determined reasonable and achievable, ISBE recorded 16 separate SPP modules and posted them on the website. 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.

ISBE solicits broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR, associated targets, and target revisions through its primary stakeholder group, the Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (formerly known as the Illinois State Advisory Council, or ISAC). ISBE engaged with this stakeholder group, monthly, through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings during FY22. The role of the Council is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. The Council functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Department. It 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 Juvenile Justice, and the general public. ISBE staff have discussions with the Council throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE staff discussed baseline data, targets, current data, and improvement strategies with the Council at the June 2023 meeting. ISBE staff provided an overview of trend data and received feedback from the Council regarding specific indicator progress. Through discussions with the Council at the June 2023 meeting, no target revisions were identified to be made.

In addition to the Council, ISBE solicited input from many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. ISBE staff met with each stakeholder group either monthly or quarterly. These stakeholder groups include:

- Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group
- Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium
- Advancing Preschool Inclusion Advisory Group
- Harrisburg Project
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE)
- Illinois Elevating Special Educators Network Advisory Council
- Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs)
- Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET) project.

ISBE also shared SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences including the IAASE fall and winter conferences as well as the ISBE/Special Education Leadership Academy (SELA) Special Education Directors Conference.

Finally, progress for several of the SPP Indicators is aligned to the Illinois State Personnel Development Grant (IESE). The IESE Advisory Council met quarterly during FY22 to review progress made toward meeting the grant goals and objectives, and to provide council members an opportunity to give feedback to the IESE Network. The council continues to provide broad stakeholder input on the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the SSIP. IESE is comprised of members representing general and special education teachers, individuals with disabilities, Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, parents, PTIs, regular education administrators, related service providers, ROEs, special education administrators, state agency representatives, teacher unions, the Illinois New Teacher Collaborative, and university general and special education departments. ISBE staff met with the IESE Advisory Council multiple times throughout FY22. The IESE Advisory Council assisted ISBE staff with reviewing Indicator 17 trend data. Through these data review discussions, there were no identified revisions that needed to be made to Indicator 17.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2012	66.67%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	66.00%	67.00%	67.00%	67.00%	67.00%
Data	59.11%	62.37%	66.67%	50.00%	62.70%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
76	145	313	62.70%	67.00%	70.61%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

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) (SiMR) 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 2022 through February 2027, 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) 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 SPPs/APRs, 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., February 1, 2023). 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 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024).

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 (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (e.g., 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 2022 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024) 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)

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

The current theory of action is on the ISBE website: www.isbe.net/Pages/SPP-APR-Indicator-17.aspx

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	Current Relationship	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	11.00%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of 4th Grade Children with IEPs Scoring at or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards for English Language Arts	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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
1,896	19,089	8.71%	10.00%	9.93%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide the data source for the FFY 2022 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.

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) English/Language Arts assessment 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), the Illinois Elevating Special Educators (IESE) Network's evaluation plan includes the following additional data collected during the period of January, 2023 through December, 2023: Professional Development (PD) Post-Surveys, High Quality Professional Development (HQPD) Checklists, Evidence-Based Professional Development Worksheets, The Illinois Implementation Fidelity Instrument (Illinois IFI), systems screening tools, State Capacity Assessments (SCA), and Regional Capacity Assessments (RCA). The IESE Network is a statewide system of professional learning funded by a five-year IDEA Part D State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG). The overall goal of the IESE Network is to improve outcomes for students with disabilities by providing research-based professional development (PD) and technical assistance (TA) to educators supporting these students. Additionally, the IESE Network supports special educators through mentoring and coaching. The SPDG outcomes are aligned with SSIP outcomes. PD post-surveys are administered to gather data regarding participant perceptions of their growth in knowledge and skills, the likelihood of implementing what was learned in their classrooms, and their perception of the effect of PD experiences upon the success of their students with disabilities. HQPD Checklists are fidelity measures used extensively as assessments within SPDGs. Evidence-based PD worksheets provide data for clear expectations for providers and trainers of the PD, accountability for the quality of the PD and coaching, utilization of effective, research-based adult learning methodology, and the collection of data with high fidelity to the objectives. The Illinois IFI collects qualitative and quantitative data on how training content is implemented in specific classrooms. Systems screening tools allow the IESE Network to ascertain districts' needs pertaining to state determined areas. IESE Network team members can then target support to those specific needs. The SCA and RCA measure the capacity of the state and each region to implement IESE Network goals. The expectation is that capacity will grow over the years of the SPDG, including perceptions about resources, leadership, data systems, and communication. Data that have been collected at this time include post-PD surveys, evidence-based PD worksheets, systems screening tools, the SCA, and RCA. IAR Data from 2021-2022

In the May 2023 SPDG Annual Performance Report to OSEP, IAR data were included on measures of student achievement and success: (1) IAR data for students with disabilities, comparing the data of those educators who have participated in IESE Network activities (and, therefore, SSIP 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. While all educators in the state have access to, at minimum, universal supports, not all educators choose to do so.

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)

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

The current evaluation plan is on the ISBE website: 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.

The pilot for the Illinois IFI was completed in February 2023 and is now considered part of the overall IESE Network evaluation plan. An additional fidelity measure, the Coaching Observation Instrument (Illinois COI), which measures the fidelity of coaching implementation has been developed. The Illinois COI is currently being piloted with the coaching systems throughout the state.

If yes, describe a rationale or justification for the changes to the SSIP evaluation plan.

The Illinois IFI, developed by the SPDG/IESE Project Evaluator and approved by the IESE Leadership and the OSEP SPDG Program Director, allowed for a broader scope of PD applications with fidelity than the originally designated RESET Rubrics. The Illinois IFI did not, however, address observable fidelity of content implementation. Therefore, with input from other OSEP SPDGs and IESE Network staff previously coaching, the Illinois COI was developed by the IESE Network Grant Coordinator, Project Director, and Program Director. The tool is a fidelity measure to determine the extent to which the coaching recommendations of EBPs are implemented effectively and efficiently to the nearest point of the student. A coaching fidelity measure is a required component of the SPDG and cannot be self-reported. The COI fulfills these requirements.

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:

The SSIP improvement strategy addresses providing educators with differentiated professional learning activities (training, TA, mentoring, and coaching) focused on literacy, social-emotional learning (SEL), and systems development and improvement. Activities associated with the improvement strategy focus on delivering research-based professional learning activities to 1) enhance the effectiveness of staff who support students with disabilities and 2) build seamless and sustainable delivery systems for specialized populations of learners. ISBE collaborates with the IESE Network to address the improvement strategy and activities. Based on districts' LEA Determinations, IESE staff utilize a universal screening tool and collaborative analysis guide to identify a district's needs and provide targeted differentiated support. The IESE Network screening tool focuses on helping districts identify 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 low performance for each identified indicator. This infrastructure design allows IESE staff to identify and plan differentiated support for the districts. Utilizing this process in conjunction with assessment tools allows the IESE Network team to gain stakeholder input at the local level as well as base services on

data to determine individual district needs.

Districts designated as Meets Requirements or Needs Assistance (NA)-Year 1 through their LEA Determination fall in the Universal Tier 1 level of support under the ISBE Special Education Accountability and Support System. IESE Network staff contact these districts in one of two ways. First, an informational email from IESE Network Staff allows districts to request additional information. Second, districts can inquire about available support and services through an online referral form on the IESE Network website (www.iesenetwork.org). If Tier 1 districts agree to partner and want individualized support, IESE Network staff meet with district and building leaders to review data and make recommendations on the most relevant and valuable resources to include in a professional learning plan. The IESE Network currently supports 39 Tier 1 Districts. During the Spring 22-23 school year, the IESE Network supported 34 Tier 1 districts.

Districts designated as NA for Two or More Consecutive Years (NA2) through their LEA Determination fall in the Targeted Tier 2 level of support under the ISBE Special Education Accountability and Support System. NA2 districts are assigned an ISBE Principal Consultant and advised of state and national technical assistance resources that may help them address the area(s) of needed support. The IESE Network is one of these available resources. During the reporting period, the IESE Network worked with one NA2 district by providing professional development.

Districts designated as Needs Intervention (NI), Needs Intervention for Three or More Consecutive Years (NI3), or Needs Substantial Intervention through their LEA Determination, fall in the Intensive Tier 3 level of support under the ISBE Special Education Accountability and Support System. IESE staff collaborates with ISBE Principal Consultants to facilitate improvement planning and provide individualized oversight, technical assistance, mentoring, and coaching support. In Spring 2023, the IESE Network supported one NI district, using the district's improvement plan as the foundation for their services. Beginning with the 2023-2024 school year, ISBE requires all NI districts to engage with IESE as a component of their TA support.

To monitor the integrity and implementation of this process, the IESE Network Grant Coordinator meets every other week with each area team and the statewide team on opposite weeks. During these meetings, IESE Network team members report on the Continuous Improvement Agreements (IESE Network supports and services contracts) with districts as well as plan progress. The Grant Evaluator also attends these meetings to review areawide and statewide data and collaborate on district improvement plans to ensure data collection procedures and timelines are met. Data from current mentoring sessions and/or professional learning sessions are also reviewed and used to plan future sessions. The ISBE Program Director also attends the statewide IESE Network 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.

The infrastructure improvement strategies implemented during the reporting period were training, technical assistance (TA), mentoring, and coaching. Below is a description of the short and intermediate outcomes achieved, measures used to assess outcomes, and how achievement was communicated.

Short-term Outcomes

Short-term outcomes focused on increasing knowledge of literacy, SEL, and systems development/improvement through a state area systems framework of PD and/or TA. Area PD participants were surveyed and indicated whether the statements were evident to no extent (1), a small extent (2), some extent (3), or a significant extent (4). Participants also indicated their perceptions of content knowledge and implementation prior to and after the training on a sliding scale (1, not very well; 100, extremely well).

Literacy Trainings

- 7 trainings held

- 368 educators and paraprofessionals attended

- Trainings covered evidence-based practices (EBPs) such as phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension across grade spans and tiers

- Survey results of literacy PD sessions (228 educators, 20 paraprofessionals)

Educators

- perceived increased knowledge (M=3.51, SD=.63)

- increased ability to apply knowledge (M=3.49, SD=.65)

- intent to incorporate knowledge into teaching (M=3.58, SD=.60)

- believed the PD increased student success (M=3.52, SD=.63)

- increased the likelihood of their remaining in education (M=3.29, SD=.89)

- significant increase in perceptions about knowledge before training (M=63.14, SD=19.54) compared to after (M=80.65, SD=13.21) ($t(228)=16.509$, $p<.001$)

- significant increase in perceptions about implementation of content before training (M=63.88, SD=20.74) compared to after (M=83.86, SD=12.93) ($t(225)=16.380$, $p<.001$).

Paraprofessionals

- perceived increased knowledge (M=2.95, SD=.59)

- increased ability to apply knowledge (M=2.90, SD=.77)

- increase in their understanding of their role (M=2.71, SD=.96)

- believed the PD would increase student success (M=2.86, SD=.79)

- increased the likelihood of their remaining in education (M=2.57, SD=.93)

- increase in perceptions of knowledge prior to the training (M=59.14, SD=18.36) compared to after (M=71.76, SD=20.26) ($t(20)=3.704$, $p=.001$)

- significant increase in perceptions about implementation of content before the training (M=59.48, SD=19.76) compared to after (M=75.76, SD=20.41) ($t(20)=5.333$, $p<.001$).

Remote Professional Development Conversations (PDC; 30 respondents to the Post-PD survey)

Educators

- were able to gain knowledge from other participants (M=3.45, SD=.69)

- affirm things that could be used in their own classrooms (M=3.48, SD=.69)

- apply the content to their own professional practice (M=3.40, SD=.68)

- believed PD session would increase student success (M=3.47, SD=.68)

SEL

- 41 sessions held

- 829 educators and paraprofessionals attended

- 8 conference sessions delivered

- Sessions addressed EBPs relating to behavioral and executive functions, de-escalation, trauma-informed practices, building positive relationships,

function-based classroom and individual interventions and functional behavioral assessments.

Survey results of SEL PD sessions (330 educators, 24 paraprofessionals)

Educators

- perceived increased knowledge of students with disabilities (M=3.48, SD=.67)
- increased ability to apply the knowledge (M=3.49, SD=.69)
- increased likelihood of incorporating it into their teaching (M=3.56, SD=.64).
- believed PD would increase student success (M=3.50, SD=.66)
- significant increase in perceptions of SEL knowledge prior to the training (M=62.55, SD=23.37) compared to after (M=81.47, SD=14.19) ($t(329)=16.210$, $p<.001$)
- significant increase in perceptions about implementation of content before the training (M=61.35, SD=24.40) compared to after (M=82.71, SD=15.73) ($t(328)=17.086$, $p<.001$).

Paraprofessionals

- increased knowledge (M=3.63, SD=.50) or understanding of content (M=3.67, SD=.48)
- increased ability to apply this knowledge (M=3.67, SD=.48)
- increased understanding of their role (M=3.46, SD=.59).

SEL Remote PDCs focused on "Teaching Students to Manage Behavior with De-escalation."

Participants (N=67)

- learned importance of being pre-emptive to avoid crises (M=3.48, SD=.69)
- learned strategies for individualized calming techniques for students (M=3.46, SD=.67)
- learned how to identify possible provoking stimuli (M=3.32, SD=.69)
- believed PD would contribute to the success of the students with disabilities in their school (M=3.42, SD=.66).

Systems Development and Improvement trainings

- 101 development and improvement trainings held
- 1873 educators and paraprofessionals attended
- Sessions addressed EBPs such as co-teaching, universal design for learning, and differentiation

Survey results for Systems Development and Improvement trainings (982 respondents)

Educators

- reported increased knowledge (M=3.48, SD=.64)
- increased application to practice (M=3.49, SD=.65)
- will incorporate knowledge gained into professional practice (M=3.57, SD=.62)
- will reflect upon, evaluate, and adjust teaching because of these sessions (M=3.56, SD=.62).
- reported PD would increase student success (M=3.52, SD=.65).
- reported lower perceptions of content knowledge before PD (M=62.91, SD=22.65) compared to after (M=80.46, SD=15.38) ($t(966)=30.092$, $p<.001$).
- reported lower levels of implementation of the content before PD (M=63.16, SD=23.54) compared to after, (M=82.69, SD=15.87) ($t(966)=30.270$, $p<.001$)

Paraprofessionals

- reported increased professional knowledge (M=3.21, SD=.76)
- increased ability to apply the knowledge to students with disabilities with whom and/or in classrooms where they worked (M=3.11, SD=.74)
- increased understanding of their role (M=3.22, SD=.80)
- believed sessions would increase success of students with disabilities (M=3.22, SD=.75).

Literacy, SEL, and systems development and improvement training outcomes were communicated with PD providers and stakeholders through data reports and feedback loops. Data were used to inform content and activities to best meet participants' needs. This directly supports SiMR achievement as well as sustainability.

Intermediate Outcomes

Intermediate outcomes focused on the implementation of seamless and sustainable delivery systems through PD and TA. IESE Network staff met with districts to establish partnerships and identify support based on ISBE LEA Determinations and other data. They used Learning Forward's PD standards and the HQPD Checklist to implement research-based professional learning experiences. They worked with districts in a train-the-trainer model for sustainability of professional learning and seamless delivery of services.

Intermediate outcomes also focused on enhancing the effectiveness of educators who support students with disabilities through coaching and mentoring. Surveys indicated the extent to which statements about literacy support received through the IESE Network supported their knowledge, teaching, and professional growth: (1) to no extent; (2) to a small extent; (3) to some extent; or (4) to a significant extent. For each of the survey items, none of the respondents (N=27) believed that coaching and mentoring had no effect. Participants perceived that the mentoring and coaching increased their knowledge and understanding of content (M=3.44, SD=.64), had been directly applied to their classroom (M=3.59, SD=.64), and positively affected student success (M=3.70, SD=.54). Educators mentored and/or coached by Network staff select the area(s) on which to focus. Currently, Network staff are coaching 9 educators in literacy, 17 in SEL, 22 in systems and are mentoring 9 educators in literacy, 16 in SEL and 23 in systems. With special educators having increased knowledge, reflecting upon that knowledge to incorporate it into their practice, applying it to their teaching, and believing that it will increase their students' success, it is anticipated that this will positively affect SiMR percentages.

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:

1. continuing to collect data to determine the effects of the differentiated professional development upon multiple measures of student achievement and success
2. grow the capacity of the IESE Network to implement effective educational innovations

The infrastructure improvement strategies of the IESE Network are expected to affect the achievement and success of students with disabilities in all partnering schools. This will be measured with (1) IAR data for students with disabilities, comparing the data of educators who participated in IESE Network activities with the statewide averages; (2) IAR data that examines growth in achievement, comparing data from students who were in classrooms of educators who participated in the IESE Network and those educators who did not; (3) graduation; and (4) student suspension/expulsion data, examining whether any differences were evident between educators who participated in the IESE Network as compared to state averages. The data help inform whether the SSIP intermediate outcomes of enhanced effectiveness of educators who support students with disabilities and improved

outcomes for students with disabilities are met. The expectation is that the activities of the IESE Network will affect student achievement, as measured by the IAR scores.

While PD provides content knowledge, coaching educators is more effective at building skills which can directly impact increased student outcomes. As a statewide system of professional learning, a structured coaching system with specific processes and procedures as well as a fidelity instrument were necessary. Documents to guide coaches through conversations around high-leverage practices (HLPs) and evidence-based practice (EBP) selection were created along with a coaching observation tool. The tool outlines observable HLPs and skills which are then transferred to the Illinois Coaching Observation Instrument (COI), the IESE Network's coaching fidelity instrument. At minimum, pre- and post-observations are completed during the coaching cycle which is individualized for each educator. A system pilot began September 1, 2023 with an end date anticipated in February 2024. Next steps include reviewing the coaching system as well as data on coaching's impact on educators' skill development and student outcomes. Data analyzed from the COI are anticipated to help inform supports coaches need, and, as a result, coaching practices are anticipated to improve. Two instruments developed by the State Implementation and Scaling-up Evidence-based Practices (SISEP) Center were used for systems measures: the SCA and the RCA. SCA data were collected in September 2021 and October 2022 and indicated significant growth in the capacity of the IESE Network to implement effective innovations. Leadership data increased from 50% to 88.89%, Infrastructure & Resources data from 83.30% to 91.67%, and Communication & Engagement data from 55.60% to 88.89%. Each of the subcategories exceeds 80%, which is considered "fluency" in the instrument evaluation, meaning the IESE Network has reached fluency in all aspects of the SCA. The following items were identified as action steps and have been addressed throughout 2023: 1) communication of an overarching data plan; 2) clarity of roles and expectations; and 3) enhanced communication about and engagement with statewide stakeholder groups. Based on the results listed above, per recommendations from an SCA developer, the SCA will be administered once per year going forward. The next administration of the SCA will occur on February 29, 2024 at the quarterly in-person meeting. The IESE Network will utilize results and action steps from the SCA to improve the state systems of support and, as a result, it is anticipated improvement in the regional systems of support will occur.

The RCA similarly measures capacity but focuses on the region versus the state. In focusing upon data from September 2022 to September 2023, all areas made significant gains in the capacity to implement IESE Network initiatives. Leadership data improved from 97.17% to 100.0%, Competency from 68.9% to 89.98%, Organization from 64.44% to 97.78%, and Stage-Based Functioning from 89.98% to 95.34%. Each of the subcategories exceeds 80%, which is considered "fluency" in the instrument evaluation, meaning that the IESE Network has reached fluency in all aspects of the RCA. Following the administration of the September 2023 RCA, participants were asked to consider some action steps based upon the conversations surrounding the items of the RCA. The action steps identified by IESE Network staff which are to be completed by the next administration of the RCA scheduled for September 2024 are: 1) continued implementation and fidelity assessment of the IESE Network coaching system; and 2) compilation of written documentation. The IESE Network will utilize results and action steps from the RCA to improve the regional systems of support which is anticipated to result in stronger district systems. The IESE Network Leadership Team will continue to review SCA and RCA data, discuss needed adjustments, and plan next steps.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

The SSIP continued its EBP focus in literacy, SEL, and systems development during the reporting period. EBPs are listed below:

Literacy

- Explicit Instruction
- Evidence-based Literacy Instruction surrounding phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, writing, and oracy
- Establishing Literacy-Rich Environments
- Multi-Sensory Literacy Activities
- Scaffolded Supports
- Flexible Grouping

SEL

- Building Positive Relationships
- Function-Based Behavior Interventions
- Classroom Management System
- Trauma-Informed Practices
- De-Escalation Strategies

Systems Development

- Co-Teaching
- Universal Design for Learning (UDL)
- Differentiation
- Positive and Constructive Behavioral and Academic Feedback

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

The National Reading Panel cited the Five Essential Components to literacy instruction: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Thus, evidence-based literacy instruction includes teaching the five essential components as well as writing and oracy. Explicit instruction of these components provides models, multiple opportunities for practice, various methods in which to practice, and continuous feedback. Phonemic awareness activities include activities that allow students to manipulate, substitute, and delete word sounds while phonics instruction allows practices of letter-sound correspondence and decoding skills including multisyllabic words for older students. Decodable readers built into a structured literacy program are necessary. Fluency activities include choral reading, paired reading, and text variety. Text exposure, discussions, and word origins (older students) build vocabulary. Students need opportunities to engage with texts (predicting, visualizing, questioning, summarizing). Older students are also provided opportunities to analyze, interpret, and infer. When considering practice opportunities, multi-sensory literacy activities to include visual, auditory, kinesthetic, and tactile experiences enhance memory and learning such as say, touch, spell in phonics. Flexible student grouping can also be used to practice skills. This allows students to collaborate with various students of different or similar ability levels. In turn, this also allows for scaffolding of skills which direct students to build on previous experiences to learn new skills. At all grade levels, students need to be exposed to literacy-rich environments which include not only at-desk materials, but also in classroom stations/centers, wall decor, and across content areas.

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. Building positive relationships with students have been shown to increase student achievement (academic and behavioral). Ways in which to build these relationships include student interests, family and cultural knowledge, greeting students at the door, community circles, and listening deeply. It is also important for teachers to have a consistent classroom management system which includes positively worded expectations, established and well-communicated procedures, visual cues

for students, and modeled behaviors. As teachers consider individual student behavior, they must understand behavioral functions (attention, escape/avoidance, sensory, tangible). Interventions based on behavioral function are more effective and efficient than those that are not. Trainings address educator decision-making regarding behavioral functions and possible function-based strategies. Other SEL trainings include ways to de-escalate behavior and work with students who have experienced trauma. De-escalation includes communication, choices, co-regulation, and redirection. Trauma-informed practices include creating safe environments, building positive relationships, fostering expected outcomes, and recognizing triggers and responses.

Systems development and improvement EBP include co-teaching, UDL, differentiation, and feedback. Co-teaching provides more opportunities for students with disabilities to remain in the general education setting. Trainings review co-teaching models as well as when to use and how to effectively implement them. While UDL is a framework for designing instruction for a broad range of learners, differentiation is considering different learning in lesson delivery. To effectively reach more students, educators should also consider adaptations (accommodations and modifications) needed based on individual student characteristics, preferences and needs. Throughout PD, coaching, mentoring, and TA, training educators, support personnel, and leadership on positive and constructive feedback leads to academic gains and appropriate behavior increases.

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.

With increased educator knowledge in literacy EBPs, positive changes in teacher practice would also be expected. Enhanced effectiveness of educators who support students with disabilities is one of the SSIP's intended intermediate outcomes. Early literacy acquisition is vital to learning. All implemented literacy EBPs relate to high quality, evidence-based literacy instruction. When students have access to EBPs, they learn to read in grades K-2, and by 4th grade, they can transition from learning to read to reading to learn. Improved outcomes for students with disabilities from implemented academic EBPs is one of the intermediate outcomes of the SSIP. It also relates to the long-term outcome, or SiMR. Professional development and individual teacher mentoring and coaching on explicit instruction, evidence-based literacy instruction components and activities (including multi-sensory activities), establishing literacy-rich environments, scaffolding, and flexible grouping have been provided to teachers around the state through the IESE Network's universal supports and services. Research from the last decade has repeatedly indicated the need for these foundational concepts, which are vital for early literacy success. Technical assistance at the district level for district-wide and sustaining implementation are also imperative for successful transfer to practice.

SEL continues to be a secondary focus of the SSIP. Increased educator knowledge regarding SEL is one of the short-term objectives of the SSIP. With increased educator knowledge in SEL, positive changes in teacher practice would also be expected. Enhanced effectiveness of educators who support students with disabilities is one of the SSIP's intended intermediate outcomes. Research indicates students' abilities to self-regulate emotions 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. Educators must be supported through training, coaching, and mentoring to implement EBPs such as building relationships with students, trauma-informed practices, de-escalation techniques, consistent classroom management, and function-based interventions which all impact student outcomes. District-level technical assistance provides leaders with ways in which to support teacher and school personnel with policies and procedures. SEL supports acquisition of academic skills throughout a student's school career. Improved outcomes for students with disabilities from implemented environmental EBPs is one of the intermediate outcomes of the SSIP.

During conversations with stakeholders (i.e., partnering districts and the Advisory Council), systems development and improvement was identified as a high need. Without adequate, effective, and efficient systems in place, literacy and social-emotional learning can be impacted. Literacy and SEL are also often embedded within other systems. For instance, literacy implementation examples are included within co-teaching PD and coaching. SEL is also discussed as an imperative educational environment consideration within UDL and Differentiation. District-level policies and procedures are highly impacted by this area. Therefore, short term outcomes on increased knowledge and intermediate outcomes educator effectiveness as well as seamless and sustainable delivery systems for specialized populations of learners are addressed.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

Two instruments were identified to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change: the High-Quality Professional Development (HQPDP) Checklist and the Illinois IFI. Another instrument, the Coaching Observation Instrument (COI) will be piloted from September 2023 through February 2024 with data to be available in the next SSIP reporting cycle.

HQPDP Checklist

The HQPD Checklist is used for each of the PD sessions held during January, 2023 through December, 2023 throughout the IESE Network to ensure that PD provided meets the quality standards in Illinois. While creating and refining PD, IESE Network staff consider each HQPD indicator and complete the checklist after implementation. The Project Evaluator reviewed the compiled data and shared them with the IESE Network Leadership Team and IESE Advisory Council. Data are used to reflect on current practices and plan for needed adjustments. The Project Evaluator also reported this data to ISBE and OSEP. There were 144 HQPD Checklists completed for this reporting cycle. The target identified to OSEP for the IESE Network is that 90% of the PD sessions, or 130 sessions, will be conducted with 90% of them (or 117) being high quality. The IESE Network has exceeded that target, with 127 of the HQPD Checklists (or 98%) of the PD sessions identified as high quality. However, even with this high level of quality, there were four items on the HQPD Checklist that the IESE Network focused upon for improvements:

- (1) Prepares participants to engage in the content by assigning activities in advance;
- (2) facilitates opportunities for each participant to practice applying the critical concepts;
- (3) engages each participant in assessment of knowledge/skill acquisition with corrective feedback; and
- (4) establishes ongoing, two-way communication (coaching) to improve the implementation fidelity of critical concepts.

In addition to using the HQPD Checklist to ensure fidelity of high-quality PD, the Illinois IFI was developed by the IESE Network. The IFI collects data from individuals who have participated in the training sessions offered by the IESE Network. There are three quantitative questions, each followed by an open-ended qualitative question, asking about:

1. whether and to what extent the elements from the training session were implemented into their classroom and professional practice.
2. perspectives of the effect that implementation of the training elements had upon their students with disabilities; and
3. a reflection regarding how they plan to incorporate these elements, long-term, into their professional practice.

The data since its March 2023 implementation indicate that 97% of respondents report that they implement either all (47.2%) or some (49.8%) of the PD strategies they learn. Participants believe the implementation positively affected their students (82.6%), and that 71.5% of participants will fully

implement this content into their professional practice, either with few or no changes (49.1%) or with some significant tweaks (22.3%). An additional 26.8% state that they plan to partially incorporate the PD strategies they received into their practice.

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.

The IESE Network used feedback loops which support decisions to continue ongoing use of our additional EBPs. In IESE Area and State Team Meetings, the Project Evaluator reviewed recent data to discuss what is going well and areas for growth. IESE staff provided suggestions for needed implementation and/or training updates. The IESE Network Advisory Council was also used as part of the feedback loop. Members provided feedback on specific data points such as IESE Network impact on student outcome data which directly link to EBPs and SiMR.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

Data from the post professional development surveys, the State Capacity Assessment Tool, the Regional Capacity Assessment Tool, the Illinois IFI, and the High-Quality Professional Development Checklists will be reviewed to determine areas of strength and needed improvement of IESE Network activities. The post-professional development surveys will enable the IESE Network Leadership Team to determine the extent to which the professional development, mentoring cohorts, and remote professional development conversations have contributed to perceptions of content knowledge gains, applications into classrooms, and further understanding of evidence-based literacy and SEL practices and their effects upon student achievement. Professional development will continue to be provided by the IESE Network focusing on literacy and SEL EBPs with emphasis being placed on those found to be most beneficial based on data in increasing educator effectiveness and student achievement. It is anticipated educators' perceptions of their effectiveness will increase, as well as an increase in student achievement by using focused literacy and SEL EBPs.

Systems development and improvement EBP PD will continue to be provided by IESE Network to address developing seamless and sustainable delivery systems for specialized populations of learners. Data from the State and Regional Capacity Assessments will be utilized in conjunction with post professional development surveys 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. In addition, results from the COI pilot will provide valuable insight into where adjustments in the coaching model will need to be made. Strong state and regional systems create strong district-level systems. It is anticipated educator effectiveness will increase, and therefore, student achievement by having and providing PD on systems development and improvement.

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.

The assessment instruments being used by the IESE Network Project Evaluator to determine the extent to which the IESE Network is meeting its stated outcomes, are providing data that identify the strengths, weaknesses, and next steps toward improvement for the SPDG. Data from the administration of both the SCA and the RCA have indicated that the capacity for the state and the region to implement the effective EBPs identified by the IESE Network are strong, as well as uncovering areas of improvement, as described in previous SSIP sections. The HQPD Checklist provides data on the quality of the PD being provided through the members of the IESE Network staff, as measured against a validated instrument regularly used and recommended by OSEP. This instrument, in partnership with data from the post-PD surveys, provides data on the quality and perceptions of the PD provided across the state. As reported, the data from these instruments are reviewed and discussed in weekly Quick Reports to the IESE Network areas, in bi-weekly meetings of the IESE Network leadership team, in quarterly in-person meetings of the IESE Network leadership team, and in annual IESE Network leadership retreats, always with the eye of using the data to make next-step decisions about providing support throughout the state of Illinois to elevating special educators and improving outcomes of students with disabilities. Finally, the Illinois IFI collects data on how high-quality PD across Illinois is being implemented in the classrooms of those who participated in the support provided by the IESE Network. Data from the administration of this instrument are reported above and have been discussed at the December 2023 in-person quarterly meeting of the IESE Network, to determine next steps for increasing the EBP implementation in our state's classrooms. Based upon the data provided throughout this report, the IESE Network and ISBE do not believe any changes are necessary at this time in implementing the SSIP.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

ISBE collected stakeholder feedback on its proposed SPP targets in multiple ways. 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
- Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (formerly ISAC)
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- 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 Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, 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, Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice, 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, regional superintendents, assistant regional superintendents, school business officials, and special education attorneys. In addition, 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. These meetings increased ISBE's capacity of diverse groups of parents and allowed them to have a voice in the development of targets and activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

Each session sought stakeholder feedback on if the proposed SPP targets were reasonable and achievable. The 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. Once the proposed targets for SPP indicators were determined reasonable and achievable, ISBE recorded 16 separate SPP modules and posted them on the website. 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.

ISBE solicits broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR, associated targets, and target revisions through its primary stakeholder group, the Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (formerly known as the Illinois State Advisory Council, or ISAC). ISBE engaged with this stakeholder group, monthly, through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings during FY22. The role of the Council is to advise the Governor, Legislature, and ISBE on current issues relating to the education of children and youth with disabilities. The Council functions as the main stakeholder group for the ISBE Special Education Department. It 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 Juvenile Justice, and the general public. ISBE staff have discussions with the Council throughout a calendar year regarding the collection and reporting processes for the indicators identified in the SPP. ISBE staff discussed baseline data, targets, current data, and improvement strategies with the Council at the June 2023 meeting. ISBE staff provided an overview of trend data and received feedback from the Council regarding specific indicator progress. Through discussions with the Council at the June 2023 meeting, no target revisions were identified to be made.

In addition to the Council, ISBE solicited input from many other stakeholders to address specific indicators within the SPP/APR. ISBE staff met with each stakeholder group either monthly or quarterly. These stakeholder groups include:

- Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Stakeholder Group
- Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Stakeholders Consortium
- Advancing Preschool Inclusion Advisory Group
- Harrisburg Project
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE)
- Illinois Elevating Special Educators Network Advisory Council
- Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs)
- Support and Technical Assistance Regionally (STARNET) project.

ISBE also shared SPP information with stakeholders throughout the state via various conferences including the IAASE fall and winter conferences as well as the ISBE/Special Education Leadership Academy (SELA) Special Education Directors Conference.

Finally, progress for several of the SPP Indicators is aligned to the Illinois State Personnel Development Grant (IESE). The IESE Advisory Council met quarterly during FY22 to review progress made toward meeting the grant goals and objectives, and to provide council members an opportunity to give feedback to the IESE Network. The council continues to provide broad stakeholder input on the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the SSIP. IESE is comprised of members representing general and special education teachers, individuals with disabilities, Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, parents, PTIs, regular education administrators, related service providers, ROEs, special education administrators, state agency representatives, teacher unions, the Illinois New Teacher Collaborative, and university general and special education departments. ISBE staff met with the IESE Advisory Council multiple times throughout FY22. The IESE Advisory Council assisted ISBE staff with reviewing Indicator 17 trend data. Through these data review discussions, there were no identified revisions that needed to be made to Indicator 17.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

ISBE engages with the SPDG/IESE Network Advisory Council as the main stakeholder group for SPP Indicator 17. Council members include representatives from ISBE, regional education offices, institutes of higher education, district general and special education administration, special education organization leaders, and parents. During council meetings stakeholders were asked to provide feedback on current trends and needs they were encountering in their settings as well as ways to better engage educators, administrators, and families. Needs included more PD on the Science of Reading, building content knowledge especially around literacy, trauma-informed practices, behavior, and inclusive practices. Administrators need more training around special education systems and system impact on student outcomes. Stakeholders also suggested developing on-demand training for early career educators as a universal support that any educator can access on the IESE Network's website. This would provide needed training on high-leverage practices prior to the beginning of the school year and specifically relate to literacy, SEL, and systems development which coincide with Indicator 17. Stakeholders stressed the importance of behavior training as well as literacy resources especially at the upper grade levels. Conversation around linking the videos to high-leverage practices is important as they may help cover the research to practice gap coming out of teacher preparation programs. Districts are also experiencing an increase of uncertified teachers serving in special education settings. Such training videos will provide access to training some educators may not have.

In addition, data updates were shared with council members on RCA results, the Illinois IFI, and the SPDG APR. Stakeholders were pleased to hear about assessment data indicating that the gap between students with and without disabilities was decreasing and more students with disabilities were progressing toward improved state assessment scores. Stakeholders were asked to provide feedback on student attendance as well as suspension/expulsions and ways to address these needs which can directly impact student outcomes. Recommendations for ways the IESE Network can address these areas centered around systems development and training such as building positive relationships, alternatives to suspensions, and behavior training. Stakeholders were also provided a brief overview of the statewide coaching system including the COI pilot being conducted. Another stakeholder group IESE Network engaged with for feedback and recommendations is the PD participants. Through surveys supplied after PD activities held throughout 2023, participants provided feedback on their learning needs and recommendations for improving IESE Network supports.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

NO

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.

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

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:

Dr. Nakia M. Douglas

Title:

Acting State Director

Email:

ndouglas@isbe.net

Phone:

773-202-6990

Submitted on:

04/22/24 4:54:29 PM

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix

Illinois 2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination (1)

Percentage (%)	Determination
95.00%	Meets Requirements

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

Section	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	20	19	95.00%
Compliance	20	19	95.00%

(1) For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2024: Part B."

2024 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements

Reading Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment (2)	Grade 4		
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8		
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	25%	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	95%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	28%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	93%	1

Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 4		
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8		
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	46%	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	92%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	25%	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	94%	1

(2) Statewide assessments include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment.

Exiting Data Elements

Exiting Data Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out	12	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma**	84	2

**When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. §300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, “the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential.”

2024 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator (3)	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021 (4)	Score
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation	99.55%	YES	2
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	98.34%	YES	2
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	98.67%	YES	2
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	97.62%		2
Timely State Complaint Decisions	91.55%		1
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	100.00%		2
Longstanding Noncompliance			2
Programmatic Specific Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	None		

(3) The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at:

https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2024_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf

(4) This column reflects full correction, which is factored into the scoring only when the compliance data are $\geq 5\%$ and $< 10\%$ for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, and $\geq 90\%$ and $< 95\%$ for Indicators 11, 12, and 13.

Data Rubric

Illinois

FFY 2022 APR (1)

Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data

APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3A	1	1
3B	1	1
3C	1	1
3D	1	1
4A	1	1
4B	1	1
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8	1	1
9	1	1
10	1	1
11	1	1
12	1	1
13	1	1
14	1	1
15	1	1
16	1	1
17	1	1

APR Score Calculation

Subtotal	21
Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2022 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
Grand Total - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	26

(1) In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

618 Data (2)

Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 8/30/23	1	1	1	3
Personnel Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Discipline Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	0	2
State Assessment Due Date: 1/10/24	1	1	1	3
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/15/23	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/3/23	1	1	1	3

618 Score Calculation

Subtotal	20
Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.23809524) =	24.76

(2) In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.23809524 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

Indicator Calculation

A. APR Grand Total	26
B. 618 Grand Total	24.76
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	50.76
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0.00
Denominator	52.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator) (3) =	0.9762
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	97.62

(3) Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.23809524.

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2024 Submission

SPP/APR Data

1) Valid and Reliable Data - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

Part B 618 Data

1) Timely – A State will receive one point if it submits all *EDFacts* files or the entire *EMAPS* survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

618 Data Collection	EDFacts Files/ EMAPS Survey	Due Date
Part B Child Count and Educational Environments	C002 & C089	8/30/2023
Part B Personnel	C070, C099, C112	2/21/2024
Part B Exiting	C009	2/21/2024
Part B Discipline	C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144	2/21/2024
Part B Assessment	C175, C178, C185, C188	1/10/2024
Part B Dispute Resolution	Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in <i>EMAPS</i>	11/15/2023
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in <i>EMAPS</i>	5/3/2023

2) Complete Data – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data submitted to *EDFacts* aligns with the metadata survey responses provided by the state in the State Supplemental Survey IDEA (SSS IDEA) and Assessment Metadata survey in *EMAPS*. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

3) Passed Edit Check – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection

Dispute Resolution

IDEA Part B

Illinois

School Year: 2022-23

A zero count should be used when there were no events or occurrences to report in the specific category for the given reporting period. Check "Missing" if the state did not collect or could not report a count for the specific category. Please provide an explanation for the missing data in the comment box at the top of the page.

Section A: Written, Signed Complaints

(1) Total number of written signed complaints filed.	244
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued.	142
(1.1) (a) Reports with findings of noncompliance	88
(1.1) (b) Reports within timelines	105
(1.1) (c) Reports within extended timelines	25
(1.2) Complaints pending.	0
(1.2) (a) Complaints pending a due process hearing.	0
(1.3) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	102

Section B: Mediation Requests

(2) Total number of mediation requests received through all dispute resolution processes.	502
(2.1) Mediations held.	313
(2.1) (a) Mediations held related to due process complaints.	135
(2.1) (a) (i) Mediation agreements related to due process complaints.	76
(2.1) (b) Mediations held not related to due process complaints.	178
(2.1) (b) (i) Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints.	145
(2.2) Mediations pending.	52
(2.3) Mediations withdrawn or not held.	137

Section C: Due Process Complaints

(3) Total number of due process complaints filed.	274
(3.1) Resolution meetings.	41
(3.1) (a) Written settlement agreements reached through resolution meetings.	21
(3.2) Hearings fully adjudicated.	18
(3.2) (a) Decisions within timeline (include expedited).	8
(3.2) (b) Decisions within extended timeline.	10
(3.3) Due process complaints pending.	18
(3.4) Due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing).	238

Section D: Expedited Due Process Complaints (Related to Disciplinary Decision)

(4) Total number of expedited due process complaints filed.	17
(4.1) Expedited resolution meetings.	5
(4.1) (a) Expedited written settlement agreements.	2
(4.2) Expedited hearings fully adjudicated.	4
(4.2) (a) Change of placement ordered	0
(4.3) Expedited due process complaints pending.	0
(4.4) Expedited due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	13

State Comments:

Errors:

Please note that the data entered result in the following relationships which violate edit checks:

State error comments:

This report shows the most recent data that was entered by:

Illinois

These data were extracted on the close date:

11/15/2023

How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2024 will be posted in June 2024. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/>



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

Final Determination Letter

June 21, 2024

Honorable Tony Sanders
State Superintendent of Education
Illinois State Board of Education
555 W Monroe St, Suite 900
Chicago, IL 60661

Dear Superintendent Sanders :

I am writing to advise you of the U.S. Department of Education's (Department) 2024 determination under Section 616 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The Department has determined that Illinois meets the requirements and purposes of Part B of the IDEA. This determination is based on the totality of Illinois' data and information, including the Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2022 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), other State-reported data, and other publicly available information.

Illinois' 2024 determination is based on the data reflected in its "2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix" (RDA Matrix). The RDA Matrix is individualized for each State and Entity and consists of:

- (1) a Compliance Matrix that includes scoring on Compliance Indicators and other compliance factors;
- (2) a Results Matrix that includes scoring on Results Elements;
- (3) a Compliance Score and a Results Score;
- (4) an RDA Percentage based on both the Compliance Score and the Results Score; and
- (5) the State's or Entity's Determination.

The RDA Matrix is further explained in a document, entitled "[How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616\(d\) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2024: Part B](#)" (HTDMD).

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) is continuing to use both results data and compliance data in making determinations in 2024, as it did for Part B determinations in 2014-2023. (The specifics of the determination procedures and criteria are set forth in the HTDMD document and reflected in the RDA Matrix for Illinois).

In making Part B determinations in 2024, OSEP continued to use results data related to:

- (1) the participation and performance of CWD on the most recently administered (school year 2021-2022) National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), as applicable (For the 2024 determinations, OSEP using results data on the participation and performance of children with disabilities on the NAEP for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. OSEP used the available NAEP data for Puerto Rico in making Puerto Rico's 2024 determination as it did for Puerto Rico's 2023 determination. OSEP did not use NAEP data in making the BIE's 2024 determination because the NAEP data available for the BIE were not comparable to the NAEP data available for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico; specifically, the most recently administered NAEP for the BIE is 2019, whereas the most recently administered NAEP for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico is 2022.)
- (2) the percentage of CWD who graduated with a regular high school diploma; and
- (3) the percentage of CWD who dropped out.

For the 2024 IDEA Part B determinations, OSEP also considered participation of CWD on Statewide assessments (which include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment). While the participation rates of CWD on Statewide assessments were a factor in each State or Entity's 2024 Part B Results Matrix, no State or Entity received a Needs Intervention determination in 2024 due solely to this criterion. However, this criterion will be fully incorporated beginning with the 2025 determinations.

You may access the results of OSEP's review of Illinois' SPP/APR and other relevant data by accessing the EMAPS SPP/APR reporting tool using your Illinois-specific log-on information at <https://emaps.ed.gov/suite/>. When you access Illinois' SPP/APR on the site, you will find, in applicable Indicators 1 through 17, the OSEP Response to the indicator and any actions that Illinois is required to take. The actions that Illinois is required to take are in the "Required Actions" section of the indicator.

It is important for you to review the Introduction to the SPP/APR, which may also include language in the "OSEP Response" and/or "Required Actions" sections.

You will also find the following important documents in the Determinations Enclosures section:

- (1) Illinois' RDA Matrix;
- (2) the HTDMD [link](#);

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

- (3) "2024 Data Rubric Part B," which shows how OSEP calculated Illinois' "Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data" score in the Compliance Matrix; and
- (4) "Dispute Resolution 2022-2023," which includes the IDEA Section 618 data that OSEP used to calculate the Illinois' "Timely State Complaint Decisions" and "Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions" scores in the Compliance Matrix.

As noted above, Illinois' 2024 determination is Meets Requirements. A State's or Entity's 2024 RDA Determination is Meets Requirements if the RDA Percentage is at least 80%, unless OSEP has imposed programmatic Specific Conditions on the State's or Entity's last three IDEA Part B grant awards (for FFYs 2021, 2022, and 2023), and those Specific Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2024 determination.

IDEA determinations provide an opportunity for all stakeholders to examine State data as that data relate to improving outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. The Department encourages stakeholders to review State SPP/APR data and other available data as part of the focus on improving equitable outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. Key areas the Department encourages State and local personnel to review are access to high-quality intervention and instruction; effective implementation of individualized family service plans (IFSPs) and individualized education programs (IEPs), using data to drive decision-making, supporting strong relationship building with families, and actively addressing educator and other personnel shortages.

For 2025 and beyond, the Department is considering three criteria related to IDEA Part B determinations as part of the Department's continued efforts to incorporate equity and improve results for CWD. First, the Department is considering as a factor OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three or more years ago). This factor would be reflected in the determination for each State and Entity through the "longstanding noncompliance" section of the Compliance Matrix beginning with the 2025 determinations. In implementing this factor, the Department is also considering beginning in 2025 whether a State or Entity that would otherwise receive a score of Meets Requirements would not be able to receive a determination of Meets Requirements if the State or Entity had OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three or more years ago). Second, the Department is considering as potential additional factors the improvement in proficiency rates of CWD on Statewide assessments. Third, the Department is considering whether and how to continue including in its determinations criteria the participation and proficiency of CWD on the NAEP.

For the FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission due on February 1, 2025, OSEP is providing the following information about the IDEA Section 618 data. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part B data submitted as of the due date will be used for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR and the 2025 IDEA Part B Results Matrix and States and Entities will not be able to resubmit their IDEA Section 618 data after the due date. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part B data will automatically be prepopulated in the SPP/APR reporting platform for Part B SPP/APR Indicators 3, 5, and 6 (as they have in the past). Under EDFacts Modernization, States and Entities are expected to submit high-quality IDEA Section 618 Part B data that can be published and used by the Department as of the due date. States and Entities are expected to conduct data quality reviews prior to the applicable due date. OSEP expects States and Entities to take one of the following actions for all business rules that are triggered in the EDPass or EMAPS system prior to the applicable due date: 1) revise the uploaded data to address the edit; or 2) provide a data note addressing why the data submission triggered the business rule. States and Entities will be unable to submit the IDEA Section 618 Part B data without taking one of these two actions. There will not be a resubmission period for the IDEA Section 618 Part B data.

As a reminder, Illinois must report annually to the public, by posting on the State educational agency's (SEA's) website, the performance of each local educational agency (LEA) located in Illinois on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after Illinois' submission of its FFY 2022 SPP/APR. In addition, Illinois must:

- (1) review LEA performance against targets in the State's SPP/APR;
- (2) determine if each LEA "meets the requirements" of Part B, or "needs assistance," "needs intervention," or "needs substantial intervention" in implementing Part B of the IDEA;
- (3) take appropriate enforcement action; and
- (4) inform each LEA of its determination.

Further, Illinois must make its SPP/APR available to the public by posting it on the SEA's website. Within the upcoming weeks, OSEP will be finalizing a State Profile that:

- (1) includes Illinois' determination letter and SPP/APR, OSEP attachments, and all State or Entity attachments that are accessible in accordance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; and
- (2) will be accessible to the public via the ed.gov website.

OSEP appreciates Illinois' efforts to improve results for children and youth with disabilities and looks forward to working with Illinois over the next year as we continue our important work of improving the lives of children with disabilities and their families. Please contact your OSEP State Lead if you have any questions, would like to discuss this further, or want to request technical assistance.

Sincerely,

Valerie C. Williams

Valerie C. Williams
Director
Office of Special Education Programs

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

cc: Illinois Director of Special Education

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.