November 21, 2023

Dr. Richard Smith, Interim Chief of Diverse Learner Supports and Services (ODLSS)
Rick Trujillo, Deputy Chief of ODLSS
Wayne Williams, Executive Director, ODLSS Operations

Chicago Public Schools – City of Chicago District 299
Office of Diverse Learner Supports and Services
42 West Madison Street Chicago, IL 60602

Dear Dr. Smith, Mr. Trujillo, and Mr. Williams,

The Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) Special Education Programmatic Support Department is grateful for your cooperation and assistance with Individualized Education Program (IEP) submissions, virtual Interviews with staff, and digital schedules as part of the Illinois Special Education Accountability and Support System process and Enhanced General Supervision Plan (EGSP). ISBE intends for the enclosed report to support a root cause analysis and collaboration with Chicago Public Schools (CPS) Networks and schools. ISBE has developed Supportive Action Plans with the identified schools in Wave 1 to ensure the following priorities associated with ISBE/CPS collaborative goals are achieved in accordance with the Enhanced General Supervision Plan:

Instructional Quality: Improve the quality of IEP writing and development for individualized services via high-quality instructional practices and progress monitoring.

Service Delivery: Improve quality of service delivery as driven by improved IEP quality.

If you have any questions regarding this report or the Illinois Special Education Accountability and Support System's EGSP process, please contact Rhonda Marks at rmarks@isbe.net and 312-814-3638.

Sincerely,

Allyson Fox-Crump
Director of Special Education Programmatic Support
Illinois State Board of Education

Cc: Cheena Burt, Director of ODLSS Procedures and Standards
      Laura Boedeker, ISBE Assistant General Counsel

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction and Purpose

Beginning with the 2022-23 school year, Chicago Public Schools (CPS) and the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) commenced a collaborative transition from the previously separate monitoring activities of the ISBE Public Inquiry Corrective Action (2018-22) and the ongoing ISBE Special Education integrated monitoring activities into a consolidated Enhanced General Supervision Plan (EGSP), as permitted by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and the *Illinois School Code*. The primary goal of the EGSP is for CPS and ISBE to work in partnership to implement the goals of the CPS Office of Diverse Learner Supports and Services (ODLSS) to meaningfully improve outcomes for CPS students with disabilities and their families.

The ISBE Special Education Programmatic Support Department genuinely appreciates the cooperation ODLSS provided during Wave 1 of this process, particularly the assistance with district and network communications, IEP submissions, and school-specific support. The following report summarizes Wave 1 Network and school information. ISBE recommends ODLSS utilize this information, keeping its 2023-24 school year goals and priorities in mind, to conduct a thorough root cause analysis to ensure that the EGSP priorities and related milestones are on-track. ISBE will continue to provide technical support and assistance to achieve the EGSP goals and/or adjust practices and processes, as necessary, during the 2023-24 school year and Wave 2 of our monitoring process.

Selected Networks and Data Sources

Per the EGSP and in collaboration with CPS leadership, nine CPS district Networks were selected to participate in "Wave 1" of the Illinois Special Education Accountability and Support System tasks for ISBE's school-based review of the provision of special education and related services to students with disabilities. The Networks and selected schools were chosen to provide an overview of the district across the city; encompass all grade levels; and represent distinct implementation of special education policies, procedures, and practices. The remaining CPS Networks will undergo the same process in "Wave 2" during the 2023-24 school year.

The EGSP is unique to CPS and ISBE; therefore, no determination is made in this analysis or the Network Summary Reports about compliance and/or results-based State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicators for the selected Networks and their participating schools.

Network Demographics

The selected elementary networks include Network 1 and Network 2 in the North geographical region of Chicago; Network 5 and Network 6 in the West/Southwest region; Network 10 and Network 11 in the South/Southwest region. The selected high school networks include Network 14 in the North region; Network 15 in the West region; and Network 16 in the South/Southwest region. *See Table 1 on the next page.*

Table 1: Wave 1 Networks and Schools

Network 1	Network 2	Network 5
• Bridge Elementary School • Portage Park Elementary School	• Hayt Elementary School • Waters Elementary School	• De Diego Elementary Community Academy • West Park Elementary Academy
Network 6	**Network 10**	**Network 11**
• Pritzker School	• Nathan Hale Elementary School • Ashburn Community Elementary School • Azuela Elementary School	• Joplin Elementary School • Stagg Elementary School
Network 14	**Network 15**	**Network 16**
• Steinmetz College Prep	• Alcott College Prep	• Farragut High School

Data Sources

Data was collected and reviewed from various sources: ISBE School Report Cards; CPS IEP file reviews; virtual interviews with individual school staff (including Related Services Providers [RSPs]); and staff surveys of school and network administrators, teachers, special education classroom assistants (SECAs), and RSPs. Master schedules, teacher schedules, RSP schedules, student schedules, and SECA schedules were provided digitally. Review of the data was utilized to identify areas of strength and areas of need for each school to target through action steps encompassed in a Supportive Action Plan (SAP). ISBE also used data sources to provide recommendations for resources, technical assistance, coaching, and professional development activities.

IEP Data Analysis Across Networks

ISBE reviewed the IEPs submitted by ODLSS to ensure they align with the priorities of the EGSP. These priorities are to improve the quality of IEP writing and development of individualized services via high-quality instructional practices and progress monitoring and to improve the quality of service-delivery driven by improved IEP content. Eight of the selected networks submitted 25 IEPs for the 2022-23 school year and 25 from the 2021-22 school year, for a total of 50 IEPs submitted per network. Due to an error caused by a duplicate student identification number, one network submitted 24 IEPs for the 2022-23 school and 24 from the 2021-22 school year, for a total of 48 IEPs Therefore, ISBE reviewed a total of 448 IEPs. While each network received its own detailed report about its IEPs, frequent observations across networks are noted below. These observations tended to fall into the following areas: policies and procedures; present levels of academic achievement and functional performance (PLAAFP), goals; parent concerns/engagement; and accommodations, modifications, and supports.

Policies and Procedures

Overall, IEP teams conducted annual assessments and triennial reevaluations appropriately, and the structure of the IEPs that were reviewed generally aligned to state and federal regulations. These

structures included, but were not limited to, academic levels, assessment, graduation, curriculum modifications and accommodations, alternative grading scales, paraprofessional fading plans, SECA responsibilities, and placement within the general education classroom. Consideration for Extended School Year (ESY) and transportation was appropriately documented if the student was found eligible. Detailed information, including updated testing data, was provided in the General Considerations, Impact of Student Disability, and Identified Skill-Building sections of the IEPs. Evaluation and assessment data were detailed in the corresponding sections of the IEP, but some files reviewed contained data in the form of letter grades or percentages without interpretation or an explanation of how they represented the students' academic skills. Furthermore, in some instances, the IEP evaluation criteria were carried over year to year. The use of technical language and acronyms within the IEP narratives also was noted.

IEPs reviewed generally contained statements indicating cross-collaboration between staff (special and general education teachers, RSPs, and SECAs). File reviews also revealed that IEP team members who were required participants consistently attended IEP meetings, but parent consent for participant excusal was inconsistent at times. It was frequently observed that there was not an indication regarding whether an IEP draft was sent to parents three-days prior to the meeting and what date the drafts were sent. IEP Notes sections were not utilized in many of the IEPs to provide a written record of the discussions and decisions that occurred during the IEP meeting or to record other relevant statements made by parents and other IEP team members.

Present Levels of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance (PLAAFP)
Reviewed IEPs contained a PLAAFP statement within the General Considerations section of the IEP. For the most part, the General Considerations section denoted current student strengths, learning styles, and other pertinent individual student data required for PLAAFP development. Student needs and barriers identified and addressed in this section were based on current assessments, student behavior, learning style, and parent concerns. Information on the impact of the students' disability on their access to the general education curriculum and environment was also represented in these sections. A lack of consistency in the level of detail provided in the PLAAFPs was noted. Some IEPs provided PLAAFPS that were general in nature while others were individualized to the student.

IEP Goals
There were several areas of concern identified during the review of IEP goals. While the goals reviewed mainly aligned to the IEP PLAAFP, in some cases they did not reflect the student's current achievement level as presented in the PLAAPF. For instance, some goals were repeated learning standards that reflected grade-level learning rather than the needs identified in the PLAAFP. Some of the goals were related to achievement of an overall score on an assessment without the consideration of individual achievement in accordance with the impact of the disability.   Other goals reviewed had evaluation criteria that did not align to the skill being evaluated. Furthermore, some of the reviewed goals aligned to a specific district or school curriculum or software, which may not be transmissible to other districts/schools if the student were to transfer.

Parent Concerns and Parent Engagement
Parent concerns were consistently noted in the network IEPs that were reviewed. Some districts use this parent input to help identify and address student needs. In fact, a small percentage of IEPs used the information to develop IEP goals. The consistent provision of interpreter services for parents also was documented appropriately. A lack of parent training services and opportunities also was distinctly noted.

Accommodations, Modifications, and Supports

Noted benchmarks, curriculum modifications, provision of related services, and paraprofessional assistance to address the required skill areas or learning barriers identified in the IEP were appropriately documented. Accommodations and modifications were listed consistently in the IEPs, but distinction of subject area was not consistently documented. A thorough evaluation of the provided IEPs revealed that classroom accommodations, modifications, alternative grading scales, and fade plans were generally aligned to the student data presented in the IEP and were appropriate to meet the student needs.

Analysis for Staff Surveys

A confidential staff survey was developed to gather feedback and information from CPS staff on key areas that the district should focus on in the enhanced model of supervision. Each question provided respondents an opportunity to include comments or additional information they would like to share related to the question. ODLSS assisted ISBE with the survey by disseminating the survey links via email to all administrators, general education teachers, special education teachers, (RSPs, and SECAs in the district. Survey results were not disaggregated by network to ensure participant confidentiality in networks with low response rates. This data reflects the responses of all Wave 1 Networks/entities. Survey questions were unique to the role of the participant and addressed the individual responsibilities assigned to each position category.

Table 2: Number of Survey Participants by Role

Participant Role	Total Number of Participants
Teachers	1049
Related Service Providers	221
Special Education Classroom Assistants	450
Administrators	49
Case Managers	88

Response categories for all survey questions were: *Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral/Unknown, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree*. Each survey was composed of 10-15 questions. ISBE principal consultants evaluated the results, compared networks, and determined that two main themes could be identified across participant roles and Networks: professional learning systems and time allotted to complete position requirements. Questions related to these themes are reported and discussed below. However, examining the overall patterns and trends of each item from each survey will be an important aspect of the root cause analysis. ISBE encourages you to reference Appendix A to access the full survey results.

Teacher Survey Results

More than 1,000 general education and special teachers completed the survey. When asked about their access to high-quality learning opportunities, teachers were primarily divided between agree (25%), neutral/unknown (29%), and disagree (22%). There also were diverse responses when asked whether they had time to develop high-quality IEPs and whether they received data and input from other IEP team members. Thirty-four percent of teachers agreed with this statement, but the next largest response

category was disagree (24%), followed by strongly agree (17%), neutral/unknown (14%), and strongly disagree (11%).

Table 3: Wave 1 Selected Teacher Survey Results

Teachers Survey Questions	Rating Scale	Percentage of Staff Responding
Teachers have access to high-quality professional learning opportunities rooted in Adult Learning Theory.	Strongly Agree	13%
	Agree	25%
	Neutral/Unknown	29%
	Disagree	22%
	Strongly Disagree	12%
Special Education and General Education teachers are provided with sufficient opportunities and time to develop quality IEPs, and they receive data and input from other IEP Team members	Strongly Agree	17%
	Agree	34%
	Neutral/Unknown	14%
	Disagree	24%
	Strongly Disagree	11%
Teachers receive monthly Case Manager meeting materials and can discuss the sections therein to ensure understanding and appropriate application to daily teaching responsibilities.	Strongly Agree	16%
	Agree	22%
	Neutral/Unknown	21%
	Disagree	25%
	Strongly Disagree	17%

Note: The distribution of responses for each survey item equals 100% +/- 1%

Related Service Provider Survey Results

Survey participants had mixed responses to items related to time allotment. For example, 32% of RSPs agreed they have the requisite time and opportunities to deliver IEP related services in a timely manner. But another 26% percent of RSPs disagreed, and 15% percent strongly disagreed. And while RSPs reported that other education providers make time to collaborate with them (14% strongly agree, 54% agree), only 41% feel they have the requisite time to collaborate and consult with other education professionals (4% strongly agree, 37% agree).

RSPs reported having access to professional development and training regarding the provision of related services to students with disabilities who have IEPs or 504 Plans (24% strongly agree, 56% agree). However, fewer reported having access to professional development and training regarding Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) and at-risk students (11% strongly agree, 42% agree).

RSPs have diverse experiences pertaining to adequate workspace to provide related services with the appropriate level of privacy. Thirty-three percent of RSPs reported having adequate space (9% strongly agree, 24% agree), while 52% reported not having adequate space (28% disagree, 24% strongly disagree).

Table 4: Wave 1 Selected Related Service Provider Survey Results

Related Service Providers Survey Questions	Rating Scale	Percentage of Staff Responding
RSPs have access to Professional Development and other training opportunities regarding the provision of related services to students with disabilities who have IEPs or 504 Plans.	Strongly Agree	24%
	Agree	56%
	Neutral/Unknown	12%
	Disagree	7%
	Strongly Disagree	2%
RSPs have access to Professional Development and other training opportunities regarding MTSS and at-risk students.	Strongly Agree	11%
	Agree	42%
	Neutral/Unknown	27%
	Disagree	18%
	Strongly Disagree	3%
RSPs have the requisite time and opportunity to appropriately deliver related services in a timely manner in accordance with student IEPs (or 504 Plans, if applicable).	Strongly Agree	7%
	Agree	32%
	Neutral/Unknown	21%
	Disagree	26%
	Strongly Disagree	15%
RSPs have the requisite time and opportunity to appropriately consult and collaborate with other special education providers and general education teachers in accordance with student IEPs (or 504 Plans, if applicable) on a consistent basis.	Strongly Agree	4%
	Agree	37%
	Neutral/Unknown	22%
	Disagree	23%
	Strongly Disagree	14%
Other education providers (e.g., teachers, case managers, paraprofessionals, fellow RSPs, etc.) are cooperative and dedicate time to consult and collaborate with you in accordance with student IEPs (or 504 Plans, if applicable) on a consistent basis.	Strongly Agree	14%
	Agree	54%
	Neutral/Unknown	18%
	Disagree	12%
	Strongly Disagree	2%
Schools provide RSPs with adequate workspace and area(s) to provide student services with a reasonable amount of privacy.	Strongly Agree	9%
	Agree	24%
	Neutral/Unknown	15%
	Disagree	28%
	Strongly Disagree	24%

Note: The distribution of responses for each survey item equals 100% +/- 1%.

Special Education Classroom Assistants Survey Results

Many SECAs reported being scheduled appropriately and only assigned to students with IEPs. However, about 30% of SECAs disagreed with this statement (18% disagree, 12% strongly disagree). Less than half of responding SECAs reported they are invited to participate in IEP meetings (20% strongly agree, 24% agree). However, SECAs reported they are encouraged, or given opportunities, to provide information regarding student-based interventions/supports, progress monitoring, and/or other data to the IEP Team prior to students' IEP meetings (30% strongly agree, 35% agree). SECAs reported that they are provided with professional development opportunities (29% strongly agree, 41% agree).

Table 5: Wave 1 Selected Special Education Classroom Assistants Survey Results

Special Education Classroom Assistants Survey Questions	Rating Scale	Percentage of Staff Responding
SECAs are scheduled appropriately and assigned only student-based duties per IEPs when students are in the building; SECAs are not assigned clerical/administrative duties (e.g., general group lunchroom/recess duties, making copies, bus duty) that take them away from IEP-based student services.	Strongly Agree	29%
	Agree	30%
	Neutral/Unknown	10%
	Disagree	18%
	Strongly Disagree	12%
SECAs are invited to participate in IEP meetings (or 504 Plan meetings, when applicable) and may attend in part or in whole.	Strongly Agree	20%
	Agree	24%
	Neutral/Unknown	15%
	Disagree	17%
	Strongly Disagree	25%
SECAs are encouraged to, or have the opportunity to, provide information regarding student-based interventions/supports, progress monitoring, and/or other data to the IEP Team prior to students' IEP meetings (or 504 Plan meetings, if applicable).	Strongly Agree	30%
	Agree	35%
	Neutral/Unknown	11%
	Disagree	15%
	Strongly Disagree	9%
SECAs are provided with Professional Development opportunities.	Strongly Agree	29%
	Agree	42%
	Neutral/Unknown	15%
	Disagree	9%
	Strongly Disagree	5%

Note: The distribution of responses for each survey item equals 100% +/- 1%.

Administrator Survey Results

Administrator surveys indicated that more than half of administrators indicated they were unsure whether ODLSS District Representatives and ODLSS Special Education Administrators (SEAs), collectively, receive professional development and training on how to best present critical special education information (best practices, legal requirements, CPS policies, etc.) to Network and school personnel (51%). Most administrators reported that their school has a consistent process to disseminate, review, and discuss professional development and other training materials regarding special education (33% strongly agree, 60% agree). Administrators unanimously agreed that special education staff are utilized appropriately and to the maximum extent possible to implement IEP services, supports, and minutes (80% strongly agree, 20% agree).

Responses related to compensatory education meetings and recovery services meetings were more diverse. Forty-four percent of administrators agreed they received appropriate and comprehensive training on compensatory education meetings, related analysis, and funding analysis. Other respondents did not feel they've had adequate training (18% disagree, 9% strongly disagree). Fewer administrators felt adequately trained on recovery services meetings, related analysis, and funding analysis (7% strongly agree, 36% agree). More administrators responded neutrally (27%) and disagreed (20% disagreed, 11% strongly disagreed) to this item.

Table 6: Wave 1 Selected Administrator Survey Results

Administrator Survey Questions	Rating Scale	Percentage of Staff Responding
Your school(s) has/have a consistent process to disseminate, review, and discuss professional development and other training materials (e.g., Case Manager Meeting materials) regarding special education (e.g., best practices, legal requirements, roles and responsibilities).	Strongly Agree	33%
	Agree	60%
	Neutral/Unknown	0%
	Disagree	4%
	Strongly Disagree	2%
ODLSS District Representatives/SEAs, collectively, receive professional development and training on how to best present critical special education information (best practices, legal requirements, CPS policies, etc.) to Network and school personnel.	Strongly Agree	9%
	Agree	27%
	Neutral/Unknown	51%
	Disagree	9%
	Strongly Disagree	4%
Special Education staff (Special Education teachers and SECAs) are being utilized appropriately and to the maximum extent possible to implement IEP services, supports, and minutes; staff schedules indicate IEP-based duties and assignments only throughout the entire school day.	Strongly Agree	80%
	Agree	20%
	Neutral/Unknown	0%
	Disagree	0%
	Strongly Disagree	0%
You have received appropriate and comprehensive training regarding Compensatory Education meetings, related analysis, and funding sources.	Strongly Agree	7%
	Agree	44%
	Neutral/Unknown	22%
	Disagree	18%
	Strongly Disagree	9%
You have received appropriate and comprehensive training/information regarding Recovery Services meetings, related analysis, and funding sources.	Strongly Agree	7%
	Agree	36%
	Neutral/Unknown	27%
	Disagree	20%
	Strongly Disagree	11%

Note: The distribution of responses for each survey item equals 100% +/- 1%.

Case Manager Survey Results

Case managers reported having adequate time to meet regularly with special education providers regarding academic and social-emotional matters, teacher-student relationships, data-based interventions, and data-based student outcomes (strongly agree 25%, agree 37%). However, more than a quarter reported not having adequate time to address these responsibilities (disagree 20%, strongly disagree 8%). The survey results also revealed that most case managers – 67% strongly agree and 26% agree – that special education staff (teachers and SECAs) are utilized appropriately (only for IEP-based duties and assignments) and to the maximum extent possible to implement IEP services, supports, and minutes. A majority of case managers reported having adequate training opportunities and resources to provide support and guidance in writing quality IEPs and developing individualized student services (strongly agree 45%, agree 36%).

Table 7: Wave 1 Selected Case Manager Survey Results

Case Manager Survey Questions	Rating Scale	Percentage of Staff Responding
You are provided with adequate time to meet regularly with special education providers regarding academic and social-emotional matters, teacher-student relationships, data-based interventions, and data-based student outcomes and progress.	Strongly Agree	25%
	Agree	37%
	Neutral/Unknown	9%
	Disagree	20%
	Strongly Disagree	8%
Special education staff (special education teachers and SECAs) are being utilized appropriately and to the maximum extent possible to implement IEP services, supports, and minutes; staff schedules indicate only IEP-based duties and assignments throughout the entire school day.	Strongly Agree	67%
	Agree	26%
	Neutral/Unknown	2%
	Disagree	2%
	Strongly Disagree	2%
You are provided with appropriate training and resources to provide support and guidance to improve the quality of IEP writing and development for individualized student services.	Strongly Agree	45%
	Agree	36%
	Neutral/Unknown	9%
	Disagree	5%
	Strongly Disagree	5%

Note: The distribution of responses for each survey item equals 100% +/- 1%.

Interviews: Data Analysis Across Network Schools

ISBE conducted confidential interviews with Wave 1 network and school staff. Note: The responses in this section are opinions based on personal feelings and experiences and are therefore subjective. As such, ISBE noted a spectrum of responses from participating staff. Topics and themes from these interviews are reported to help CPS gain insight into systemic practices that can impact service delivery and instructional practices for students with disabilities. It will be important for CPS to examine these trends as part of a root cause analysis to ensure recommended practices and procedures are consistently implemented and fully understood by school-based staff. ISBE interview questions covered five main areas:

- Staff responses related to district policies, practices, and procedures;
- Staff responses related to data use;
- Staff responses related to least restrictive environment (LRE)/continuum of services;
- Staff responses related to supports and resources; and
- Staff responses related to parent engagement.

ISBE developed individualized interview questions specific to special education service delivery roles: teachers, special education classroom assistants, special education administrators, district representatives, case managers, and school-based administrators. ISBE interviewed 87 staff members across the Wave 1 networks.

Staff Responses Related to District Policies, Practices, and Procedures

Inclusion, procedural safeguards, case management, and communication/collaboration were topics often discussed during the network staff interviews. Many staff reported that targeted professional learning on inclusive special education practices is offered and advertised to staff. They also reported that there are regularly scheduled cross-departmental meetings to discuss equitable inclusion of students with disabilities. Professional learning opportunities and activities related to inclusion are perceived as available; however, the staff responsible for delivering inclusive special education services are not perceived as having the knowledge necessary to do this. Similarly, some staff expressed concerns that SECAs are not properly trained before being assigned to students.

Staff shared several established practices that their schools have in place to support their students with disabilities. The schools prioritize IEP and English learner (EL) services when building master schedules and provide parents with the IEP draft and meeting materials three days prior to the scheduled meeting; ODLSS District Representatives and Special Education Administrators provide support services. Staff members remain concerned about the inconsistency with which required service minutes are provided and the lack of opportunities for SECAs to attend IEP meetings.

Case Managers in many Networks provide oversight of IEP content, but some networks also require principals to approve IEP content. Case managers also provide pertinent information to special education staff on a monthly basis. Some staff have noted that case managers appear to be overwhelmed with their responsibilities and that this can affect the quality of IEP content.

Concerns about communication were also raised during the interviews. Staff perceived a lack of communication and involvement by ODLSS leadership. They also noted the difficulty in obtaining a qualified interpreter when needed. They reported that ODLSS can only qualify interpreters for Spanish, but qualified interpreters of diverse spectrum of languages are needed.

Staff Responses Related to Data Use

Overall, staff reported that they utilize current qualitative and quantitative data from evaluations to develop IEP content. Many reported a lack of a uniform system for collecting progress monitoring data of IEP goals, but others reported that school-based interventionists have been instrumental in supporting this data collection process. It was frequently noted that not all staff have the fundamental knowledge required to collect MTSS data.

Staff Responses Related to LRE/Continuum of Services

Staff reported that student placement into the LRE is determined using data. Further, there are school initiatives in place to certify qualifying staff with an English as a Second Language (ESL) endorsement to better meet students' individualized learning needs. However, staff are concerned that the current allocation of special education positions is no longer adequate and needs to be revised.

Concerns related to professional learning also were frequently discussed. Staff reported needing professional learning opportunities related to inclusion models and IEP development, particularly as it relates to service delivery minutes in relation to established IEP goals.

Staff Reponses Related to Supports and Resources

Staff consistently reported that they can easily access students' IEPs and information about their educational requirements through Aspen. Administrators also are viewed as providing the tools and resources teachers need to effectively meet their students' needs. Administrators view related service

providers as knowledgeable and an essential asset to schools, but RSPs expressed concerns about the lack of consistent access to evaluative tools or adequate service delivery space within the school.

Staff were concerned about the spectrum of disabilities and grade levels assigned to their classes. This often impacts class size and is perceived as an obstacle to effective goal monitoring and service delivery. They also reported a lack of awareness about IEP facilitation and other dispute resolution options.

Staff Responses Related to Parent Engagement

There was less discussion pertaining to parent engagement, but staff did report using a variety of methods to engage parents at IEP meetings or to discuss student progress.

Feedback

The review of IEP files and staff surveys and interviews revealed insight into the district's approaches to special education practices and efforts in supporting outcomes for students with disabilities and their families in Chicago Public Schools. The sources of information that were reviewed provided the basis for feedback to strengthen inclusive practices for students with disabilities in the areas of IEP development and implementation and provision of targeted support for school-based staff and families.

Policies, Practices, and Procedures

In regard to selected schools, the data indicates that school-based staff require increased knowledge of evidence-based practice implementation, IEP procedures, and high-quality IEP development as well as easy access to effective professional development. Survey and interview responses also indicate a disconnect in staff perceptions related to staff allocation and workload.

IEP Practices

CPS has established a firm platform in which to extend the content of IEPs in order for the student to profit academically, socially, emotionally, and behaviorally based on their individual characteristics and disability impact. CPS IEPs have positive elements that were described in the individual network reports. Overall, other areas also require improvement and attention.

Consistent high-quality goal writing is one area that needs to be addressed. IEPs did not clearly delineate how to effectively implement goals using specific strategies that reflect specialized instruction specific to their educational setting. Furthermore, critical guidelines for writing goals are not consistently followed. The following guidelines were specifically noted:

- Goals (and the PLAAFPs) should be updated annually.
- Goals should reflect students' current achievement level as described in the PLAAPF. Therefore, the goals and PLAAPFs should be aligned.
- Goals should have appropriate evaluation criteria to measure the targeted skill and measurement criteria should reflect growth within the context of the impact of the student's disability.
- Goals should be transmissible to another school or district. NOTE: Naming specific software or curriculum/brands in the goals prevents this transferability.

Technical language was present in some IEPs. The use of technical language, jargon, and acronyms can be a barrier to parent understanding and engagement. Sometimes the accommodations and modifications in the IEPs did not differ across academic areas, and progress monitoring did not consistently align with the IEP content to realistically facilitate student learning and demonstrate a student's knowledge. During

interviews staff indicated they send out three-day IEP drafts prior to IEP meetings. However, the IEP file reviews indicated that this practice is not consistently completed or properly tracked. Having parents properly sign the IEP team member(s) excusal form was also not consistently practice. Additionally, while a majority of IEPs noted at least one harmful effect as a result of students' IEP, some -- including some for students with more restrictive LRE -- failed to list potentially harmful effects due to placement.

Collaboration and Professional Learning Opportunities
Survey and interview responses provided valuable insight and information on various strengths and areas for further exploration. It was noted that staff feel collaboration within their teams is productive when time allows. Although staff reported they were able to collaborate, there was not a consistent schedule of meeting times set during which discussions can take place. The RSP survey noted that while other education providers are cooperative and dedicate time to consult and collaborate with RSPs (strongly agree 14%, agree 54%), fewer RSPs feel they have the time and opportunity to consult and collaborate with them (strongly agree 4%, agree 37%).

Many SECAs indicated they are provided with professional development opportunities (strongly agree 29%, agree 42%). SECAs also expressed that professional development opportunities are beneficial when coverage is available so that they can attend them. However, staff interviews suggested that SECAs require more training prior to working with students with disabilities to improve their knowledge and ability. This could suggest that more professional learning opportunities need to be provided before SECAs are assigned and then early in their assignment. It also could suggest that while professional learning opportunities are available, there is not adequate coverage to allow SECAs to attend. Furthermore, SECAs may be accessing professional learning, but be unable to apply the information they learned to the learning environment.

The teacher survey showed that less than 40% of teachers reported having access to high-quality professional learning opportunities developed in Adult Learning Theory (strongly agree 13%, agree 25%) and a further 29% responded neutral/unknown to this item. This aligns with statements shared during staff interviews that indicated staff do not have adequate knowledge of inclusive special education practices, techniques for incorporating social-emotional learning (SEL) goals to ensure effective transition and allocating service minutes. RSPs reported more access to professional learning opportunities, but administrators' access to necessary training varies widely.

Staff were specifically asked during interviews whether high-quality professional learning opportunities are made available. This data does not reflect whether teachers have class coverage or adequate opportunity to take part in available PD. Furthermore, there is not data to indicate whether the PD provided results in a change in teacher practices in the classroom or student outcomes.

Staff Allocation/Staff Workload
There was some discrepancy of perspective by staff role in whether special education staff are appropriately utilized. Administrators and case managers both have a high level of agreement on this item. Overall, all administrators (strongly agree 80%, agree 20%) and 93% of case managers (strongly agree 67%, agree 26%) believe special education staff are being utilized appropriately and to the maximum extent possible to implement IEP services, supports, and minutes. However, 30% of SECAs disagreed with this statement (disagree 18%, strongly disagree 12%). The teacher survey indicated that 35% of teachers reported not having adequate time to develop quality IEPs (disagree 24%, strongly

disagree 11%). Additionally, general education teacher interviews indicated a need for more collaboration with special education teachers on IEP development.

RSPs also report not having adequate time to complete essential duties. Forty-one percent reported they are unable to provide required service minutes in a timely manner, and 37% responded that they did not have the time or opportunity to collaborate with other special education staff. This is supported by interview data. Staff expressed concerns about service minutes not being served. Staff also noted their concern that the current special education staff allocation may no longer be adequate.

Data Use
Interview and survey data determined that there is a need for general and special education teachers to readily adjust their instructional practices based on student progress. This data also suggests that teachers may require increased knowledge for collecting data. Staff interviews indicated that school-based interventionists are instrumental in supporting data collection and progress monitoring.

LRE/Continuum of Services
Data from staff interviews suggests that some staff lack the knowledge necessary for allotting service minutes. This problem may be compounded by an apparent special education personnel shortage within the district. Survey results indicate that only 39% of RSPs reported having adequate time to deliver their service minutes, and staff interviews revealed that service minutes are inconsistently provided. Adequate data is not available to determine whether staff lack the necessary skills to allocate service minutes, or whether they feel they cannot allot the necessary time because of resource shortages.

Supports and Resources
Overall, staff expressed confidence in the support from their administration. It was noted in interviews that network and school-based administrators provide tools and resources to help teachers successfully meet the needs of their students with disabilities and are also viewed positively by staff. However, a number of staff indicated they were unaware of facilitated IEP meetings and other conflict resolution options, indicating that network and school administrators may not be disseminating information as effectively as they need to. And while most administrators reported that their school has a consistent process to disseminate, review, and discuss professional development and other training materials (strongly agree 33%, agree 60%), more than half (51%) indicated neutral/unknown when asked whether they have received professional development on how to best present critical special education information to network and school personnel.

Furthermore, data suggests that that professional abilities of RSPs may be inhibited by administrative under-sight. More than a third of RSPs reported not having adequate time to provide required service minutes in a timely manner or collaborate with other special education staff, and more than half do not have adequate workspace to provide services. Staff interviews also noted that RSPs expressed concerns about a lack of access to evaluative tools necessary to do their jobs.

Case managers are critical members of special education teams. They provide key oversight of IEP content and essential information to special educators on a monthly basis. However, there is a discrepancy in how case manager efficacy is perceived. While case managers reported that they believe special education staff are appropriately utilized, 28% of them (disagree 20%, strongly disagree 8%) reported not having adequate time to meet regularly with special education providers. Compare this to the 42% of teachers who reported that they do not receive the necessary monthly materials from the case manager. Data

from staff interviews supports the survey data: interview responses indicated that some case managers are perceived as overwhelmed, which can sometimes impact the quality of IEP content.

Parent Engagement

Parent engagement is essential; it offers parents/guardians the opportunity to become stakeholders in their child's education. Research shows that meaningful parent engagement is closely linked to better student behavior, higher academic achievement, and enhanced social skills. However, the review of data resulted in very little information about how CPS engages with parents and involves them in the IEP process. IEP reviews indicated that schools typically provide interpreters, but staff interviews noted that they are only able to request Spanish-speaking interpreters at this time and have limited access to interpreters for the array of languages their students and families use. IEP reviews also noted that schools are not providing parent training services. And while IEPs consistently noted parent concerns, only a few are utilizing that information to develop goals. Staff reported during interviews that they used a variety of methods to engage parents in IEP meetings or to discuss student progress. However, the spectrum of methods, frequency, and success of these methods was not discussed in detail. The IEP file reviews also noted that procedures put in place to engage families in the IEP process and protect their rights are not always consistently followed.

Recommendations

ISBE recommends a deep dive into ISBE's 5Essentials Survey which addresses:

- Effective Leaders
- Collaborative Teachers
- Involved Families
- Supportive Environments
- Ambitious Instruction

Research derived from the survey has proven schools that are strong on at least three of the 5Essentials are 10 times more likely to improve student outcomes. The above feedback supports the need for a root cause analysis. ISBE recommends using the Critical Components Tool (CCT). This tool can provide guidance for developing, implementing, and evaluating quality programs and special education services.

The following recommendations are derived from data collected throughout this report.

Policies, Practices, and Procedures

ISBE recommends addressing whether inconsistencies in IEP procedures and development are the result of skill or performance deficits as part of the CCT. Further, this process should also address issues regarding access to professional learning, opportunities to collaborate, and staff allocation and workload.

IEP Practices

ISBE issued nine network reports that delineated a summary of the IEP review and included recommendations for individual IEP content improvement. ISBE's IEP review identified content that indicates a need for root cause analysis, as stated above, and thus, targeted professional development at the district, network, and school levels. As ISBE reviewed IEPs, questions that can be used in an approach for extending IEP quality emerged. This can result in student academic/SEL growth and increased access to the general education curriculum and classroom.

- Does the IEP content, as a whole, propel the student to the next step (academically, behaviorally, social/emotionally)?
- What additional content should be included in the IEP to target parent training, thus affording increased parent engagement and comprehension of their child's needs?
- Does the IEP team use progress monitoring data and evolving evaluative criteria based on student performance and environmental factors to alleviate barriers?
- Do statements for PLAAFPs include all areas identified in assessment reports? Are the PLAAFPs accurate, relevant, and sufficient to plan a progressive educational program?
- Are PLAAPFs individualized according to content area and related to missing skills/barriers that affect academic/SEL progresses identified by assessment?
- Do current student skills demonstrate progression? Or are academic/SEL outcomes from interventions, services, supports, and placement decisions implemented from the previous year? If so, does the IEP explain the lack of progression and how it is being addressed?
- Does the IEP team identify and consider areas of potential success in the general education curriculum and classroom when determining LRE?
- Do goals and benchmarks build on each other year-to-year relative to increased instructional/SEL interventions, services, supports, and placement decisions?
- Are goals individualized across content area to target identified missing skills/barriers and are benchmarks sequential representations of goal achievement?
- From year-to-year, does the IEP team construct and document IEP progress monitoring procedures that determine a valid criterion for progress on individualized goals and sequential benchmarks?
- From year-to-year, does the IEP team determine placement decisions based on adjusted goals, interventions, services, and supports that increase student participation in the general education classroom?
- Does the IEP team utilize the IEP narrative box for additional individualized accommodations and modifications?
- Are accommodations and modifications relevant to the student's current needs? Does the IEP team reevaluate accommodations and modifications for assessments, curriculum and instruction, graduation, and grading criteria each year? Do accommodations and modifications address extracurricular/nonacademic activities and Behavioral Interventions Plans (BIPs) to allow increased participation with their peers?
- Do accommodations and modifications target alleviation of missing skills/barriers; assist in individualized academic/SEL progress; and support PLAAPFs, goals, benchmarks, interventions, services, supports, and placement decisions?

The previous questions highlight areas for IEP team consideration when planning to meet the individualized needs of students with disabilities. These questions are intended to assist IEP teams in developing IEPs that extend beyond normal content and into a document that affords greater academic, social, emotional, and behavioral content for the student.

Collaboration and Professional Learning Opportunities

Recommendations for policies, practices, and procedures target evidence-based inclusion models and effective implementation of these models within the classroom setting. Access to professional

development should be improved on the ODLSS website and staff portal. Additionally, professional development should include techniques for incorporating SEL goals for 8th and 12th grade students to align with timely graduation. Teachers providing individual professional development plans at the beginning of the school year should assist administration in constructing meaningful activities.

Staff shared that they are encouraged to participate in professional development but are unable to attend because they do not have classroom coverage. ISBE recommends CPS ensures coverage is available for all staff when there are professional development opportunities. In particular, SECAs should annually receive training relevant to their duties and responsibilities. In addition to increasing educational staff access to professional development opportunities, ISBE recommends addressing professional learning availability, opportunity, and the resulting outcomes as part of their CCT.

Based on the data analysis and feedback previously noted in this report, some additional recommendations include ensuring there is consistent time for collaboration throughout the school year. In particular, it is recommended that school leaders establish a dedicated time for team collaboration throughout the school year.

Staff Allocation/Staff Workload

Some case managers are overwhelmed with their responsibilities. Administration should review the day-to-day responsibilities of case managers to ensure they align with those outlined within ODLSS Procedural Manual. There is a need for increased involvement of SECAs in the IEP process and meetings, especially since they work closely with special education students and can provide critical insight on students' learning behavior. Opinions about special education staff assignment vary between administrators/case managers and teachers, SECAs, and RSPs. Additionally, survey and interview data indicated concerns that teachers and RSPs do not have time to perform essential job duties like providing service minutes or writing IEPs. Therefore, ISBE recommends an evaluation of staff allocation and district policies for determining workload as part of its root cause analysis.

Data Use

Recommendations for data use target creating a uniform schoolwide system for collecting data and progress monitoring IEP goals. A consistent and valid source of data will allow general and special education teachers to modify their specially designed instruction based on individual student need. School-based interventionists should be used to improve staff foundational knowledge in collecting MTSS data and assist with developing practices for progress monitoring of IEP goals.

LRE/Continuum of Services

Examining service allocation is a key issue to examine as part of the CCT. Determining the root cause of this reported need can help CPS understand whether teachers lack the necessary skills to determine service minutes, or if their practices are influenced by resource shortages. In either case, recommendations for CPS indicate the need for written guidance on recommended service delivery minutes according to established goals. ODLSS and Network administrators can assist in this area. Additionally, they can assist in the allocation of special education positions within individual schools and addressing teachers' professional development needs.

Supports and Resources

Recommendations for supports and resources target ODLSS consistently providing related service providers with evaluative tools. School administrators should ensure that related service providers have adequate service delivery space within the school. School administrators will need to survey and secure available spaces in the school that offers privacy for service delivery. Special and general education teachers need more guidance from district representatives in maintaining classrooms that contain diverse categories of disabilities and grade levels.

ODLSS should increase its guidance to enhance staff knowledge of IEP facilitation and other dispute resolution practices. Based on feedback, ISBE recommends that that both ODLSS and school administrators prioritize the timely dissemination of this information and other critical information and procedures to their staff by using different platforms, such as email communications, staff meetings throughout the school year, and a centralized hub where such documents can be stored for easy reference.

Parent Engagement

Recommendations for parent engagement target school administration, staff, and parent collaboration to develop activities that focus on parent outreach, engagement, and training. Network staff can be instrumental in providing knowledge and support for extending parent engagement.

Resources

The resources listed below are a targeted collective summation based on subsections listed above.

Table 8: Targeted Tools and Resources to Assist with Recommendations

Topic	Resources	Description
Root Cause Analysis	Critical Components Tool	Root cause analysis tool required by ISBE.
IEP Development	IEP Quality Project	Online tutorial program that aids in developing high-quality IEPs; also provides instruction and support to districts.
	IRIS Center: Developing High-Quality IEPs	This module details the process of developing high-quality IEPs for students with disabilities. The module discusses the requirements for IEPs as outlined in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) with implications of the Supreme Court's ruling in *Endrew F. v. Douglas County School District*
Parent Support	Family Resource Center on Disabilities	Providing parents of children with disabilities with information training and assistance.

Topic	Resources	Description
Professional Learning	ISBE Standards and Instruction Professional Learning	The Standards and Instruction Department supports professional learning by showcasing in-person and virtual professional development opportunities available across the state.
	Multilingual ISBE Sponsored WIDA Workshops	World Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) – Professional Development to address the needs of English Learners.
Resources	ISBE Special Education Catalog of Supports and Resources	The Catalog of Supports and Resources was created in order to provide information regarding resources available to support the diverse needs of students with disabilities. The resources cover the areas of academics, accommodations, assessment, behavior, early childhood, inclusive practices, multilingual learners, transition, and transportation.
	ISBE Website Resources Google Classroom	In collaboration with Illinois State University, this website offers an abundance of activities and resources for use in the classroom.
	State-Sponsored IEP Facilitation	IEP facilitation is a process that helps foster effective communication between parents and districts as they develop a mutually acceptable IEP. This process may be used as a preventative measure in which a trained facilitator promotes whole team participation, acknowledging and addressing differing opinions in a respectful and neutral manner. IEP facilitation can improve relationships between school districts and parents in order to effectively plan services to meet the needs of the student

Topic	Resources	Description
	[High-Leverage Practices](#)	In partnership with the Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability and Reform (CEEDAR), the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) has developed and published a set of high-leverage practices (HLPs) for special educators and teacher candidates. The HLPs are organized around four aspects of practice: • **Collaboration** • **Assessment** • **Social/emotional/behavioral** • **Instruction**
	[ISBE Illinois Quality Framework](#)	The Illinois Quality Framework is a document that includes standards, indicators, and guiding questions for diverse stakeholder groups to use in open, honest, inquiry-based conversation. These conversations set the stage for the completion of the Illinois Quality Framework Supporting Rubric.

Next Steps

ISBE principal consultants will be a supportive partner with the CPS schools to collaborate in the development and implementation of the Supportive Action Plan. ISBE principal consultants will:

- Inform the CPS school of relevant available professional learning opportunities, and
- Support and collaborate with CPS school in the alignment of resources, technical assistance, and participation in School Accountability Team (SAT) meetings to address root causes and implementation of actions listed this Supportive Action Plan

Action Steps are based on an integration of the CPS school priorities and ISBE recommendations (actions required and suggested improvements) from the ISBE Network Summary Report.

Table 9: Action Steps Template

Action Step 1: *(What is the target area)*

Action Step *What action will be taken? How will progress be monitored? How will you measure progress?*	Person Responsible *Who will oversee the implementation of action steps (include role of the principal)?*	Required Resources *(Professional Learning, Technical Assistance, Resources, ISBE/ODLSS Supports*	Timeline *Projection of initiation dates.*	Outcome *What were the outcomes of implementation, including measurement of progress, barriers, revision of action step?*
• **Action:** • **Progress Monitoring:** • **Progress Measurement:**	•	•	•	•

Conclusion

The Illinois State Board of Education appreciates the efforts that ODLSS and all participating CPS Networks and schools put forth during this "Wave 1" of the Illinois Special Education Accountability and Support System process. The foundation for the EGSP process was modeled on the results-based accountability framework that provides a balanced approach for accountability and emphasizes improved outcomes that align with the EGSP priorities of instructional quality and service delivery. If you have any questions regarding this report or the Illinois Special Education Accountability and Support System's CPS EGSP process, please contact Rhonda Marks at rmarks@isbe.net or 312-814-3638.

Appendix A: Wave 1 Survey Results

Table 10: Wave 1 Teacher Survey Results

Teacher Survey Data		Wave 1 Networks	
Question 1	**Response**	**N**	**%**
Teachers engage in discussion and collaboration with colleagues (student's other teachers, RSPs, paraprofessionals, case managers) to prepare for: Referral meetings, Consent Assessment Planning meetings, Evaluations, Eligibility Determination meetings, IEP meetings, and Manifestation Determination Review meetings.	Strongly Agree	365	36%
	Agree	418	41%
	Neutral/Unknown	92	9%
	Disagree	106	10%
	Strongly disagree	32	3%
	Total	**1013**	**100%**
Question 2			
IEPS for 8th grade or 12th grade students with disabilities incorporate strategies that address individual academic challenges to graduate on time (or as indicated in the IEP).	Strongly Agree	240	24%
	Agree	320	32%
	Neutral/Unknown	418	41%
	Disagree	25	2%
	Strongly disagree	10	1%
	Total	**1013**	**100%**
Question 3			
IEPS for 8th grade or 12th grade students with disabilities incorporate strategies that address individual social-emotional and/or functional challenges to graduate on time (or as indicated in the IEP).	Strongly Agree	240	24%
	Agree	310	31%
	Neutral/Unknown	421	42%
	Disagree	29	3%
	Strongly disagree	13	1%
	Total	**1013**	**100%**
Question 4			
Parents are provided with Draft RSP reports and assessment results (for initial evaluations or reevaluations) and Draft IEP documents at least 3 school days prior to an Eligibility Determination and/or IEP meeting.	Strongly Agree	426	42%
	Agree	264	26%
	Neutral/Unknown	266	26%
	Disagree	41	4%
	Strongly disagree	16	2%
	Total	**1013**	**100%**
Question 5			
Teachers have access to high quality professional learning opportunities rooted in Adult Learning Theory.	Strongly Agree	131	13%
	Agree	252	25%
	Neutral/Unknown	294	29%
	Disagree	219	22%
	Strongly disagree	117	12%
	Total	**1013**	**100%**

Question 6			
Your school employs (i.e., has filled) the requisite number of certified special education teachers and bilingual special education teachers to provide instructional services to students with disabilities per their IEPs. This question speaks to positions approved by ODLSS, not the number of positions you believe the school should have.	Strongly Agree	231	23%
	Agree	304	30%
	Neutral/Unknown	210	21%
	Disagree	163	16%
	Strongly disagree	105	10%
	Total	**1013**	**100%**
Question 7	Response		
If your school has special education teacher vacancies, administration secures properly certified substitutes and, if not, incorporates a contingency plan to ensure students are receiving most/all of their IEP minutes, and those minutes/services are tracked accordingly.	Strongly Agree	158	16%
	Agree	255	25%
	Neutral/Unknown	320	32%
	Disagree	168	17%
	Strongly disagree	112	11%
	Total	**1013**	**100%**
Question 8			
If IEP services are not provided regularly due to teacher vacancies or lack of certified substitute teachers, progress monitoring data is tracked, and parents are notified of compensatory education meetings when necessary.	Strongly Agree	118	12%
	Agree	201	20%
	Neutral/Unknown	463	46%
	Disagree	136	13%
	Strongly disagree	95	9%
	Total	**1013**	**100%**
Question 9			
Special Education and General Education teachers are provided with sufficient opportunities and time to develop quality IEPs, and they receive data and input from other IEP Team members.	Strongly Agree	171	17%
	Agree	347	34%
	Neutral/Unknown	143	14%
	Disagree	239	24%
	Strongly disagree	113	11%
	Total	**1013**	**100%**
Question 10			
Teachers receive monthly Case Manager meeting materials and have the opportunity to discuss the sections therein to ensure understanding and appropriate application to daily teaching responsibilities.	Strongly Agree	162	16%
	Agree	218	22%
	Neutral/Unknown	215	21%
	Disagree	253	25%
	Strongly disagree	165	16%
	Total	**1013**	**100%**
Question 11			
General Education teachers implement accommodations and modifications and can speak to the impact on individual students at IEP meetings.	Strongly Agree	304	30%
	Agree	457	45%
	Neutral/Unknown	111	11%
	Disagree	103	10%
	Strongly disagree	38	4%
	Total	**1013**	**100%**

Question 12			
SECAs (i.e. paraprofessionals) are utilized appropriately, providing IEP-based supports and services to students and teachers and are not assigned clerical duties and general lunchroom or recess duties.	Strongly Agree	266	26%
	Agree	352	35%
	Neutral/Unknown	169	17%
	Disagree	149	15%
	Strongly disagree	77	8%
	Total	**1013**	**100%**

Note: The distribution of responses for each survey item equals 100% +/- 1%

Table 11: Wave 1 Related Service Provider Survey Results

RSP Survey Data		Wave 1 Networks	
Question 1	**Response**	**N**	**%**
RSPs have access to Professional Development and other training opportunities regarding the provision of related services to students with disabilities who have IEPs or 504 Plans.	Strongly Agree	57	24%
	Agree	133	56%
	Neutral/Unknown	28	12%
	Disagree	16	7%
	Strongly disagree	4	2%
	Total	**238**	**100%**
Question 2			
RSPs have access to Professional Development and other training opportunities regarding MTSS and at-risk students.	Strongly Agree	25	11%
	Agree	99	42%
	Neutral/Unknown	64	27%
	Disagree	42	18%
	Strongly disagree	8	3%
	Total	**238**	**100%**
Question 3			
RSPs are consistently provided with the necessary evaluative tools to comprehensively assess and determine the impact of a student's disability on learning and access to the general education curriculum.	Strongly Agree	25	11%
	Agree	92	39%
	Neutral/Unknown	52	22%
	Disagree	41	17%
	Strongly disagree	28	12%
	Total	**238**	**100%**
Question 4			
RSPs have the requisite time and opportunity to appropriately deliver related services in a timely manner in accordance with student IEPs (or 504 Plans if applicable).	Strongly Agree	16	7%
	Agree	75	32%
	Neutral/Unknown	49	21%
	Disagree	62	26%
	Strongly disagree	36	15%
	Total	**238**	**100%**

Question 5			
RSPs have the requisite time and opportunity to appropriately consult and collaborate with other special education providers and general education teachers in accordance with student IEPs (or 504 Plans if applicable) on a consistent basis.	Strongly Agree	10	4%
	Agree	89	37%
	Neutral/Unknown	52	22%
	Disagree	54	23%
	Strongly disagree	33	14%
	Total	**238**	**100%**
Question 6			
Other education providers (e.g., teachers, case managers, paraprofessionals, fellow RSPs, etc.) are cooperative and dedicate time to consult and collaborate with you in accordance with student IEPs (or 504 Plans if applicable) on a consistent basis.	Strongly Agree	33	14%
	Agree	128	54%
	Neutral/Unknown	43	18%
	Disagree	29	12%
	Strongly disagree	5	2%
	Total	**238**	**100%**
Question 7			
RSPs document, share, and discuss current evaluative data at Eligibility Determination and IEP meetings versus a simple review of past evaluative data as the source of current student abilities.	Strongly Agree	94	39%
	Agree	129	54%
	Neutral/Unknown	11	5%
	Disagree	2	1%
	Strongly disagree	2	1%
	Total	**238**	**100%**
Question 8			
RSPs adjust service delivery models, evaluation criteria, and LRE minutes based on individual student needs, progress, and data versus their caseloads or what a parent/guardian prefers.	Strongly Agree	75	32%
	Agree	116	49%
	Neutral/Unknown	28	12%
	Disagree	18	8%
	Strongly disagree	1	0%
	Total	**238**	**100%**
Question 9			
RSPs are notified in a timely manner when a Dispute Resolution matter occurs at one of their assigned schools: Mediation, Due Process, State Complaint, ISBE Facilitated IEP Meeting.	Strongly Agree	26	11%
	Agree	61	26%
	Neutral/Unknown	126	53%
	Disagree	23	10%
	Strongly disagree	2	1%
	Total	**238**	**100%**

Question 10			
Schools provide RSPs with adequate workspace and area(s) to provide student services with a reasonable amount of privacy.	Strongly Agree	22	9%
	Agree	58	24%
	Neutral/Unknown	36	15%
	Disagree	66	28%
	Strongly disagree	56	24%
	Total	**238**	**100%**
Question 11			
Special Education staff (Special Education teachers and SECAs) are being utilized appropriately in school(s) and to the maximum extent possible to implement IEP services, supports, and minutes. If disagree, please describe and provide examples in the narrative.	Strongly Agree	21	9%
	Agree	88	37%
	Neutral/Unknown	68	29%
	Disagree	39	16%
	Strongly disagree	22	9%
	Total	**238**	**100%**
Question 12			
IEP Team members engage in discussion and collaboration with their IEP Team colleagues (RSPs, general education and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, case managers) to adequately prepare for: Referral meetings, Consent Assessment Planning meetings, Evaluations, Eligibility Determination meetings, IEP meetings, and Manifestation Determination Reviews.	Strongly Agree	49	21%
	Agree	131	55%
	Neutral/Unknown	28	12%
	Disagree	25	11%
	Strongly disagree	5	2%
	Total	**238**	**100%**

Note: The distribution of responses for each survey item equals 100% +/- 1%

Table 12: Special Education Classroom Assistant Survey Results

SECA Survey Data		Wave 1 Networks	
Question 1	Response	N	%
SECAs are scheduled appropriately and assigned only student-based duties per IEPs when students are in the building; SECAs are not assigned clerical/administrative duties (e.g., general group lunchroom/recess duties, making copies, bus duty) that take them away from IEP-based student services.	Strongly Agree	126	29%
	Agree	133	31%
	Unknown/Neutral	42	10%
	Disagree	80	18%
	Strongly disagree	53	12%
	Total	**434**	**100%**
Question 2			
SECAs have schedules that indicate specific times, locations (e.g., classroom). student names, and class descriptions (e.g., ELA, science, etc.); schedules reflect SECA assignments for the entire workday.	Strongly Agree	197	45%
	Agree	179	41%
	Unknown/Neutral	26	6%
	Disagree	22	5%
	Strongly disagree	10	2%
		434	**100%**

Question 3			
SECAs are not directed to serve as substitute teachers. If SECAs are assigned as substitute teachers, please indicate the circumstances and frequency that this occurs.	Strongly Agree	158	36%
	Agree	116	27%
	Unknown/Neutral	68	16%
	Disagree	58	13%
	Strongly disagree	34	8%
		434	**100%**
Question 4			
Bilingual SECAs are not utilized as interpreters at IEP meetings. If SECAs are directed to serve in this role, please indicate the circumstances and frequency that this occurs.	Strongly Agree	84	19%
	Agree	81	19%
	Unknown/Neutral	198	46%
	Disagree	43	10%
	Strongly disagree	28	6%
		434	**100%**
Question 5			
SECAs are invited to participate in IEP meetings (or 504 Plan meetings when applicable) and may attend in part or in whole.	Strongly Agree	85	20%
	Agree	103	24%
	Unknown/Neutral	64	15%
	Disagree	73	17%
	Strongly disagree	109	25%
		434	**100%**
Question 6			
SECAs are encouraged to, or have the opportunity to, provide information regarding student-based interventions/supports, progress monitoring, and/or other data to the IEP Team prior to students' IEP meetings (or 504 Plan meetings if applicable).	Strongly Agree	129	30%
	Agree	153	35%
	Unknown/Neutral	49	11%
	Disagree	63	15%
	Strongly disagree	40	9%
		434	**100%**
Question 7			
SECAs are provided with updated information (or a copy of a new IEP or 504 Plan) after all IEP/504 meetings and revisions.	Strongly Agree	88	20%
	Agree	126	29%
	Unknown/Neutral	67	15%
	Disagree	94	22%
	Strongly disagree	59	14%
		434	**100%**

Question 8			
SECAs are provided with Professional Development opportunities. If so, please describe the types of PD and frequency.	Strongly Agree	127	29%
	Agree	180	41%
	Unknown/Neutral	63	15%
	Disagree	41	9%
	Strongly disagree	23	5%
		434	**100%**
Question 9			
Special Education teachers collaborate with SECAs to plan, implement, and adjust supports and services for students per their IEPS (or 504 Plans when applicable).	Strongly Agree	118	27%
	Agree	167	38%
	Unknown/Neutral	48	11%
	Disagree	62	14%
	Strongly disagree	39	9%
		434	**100%**
Question 10			
If applicable, General Education teachers collaborate with SECAs to plan, implement, and adjust supports and services for students per their IEPS (or 504 Plans when applicable).	Strongly Agree	85	20%
	Agree	148	34%
	Unknown/Neutral	74	17%
	Disagree	74	17%
	Strongly disagree	53	12%
		434	**100%**

Note: The distribution of responses for each survey item equals 100% +/- 1%

Table 13: Administrator Survey Results

Administrator Survey Data		Wave 1 Networks	
	Response	**N**	**%**
Question 1	Strongly Agree	23	51%
There is administrative oversight and support to ensure that 8th grade or 12th grade students with disabilities meet CPS requirements to graduate on time.	Agree	14	31%
	Neutral/Unknown	4	9%
	Disagree	4	9%
	Strongly disagree	0	0%
	Total	**45**	**100%**
Question 2			
You are notified in a timely manner when a Dispute Resolution matter occurs at your school/one of your assigned schools: Mediation, Due Process, State Complaint, ISBE Facilitated IEP Meeting.	Strongly Agree	8	18%
	Agree	19	42%
	Neutral/Unknown	18	40%
	Disagree	0	0%
	Strongly disagree	0	0%
	Total	**45**	**100%**

Question 3			
The function of ISBE Facilitated IEP Meetings and the process to request facilitation has been communicated to School Administration and Network Chiefs.	Strongly Agree	8	18%
	Agree	12	27%
	Neutral/Unknown	13	29%
	Disagree	7	16%
	Strongly disagree	5	11%
	Total	**45**	**100%**
Question 4			
Your school/your assigned schools has/have been provided with information regarding how to request a third-party interpreter for IEP (or other) meetings and related communications to families and students, and support is provided to locate and schedule an interpreter.	Strongly Agree	14	31%
	Agree	22	49%
	Neutral/Unknown	4	9%
	Disagree	4	9%
	Strongly disagree	1	2%
	Total	**45**	**100%**
Question 5			
CPS school-based administrators (e.g., principals, APs) regularly meet with their Case Manager(s), and Special Education providers (teachers, paraprofessionals, clinicians) regarding academic and social-emotional supports, positive teacher-student relationships, and data-based expectations and improvements for students with disabilities.	Strongly Agree	24	53%
	Agree	16	36%
	Neutral/Unknown	1	2%
	Disagree	4	9%
	Strongly disagree	0	0%
		45	**100%**
Question 6			
Your school(s) has/have a consistent process to disseminate, review, and discuss professional development and other training materials (e.g., Case Manager Meeting materials) regarding special education (e.g., best practices, legal requirements, roles and responsibilities).	Strongly Agree	15	33%
	Agree	27	60%
	Neutral/Unknown	0	0%
	Disagree	2	4%
	Strongly disagree	1	2%
	Total	**45**	**100%**
Question 7			
ODLSS District Representatives/SEAs, collectively, receive professional development and training on how to best present critical special education information (best practices, legal requirements, CPS policies, etc.) to Network and school personnel.	Strongly Agree	4	9%
	Agree	12	27%
	Neutral/Unknown	23	51%
	Disagree	4	9%
	Strongly disagree	2	4%
	Total	**45**	**100%**

Question 8			
ODLSS has informed Networks and schools of their partnership with ISBE, with the mutual goal of supporting the well-being and achievement of CPS' students with disabilities.	Strongly Agree	5	11%
	Agree	23	51%
	Neutral/Unknown	10	22%
	Disagree	5	11%
	Strongly disagree	2	4%
	Total	**45**	**100%**
Question 9			
You have received timely communication of ODLSS policy and procedures regarding the provision of interpretation services at IEP meetings and translation of IEP documents. Examples may include: legal requirements on interpretation/translation services, electronic info/links to request interpreter services, ODLSS parent brochures, resources for third party interpretation services.	Strongly Agree	7	16%
	Agree	22	49%
	Neutral/Unknown	8	18%
	Disagree	5	11%
	Strongly disagree	3	7%
	Total	**45**	**100%**
Question 10			
Your school(s) utilize(s) the Case Manager and/or at least one (other) special educator to assist the school administrators/scheduler/programmer with grouping and scheduling students with disabilities appropriately to ensure that all special education minutes are implemented per student IEPs.	Strongly Agree	33	73%
	Agree	12	27%
	Neutral/Unknown	0	0%
	Disagree	0	0%
	Strongly disagree	0	0%
	Total	**45**	**100%**
Question 11			
Special Education staff (Special Education teachers and SECAs) are being utilized appropriately and to the maximum extent possible to implement IEP services, supports, and minutes; staff schedules indicate IEP-based duties and assignments only throughout the entire school day.	Strongly Agree	36	80%
	Agree	9	20%
	Neutral/Unknown	0	0%
	Disagree	0	0%
	Strongly disagree	0	0%
	Total	**45**	**100%**
Question 12			
There is a designated staff member at your school(s) who oversees accurate data entry into the Illinois State Board of Education Student Information System (SIS).	Strongly Agree	15	33%
	Agree	15	33%
	Neutral/Unknown	9	20%
	Disagree	5	11%
	Strongly disagree	1	2%
	Total	**45**	**100%**

Question 13			
You have received appropriate and comprehensive training regarding Compensatory Education meetings, related analysis, and funding sources.	Strongly Agree	3	7%
	Agree	20	44%
	Neutral/Unknown	10	22%
	Disagree	8	18%
	Strongly disagree	4	9%
	Total	**45**	**100%**
Question 14			
You have received appropriate and comprehensive training/information regarding Recovery Services meetings, related analysis, and funding sources.	Strongly Agree	3	7%
	Agree	16	36%
	Neutral/Unknown	12	27%
	Disagree	9	20%
	Strongly disagree	5	11%
	Total	**45**	**100%**

Note: The distribution of responses for each survey item equals 100% +/- 1%

Table 14: Case Manager Survey Results

Case Manager Survey		Wave 1 Total	
Question 1	Response	N	%
Team members engage in discussion and collaboration with their IEP Team colleagues (RSPs, general education and special education teachers ,paraprofessionals, case managers) to adequately prepare for: Referral meetings, Consent Assessment Planning meetings, Evaluations, Eligibility Determination meetings, IEP meetings, and Manifestation Determination Reviews.	Strongly Agree	59	67%
	Agree	24	27%
	Neutral/Unknown	4	5%
	Disagree	0	0%
	Strongly disagree	1	1%
	Total	**88**	**100%**
Question 2			
In collaboration with and support from school administration (Principal/AP), and per the ODLSS Procedural Manual, you oversee and ensure implementation of all IEPs and 504 Plans for students with disabilities in your school.	Strongly Agree	67	76%
	Agree	16	18%
	Neutral/Unknown	2	2%
	Disagree	2	2%
	Strongly disagree	1	1%
	Total	**88**	**100%**
Question 3			
Special education teachers develop IEPs based on current qualitative and quantitative data, and PLAAFPs/benchmarks/goals are intentionally updated to meet changing student needs at least annually	Strongly Agree	49	56%
	Agree	32	36%
	Neutral/Unknown	7	8%
	Disagree	0	0%
	Strongly disagree	0	0%
	Total	**88**	**100%**

Question 4			
You have been provided with information on and understand the process to request ISBE Facilitated IEP Meetings, and you have communicated and explained the process to school personnel.	Strongly Agree	42	48%
	Agree	21	24%
	Neutral/Unknown	7	8%
	Disagree	13	15%
	Strongly disagree	5	6%
	Total	**88**	**100%**
Question 5			
A qualified interpreter is invited to all Eligibility Determination, IEP, and 504 meetings for parents who are limited English proficient. If not, please explain via narrative.	Strongly Agree	57	65%
	Agree	19	22%
	Neutral/Unknown	7	8%
	Disagree	5	6%
	Strongly disagree	0	0%
	Total	**88**	**100%**
Question 6			
Your school has been provided with information regarding how to request a third-party interpreter, and support is provided to locate and schedule an interpreter for IEP (or other) meetings and related communications.	Strongly Agree	51	58%
	Agree	25	28%
	Neutral/Unknown	6	7%
	Disagree	5	6%
	Strongly disagree	1	1%
	Total	**88**	**100%**
Question 7			
You are provided with adequate time to meet regularly with special education providers regarding academic and social-emotional matters, teacher-student relationships, data-based interventions, and data-based student outcomes and progress.	Strongly Agree	22	25%
	Agree	33	38%
	Neutral/Unknown	8	9%
	Disagree	18	20%
	Strongly disagree	7	8%
	Total	**88**	**100%**
Question 8			
You and at least one other IEP Team member assist the Principal/scheduler/programmer with grouping and scheduling students with disabilities appropriately to ensure that all special education minutes are implemented per student IEPs.	Strongly Agree	54	61%
	Agree	22	25%
	Neutral/Unknown	6	7%
	Disagree	4	5%
	Strongly disagree	2	2%
	Total	**88**	**100%**

Question 9			
Special Education staff (Special Education teachers and SECAs) are being utilized appropriately and to the maximum extent possible to implement IEP services, supports, and minutes; staff schedules indicate IEP-based duties and assignments only throughout the entire school day.	Strongly Agree	59	67%
	Agree	23	26%
	Neutral/Unknown	2	2%
	Disagree	2	2%
	Strongly disagree	2	2%
	Total	**88**	**100%**
Question 10			
You are provided with appropriate training and resources to provide support and guidance to improve the quality of IEP writing and development for individualized student services.	Strongly Agree	40	45%
	Agree	32	36%
	Neutral/Unknown	8	9%
	Disagree	4	5%
	Strongly disagree	4	5%
	Total	**88**	**100%**
Question 11			
The IEP Team ensures that service delivery decisions and implementation are informed by data and thoroughly discussed with input from all team members, including the parent/guardian. You are equipped and confident in leading these discussions before and during IEP (and other) meetings.	Strongly Agree	58	66%
	Agree	25	28%
	Neutral/Unknown	2	2%
	Disagree	2	2%
	Strongly disagree	1	1%
	Total	**88**	**100%**
Question 12			
RSPs are cooperative team members and participate equally in special education meetings and activities.	Strongly Agree	55	63%
	Agree	27	31%
	Neutral/Unknown	2	2%
	Disagree	3	3%
	Strongly disagree	1	1%
	Total	**88**	**100%**
Question 13			
There is administrative oversight and support to ensure that 8th grade or 12th grade students with disabilities meet CPS requirements to graduate on time.	Strongly Agree	52	59%
	Agree	22	25%
	Neutral/Unknown	10	11%
	Disagree	2	2%
	Strongly disagree	2	2%
	Total	**88**	**100%**

Question 14			
You are notified in a timely manner when a Dispute Resolution matter occurs at one of their assigned school/staff: Mediation, Due Process, State Complaint, ISBE Facilitated IEP Meeting	Strongly Agree	39	44%
	Agree	19	22%
	Neutral/Unknown	27	31%
	Disagree	2	2%
	Strongly disagree	1	1%
	Total	**88**	**100%**

Note: The distribution of responses for each survey item equals 100% +/- 1%