

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B
for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education
Act

For reporting on
FFY 2021

Illinois



PART B DUE February 1, 2023

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. 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 IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

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

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

Policies and Procedures for Effective IDEA Implementation

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

Fiscal Management System

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

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

The SPP functions as an accountability mechanism and the actual plan for systems change. It documents quantifiable indications of performance in the priority areas of FAPE in the LRE, disproportionality, and effective general supervision. Measurable and rigorous targets are set for each SPP indicator with the intention of leading to improved results for children and youth with disabilities. ISBE's progress toward meeting its targets on each SPP indicator must be reported each year in the APR. Stakeholder involvement remains key to the development and implementation of the SPP. Please see <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/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: state complaints, due process hearings, and SPP Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13. ISBE uses current data and trend data to determine the level of technical assistance needed to support correction of noncompliance and program improvement in LEAs through the Illinois Special Education Accountability and Support System. The system is designed to:

- Maintain a high level of compliance with IDEA federal regulations and Illinois Administrative Rules for special education.
- Support 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, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

ISBE's technical assistance system addresses both the timely correction of noncompliance and improved results for students with disabilities through an array of modalities and graduated levels of intensity, from consultation to ongoing coaching and support from ISBE staff and technical assistance providers. 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". 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 2021 through June 2022, the Harrisburg Project responded to 9,126 phone calls from LEAs, of which 90% were resolved within 24 hours or less. They received 21,905 emails, sent 211,715 email bursts, and hosted 67 trainings with over 1,800 attendees. Additional information regarding the Harrisburg Project can be found at: <https://www.hbusg.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 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), Project Reach, 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 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/>).
- Project Reach provides professional learning and coaching for schools and families working with students with deaf-blindness (<https://www.philiprockcenter.org/project-reach>).
- 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://iepq.education.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.

Broad Stakeholder Input:

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

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

Stakeholders included professional development providers, school district representatives, educational advocates, Illinois Early Learning Project representatives, Chicago Public Schools representatives, Parent Training and Information Center representatives, parent members of 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, 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. 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 engages on a monthly basis with this stakeholder group through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. 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 Services 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 Corrections/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 discusses baseline data, targets, potential target revisions, and improvement strategies with the Council as necessary. Date regarding the effectiveness of improvement strategies is shared with the Council to solicit feedback for continuous improvement. The Council assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising SPP targets for many of the indicators. No target revisions were made for FFY21.

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

Finally, progress for several of the SPP Indicators is aligned to the Illinois State Personnel Development Grant (IESE). The IESE Advisory Council meets quarterly 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 provides 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, ISAC, 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 have discussions with the IESE Advisory Council multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding Indicator 17. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, potential target revisions, and improvement strategies with the council as necessary. The IESE Advisory Council assists ISBE staff with reviewing Indicator 17 trend data and setting and revising targets for Indicator 17. No revisions were made to Indicator 17 for FFY21.

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

YES

Number of Parent Members:

8

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. These parents also have the opportunity to suggest ideas for improvement for specific SPP Indicators. Progress on the SPP targets will be reevaluated in the spring of 2023 after the FFY21 SPP/APR submission. Targets will be revisited based on the progress data shared with the stakeholders.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

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

In order to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents engaging in activities designed to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, every parent of a child with a disability aged 3-21 in the state of Illinois had the opportunity to listen to recorded modules for specific SPP Indicators and to complete SPP Indicator surveys as a means of providing feedback to ISBE 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 also holds monthly meetings with representatives from the two OSEP-funded PTIs, the Council, and Equip for Equality, the state's protection and advocacy group. These meetings allow 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 meets 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. ISBE's Department of Family and Community Engagement (FACE) also holds monthly Statewide FACE Network meetings and representatives from ISBE's Special Education Department and the PTIs attend to discuss ways to increase parental engagement in education.

Soliciting Public Input:

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

In order 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.

ISBE meets with its primary stakeholder groups at least four times a year. At least once during the year, ISBE shares SPP outcomes data with these groups and analyzes both progress and slippage data as compared to previous years. Stakeholders can discuss SPP indicators at that time to address the appropriateness of targets, improvement strategies, and progress. In addition, the ISBE director of special education meets regularly throughout the year with the two Parent Training and Information Centers in the state to discuss pertinent issues, including SPP progress. Directors of these centers can provide feedback regarding improvement strategies during these meetings. Progress is also monitored and evaluated through individual online LEA Profiles that display a district's progress toward the SPP targets. District progress toward SPP targets is also monitored and evaluated through the Illinois Special Education Accountability and Support System, of which individual LEA Determinations are a part. The stakeholder group associated with the accountability system assists in evaluating district progress and revising system components as necessary based on district outcome data.

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 SPP/APR information on its website: <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPPAPR-Indicators.aspx>. The most recent SPP/APR is posted on the webpage, as is information about changes for the FFY20-25 SPP cycle. Specific SPP indicator information is available for public review on the webpage, 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 2020 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 2020 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2020 APR in 2022, is available.

The Illinois SPP/APR continues to be available on the ISBE website at <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPPAPR-Indicators.aspx>. District Special Education Profiles for school years 2002-2003 through 2015-2016 are also available on the website at <http://webprod1.isbe.net/LEAProfile/SearchCriteria1.aspx>. These Profiles document the performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR. Beginning with the 2016-2017 school year, special education data was 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. After selecting a specific district, the custom report card builder button is used to select "Students with IEPs" and generate a PDF report.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Intro - OSEP Response

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	82.57%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	84.00%	71.80%	73.00%	74.20%	82.60%
Data	70.52%	71.18%	71.64%	69.90%	87.43%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	82.60%	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)
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education

Stakeholders included professional development providers, school district representatives, educational advocates, Illinois Early Learning Project representatives, Chicago Public Schools representatives, Parent Training and Information Center representatives, parent members of 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, 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. 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 engages on a monthly basis with this stakeholder group through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. 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 Services 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 Corrections/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 discusses baseline data, targets, potential target revisions, and improvement strategies with the Council as necessary. Date regarding the effectiveness of improvement strategies is shared with the Council to solicit feedback for continuous improvement. The Council assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising SPP targets for many of the indicators. No target revisions were made for FFY21.

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

Finally, progress for several of the SPP Indicators is aligned to the Illinois State Personnel Development Grant (IESE). The IESE Advisory Council meets quarterly 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 provides 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, ISAC, 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 have discussions with the IESE Advisory Council multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding Indicator 17. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, potential target revisions, and improvement strategies with the council as necessary. The IESE Advisory Council assists ISBE staff with reviewing Indicator 17 trend data and setting and revising targets for Indicator 17. No revisions were made to Indicator 17 for FFY21.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	15,740
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	333
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	330
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	1,732

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
15,740	18,135	87.43%	82.60%	86.79%	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 EDFacts file specification FS009.

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

Measurement

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 data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), 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.

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

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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target <=	4.70%	4.60%	4.50%	4.50%	13.70%
Data	3.39%	3.54%	3.22%	2.89%	8.92%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	13.70%	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)
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education

Stakeholders included professional development providers, school district representatives, educational advocates, Illinois Early Learning Project representatives, Chicago Public Schools representatives, Parent Training and Information Center representatives, parent members of 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, 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. 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 engages on a monthly basis with this stakeholder group through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. 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 Services 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 Corrections/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 discusses baseline data, targets, potential target revisions, and improvement strategies with the Council as necessary. Data regarding the effectiveness of improvement strategies is shared with the Council to solicit feedback for continuous improvement. The Council assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising SPP targets for many of the indicators. No target revisions were made for FFY21.

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

Finally, progress for several of the SPP Indicators is aligned to the Illinois State Personnel Development Grant (IESE). The IESE Advisory Council meets quarterly 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 provides 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, ISAC, 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 have discussions with the IESE Advisory Council multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding Indicator 17. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, potential target revisions, and improvement strategies with the council as necessary. The IESE Advisory Council assists ISBE staff with reviewing Indicator 17 trend data and setting and revising targets for Indicator 17. No revisions were made to Indicator 17 for FFY21.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	15,740
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	333
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	330
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	1,732

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
1,732	18,135	8.92%	13.70%	9.55%	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	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	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)
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education

Stakeholders included professional development providers, school district representatives, educational advocates, Illinois Early Learning Project representatives, Chicago Public Schools representatives, Parent Training and Information Center representatives, parent members of 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, 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. 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 engages on a monthly basis with this stakeholder group through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. 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 Services 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 Corrections/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 discusses baseline data, targets, potential target revisions, and improvement strategies with the Council as necessary. Data regarding the effectiveness of improvement strategies is shared with the Council to solicit feedback for continuous improvement. The Council assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising SPP targets for many of the indicators. No target revisions were made for FFY21.

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

Finally, progress for several of the SPP Indicators is aligned to the Illinois State Personnel Development Grant (IESE). The IESE Advisory Council meets quarterly 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 provides 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, ISAC, 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 have discussions with the IESE Advisory Council multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding Indicator 17. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, potential target revisions, and improvement strategies with the council as necessary. The IESE Advisory Council assists ISBE staff with reviewing Indicator 17 trend data and setting and revising targets for Indicator 17. No revisions were made to Indicator 17 for FFY21.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

04/05/2023

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	20,846	20,789	21,642
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1,321	655	3,482
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	17,419	17,727	14,054
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1,474	1,491	2,109

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

04/05/2023

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	20,834	20,790	21,632
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1,313	642	3,456
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	17,346	17,628	13,903
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1,466	1,490	2,098

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

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	20,214	20,846	73.95%	95.00%	96.97%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	19,873	20,789	65.83%	95.00%	95.59%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	19,645	21,642	86.08%	95.00%	90.77%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	20,125	20,834	73.09%	95.00%	96.60%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	19,760	20,790	64.58%	95.00%	95.05%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	19,457	21,632	86.08%	95.00%	89.95%	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.isbe.net/ilreportcard>.

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

<https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPPAPR-Indicators.aspx>

The Assessment Participation Report required by OSEP can be found under the 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

3A - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

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

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	11.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	7.00%	7.00%	7.00%	7.00%	8.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	8.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	11.00%	11.00%	11.00%	11.00%	12.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	5.50%	5.50%	5.50%	5.50%	6.50%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	6.50%	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)
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education

Stakeholders included professional development providers, school district representatives, educational advocates, Illinois Early Learning Project

representatives, Chicago Public Schools representatives, Parent Training and Information Center representatives, parent members of 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, 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. 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 engages on a monthly basis with this stakeholder group through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. 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 Services 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 Corrections/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 discusses baseline data, targets, potential target revisions, and improvement strategies with the Council as necessary. Data regarding the effectiveness of improvement strategies is shared with the Council to solicit feedback for continuous improvement. The Council assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising SPP targets for many of the indicators. No target revisions were made for FFY21.

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

Finally, progress for several of the SPP Indicators is aligned to the Illinois State Personnel Development Grant (IESE). The IESE Advisory Council meets quarterly 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 provides 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, ISAC, 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 have discussions with the IESE Advisory Council multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding Indicator 17. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, potential target revisions, and improvement strategies with the council as necessary. The IESE Advisory Council assists ISBE staff with reviewing Indicator 17 trend data and setting and revising targets for Indicator 17. No revisions were made to Indicator 17 for FFY21.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/05/2023

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	18,740	18,382	17,536
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	147	64	251
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with	1,485	808	769

accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			
--	--	--	--

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/05/2023

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	17,265	17,515	13,830
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,494	616	582

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,632	18,740	7.45%	10.00%	8.71%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	872	18,382	5.17%	7.00%	4.74%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	1,020	17,536	6.34%	7.50%	5.82%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

Slippage was noted for Grade 8 on the Reading Assessment. The slippage for grade 8 was 0.43%. An analysis of the data was completed to identify reasons for slippage. During the 2021-2022 school year, many students were returning to school after being fully remote due to COVID-19 since the 2019-2020 school year. While some LEAs did return to in-person learning during the 2020-2021 school year, many were unable to do so as they lacked the capacity to implement COVID protocols and restrictions. In addition to this return to in-person learning, Per Executive Order 2021-22, COVID-19 protocols were still in place throughout Illinois schools. These protocols included, social distancing, masking, contact tracing and quarantining of students who had or may have been exposed to COVID-19. Isolation and/or quarantining was set in compliance with the CDC's recommendation for 10 days but was later reduced to 5 days in January 2022. Full COVID 19 protocols were not lifted until the summer of 2022. Due to these continued restrictions and protocols, students may have experienced ongoing reduced, disrupted and/or adjusted learning opportunities which could have impacted assessment scores. Students in Grade 8 without IEPs taking the general assessment also showed a decline in scores (4.5%) from SY 2020-2021.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

Slippage was noted for High School on the Reading Assessment. The slippage for High School students with IEPs was 0.52%. During the 2021-2022 school year, many students were returning to school after being fully remote due to COVID-19 since the 2019-2020 school year. While some LEAs did return to in-person learning during the 2020-2021 school year, many were unable to do so as they lacked the capacity to implement COVID protocols and restrictions. In addition to this return to in-person learning, per Executive Order 2021-22, COVID-19 protocols were still in place throughout Illinois schools. These protocols included, social distancing, masking, contact tracing and quarantining of students who had or may have been exposed to COVID-19. Isolation and/or quarantining was set in compliance with the CDC's recommendation for 10 days but was later reduced to 5 days in January 2022. Full COVID 19 protocols were not lifted until the summer of 2022. Due to these continued restrictions and protocols, students may have experienced ongoing reduced, disrupted and/or adjusted learning opportunities which could have impacted assessment scores. Students in High School without IEPs taking the general assessment also showed a decline in scores (2.3%) from SY 2020-2021.

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,494	17,265	8.26%	11.00%	8.65%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	616	17,515	4.23%	5.50%	3.52%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	582	13,830	4.65%	6.50%	4.21%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

Slippage was noted for Grade 8 on the Math Assessment. The slippage for grade 8 was 0.71%. An analysis of the data was completed to identify reasons for slippage. During the 2021-2022 school year, many students were returning to school after being fully remote due to COVID-19 since the 2019-2020 school year. While some LEAs did return to in-person learning during the 2020-2021 school year, many were unable to do so as they lacked the capacity to implement COVID protocols and restrictions. In addition to this return to in-person learning, per Executive Order 2021-22, COVID-19 protocols were still in place throughout Illinois schools. These protocols included, social distancing, masking, contact tracing and quarantining of students who had or may have been exposed to COVID-19. Isolation and/or quarantining was set in compliance with the CDC's recommendation for 10 days but was later reduced to 5 days in January 2022. Full COVID 19 protocols were not lifted until the summer of 2022. Due to these continued restrictions and protocols, students may have experienced ongoing reduced, disrupted and/or adjusted learning opportunities which could have impacted assessment scores. Students in Grade 8 without IEPs taking the general assessment also showed a decline in scores (3.2%) from SY 2020-2021.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

Slippage was noted for High School on the Math Assessment. The slippage for High School students with IEPs was 0.44%. During the 2021-2022 school year, many students were returning to school after being fully remote due to COVID-19 since the 2019-2020 school year. While some LEAs did return to in-person learning during the 2020-2021 school year, many were unable to do so as they lacked the capacity to implement COVID protocols and restrictions. In addition to this return to in-person learning, per Executive Order 2021-22, COVID-19 protocols were still in place throughout Illinois schools. These protocols included, social distancing, masking, contact tracing and quarantining of students who had or may have been exposed to COVID-19. Isolation and/or quarantining was set in compliance with the CDC's recommendation for 10 days but was later reduced to 5 days in January 2022. Full COVID 19 protocols were not lifted until the summer of 2022. Due to these continued restrictions and protocols, students may have experienced ongoing reduced, disrupted and/or adjusted learning opportunities which could have impacted assessment scores.

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

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

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

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

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

<https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPPAPR-Indicators.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	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	14.00%	14.00%	14.00%	14.00%	15.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	22.50%	22.50%	22.50%	22.50%	23.50%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	22.00%	22.00%	22.00%	22.00%	22.50%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	19.50%	19.50%	19.50%	19.50%	20.50%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	4.50%	4.50%	4.50%	4.50%	5.50%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	3.50%	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)
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education

Stakeholders included professional development providers, school district representatives, educational advocates, Illinois Early Learning Project representatives, Chicago Public Schools representatives, Parent Training and Information Center representatives, parent members of 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, 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. 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 engages on a monthly basis with this stakeholder group through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. 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 Services 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 Corrections/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 discusses baseline data, targets, potential target revisions, and improvement strategies with the Council as necessary. Data regarding the effectiveness of improvement strategies is shared with the Council to solicit feedback for continuous improvement. The Council assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising SPP targets for many of the indicators. No target revisions were made for FFY21.

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

Finally, progress for several of the SPP Indicators is aligned to the Illinois State Personnel Development Grant (IESE). The IESE Advisory Council meets quarterly 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 provides 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, ISAC, 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 have discussions with the IESE Advisory Council multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding Indicator 17. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, potential target revisions, and improvement strategies with the council as necessary. The IESE Advisory Council assists ISBE staff with reviewing Indicator 17 trend data and setting and revising targets for Indicator 17. No revisions were made to Indicator 17 for FFY21.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/05/2023

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	1,474	1,491	2,109
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	135	233	408

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/05/2023

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	1,465	1,489	5,177
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	352	86	756

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	135	1,474	13.44%	14.00%	9.16%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	233	1,491	15.00%	22.50%	15.63%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	408	2,109	25.18%	22.00%	19.35%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

Slippage was noted for grade 4 on the alternate assessment in Reading. The slippage for grade 4 was 4.04%. An analysis of the data was completed to identify reasons for slippage. During the 2021-2022 school year, many students were returning to school after being fully remote due to COVID-19 since the 2019-2020 school year. While some LEAs did return to in-person learning during the 2020-2021 school year, many were unable to do so as they lacked the capacity to implement COVID protocols and restrictions. In addition to this return to in-person learning, per Executive Order 2021-22, COVID-19 protocols were still in place throughout Illinois schools. These protocols included, social distancing, masking, contact tracing and quarantining of students who had or may have been exposed to COVID-19. Isolation and/or quarantining was set in compliance with the CDC's recommendation for 10 days but was later reduced to 5 days in January 2022. Full COVID 19 protocols were not lifted until the summer of 2022. Due to these continued restrictions and protocols, students may have experienced ongoing reduced, disrupted and/or adjusted learning opportunities which could have impacted assessment scores.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

Slippage was noted for high school on the alternate assessment in Reading. The slippage for high school students was 7.01%. During the 2021-2022 school year, many students were returning to school after being fully remote due to COVID-19 since the 2019-2020 school year. While some LEAs did return to in-person learning during the 2020-2021 school year, many were unable to do so as they lacked the capacity to implement COVID protocols and restrictions. In addition to this return to in-person learning, per Executive Order 2021-22, COVID-19 protocols were still in place throughout Illinois schools. These protocols included, social distancing, masking, contact tracing and quarantining of students who had or may have been exposed to COVID-19. Isolation and/or quarantining was set in compliance with the CDC's recommendation for 10 days but was later reduced to 5 days in January 2022. Full COVID 19 protocols were not lifted until the summer of 2022. Due to these continued restrictions and protocols, students may have experienced ongoing reduced, disrupted and/or adjusted learning opportunities which could have impacted assessment scores. Students in high school without IEPs taking the general assessment also showed a decline in scores (2.3%) from SY 2020-2021.

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	352	1,465	32.22%	19.50%	24.03%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	86	1,489	5.85%	4.50%	5.78%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	756	5,177	23.56%	3.50%	14.60%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

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

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

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

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

<https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPPAPR-Indicators.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 EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 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 2021-2022 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 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	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	26.50	26.50	26.50	26.50	25.50
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	32.50	32.50	32.50	32.50	31.50
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	29.00	29.00	29.00	29.00	28.00
Math	A <=	Grade 4	22.50	22.50	22.50	22.50	21.50
Math	B <=	Grade 8	27.00	27.00	27.00	27.00	26.00
Math	C <=	Grade HS	28.50	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)
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois

•Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council

•Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee

•Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education

Stakeholders included professional development providers, school district representatives, educational advocates, Illinois Early Learning Project representatives, Chicago Public Schools representatives, Parent Training and Information Center representatives, parent members of 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, 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. 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 engages on a monthly basis with this stakeholder group through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. 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 Services 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 Corrections/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 discusses baseline data, targets, potential target revisions, and improvement strategies with the Council as necessary. Data regarding the effectiveness of improvement strategies is shared with the Council to solicit feedback for continuous improvement. The Council assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising SPP targets for many of the indicators. No target revisions were made for FFY21.

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

Finally, progress for several of the SPP Indicators is aligned to the Illinois State Personnel Development Grant (IESE). The IESE Advisory Council meets quarterly 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 provides 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, ISAC, 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 have discussions with the IESE Advisory Council multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding Indicator 17. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, potential target revisions, and improvement strategies with the council as necessary. The IESE Advisory Council assists ISBE staff with reviewing Indicator 17 trend data and setting and revising targets for Indicator 17. No revisions were made to Indicator 17 for FFY21.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/05/2023

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	126,158	139,996	142,080
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	18,740	18,382	17,536

c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	38,491	40,018	38,895
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,648	2,398	3,316
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	147	64	251
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,485	808	769

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/05/2023

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	125,852	139,491	141,573
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	17,265	17,515	13,830
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	31,490	31,553	40,148
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,494	616	582
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,494	616	582

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	8.71%	32.61%	20.61	26.50	23.90	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	4.74%	30.30%	29.39	32.50	25.55	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	5.82%	29.71%	26.07	29.00	23.89	Met target	No Slippage

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	8.65%	26.21%	15.26	22.50	17.56	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	3.52%	23.06%	22.16	27.00	19.54	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	4.21%	28.77%	23.89	28.50	24.56	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 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 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n and/or cell size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target <=	4.20%	4.00%	3.80%	3.80%	3.80%
Data	2.35%	1.64%	1.53%	1.18%	1.29%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target ≤	3.60%	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)
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education

Stakeholders included professional development providers, school district representatives, educational advocates, Illinois Early Learning Project representatives, Chicago Public Schools representatives, Parent Training and Information Center representatives, parent members of 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, 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. 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 engages on a monthly basis with this stakeholder group through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. 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 Services 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 Corrections/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 discusses baseline data, targets, potential target revisions, and improvement strategies with the Council as necessary. Data regarding the effectiveness of improvement strategies is shared with the Council to solicit feedback for continuous improvement. The Council assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising SPP targets for many of the indicators. No target revisions were made for FFY21.

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

Finally, progress for several of the SPP Indicators is aligned to the Illinois State Personnel Development Grant (IESE). The IESE Advisory Council meets quarterly 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 provides 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, ISAC, 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 have discussions with the IESE Advisory Council multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding Indicator 17. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, potential target revisions, and improvement strategies with the council as necessary. The IESE Advisory Council assists ISBE staff with reviewing Indicator 17 trend data and setting and revising targets for Indicator 17. No revisions were made to Indicator 17 for FFY21.

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
0	852	1.29%	3.60%	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.

For FFY21, ISBE examined suspension/expulsion data for students with IEPs for all 852 LEAs in the State. In total, 852 / 852 districts met the minimum n-size requirement of at least five students with IEPs. A total of 391 of the 852 LEAs that met the minimum n-size requirement documented at least one student discipline event for the school year being monitored. Of the 391 LEAs with documented discipline events for students with IEPs, 38 LEAs suspended or expelled at least one student with an IEP for more than 10 days. After applying the significant discrepancy criteria listed above, no LEAs met the State's criteria for significant discrepancy.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

It should be noted that COVID-19 factors most likely impacted the data for this indicator. At the beginning of the 2020-21 school year, districts were allowed to transition back from mandatory remote learning to in-person learning while following Illinois Department of Public Health (IDPH) requirements related to the health and safety of students. However, districts that were unable to adhere to IDPH requirements were allowed to implement blended remote learning days. During these days, districts utilized hybrid models of in-person and remote instruction. In addition, quarantines caused students to miss school for a period of time. These factors are thought to have impacted the number of students with disabilities being suspended or expelled for more than 10 days in a school year. For example, in FFY20, 741 / 851 districts documented at least one student discipline event for the school year being monitored as compared to 391 / 852 for FFY21. In FFY20 128 LEAs with documented discipline events suspended or expelled at least one student with an IEP for more than 10 days as compared to 38 LEAs in FFY21.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 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 2021. 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. 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. While the State did not identify noncompliance in FFY21, any future noncompliance will be addressed by a recently implemented statewide technical assistance project that focuses on the implementation of culturally responsive functional behavior analysis and effective behavior intervention plans to reduce the number of suspensions and expulsions exceeding 10 school days for students with IEPs. The Behavior Assessment Training project will provide 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 2020

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 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2020-2021 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 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 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR introduction).

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.12%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	852	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

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

1. A Suspension/Expulsion Rate is calculated for each LEA for each race/ethnicity group with at least five students with IEPs as follows: $((\# \text{ of students with IEPs suspended or expelled for more than 10 days for each race/ethnicity subgroup}) / (\# \text{ of students with IEPs})) * 100$.
 2. When identifying if an LEA has a significant discrepancy by race and ethnicity, a state rate is configured for each race/ethnic group separately as follows: $((\# \text{ of students with IEPs suspended or expelled for more than 10 days, in each race/ethnicity category}) / (\# \text{ of students with IEPs}))$.
 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 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 in at least one racial subgroup.
- For FFY21, ISBE examined suspension/expulsion data for students with IEPs for all 852 LEAs in the State. In total, 852 / 852 districts met the minimum n-size requirement of at least five students with IEPs. A total of 391 of the 852 LEAs that met the minimum n-size requirement documented at least one student discipline event for the school year being monitored. Of the 391 LEAs with documented discipline events for students with IEPs, 38 LEAs suspended or expelled at least one student with an IEP for more than 10 days. After applying the significant discrepancy criteria listed above, no LEAs met the State's criteria for significant discrepancy.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

It should be noted that COVID-19 factors most likely impacted the data for this indicator. At the beginning of the 2020-21 school year, districts were allowed to transition back from mandatory remote learning to in-person learning while following Illinois Department of Public Health (IDPH) requirements related to the health and safety of students. However, districts that were unable to adhere to IDPH requirements were allowed to implement blended remote learning days. During these days, districts utilized hybrid models of in-person and remote instruction. In addition, quarantines caused students to miss school for a period of time. These factors are thought to have impacted the number of students with disabilities being suspended or expelled for more than 10 days in a school year. For example, in FFY20, 741 / 851 districts documented at least one student discipline event for the school year being monitored as compared to 391 / 852 for FFY21. In FFY20 128 LEAs with documented discipline events suspended or expelled at least one student with an IEP for more than 10 days as compared to 38 LEAs in FFY21.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 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 2021. 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. 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. While the State did not identify noncompliance in FFY21, any future noncompliance will be addressed by a recently implemented statewide technical assistance project that focuses on the implementation of culturally responsive functional behavior analysis and effective behavior intervention plans to reduce the number of suspensions and expulsions exceeding 10 school days for students with IEPs. The Behavior Assessment Training project will provide 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 2020

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 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for this indicator for FFY 2021. The State reported, "a state rate is configured for each race/ethnic group separately as follows ((#of students with IEPs suspended or expelled for more than 10 days, in each race/ethnicity category)/(# of students with IEPs))." OSEP reminds the State that its chosen methodology cannot result in different thresholds for different racial and ethnic groups to demonstrate whether an LEA has a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

4B- 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.

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	2019	Target >=	56.00%	57.00%	58.00%	58.00%	52.70%
A	50.44%	Data	52.51%	52.53%	52.79%	52.70%	53.34%
B	2019	Target <=	16.50%	16.00%	15.50%	15.50%	12.37%
B	12.37%	Data	13.44%	13.22%	13.05%	12.92%	13.09%
C	2019	Target <=	3.90%	3.90%	3.90%	3.90%	6.39%
C	6.39%	Data	6.23%	6.33%	6.50%	6.68%	6.28%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	52.90%	53.10%	53.30%	53.50%	53.70%
Target B <=	12.35%	12.33%	12.31%	12.29%	12.27%
Target C <=	6.38%	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)
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education

Stakeholders included professional development providers, school district representatives, educational advocates, Illinois Early Learning Project representatives, Chicago Public Schools representatives, Parent Training and Information Center representatives, parent members of 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, 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. 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 engages on a monthly basis with this stakeholder group through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. 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 Services 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 Corrections/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 discusses baseline data, targets, potential target revisions, and improvement strategies with the Council as necessary. Data regarding the effectiveness of improvement strategies is shared with the Council to solicit feedback for continuous improvement. The Council assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising SPP targets for many of the indicators. No target revisions were made for FFY21.

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

Finally, progress for several of the SPP Indicators is aligned to the Illinois State Personnel Development Grant (IESE). The IESE Advisory Council meets quarterly 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 provides 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, ISAC, 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 have discussions with the IESE Advisory Council multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding Indicator 17. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, potential target revisions, and improvement strategies with the council as necessary. The IESE Advisory Council assists ISBE staff with reviewing Indicator 17 trend data and setting and revising targets for Indicator 17. No revisions were made to Indicator 17 for FFY21.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	266,410
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	141,712
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	34,699
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	15,414
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	414

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	613

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 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	141,712	266,410	53.34%	52.90%	53.19%	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	34,699	266,410	13.09%	12.35%	13.02%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	16,441	266,410	6.28%	6.38%	6.17%	Met target	No Slippage

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 EDFacts file specification FS089.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data – 6A, 6B

Part	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	Target >=	32.70%	32.80%	32.90%	32.90%	46.00%
A	Data	40.00%	40.76%	44.82%	45.42%	48.07%
B	Target <=	30.70%	30.60%	30.50%	30.50%	26.30%
B	Data	26.76%	24.94%	23.49%	23.02%	26.27%

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

Stakeholders included professional development providers, school district representatives, educational advocates, Illinois Early Learning Project representatives, Chicago Public Schools representatives, Parent Training and Information Center representatives, parent members of 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, 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. 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 engages on a monthly basis with this stakeholder group through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. 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 Services 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 Corrections/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 discusses baseline data, targets, potential target revisions, and improvement strategies with the Council as necessary. Data regarding the effectiveness of improvement strategies is shared with the Council to solicit feedback for continuous improvement. The Council assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising SPP targets for many of the indicators. No target revisions were made for FFY21.

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

Finally, progress for several of the SPP Indicators is aligned to the Illinois State Personnel Development Grant (IESE). The IESE Advisory Council meets quarterly 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 provides 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, ISAC, 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 have discussions with the IESE Advisory Council multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding Indicator 17. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, potential target revisions, and improvement strategies with the council as necessary. The IESE Advisory Council assists ISBE staff with reviewing Indicator 17 trend data and setting and revising targets for Indicator 17. No revisions were made to Indicator 17 for FFY21.

Targets

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

Inclusive Targets

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

Target Range not used

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

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

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

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

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

Inclusive Targets – 6C

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

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

07/06/2022

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	8,015	11,133	3,607	22,755
a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	3,716	5,859	1,889	11,464
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	2,201	2,304	651	5,156
b2. Number of children attending separate school	243	335	101	679
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	1	2	3
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	29	25	8	62

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 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	11,464	22,755	48.07%	46.50%	50.38%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	5,838	22,755	26.27%	26.04%	25.66%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Home	62	22,755	0.32%	0.27%	0.27%	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 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

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

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

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

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

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

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A1	2019	Target >=	86.10%	86.20%	86.30%	86.30%	83.95%
A1	83.93%	Data	76.99%	83.73%	84.38%	83.93%	77.44%

A2	2019	Target >=	55.40%	55.50%	55.60%	55.60%	47.20%
A2	47.11%	Data	47.20%	50.35%	50.08%	47.11%	42.18%
B1	2019	Target >=	86.80%	86.90%	87.00%	87.00%	84.10%
B1	84.09%	Data	77.91%	83.51%	84.24%	84.09%	78.17%
B2	2019	Target >=	53.70%	53.80%	53.90%	53.90%	45.10%
B2	45.07%	Data	45.54%	48.35%	47.95%	45.07%	39.39%
C1	2019	Target >=	87.90%	88.00%	88.10%	88.10%	85.80%
C1	85.77%	Data	78.70%	85.13%	86.39%	85.77%	78.74%
C2	2019	Target >=	64.10%	64.20%	64.30%	64.30%	53.40%
C2	53.32%	Data	54.62%	57.66%	57.14%	53.32%	47.33%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	83.95%	83.95%	83.95%	83.95%	84.00%
Target A2 >=	47.20%	47.20%	47.20%	47.20%	47.50%
Target B1 >=	84.10%	84.10%	84.10%	84.10%	84.50%
Target B2 >=	45.10%	45.10%	45.10%	45.10%	45.50%
Target C1 >=	85.80%	85.80%	85.80%	85.80%	86.00%
Target C2 >=	53.40%	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)
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education

Stakeholders included professional development providers, school district representatives, educational advocates, Illinois Early Learning Project representatives, Chicago Public Schools representatives, Parent Training and Information Center representatives, parent members of 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, 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. 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 engages on a monthly basis with this stakeholder group through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. 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 Services 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 Corrections/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 discusses baseline data, targets, potential target revisions, and improvement strategies with the Council as necessary. Data regarding the effectiveness of improvement strategies is shared with the Council to solicit feedback for continuous improvement. The Council assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising SPP targets for many of the indicators. No target revisions were made for FFY21.

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

Finally, progress for several of the SPP Indicators is aligned to the Illinois State Personnel Development Grant (IESE). The IESE Advisory Council meets quarterly 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 provides 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, ISAC, 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 have discussions with the IESE Advisory Council multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding Indicator 17. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, potential target revisions, and improvement strategies with the council as necessary. The IESE Advisory Council assists ISBE staff with reviewing Indicator 17 trend data and setting and revising targets for Indicator 17. No revisions were made to Indicator 17 for FFY21.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

9,505

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	66	0.69%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,731	18.21%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	3,607	37.95%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,143	33.07%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	958	10.08%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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>	6,750	8,547	77.44%	83.95%	78.98%	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>	4,101	9,505	42.18%	47.20%	43.15%	Did not meet target	No 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	45	0.47%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,698	17.86%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	3,811	40.09%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,314	34.87%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	637	6.70%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	7,125	8,868	78.17%	84.10%	80.35%	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>	3,951	9,505	39.39%	45.10%	41.57%	Did not meet target	No 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	54	0.57%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,593	16.76%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	3,200	33.67%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,662	38.53%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	996	10.48%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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>	6,862	8,509	78.74%	85.80%	80.64%	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	4,658	9,505	47.33%	53.40%	49.01%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$							

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

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

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

- 1) Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming Systems (AEPS)
- 2) 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 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, 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)
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education

Stakeholders included professional development providers, school district representatives, educational advocates, Illinois Early Learning Project representatives, Chicago Public Schools representatives, Parent Training and Information Center representatives, parent members of 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, 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. 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 engages on a monthly basis with this stakeholder group through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. 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 Services 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 Corrections/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 discusses baseline data, targets, potential target revisions, and improvement strategies with the Council as necessary. Data regarding the effectiveness of improvement strategies is shared with the Council to solicit feedback for continuous improvement. The Council assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising SPP targets for many of the indicators. No target revisions were made for FFY21.

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

Finally, progress for several of the SPP Indicators is aligned to the Illinois State Personnel Development Grant (IESE). The IESE Advisory Council meets quarterly 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 provides 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, ISAC, 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 have discussions with the IESE Advisory Council multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding Indicator 17. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, potential target revisions, and improvement strategies with the council as necessary. The IESE Advisory Council assists ISBE staff with reviewing Indicator 17 trend data and setting and revising targets for Indicator 17. No revisions were made to Indicator 17 for FFY21.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	53.80%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	60.00%	60.00%	61.00%	61.00%	70.50%
Data	68.75%	67.04%	70.00%	73.91%	70.79%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
2,253	3,257	70.79%	71.00%	69.17%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Several factors may have resulted in the slippage for SPP 8. There was a change in how the survey information was distributed to districts. In previous years, survey announcements and reminders were sent to both the school district superintendent and the state-approved director of special education. For this survey administration, the first email regarding the survey was sent to both school district superintendents and state-approved directors of special education and follow up reminders were only sent to state-approved directors of special education in an effort to decrease the volume of emails to superintendents from ISBE. Some state approved directors of special education are responsible for multiple LEAs within their special education cooperative. As such, if the state-approved director did not forward the reminder to the LEA, LEAs would not have received follow up reminders

regarding the survey, potentially affecting the number of survey responses and the percent of parents reporting that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. It was noted by the ISBE SPP 8 team that 70% of the surveys were distributed through special education cooperative administrators. In addition, the survey window was opened two weeks later than planned due to a change in ISBE personnel who were working on the SPP 8 data processes. To address this, the survey window was extended to allow adequate time for survey completion. However, the shift in the timeline could have affected the number of survey responses, potentially contributing to the 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.

46,180

Percentage of respondent parents

7.05%

Response Rate

FFY	2020	2021
Response Rate	8.14%	7.05%

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. Beginning with the FFY20 survey, ISBE's vendor sent a questionnaire to districts in the current year's survey cycle to determine the specific activities being implemented by each district to maximize the number of surveys completed. The questionnaire is designed to promote awareness of the parent survey and encourage districts to reach out to parents and families within their boundaries regarding survey completion, especially parents and families that may be underrepresented. One strategy ISBE utilizes to address underrepresented groups is to 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. Another strategy ISBE is implementing is notifying district administrators earlier in the school year that their parents would be receiving the survey. To increase the overall response rate and the response rate from underrepresented groups, the actual survey was also distributed earlier in the year. In addition, ISBE includes a QR code which is added to the letter distributed to families as another option for accessing the survey and as strategy to increase overall response rate and response rates in underrepresented groups. Another strategy ISBE is currently implementing is working collaboratively with our agency's data governance department on the potential use of email addresses and phone numbers as another means of increasing the survey response rate. ISBE also plans to brainstorm with its two PTIs to determine if they could support ISBE regarding increased awareness to parents and families about the survey in order to increase the overall response rate and the response rate from underrepresented groups.

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

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

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 two subgroups were less likely to respond. Families identifying as Black 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 were less likely to respond to the survey, 63.59% of the respondent families identifying as Black reported that the school facilitated parent involvement as compared to the overall rate of 69.16%. In addition, although families of students identified with Specific Learning Disabilities were less likely to respond to the survey, 70.23% of the respondent families of students identified with Specific Learning Disabilities reported that the school facilitated parent involvement. Therefore, data showed the discrepancies were not significant enough to identify a nonresponse bias.

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. 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 2021 survey respondents was examined by student age, gender, race/ethnicity, disability, and English language learner status. Given that the overall survey sample was representative of the population of students with disabilities ages 3-21 in the state, an examination of the response rate by subgroup sheds light on whether the survey responses were also representative of the state population.

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

The sample of parents with preschool children aged 3-5 receiving special education services is representative of five racial/ethnic groups and not representative of two groups. Specifically, families identifying as Black were less likely to complete the survey. Students identifying as Black made up 12.30% of the survey group and 6.98% of the survey respondents (a -5.32% difference). In contrast, families identifying as Hispanic were more likely to complete the survey. Students identifying as Hispanic made up 26.12% of the survey group and 31.75% of the survey responses (a +5.63% difference). The sample of parents with school-aged children receiving special education services is representative of four racial/ethnic groups and not representative of three groups. Specifically, families identifying as Black or Hispanic were less likely to complete the survey. Students identifying as Black made up 19.61% of the survey group and 12.14% of the survey responses (a -7.47% difference). Students identifying as Hispanic made up 27.82% of the survey group and 24.48% of the survey responses (a -3.34% difference). In contrast, families identifying as White were more likely to complete the survey. Students identifying as White made up 45.21% of the survey group and 55.05% of the survey responses (a +9.84% difference).

When the sample combines both parents with preschool and school-aged children receiving special education services, the overall sample is representative of five racial/ethnic groups and not representative of two groups. Students identifying as Black made up 19.04% of the overall survey group and 11.64% of the survey respondents (a -7.40% difference). In contrast, students identifying as White made up 45.70% of the overall survey group and 54.94% of the survey responses (a +9.24% difference).

The sample of parents with preschool children aged 3-5 receiving special education services is representative of 12 of the 14 disability categories, as is the sample of parents with school-aged children receiving special education services. Specifically, families of preschool students identified with Developmental Delays were less likely to complete the survey. Students identified with Developmental Delays made up 49.54% of the survey group and 45.40% of the survey responses (a -4.14% difference). In contrast, families of preschool students identified with Speech or Language Impairments were more likely to complete the survey. Students identified with Speech or Language Impairments made up 36.45% of the survey group and 40.00% of the survey responses (a +3.55% difference). In terms of the school-age population, families of students identified with Specific Learning Disabilities were less likely to complete the survey. Students identified with Specific Learning Disabilities made up 35.68% of the survey group and 27.61% of the survey responses (a -8.07% difference). In contrast, families of students identified with Autism Spectrum Disorders were more likely to complete the survey. Students identified with Autism made up 10.57% of the survey group and 15.81% of the survey responses (a +5.24% difference).

When the sample combines both parents with preschool and school-aged children receiving special education services, the overall sample is representative of 12 of the 14 disability categories. Students identified with Specific Learning Disabilities made up 32.89% of the overall survey group and 24.97% of the survey responses (a -7.92% difference). In contrast, students identified with Autism Spectrum Disorders made up 10.42% of the overall survey group and 15.26% of the survey respondents (a +4.84% difference).

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

NO

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

ISBE will work with its survey vendor and the school districts in the current year's survey cycle to complete follow up activities with families who are less likely to complete the survey. For example, districts will be strongly encouraged to utilize electronic survey invitations, reminder emails, reminder text messages, recorded phone messages, live phone calls, 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 will continue to include resources for parents, families, and districts on its SPP Indicator 8 webpage at: <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/SPP-APR-Indicator-8.aspx>. To support parents and families, an example of the survey will be posted along with the informational flyers that were distributed at the local level. Information regarding accessibility to language assistance, including a Spanish translation, and contact information for support from ISBE's vendor will be made available to parents via the website. To support districts, correspondence to districts will be posted. Individual response rate percentages will be shared with districts at specific intervals during the survey window so districts can encourage parent participation if necessary.

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

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

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously approved sampling plan changed?	YES
If yes, provide sampling plan.	SPP Indicator 8 Sampling Plan

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 46,180 parents of students with disabilities in Illinois who were selected to participate in the 2021-22 Illinois Parent Involvement Survey, 3,257 parents responded, yielding an 7.05% response rate. This FFY21 response rate decreased 1.09% from a response rate of 8.14% in FFY20. FFY20 data show that 3,742 respondents completed the survey. The FFY21 response rate of 7.05% was calculated using the total number of surveys received (3,257) divided by the total number of surveys mailed (46,180). However, 1,513 surveys were undeliverable and were returned to the sender. Therefore, the response rate based on the total number of surveys received (3,742) divided by the total number of surveys assumed delivered (44,667) is 7.29%.

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 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 were less likely to complete the survey, as were families of students identified with Specific Learning Disabilities. In contrast, families identifying as White were more likely to complete the survey, as were families of students identified with Autism Spectrum Disorders.

The State reported on the actions it is taking to address representativeness in the SPP 8 section entitled, "Describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics." In order to ensure that future response data are more representative, ISBE continues to work with its survey vendor and the school districts in the current year's survey cycle to complete follow up activities with families who are less likely to complete the survey. ISBE's survey vendor will continue to compile survey response data at regular intervals during the survey timeframe to determine which districts and families will be targeted for follow up communications regarding survey completion. ISBE also includes resources for parents, families, and districts on its SPP Indicator 8 webpage in an effort to increase representativeness.

8 - OSEP Response

The State submitted its sampling plan for this indicator with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR. OSEP's evaluation of the sampling plan indicated that it is approvable.

8 - 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.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 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.

12

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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	840	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 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 FFY21, 840 / 852 LEAs met the minimum n-size requirement and 12 / 852 LEAs did not meet the minimum n-size requirement for further analysis under SPP 9. One of the 840 LEAs met the criteria for overrepresentation based on race/ethnicity set by ISBE. This LEA was required to conduct self-assessment activities for FFY21. 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 2020

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 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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 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, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 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.

95

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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
49	0	757	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 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 FFY21, 757 / 852 LEAs met the minimum n-size requirement. Forty-nine (49) of the 757 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 49 LEAs were required to conduct self-assessment activities for FFY21. After a thorough review of LEA self-assessments and

status reports, none of the 49 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 2020

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 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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 noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.92%	99.20%	99.42%	99.61%	95.13%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
29,090	29,001	95.13%	100%	99.69%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

89

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 FFY21 there were 89 students out of 29,090 students (0.31%) whose evaluations were completed beyond the 60 school-day timeline. The number of days beyond the timeline ranged from 1 day to 286 days. Thirty-six of the 89 evaluations (40.46%) were completed 1-10 days beyond the timeline. Twelve of the 89 evaluations (13.48%) were completed 11-20 days beyond the timeline. Twelve of the 89 evaluations (13.48%) were completed 21-30 days beyond the timeline, and 29 of the 89 evaluations (32.58%) were completed more than 30 days beyond the timeline. Reported reasons for exceeding the 60 school-day timeline included procedures/practices not timely (67.42%), lack of personnel resources (12.36%), summer issues (10.11%) and hearing/vision/medical issues (10.11%).

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

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

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

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

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
44	44	0	0

FFY 2020 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 44 LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY20 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. After completing this process, ISBE was able to verify that 100% of the 44 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 Memorandum 09-02, ISBE verified correction of each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, through a review of updated data via the statewide database.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

The State reported that it verified that each of the 44 LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY20 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 2020 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 44 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 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.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.17%	96.90%	99.03%	97.75%	91.63%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	9,030
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	1,132

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	7,119
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.	204
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	45
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.	460

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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.	7,119	7,189	91.63%	100%	99.03%	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

70

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 70 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 1-123. Fifty-one students (72.86%) were 1-30 days beyond the timeline, sixteen students (22.86%) were 31-60 days beyond the timeline, one student (1.42%) was 61-90 days beyond the timeline, and two students (2.86%) were 90+ days beyond the timeline. In terms of reasons for the delays, 51.43% 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 48.57% 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 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
27	27	0	0

FFY 2020 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 27 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: SPP Indicator 12. 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. After completing this process, ISBE was able to verify that 100% of the 27 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 Memorandum #09-02, ISBE verified correction of each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, through a review of updated data via the statewide data system.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

The State reported that it verified that each of the 27 LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY20 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 2020 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 27 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 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.

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.63%	99.17%	99.57%	99.70%	99.70%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
69,018	70,379	99.70%	100%	98.07%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Overall, Illinois increased from 208 IEPs out of compliance in FFY20 to 1,361 IEPs out of compliance in FFY21. Of the four districts that had SPP 13 findings in both FFY20 and FFY21, two showed improvements in their SPP 13 percentages, one had no significant percentage change, and one dropped significantly from 98.56% to 90.03%. The district that had the significant decrease in its percentage increased from 189 IEPs out of compliance in FFY20 to 1,339 IEPs out of compliance in FFY21. This large district accounted for the majority of the SPP 13 noncompliance in FFY21 as 1,339 out of the 1,361 instances of noncompliance were associated with this district. After analyzing data for this district, it appears that the following factors may have contributed to the increase in noncompliance: internal staff transitions and network reorganizations at the district administrative level, internal district modifications to the electronic IEP, and inconsistencies in data entry by staff. ISBE continues to provide technical assistance to the districts with noncompliance through their Corrective Action Plan implementation.

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

The OSEP Part B SPP and APR Indicator Measurement Table for FFY21 indicates that a State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

ISBE continued to report students aged 16 and above in the new SPP/APR cycle without including its youth aged 14 ½ to 16. The consistent reporting of the percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above for this indicator allows ISBE and its stakeholders to continue monitoring trend data from the original baseline data in order to inform decision making around 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 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
5	5	0	0

FFY 2020 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 5 LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY20 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 5 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 Memorandum 09-02, ISBE verified correction of each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, through updated data from previously noncompliant files.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

The State reported that it verified that each of the 5 LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY20 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 2020 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 5 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 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.

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

Instructions

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

Collect data by September 2022 on students who left school during 2020-2021, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2020-2021 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

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

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

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

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

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

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

II. Data Reporting

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

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

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

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

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

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

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 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.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	2017	Target ≥	35.00%	35.00%	35.00%	35.10%	29.60%
A	29.59%	Data	32.07%	29.59%	29.58%	29.55%	22.17%
B	2017	Target ≥	57.00%	57.00%	57.00%	57.00%	63.50%
B	63.46%	Data	64.22%	63.46%	60.88%	66.90%	61.32%
C	2017	Target ≥	73.00%	74.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.75%
C	75.74%	Data	76.09%	75.74%	71.79%	77.62%	73.21%

FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A ≥	29.60%	29.60%	29.60%	29.60%	30.00%
Target B ≥	63.50%	63.50%	63.50%	63.50%	66.00%
Target C ≥	75.75%	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)
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education

Stakeholders included professional development providers, school district representatives, educational advocates, Illinois Early Learning Project

representatives, Chicago Public Schools representatives, Parent Training and Information Center representatives, parent members of 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, 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. 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 engages on a monthly basis with this stakeholder group through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. 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 Services 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 Corrections/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 discusses baseline data, targets, potential target revisions, and improvement strategies with the Council as necessary. Data regarding the effectiveness of improvement strategies is shared with the Council to solicit feedback for continuous improvement. The Council assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising SPP targets for many of the indicators. No target revisions were made for FFY21.

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

Finally, progress for several of the SPP Indicators is aligned to the Illinois State Personnel Development Grant (IESE). The IESE Advisory Council meets quarterly 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 provides 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, ISAC, 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 have discussions with the IESE Advisory Council multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding Indicator 17. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, potential target revisions, and improvement strategies with the council as necessary. The IESE Advisory Council assists ISBE staff with reviewing Indicator 17 trend data and setting and revising targets for Indicator 17. No revisions were made to Indicator 17 for FFY21.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	3,584
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	1,034
Response Rate	28.85%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	301
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	409
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)	52
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).	55

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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	301	1,034	22.17%	29.60%	29.11%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	710	1,034	61.32%	63.50%	68.67%	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	1,034	73.21%	75.75%	79.01%	Met target	No Slippage

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	2020	2021
Response Rate	47.11%	28.85%

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 continue to collaborate with the Information Technology Department staff at the agency to determine the feasibility and logistics of including an electronic version of the survey as an option for school leavers as a means to increase the response rate. This prospect was discussed last year but was deemed not feasible at that time due to multiple factors. One strategy that ISBE staff will implement is the collaboration with the Illinois Department of Human Services, Division of Rehabilitation Services (DRS) to determine if DRS contacts would be a viable resource for connecting with former students for survey completion to increase overall response rates and response rates of underrepresented groups. Another strategy ISBE staff will implement to increase the overall response rate and the response rate of underrepresented populations is the possibility of compiling response data at regular intervals during the survey timeframe to determine which districts and students/families will be targeted for follow up communications regarding survey completion. District response rate percentages would be shared with districts at specific intervals during the survey window so they could encourage participation if necessary. Another strategy ISBE will implement to increase response rates of underrepresented groups, is utilizing LEAs who have a good response rate for underrepresented groups to understand the processes they utilize. This information will be used to provide TA and best practices to all LEAs to increase overall response rates and response rates in underrepresented groups.

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

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

ISBE reviewed data related to underrepresented groups completing the survey and found that nonresponse bias data was not significant between the overall survey completers and the three underrepresented groups. The analyses of response rate data indicated that three subgroups were less likely to respond. However, it was noted that two of the subgroups (school leavers identifying as Black and youth identified with Emotional Disabilities) had a nonresponse rate that was lower than the overall nonresponse rate. The third underrepresented group (youth who graduated with a diploma) did have slightly higher rates of nonresponse as compared to the overall nonresponse rate. However, this group also made up 68.67% of the total responses received. Therefore, this indicates nonresponse bias is not present, as this group was the largest subgroup to receive the survey and the largest subgroup to respond.

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 2021 survey respondents was examined by gender, race/ethnicity, exit reason, and disability category. Given that the overall survey sample was representative of the state's youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, an examination of the response rate by subgroup sheds light on whether the survey responses were also representative of this state population.

The results of the analysis indicated that student gender status was not a significant predictor of survey completion. Therefore, the sample of students who responded to the survey is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school in terms of gender. While the overall sample of students who responded to the survey is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school in multiple racial/ethnic groups, exit categories, and disability categories, survey result analyses indicated some statistically significant differences between students who did and did not respond to the survey in terms of race/ethnicity, exit reason, and primary disability category. Specifically, school leavers identifying as Black were less likely to complete the survey, as were youth who graduated with a diploma and youth identified with Emotional Disabilities. Youth identifying as Black who were no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school made up 26.81% of the survey group and 20.12% of the survey responses (an -6.70% difference). Youth who exited with a diploma made up 72.96% of the survey group and 68.67% of the survey responses (an -4.30% difference). Youth identified with Emotional Disabilities made up 13.81% of the survey group and 10.44% of the responses (a -3.37% difference). In contrast, school leavers identifying as Hispanic were more likely to complete the survey, as were youth identified with a primary disability of Specific Learning Disability. Youth identifying as Hispanic who were no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school made up 17.35% of the survey group and 20.89% of the survey responses (a +3.53% difference). Youth identified with Specific Learning Disabilities made up 46.82% of the survey group and 50.87% of the survey responses (a +4.05% difference).

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

NO

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

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

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.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously approved sampling plan changed?	YES
If yes, provide sampling plan.	SPP Indicator 14 Sampling Plan

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 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 status was not a significant predictor of survey completion. Survey result analyses also indicated that school leavers identifying as Black were less likely to complete the survey, as were youth who exited with a diploma and youth identified with Emotional Disabilities. In contrast, school leavers identifying as Hispanic were more likely to complete the survey, as were youth identified with a primary disability of Specific Learning Disabilities.

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." In order to ensure that future response data are more representative, ISBE added NTACT resource documents to the SPP 14 webpage and provided 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 2022-2023 survey.

14 - OSEP Response

The State submitted its sampling plan for this indicator with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR, and OSEP's evaluation of the sampling plan indicated that it is approvable.

14 - 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.

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/02/2022	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	10
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/02/2022	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	1

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

Stakeholders included professional development providers, school district representatives, educational advocates, Illinois Early Learning Project representatives, Chicago Public Schools representatives, Parent Training and Information Center representatives, parent members of 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, 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. 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 engages on a monthly basis with this stakeholder group through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. 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 Services 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 Corrections/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 discusses baseline data, targets, potential target revisions, and improvement strategies with the Council as necessary. Data regarding the effectiveness of improvement strategies is shared with the Council to solicit feedback for continuous improvement. The Council assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising SPP targets for many of the indicators. No target revisions were made for FFY21.

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

Finally, progress for several of the SPP Indicators is aligned to the Illinois State Personnel Development Grant (IESE). The IESE Advisory Council meets quarterly 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 provides 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, ISAC, 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 have discussions with the IESE Advisory Council multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding Indicator 17. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, potential target revisions, and improvement strategies with the council as necessary. The IESE Advisory Council assists ISBE staff with reviewing Indicator 17 trend data and setting and revising targets for Indicator 17. No revisions were made to Indicator 17 for FFY21.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2012	26.67%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	25.00% - 35.00%	25.00% - 35.00%	25.00% - 35.00%	25.10%-35.10%	25.10%
Data	42.50%	32.43%	37.04%	16.67%	25.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
1	10	25.00%	25.10%	10.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

ISBE attributes the slippage in SPP 15 to higher rates of success in mediation. The number of resolution sessions has steadily decreased from 37 sessions in FFY17 to 10 sessions in FFY21. In FFY20 there were 12 resolution sessions as compared to the 10 sessions in FFY21. In contrast, there were 186 mediations held in FFY20 as compared to 253 mediations held in FFY21. The success rate for mediation agreements jumped from 50% in FFY20 to 62.45% in FFY21. During FFY21, ISBE data documented an increase of parents invoking the "stay put" provision of IDEA Due Process proceedings in connection with State-sponsored mediation. Under this Illinois School Code provision, a parent may invoke "stay-put" in connection with

a request to mediate an issue affecting the placement of a student with disabilities before requesting a due process hearing. Thus, many parties completed mediation prior to filing for a due process hearing. ISBE believes this is a significant factor in the decreasing resolution meeting numbers.

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 resolution mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

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

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

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

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1 Mediations held	252
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	61
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	97

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

Stakeholders included professional development providers, school district representatives, educational advocates, Illinois Early Learning Project representatives, Chicago Public Schools representatives, Parent Training and Information Center representatives, parent members of 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, 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. 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 engages on a monthly basis with this stakeholder group through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. 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 Services 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 Corrections/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 discusses baseline data, targets, potential target revisions, and improvement strategies with the Council as necessary. Data regarding the effectiveness of improvement strategies is shared with the Council to solicit feedback for continuous improvement. The Council assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising SPP targets for many of the indicators. No target revisions were made for FFY21.

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

Finally, progress for several of the SPP Indicators is aligned to the Illinois State Personnel Development Grant (IESE). The IESE Advisory Council meets quarterly 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 provides 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, ISAC, 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 have discussions with the IESE Advisory Council multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding Indicator 17. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, potential target revisions, and improvement strategies with the council as necessary. The IESE Advisory Council assists ISBE staff with reviewing Indicator 17 trend data and setting and revising targets for Indicator 17. No revisions were made to Indicator 17 for FFY21.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2012	66.67%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	66.00%	66.00%	67.00%	67.00%	67.00%
Data	72.73%	59.11%	62.37%	66.67%	50.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
61	97	252	50.00%	67.00%	62.70%	Did not meet 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) for Children with Disabilities.

Targets: In its FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2021 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2021 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 2021 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2022). 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 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023; for the FFY 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023) for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023) 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	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target> =	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	11.00%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of 4th Grade Children with IEPs Scoring at or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of 4th Grade Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
1,632	18,741	7.06%	10.00%	8.71%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 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) to determine how many 4th grade children with IEPs scored at or above proficient

on this regular assessment. Then ISBE determines whether the current FFY target was met based on the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient as compared to the number of students who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)

YES

Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.

In addition to the primary source of data used to demonstrate progress toward the SiMR (statewide assessment data), ISBE's evaluation plan includes the following additional data collected: Professional development post surveys, Evidence-Based Professional Development Worksheets, The Illinois Implementation Fidelity Instrument (Illinois IFI), systems screening tools, State Capacity Assessments, and Regional Capacity Assessments. Professional development post surveys are administered to gather data regarding participant perceptions of their own growth in both knowledge and skills, the likelihood of their implementing in their classrooms what was learned, and their perception of the effect of professional development experience upon the success of their students with disabilities. Evidence-based professional development worksheets provide data for clear expectations for the providers and trainers of the professional development; accountability for the quality of the professional development and coaching, the utilization of effective, research-based adult learning methodology, and the collection of data with high fidelity to the objectives. The Illinois IFI collects qualitative and quantitative data on how the training is implemented in specific classrooms. Systems screening tools allow the Illinois Elevating Special Educators (IESE) Network and districts to ascertain the needs of districts within each of the identified areas of the state so that the work of the program advisor can target the needs of the districts. 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 Network is to improve outcomes for students with IEPs by providing tiered professional development and technical assistance to the educators supporting these students. The Network supports special educators through research-based professional development, technical assistance, mentoring, and coaching. The SSIP outcomes are aligned with the SPDG outcomes. State and regional capacity assessments measure the capacity the state and the region have to implement the IESE Network, with the expectation that capacity will grow over the years of the SPDG, which includes perceptions about resources, leadership, data systems, and communication. Data that have been collected at this time include post-professional development surveys, evidence-based professional development worksheets, systems screening tools, the State Capacity Assessment completed in October 2022, and Regional Capacity Assessments completed in February and September 2022.

IAR Data from 2020-2021

In the May 2022 SPDG Annual Performance Report to OSEP, IAR baseline data was 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 the ability to access universal supports (at a minimum), not all educators choose to do so. These data are considered a baseline to be used as a comparative measure for Spring 2023 IAR data.

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.

Instead of using the RESET Rubrics as the measure of implementation, the IESE Network developed an individualized instrument, the Illinois Implementation Fidelity Instrument (Illinois IFI), to measure fidelity of implementation to better meet the specific needs of the IESE Network.

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

The RESET Rubrics are designed to measure the implementation of evidence-based practices and are strong and validated instruments. The professional development provided through the IESE Network aligns with High Leverage Practices; however, the RESET rubrics are based upon specific evidenced-based practices which are evidenced in many of the professional development sessions offered by the IESE Network, but not all. Therefore, it was necessary to find or develop an instrument that aligned with all of the professional development occurring through the IESE Network. The Illinois IFI, developed by the SPDG/IESE Project Evaluator and approved by the IESE Leadership and the OSEP SPDG Program Director, allows for a broader scope of professional development applications with fidelity.

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, technical assistance, mentoring, and coaching) focused on literacy, social-emotional learning, 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. The Network divides the state into five regions, with an IESE Network Program Advisor leading each of the regions. With the district's LEA Determination in mind, the Program Advisors utilize a universal screening tool and collaborative analysis guide to identify the needs of each district. Then differentiated supports that target those district needs directly are planned, implemented, and assessed. The IESE Network screening tool focuses on helping districts identify the factors related to the lack of progress for any identified indicator, while the collaborative analysis guide helps facilitate a deeper dive into the root cause of low performance for each identified indicator. This infrastructure design allows each area team to identify and plan differentiated support for the districts in their assigned area. By using this process in conjunction with the assessment tools, the IESE Network team can gain stakeholder input at the local level as well base services on data to determine the individual needs of each district.

Districts that are designated as Meets Requirements or Needs Assistance through their LEA Determination fall in the Tier 1 level of support under the ISBE Special Education Accountability and Support System. IESE Network Program Advisors and Regional Specialists make contact with Tier 1 districts in one of two ways. First, IESE Network Staff send informational emails to all Tier 1 districts. Districts can request more information from that email. Also, Tier 1 districts can inquire about supports and services through an online referral form on the IESE Network website. An IESE Network Program Advisor will reach out to the entity to set up a meeting. If Tier 1 districts agree to partner and want individualized support, IESE Network staff meets 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 32 Tier 1 Districts. During the 2021-22 school year, the IESE Network supported 18 Tier 1 districts.

Districts that are designated as Needs Assistance for Two or More Consecutive Years through their LEA Determination fall in the Tier 2 level of support under the ISBE Special Education Accountability and Support System. Tier 2 districts are advised of state and national technical assistance resources that may help them address the area(s) for which they need support. The IESE Network is one of the available resources. During the 2021-22 school year, the IESE Network supported three Tier 2 districts using the districts' improvement plans as the foundation for their services. Services for these districts continue this school year.

Districts that are designated as Needs Intervention, Needs Intervention for Three or More Consecutive Years, or Needs Substantial Intervention through their LEA Determination fall in the Tier 3 level of support under the ISBE Special Education Accountability and Support System. The IESE Network collaborates with ISBE staff to facilitate improvement planning and provide individualized oversight, technical assistance, mentoring, and coaching support. The IESE Network is currently supporting one Tier 3 district, using the district's improvement plans as the foundation for their services. During the 2021-22 school year, the IESE Network supported two Tier 3 districts. Services for these districts continue.

To monitor the integrity and implementation of this process, the IESE Network Grant Coordinator meets with each area team once a week and the statewide team once a week. During these meetings, IESE Network Program Advisors and Regional Specialists report on the progress being made in each Continuous Improvement Agreement with districts. The grant evaluator attends these meetings to review area wide and statewide data with the team. She also collaborates with each team as they are creating their improvement plans with districts, so data collection procedures and timelines are met. Data from current mentoring sessions and/or professional learning sessions is also reviewed and used to plan future sessions. The ISBE Program Director also attends the statewide IESE 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.

Short-term outcomes focused on increasing knowledge of literacy, social-emotional learning (SEL), and systems development and improvement through the systems framework area of professional development (PD) and/or technical assistance. Surveys were administered for each area. Participants indicated whether the statements were evident to no extent (1), a small extent (2), some extent (3), or a significant extent (4). Four literacy trainings serving 66 special educators and two conference sessions were delivered. Sessions covered strategies for phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension across grade spans and tiers. Surveys indicated that educators perceived increased knowledge ($M=3.35$, $SD=.67$), increased understanding of content ($M=3.31$, $SD=.62$), increased ability to apply knowledge ($M=3.42$, $SD=.61$), and the intent to incorporate knowledge into teaching ($M=3.50$, $SD=.62$). They believed the PD would increase student success ($M=3.44$, $SD=.62$).

Educators also reported on their level of content knowledge pre- and post-training on a 0-100 scale (0 = no knowledge and 100 = complete knowledge). There was a significant increase in perceptions about level of knowledge prior to the training ($M=69.11$, $SD=23.59$) as compared to after ($M=83.94$, $SD=15.36$) ($t(46)=6.911$, $p<.001$). A second question addressed PD strategy implementation. There was a significant increase in perceptions about implementation of content from before the training ($M=66.91$, $SD=24.67$) as compared to after ($M=85.11$, $SD=14.69$) ($t(46)=6.367$, $p<.001$).

Fourteen SEL sessions were held for 387 educators, one session was held for 268 paraprofessionals, and three conference sessions were delivered. A training video was also created for a large district. Sessions addressed behavioral and executive functions, trauma-informed practices, positive relationships, relationship building, and function-based classroom and individual interventions. Educators perceived that PD increased their knowledge of students with disabilities ($M=3.30$, $SD=.71$) or increased their understanding of content ($M=3.24$, $SD=.70$). Participants reported an increase in the ability to apply the knowledge ($M=3.33$, $SD=.69$) and incorporate it into their teaching ($M=3.45$, $SD=.66$). Participants believed that the PD would increase student success ($M=3.36$, $SD=.65$). Educators also reported on their level of content knowledge pre- and post-training on a scale between 0-100. There was a significant increase in perceptions about their level of SEL knowledge prior to the training ($M=62.54$, $SD=23.64$) as compared to after ($M=81.47$, $SD=14.19$) ($t(156)=12.094$, $p<.001$). A second question addressed implementing the PD strategies. There was a significant increase in perceptions about the implementation of the content from before the training ($M=62.71$, $SD=24.12$) as compared to after ($M=82.36$, $SD=14.31$) ($t(156)=12.327$, $p<.001$). Paraprofessionals who participated in training indicated that it increased their knowledge ($M=2.86$, $SD=.75$) or understanding of content ($M=2.81$, $SD=.84$), increased their ability to apply this knowledge ($M=2.87$, $SD=.84$), incorporate it into their practice ($M=3.12$, $SD=.78$), and evaluate and adjust their practice ($M=2.87$, $SD=.84$). SEL was also a topic of online PD for early career special educators. They reported the PD would contribute to student success ($M=3.37$, $SD=.69$), contribute to better communication with parents ($M=3.22$, $SD=.70$), and increase the likelihood of remaining in their position ($M=3.19$, $SD=.68$).

Forty-two systems development and improvement trainings for 874 educators and one training for 401 paraprofessionals addressed inclusive practices, high leverage practices in special education, IEP goals, and paraprofessional roles and responsibilities. A systems training video was also created for a large district. Participants reported increased knowledge ($M=3.16$, $SD=.81$), increased understanding of content ($M=3.13$, $SD=.80$), and increased application to practice. They believed they increased their ability to apply the knowledge to their teaching ($M=3.15$, $SD=.82$); to reflect upon, evaluate, and adjust their teaching ($M=3.22$, $SD=.81$); and the likelihood that the knowledge would be incorporated into and affect their teaching ($M=3.25$, $SD=.78$). They reported that the PD would increase student success ($M=3.23$, $SD=.83$). Participants reported on their level of systems knowledge pre- and post-training on a scale between 0-100. There was significant growth in both knowledge of content and intent to implement. Prior to PD, participants reported lower perceptions of their content knowledge ($M=67.57$, $SD=22.66$) as compared to after ($M=81.18$, $SD=17.34$) ($t(852)=22.565$, $p<.001$). Prior to PD, they reported lower levels of implementation of the content into their classrooms ($M=69.98$, $SD=22.06$) than after, where they reported significantly higher intentions to implement what was learned ($M=82.96$, $SD=16.94$) ($t(852)=22.250$, $p<.001$).

Intermediate outcomes focused on the implementation of seamless and sustainable delivery systems for specialized populations of learners through the systems framework area of PD and/or technical assistance. IESE Network staff met with districts to establish partnerships and identify support based on ISBE LEA Determinations and other data. Network staff used Learning Forward's PD standards and the High-Quality PD Checklist to implement research-based professional learning experiences. Network staff worked with districts in a train-the-trainer model for sustainability of professional

learning and seamless delivery of services. Two instruments developed by the State Implementation and Scaling-up Evidence-based Practices (SISEP) Center were used to measure systems: the Regional Capacity Assessment (RCA) and State Capacity Assessment (SCA). The SCA uses a consensus model of data collection that incorporates qualitative and quantitative data to determine if statements about the capacity for the Network to effectively enact its innovations is (0) not present; (1) partially present; or (2) fully present. SCA data collected in September 2021 and October 2022 noted significant growth in the capacity of the Network to implement effective innovations across the state in all three categories. 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%. The RCA similarly measures capacity but focuses on the region versus the state. The RCA was conducted with all five regional teams in February 2022 and September 2022. All regions made significant gains in the capacity to implement the Network initiatives. Leadership data improved from 64.29% to 97.14%, Competency from 40% to 66.67%, Organization from 35.56% to 62.22%, and Stage-Based Functioning from 50% to 90%. Overall RCA percentages improved from 45.71% to 75.36%.

Intermediate outcomes also focused on enhancing the effectiveness of educators who support students with disabilities via coaching and mentoring. Surveys indicated level of agreement to statements about literacy support received through the IESE Network. Levels of agreement were chosen from a six-point scale: strongly disagree (1); disagree (2); slightly disagree (3); slightly agree (4); agree (5); or strongly agree (6). All participants agreed that the mentoring and coaching increased their knowledge and understanding of content ($M=5.33$, $SD=.58$), had been directly applied to their classroom ($M=5.67$, $SD=.58$), and positively affected student success ($M=5.33$, $SD=.58$). Network staff are coaching 25 educators in literacy, 43 in SEL, and 48 in systems and are mentoring 31 educators in literacy, 59 in SEL, and 61 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 continuing to collect data to determine the effects of the differentiated professional development (PD) upon multiple measures of student achievement and success, as well as to grow the capacity of the IESE Network to implement effective educational innovations. The infrastructure improvement strategies of the 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 those educators who have participated in IESE Network activities with the statewide averages; (2) IAR data that examines growth in achievement, comparing data from those students who were in classrooms of educators who participated in the IESE Network and those who were not; (3) student attendance data; and (4) student suspension/expulsion data, again examining whether any differences are evident between those who had educators who were participating in the IESE Network as compared to state averages. 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.

Another step toward infrastructure improvement uses RCA and SCA data to identify clear next steps toward growing in the capacity to implement effective educational innovations both at the State and Regional levels. Data from SCA and RCA administrations were shared with the IESE Network Leadership Team at a retreat in May 2022, and again in quarterly in-person meetings on 3 October and 16 December 2022. The Network Leadership Team met to review the data and discuss the next steps toward improvement based upon the data. The Network Leadership team will meet again in March and May 2023 to review data, discuss adjustments, and plan next steps. Below are the next steps that will be addressed by the Network Leadership Team by its next quarterly meeting in March 2023. The following action steps were presented to the Network Leadership Team on October 3, 2022, with the expectation that they will be addressed and reflected in the administration of the SCA in March 2023:

1. Communication of an Overarching Data Plan. Although the Network has improved in the areas of data collection, analysis, and reporting, a next step by 17 March 2023 needs to be the communication of an overarching data plan that is cohesive with the statewide vision, yet applicable in all of the individual Areas.
2. Clarity of Roles and Expectations. Although the Network has clearly identified roles, functions, and structures for its members, these are not as clearly defined for the Regional Specialists who are hired by the Regional Offices of Education (ROEs). A next step is for the Grant Coordinator to meet with each of the sub-granting ROEs to clarify the structure of responsibility, training, roles, guidance, and supervision of the Regional Specialists. These meetings occurred in January 2023 and will occur quarterly through the life of the grant.
3. Enhance communication and engagement with statewide stakeholder groups. Although the Grant Coordinator and Project Director are in regular communication with stakeholders, the Network Leadership Team has limited awareness of these conversations. A next step is to clearly define the stakeholders who are involved in designing solutions alongside the Network, at both the state level and the regional level. Finally, communication to the entire Network, at the in-person quarterly meetings about how these stakeholders are provided information, given feedback, engaged in dialogue, and addressing any barriers to effective communication.

Following the administration of the RCA, participants were asked to consider action steps based upon the conversations surrounding the items of the RCA. Below are action steps that were identified by IESE Network staff in almost all of the respective Areas to be completed by the administration of the five RCAs throughout the month of February 2023.

1. Establishment of a Coaching System. Although a coaching system is identified in each of the Areas, the use of a delivery plan to support district implementation teams and the collection of coaching effectiveness data are not in place. The next step is for the Network to engage in conversations and planning about what this would look like in each of the Areas, given the capacity provided by the resources in existence.
2. Establishment of a Fidelity Instrument for PD Application. The HQPD Checklist is a good fidelity instrument to determine the quality of the PD being provided, but there does not exist a fidelity instrument to measure how well the PD provided is being applied at the point of the student. Every one of the Areas across the IESE Network identified this as being "partially in place," or "not in place." A next step is the development of the Illinois IFI (which has been completed and is currently being piloted across the Network).
3. Updates to the IESE Network Handbook. Several items from the Area RCA administrations indicated updates that are needed to the IESE Network Handbook that would address identified deficiencies in regional capacity. These include:
 - i. Identification of Executive Leader and Coordinator Persons. Areas clearly identified the Program Coordinator as the "Coordinator," but were varied in the person they identified as the "Executive Leader." In January 2023, these roles have been clarified via meetings the Grant Coordinator had with each of the Area teams.
 - ii. Regional Specialist Roles and Responsibilities. Areas were clear on the reporting structure and job descriptions of the Program Advisors, but not the Regional Specialists. They reported that the reporting structure, responsibility for writing professional learning plans, and responsibility for training new Regional Specialists were partially in place and not in writing. Using the current role descriptions, Network Area Teams further defined, in writing, each role specific to their area. Regional Specialists were provided with a template for writing professional learning plans and identified training will be provided through the grant.
 - iii. Clarify Process of Communicating with the SEA on Policy Relevant Information. A written, short paragraph in the Handbook on how the Network

Areas communicate policy relevant information to the SEA/ISBE, as well as discuss it among the Network Leadership Team would address this item. The process for communicating with the SEA was discussed at the December quarterly meeting as well as written in the IESE Handbook. The above information was shared with the Grant Coordinator and the Project Director, as well as with the IESE Network Leadership Team. The RCA will be conducted twice a year with each of the statewide areas of the Network, with the next one scheduled to occur in February 2023. The expectation is that through data collected via both instruments, and reflection upon that data resulting in implementing change in the state and regional capacities of the Network, these are clear strategies to improvements in infrastructure. The SPDG Annual Performance Report (APR) and/or current data is shared with members at each of the quarterly meetings. The members have provided insight into issues impacting districts, educators, and families. Numerous suggestions from council members have been adopted by the Network Leadership team. Renewed efforts and changes to the IESE Network activities occur with Advisory Council input, and results will continue to be brought before the Council on a regular basis.

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

Last cycle, educators participated in professional learning activities to increase their knowledge and enhance their effectiveness in the following areas related to literacy and social-emotional learning based on area and district need:

- ? Early Literacy Instructional Delivery: The Big 5 (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension)
- ? Reading and Writing Interventions: IXL, Read 180, Reading Plus, Read Naturally, Lexia Core 5, SPIRE
- ? Social/Emotional Learning: Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL) Framework

The SSIP continued to focus on implementing evidence-based practices in early literacy, social-emotional learning, and systems development. However, the number of trainings held, and evidence-based practices covered increased. Educators participated in these activities throughout the year to increase knowledge and skills in the following areas based on need:

- ? Explicit Instruction
- ? High Leverage Practices in Special Education (Collaboration, Assessment, Instruction, Social/Emotional/Behavioral Supports)
- ? Early Literacy Instruction (phonological awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, comprehension)
- ? Literacy Standards and Curriculum Evaluation
- ? Reading and Writing Interventions
- ? Literacy within MTSS
- ? Science of Reading/Structured Literacy/Scarborough's Rope
- ? Social-Emotional Learning: Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL) Framework
- ? CASEL's Theory of Action for Effective SEL Implementation
- ? Understanding Functions of Behavior - Function-Based Behavioral Interventions, Managing vs. Changing Behavior
- ? Trauma-Informed Practices - ACES
- ? Building Positive Relationships (effects of anger, emotional competence, crisis communication, active listening)
- ? Positive and Consistent Classroom Management
- ? Universal Design for Learning and Differentiation strategies

During conversations with partnering districts, entities, and the IESE Network Advisory Council, systems improvement was identified as a high district need. Without adequate, effective, and efficient systems in place, early 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 inclusive practice professional learning opportunities. SEL is also discussed as an imperative educational environment consideration within UDL and Differentiation. Therefore, the number of trainings may not adequately represent how often Literacy and SEL are discussed.

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

High Leverage Practices in Special Education include the following domains: Collaboration, Assessment, Instruction, and Social/Emotional/Behavioral. With educators' consistent use, HLPs have been shown to increase outcomes for students with disabilities. Professional learning provided fell under these domains through evidence-based practices. Early literacy instructional delivery includes addressing foundational skill standards (The Big Five), phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. The IESE early literacy training follows the Science of Reading, Structured Literacy, and Scarborough's Reading Rope as a specific framework for improving instructional delivery of the foundational skills for learning to read. Instructional delivery such as explicit instruction was also provided. These trainings are available in all three tiers of support. At Tier 1, IESE delivered overviews of evidence-based practices in early literacy to small groups of educators, schools, or districts as requested. Participants had already received training on early literacy instruction and needed a general overview of the components. Schools or districts that needed more detailed sessions on parts of early literacy instruction received Tier 2 supports, which often included follow up coaching. Tier 2 support consisted of smaller groups of educators who needed practical feedback on how to implement early literacy instructional strategies. Tier 3 support consists of specific feedback and coaching provided on a scheduled basis.

Reading and writing interventions are multi-tiered approaches to the early identification and support of students with learning needs in these areas. Training sessions covering reading and writing interventions included phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Some of these techniques included Focus on vowels, CVC Words, Word Slide, Sound it out in your head, Nonsense words, Review and Repetition, chunking, visual cues, pattern searching, read to partners, highlighting, think alouds, annotating, and others. Writing interventions further focused on critical thinking, syntax, text structure, mechanics, and spelling. Each of these techniques is research based for early literacy and intervention instructional methods.

Social-emotional learning (SEL) is a methodology that helps students of all ages better comprehend their emotions, feel those emotions fully, and demonstrate empathy for others. This includes self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision making. Some techniques included in the SEL trainings were for adults to use while others were for students to learn to use. All techniques are based on behavioral science research and taken from universal trainings such as Therapeutic Crisis Intervention, Positive Behavior Facilitation, De-escalation, Active Listening, Emotional Competence, Trauma-Informed Practices (Adverse Childhood Experiences), and Effective Interventions for Behaviors (disruptive, aggressive, and violent). Positive relationships are the basis for social-emotional learning and were covered in all trainings. Behavioral functions were presented to recognize educators' own behaviors as well as why students may act in various ways. Function-based classroom and individual interventions were reviewed. Also included in this training is how to effectively implement an SEL framework (CASEL) in a building or district, which requires a systematic plan that infuses social-emotional and academic learning throughout the school day. Much like the tiers of support for literacy, Tier 1 support consisted of overviews of evidence-based practices in SEL to small groups of educators, schools, or districts that requested it. These participants came from districts with an SEL Framework in place and needed a general review of the components. Schools or districts that

needed a series of more detailed sessions on SEL instruction received Tier 2 supports, which often included follow up coaching. At this tier, IESE also helped districts analyze discipline data to determine the areas of SEL for training focus. Tier 2 support consisted of smaller groups of educators who needed practical feedback on how to infuse SEL into their academic instruction. Tier 3 support consists of specific feedback and coaching provided on a scheduled basis.

Systems development and improvement evidence-based practices include UDL and Differentiation. While UDL is a framework for designing instruction for a broad range of learners, Differentiation is considering different learners 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.

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes.

Early literacy continues to be the main focus of the SSIP. The IESE Network provides differentiated professional learning to educators on early literacy instructional delivery (the Big 5) as well as on reading and writing interventions. This directly relates to one of the short-term objectives of the SSIP: increased educator knowledge regarding literacy. With increased educator knowledge in literacy, positive changes in teacher practice would also be expected. That relates directly to one of the SSIP's intended intermediate outcomes: enhanced effectiveness of educators who support students with disabilities. Early literacy acquisition is vital to learning. When students have access to high quality, evidence-based early literacy instruction, they learn to read in K-2, and by 4th grade, they can transition from learning to read to reading to learn. This directly relates to one of the intermediate outcomes of the SSIP: improved outcomes for students with disabilities from implemented academic evidence-based practices. It also relates to the long-term outcome, or SiMR, which states, "The percentage of 4th grade students with disabilities who are proficient or above the grade level standard on the state English-language arts assessment will increase." Professional development on early literacy has been provided to teachers around the state through Tier 1, district, or area wide meetings. These trainings included presentation of the four foundational skills of early literacy: print concepts, phonological awareness, phonics and word recognition, and fluency. Once the instructional strategies of these basic concepts are understood, training continues to include building comprehension skills. Research from the last decade has repeatedly indicated the need for these foundational concepts, which are vital for early literacy success.

Social-emotional learning continues to be a secondary focus of the SSIP. The IESE Network provides differentiated professional learning to educators on social-emotional learning based on the CASEL framework. This directly relates to one of the short-term objectives of the SSIP: increased educator knowledge regarding social-emotional learning. With increased educator knowledge in social-emotional learning, positive changes in teacher practice would also be expected. That relates directly to one of the SSIP's intended intermediate outcomes: enhanced effectiveness of educators who support students with disabilities. CASEL cites research indicating when students can self-regulate emotions, this translates into the classroom, which supports them in focusing on academic learning. Hundreds of studies offer consistent evidence that SEL bolsters academic performance. When students have positive self-perceptions, feel connected to the school, and can express their feelings in productive ways, they are more comfortable taking academic risks and accepting feedback on their work. SEL supports acquisition of academic skills throughout a student's school career. This directly relates to one of the intermediate outcomes of the SSIP: improved outcomes for students with disabilities from implemented environmental evidence-based practices.

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

There are two identified instruments used to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change: the High-Quality Professional Development (HQPD) Checklist and the Illinois Implementation Fidelity Instrument (IFI).

HQPD Checklist

The High-Quality Professional Development checklist is used for each of the professional development sessions held throughout the IESE Network to ensure that the professional development provided meets the quality standards in Illinois. While creating and refining professional development, IESE Network Program Advisors and Regional Specialists consider each HQPD indicator and complete the checklist after implementation. The Project Evaluator reviews compiled data and shares 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 reports this data to ISBE and OSEP. Data for the HQPD Checklist was available as of the end of November 2022. Data continues to be collected through February 2023 for the May 2023 SPDG reporting period. SSIP data is a part of this SPDG data collection and will be reported in next year's SSIP. The data showed that 77% of professional development was delivered with 90% fidelity (the SPDG performance measure is 90% of professional development delivered with 90% fidelity). The data was shared with the IESE Network Leadership Team at its quarterly meeting in December 2022, with discussion about the data identifying items which are most problematic for high quality professional development:

- ? Content builds on or relates to participants' previous professional development.
- ? Includes opportunities for participants to apply content and/or practice skills during training.
- ? Engages participants in assessment of their acquisition of knowledge and skills.
- ? Details follow-up activities that require participants to apply their learning; and
- ? Describes opportunities for coaching to improve fidelity of implementation.

The IESE Network Leadership Team discussed ways to better address these in the professional development being provided. Data will continue to be collected through February 2023 for the May 2023 SPDG reporting period.

In addition to using the HQPD Checklist to ensure fidelity of high-quality professional development, the Illinois IFI was developed by the IESE Network Leadership and reviewed and approved by the OSEP SPDG program director for use toward ensuring fidelity of implementation of the professional development received. 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 IFI is currently being piloted for training occurring from November 2022 through February 2023. The data collected during this pilot period, including response rates, will be reviewed by the IESE Network leadership to determine its effectiveness in measuring fidelity of implementation and whether changes need to be made in order to increase its validity and reliability for future use. As of the time of this report, there has been a 26.32% response rate to the IFI from participants of the professional development provided by the IESE Network in December 2022. Since the IFI is sent out 3 weeks following the PD, this response rate is likely to increase. Of those who responded, 97.9% reported that all (37.0%) or some (60.9%) of the professional development strategies were applied. Seventy-seven percent believed that the PD that was implemented positively affected student success and/or engagement, and almost half of the participants (48.9%) plan to FULLY incorporate the PD strategies with few or no changes, with an additional 13.3% planning to fully implement it with some significant tweaks. This is preliminary data that is still being collected through PD completed in February 2023.

Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

For all professional development offered through the IESE Network, a post professional development survey is required. QuickReports are sent each Monday to the IESE Program Advisors and Regional Specialists who review the responses and adjust content for future professional development sessions. These are also used for remote mentoring sessions, administrative academies, and cohort mentoring groups that are occurring across the state. The distributed surveys include questions about participant perceptions of the professional development content, application to the curriculum or pedagogy of the educator, their intention in implementing it, and their own growth in understanding the content. Questions also are designed to ask about what participants knew prior to engaging in professional development and what they know after participation, both about content knowledge and classroom implementation. Finally, some questions that are aligned to the identified performance measures of the SPDG which are also connected to the SiMR include: perceptions of how this professional development will affect student achievement, how well it enhanced their ability to connect this information to parents and families, and whether participating in these types of sessions contributes to the likeliness of their remaining a special educator in the state of Illinois. Current data support the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

While this data is currently being collected, the data collection that encompasses the entire SPDG year is still in progress. Once the data is fully collected and reviewed in April 2023, decisions about the need to address activities of the IESE Network will be made after reviewing the data. This additional information would be included in the FFY22 SSIP. A focus will be placed upon the connections between the independent variables (professional development, mentoring, coaching, and technical assistance) and the dependent variable (student IAR data) to determine whether correlations have been found between them. Second, the data from each of the IESE Network activities will be reviewed considering the strengths and the weaknesses that the data provide, discussing both and why those numbers may be what they are. Particular attention will be paid to the initial baseline data from the fidelity measures of the High-Quality Professional Development Checklist and the Illinois IFI, discussing how these, and possibly other measures, can be utilized. Finally, and most important, data will be shared with the IESE Advisory Council, comprised of stakeholders from all contributors to the education process, seeking perspectives that those individuals more closely involved in the IESE Network may not see or identify. From continued data collection, decisions will be made about continued use of practices and ways in which to add/change evidence-based practices.

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

In April 2023, the 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 the strengths and weaknesses of the IESE Network activities. The data will then be viewed through the lens of the multiple measures of student achievement. Taken together, these will enable the IESE Network to make data-based decisions on the next steps for the following year(s) of the SSIP. The post-professional development surveys will enable the IESE Network Leadership Team to determine the extent to which the professional development, the mentoring cohorts, and the remote professional development conversations have contributed to perceptions of content knowledge gains, applications into classrooms, and further understanding of research-based practices and their effects upon student achievement. The State and Regional Capacity Assessments will enable the IESE Network Leadership Team to determine whether the leadership, communication, data sharing, and resources need changes in order to provide the state team and the regional teams with the capacity to continue to expand the initiatives of the IESE Network across the state of Illinois. Finally, the IESE Advisory Council, comprised of a wide range of stakeholder supporters, will review the data at their regular meetings and provide extensive feedback and direction to the next steps of the IESE Network. The IESE Network is a statewide initiative that involves a great number of people and organizations, each of which has a claim in contributing to the success of the students with disabilities across the state of Illinois. It is the intent and plan of the IESE Network Leadership Team to lean upon these resources to use data to make the best decisions possible for Illinois students.

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 that are being used by the IESE Network project evaluator to determine the extent to which the Network is meeting its stated outcomes are providing data that identifies the strengths and next steps toward improvement for the SPDG. Data from the administration of both the State Capacity Assessment and the Regional Capacity Assessment have indicated that the capacity for the state and the region to implement the effective educational innovations 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 professional development being provided through the members of the IESE Network leadership team, as measured against a validated instrument regularly used and recommended by the United States Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs. This instrument, in partnership with data from the post-PD surveys provides data on the quality and perceptions of the professional development 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. Finally, the Illinois Implementation Fidelity Instrument was recently developed and is being piloted to collect data on how the high-quality professional development across the state of 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 will be shared and discussed in order to determine next steps for increasing the implementation of evidence-based practices 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)
- Creating a Positive Pathway Forward for Special Education in Illinois
- Illinois Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Network Advisory Council
- Early Childhood Outcomes System Stakeholders Committee
- Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education

Stakeholders included professional development providers, school district representatives, educational advocates, Illinois Early Learning Project

representatives, Chicago Public Schools representatives, Parent Training and Information Center representatives, parent members of 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, 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. 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 engages on a monthly basis with this stakeholder group through subcommittee meetings and committee of the whole meetings throughout the year. 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 Services 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 Corrections/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 discusses baseline data, targets, potential target revisions, and improvement strategies with the Council as necessary. Data regarding the effectiveness of improvement strategies is shared with the Council to solicit feedback for continuous improvement. The Council assists ISBE staff with reviewing SPP trend data and setting and revising SPP targets for many of the indicators. No target revisions were made for FFY21.

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

Finally, progress for several of the SPP Indicators is aligned to the Illinois State Personnel Development Grant (IESE). The IESE Advisory Council meets quarterly 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 provides 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, ISAC, 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 have discussions with the IESE Advisory Council multiple times throughout a calendar year regarding Indicator 17. ISBE discusses baseline data, targets, potential target revisions, and improvement strategies with the council as necessary. The IESE Advisory Council assists ISBE staff with reviewing Indicator 17 trend data and setting and revising targets for Indicator 17. No revisions were made to Indicator 17 for FFY21.

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

ISBE engages with the SPDG/IESE Advisory Council as the main stakeholder group for SPP Indicator 17. ISBE met with the Council on February 3, 2022, to provide a report on the SSIP. An overview of the SPP was provided before taking a deeper dive into SPP Indicator 17 (SSIP) and its focus. The SSIP improvement strategy and its corresponding activities were reviewed with the group. The theory of action, logic model, and improvement plan/evaluation plan were also discussed. One stakeholder asked about SSIP targets, and those were explained in more detail for the Council. Stakeholder input and feedback indicated that the SSIP strategy, activities, theory of action, logic model, and improvement plan/evaluation plan aligned well with the SPDG. Stakeholders indicated that they appreciated the fact that efforts were not being duplicated. There was a stakeholder question and subsequent discussion around how the science of reading played into the SSIP. Professional learning around this area was shared with the group. Another stakeholder asked about pre-service opportunities for university students as they prepare to enter Illinois schools. These individuals are being included in professional learning sessions and remote mentoring sessions that focus on meeting the needs of all students. One stakeholder mentioned ensuring that this work was embedded into the administrator academies that were being offered. The IESE Network acknowledged that suggestion. Lastly, a stakeholder asked about whether individuals had ongoing participation versus attending a single session. Surveys given to participants document what type of training individuals are involved in and if they were involved on a regular basis. The IESE Network analyzes that data to plan their next steps.

The Council met again on May 19, 2022, with the main topic of discussion being 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. After hearing Network recommendations based on SPDG APR data, stakeholders also suggested that the Network ensure that special education cooperative directors receive Network communications to provide them opportunities to have a role in the process. The Network staff indicated that one of their goals was to facilitate regular and ongoing communication between special education cooperatives and districts, so educators had additional support outside of their building administrators. Several IESE Network continuous improvement agreements are currently with special education cooperatives. Providing administrator academies was also discussed by the Network as a means of increasing awareness and support.

The Council met on September 8, 2022, to discuss IESE goals and objectives, and to get a statewide report from the Network. One stakeholder indicated that early childhood personnel would like increased engagement with the Network. The Network leadership planned to meet with this stakeholder to discuss this possibility further. Such increased engagement could potentially positively impact the SSIP as the target grades are pre-K through grade 4.

The Council met on November 10, 2022, to receive another statewide report and to plan next steps. Future activities to explore included assessing the implementation of professional development at the student level, developing a sustainable statewide coaching system, and communicating a comprehensive data plan for stakeholders. Stakeholders asked about the coaching system and were told that some Network team members are currently coaching; however, there is no set statewide system in place as of yet. Current coaching opportunities include administrator requests and following a PD session. A statewide system will provide similar opportunities. It will provide a model for team members to make coaching decisions and include structured observation and feedback protocols. Such a system would mutually benefit the SPDG and SSIP activities as coaching is strong component for both.

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:

Barbara Moore

Title:

State Director of Special Education

Email:

bmoore@isbe.net

Phone:

2177825589

Submitted on:

04/27/23 12:38:34 PM

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix

2023 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination¹

Percentage (%)	Determination
80.00%	Meets Requirements

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	24	18	75.00%
Compliance	20	17	85.00%

2023 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements

Reading Assessment Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	90%	2
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	88%	1
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	25%	2
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	95%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	28%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	93%	1

Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	NVR	0
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	NVR	0
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	46%	2
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	92%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	25%	2
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	94%	1

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 2023: Part B."

Exiting Data Elements

Exiting Data Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out	10	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma**	86	2

*Due to privacy concerns the Department has chosen to suppress this calculation.

**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."

2023 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator ²	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020	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.	NVR	N/A	0
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	99.69%	YES	2
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	99.03%	YES	2
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	98.07%	YES	2
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	90.93%		1
Timely State Complaint Decisions	97.32%		2
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	100.00%		2
Longstanding Noncompliance			2
Specific Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	None		

² The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at: https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2023_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf

Data Rubric

FFY 2021 APR³

	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	0	0
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
	Subtotal	20
APR Score Calculation	Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2021 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) =	25

³ 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 ⁴		
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 4/6/22	1	1	1	3
Personnel Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 11/2/22	1	0	1	2
Discipline Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	0	2
State Assessment Due Date: 12/21/2022	1	0	1	2
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/4/22	1	1	1	3
			Subtotal	18
618 Score Calculation			Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.23809524) =	22.29

⁴ 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	25
B. 618 Grand Total	22.29
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	47.29
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*) =	0.9093
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	90.93

***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 2023 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	1 st Wednesday in April
Part B Personnel	C070, C099, C112	1 st Wednesday in November
Part B Exiting	C009	1 st Wednesday in November
Part B Discipline	C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144	1 st Wednesday in November
Part B Assessment	C175, C178, C185, C188	Wednesday in the 3 rd week of December (aligned with CSPR data due date)
Part B Dispute Resolution	Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in EMAPS	1 st Wednesday in November
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in EMAPS	1 st Wednesday in May

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

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 2023 will be posted in June 2023. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

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