

Illinois Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are a 14% gap between the graduation rate for students with disabilities and the graduation rate for all students. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 10.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 11%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the percentage and actual numbers used in the calculation for the indicator. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State revised its FFY 2005 data based on updated and more accurate enrollment counts for grades 9-12. The State's revised data for FFY 2005 for the percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school are 6.23%. Therefore, the State's revised data for FFY 2005 for this indicator are a 2.33% gap between the percent of youth dropping out of high school and the percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are a 2.1% gap between the dropout rate for students with disabilities and the dropout rate for all students. These data represent progress from the revised FFY 2005 data of 2.33%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 1.4%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 60.9%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 68.7%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 55%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the required FFY 2005 progress data and progress data from FFY 2006. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]		
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State revised its FFY 2005 data based on the inclusion of results from the 11th grade student assessment. The revised data for FFY 2005 are 98% for reading and math.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 99.5% for reading and math. These data represent progress from the revised FFY 2005 data of 98% for reading and math.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 95%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, progress data for the 11th grade for FFY 2005. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State revised its FFY 2005 data based on the inclusion of results from 11th grade student assessment. The revised data are 33.3% for reading and 43.5% for math.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 36.8% for reading and 48.4% for math.</p> <p>These data represent progress from the revised FFY 2005 data of 33.3% for reading and 43.5% for math. The State met its FFY 2006 targets of 34% for reading and 36% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, data for the 11th grade for FFY 2005. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 3.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 4.82%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 5%.</p> <p>The State did not provide the information required by the FFY 2005 response table related to providing a description of how the State reviewed, and if appropriate, revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise), its</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, a description of the review and if appropriate revision of policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]	<p>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 compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2005. The State reported that it will complete a self-assessment process with districts identified in FFY 2006 (and for all districts with significant discrepancy in all future reporting cycles) to analyze and, if appropriate, revise policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards by the end of the 2008 calendar year to be reported in the FFY 2007 APR.</p>	<p>ensure compliance with IDEA for districts identified as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2005 APR. Although the State indicated in its FFY 2006 APR that it will, for districts identified as having significant discrepancies in FFY 2006 and future years, meet the requirements of 34 CFR §300.170(b) by requiring the districts to conduct a self-assessment, the State did not describe how it met the requirements of 34 CFR §300.170(b) for districts identified as having significant discrepancies in FFY 2005. This represents noncompliance with 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p> <p>In reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must describe the results of the State’s examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008). In addition, the State must describe the review, and if appropriate, revision of 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 compliance with the IDEA for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion: B. Percent of districts identified by</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 4B was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>	

Illinois Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
<p>the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>																		
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p> <p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 727 1419 1109"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td>49.3%</td> <td>49.2%</td> <td>48.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>18.9%</td> <td>18.4%</td> <td>20.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>5.9%</td> <td>6.2%</td> <td>5.24%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for Indicator 5B, and slippage for Indicators 5A and 5C, from the FFY 2005 data. The State met its FFY 2006 targets for Indicators 5A and 5B, and did not meet its target for Indicator 5C.</p> <p>The State explained that the FFY 2006 data in the APR differ from the data reported under IDEA section 618 because the 618 data include parentally placed children in private schools, but the APR data do not.</p>		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	49.3%	49.2%	48.5%	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	18.9%	18.4%	20.1%	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	5.9%	6.2%	5.24%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target															
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	49.3%	49.2%	48.5%															
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	18.9%	18.4%	20.1%															
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	5.9%	6.2%	5.24%															
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 6 was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>																	

Illinois Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																								
<p>education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>																										
<p>7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 597 1419 1284"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 597 1062 773">06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1062 597 1178 773">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1178 597 1297 773">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1297 597 1419 773">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 773 1062 841">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 773 1178 841">3.6%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1178 773 1297 841">4.1%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1297 773 1419 841">3.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 841 1062 976">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 841 1178 976">4.6%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1178 841 1297 976">4.9%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1297 841 1419 976">4.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 976 1062 1078">c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 976 1178 1078">26.5%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1178 976 1297 1078">26.7%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1297 976 1419 1078">14.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1078 1062 1180">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1078 1178 1180">34.5%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1178 1078 1297 1180">34.2%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1297 1078 1419 1180">35.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1180 1062 1284">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1180 1178 1284">30.7%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1178 1180 1297 1284">30.1%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1297 1180 1419 1284">42.8%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The State provided improvement activities for this indicator covering the remaining years of the SPP.</p>	06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	3.6%	4.1%	3.0%	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	4.6%	4.9%	4.2%	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	26.5%	26.7%	14.4%	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	34.5%	34.2%	35.5%	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	30.7%	30.1%	42.8%	<p>The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide progress data with the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, and baseline data and targets with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																							
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	3.6%	4.1%	3.0%																							
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	4.6%	4.9%	4.2%																							
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	26.5%	26.7%	14.4%																							
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	34.5%	34.2%	35.5%																							
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	30.7%	30.1%	42.8%																							
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline, targets, and improvement activities for this</p>	<p>The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a response</p>																								

Illinois Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 56.6%. These data represent progress from the revised FFY 2005 data of 53.8%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 54%.</p>	<p>group that was not representative of the population in regards to age, disability, and race/ethnicity. The State reported that it plans to continually work with stakeholders and the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC) to increase the response rate and is currently investigating strategies, such as weighting responses, to ensure representativeness of the survey respondents. In the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must continue to address whether its FFY 2007 data are representative. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to address representativeness by age, disability, race/ethnicity, and gender.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP cannot accept that revision because the State did not calculate its baseline using complete data for the number of districts determined to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%. However, these data are not valid and reliable because the State did not report the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2006 and FFY 2005 to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification. The State identified districts with disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services, but did not determine if disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification in all of the districts with</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, a description and report on its review of data and information for all race ethnicity categories, including white students, in the State to determine if there was disproportionate representation that was the result of inappropriate identification for FFY 2005. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, information that clarifies that when the State determines that significant disproportionality is occurring in an LEA</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>disproportionate representation. The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2005 (16 districts) and FFY 2006 (17 districts) to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services; however “to date, 12 of the 16 districts which had disproportionate representation in FFY 2005 have completed self-assessments” and “13 out of the 17 districts which had disproportionate representation in FFY 2006 have completed self-assessments” to determine if the disproportionality was due to inappropriate identification. The State determined that in 12 of the 16 districts in FFY 2005 and 13 of the 17 districts in FFY 2006, the disproportionate representation was not the result of inappropriate identification. However, the State did not determine if disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification in 4 districts in FFY 2005 and 4 districts in FFY 2006 that were found to have underrepresentation.</p> <p>Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage or whether the State met its target.</p>	<p>with respect to the identification, placement, or discipline of children as children with disabilities, the State: (1) provides for the review (and, if appropriate) revision of policies, procedures, and practices; (2) requires the LEA to reserve the maximum amount of funds to be used for early intervening services; and (3) requires the LEA to publicly report on the revision of policies, procedures, and practices. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State was also required to provide baseline data from FFY 2005 and FFY 2006, progress data on the percent of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification, and a description of how the State made that determination (e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures, etc.). The State did not provide complete FFY 2005 baseline data and FFY 2006 progress data. The State reported it would complete the self-assessment process with the remaining districts that were found to have underrepresentation in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 by the end of the 2008 calendar year to determine if the disproportionality was due to inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State must provide, in its FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, valid and reliable baseline data from FFY 2005 and progress data from FFY 2006 on the percent of districts identified with disproportionate</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP cannot accept that revision because the State did not calculate its baseline using complete data for the number of districts determined to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0.46%. However, these data are not valid and reliable because the State did not report the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2006 and FFY 2005 to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification. The State identified districts with disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories, but did not determine if disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification in all of the districts with disproportionate representation. The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2005 (88 districts) and FFY 2006 (88 districts) to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories; however "to date, 64 of the 88 districts which had disproportionate representation in FFY 2005 have completed self-assessments" and "64 out of the 88 districts which had disproportionate representation in FFY 2006 have completed self-assessments" to determine if the disproportionality was due to inappropriate identification. The State determined that 4 of the 64 districts identified in FFY 2005 had disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification and 4 of the 64 districts identified in FFY 2006 had disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification. However, the State did not determine if disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification in 24 districts in FFY 2005 and 24 district in FFY 2006 that were found to have underrepresentation.</p> <p>Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, a description and report on its review of data and information for all race ethnicity categories, including white students, in the State to determine if there was disproportionate representation that was the result of inappropriate identification for FFY 2005. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, information that clarifies that when the State determines that significant disproportionality is occurring in an LEA with respect to the identification, placement, or discipline of children as children with disabilities, the State: (1) provides for the review (and, if appropriate) revision of policies, procedures, and practices; (2) requires the LEA to reserve the maximum amount of funds to be used for early intervening services; and (3) requires the LEA to publicly report on the revision of policies, procedures, and practices. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State was also required to provide baseline data from FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 progress data on the percent of districts</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>slippage. The State did not meet its target of 100%.</p>	<p>identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification, and a description of how the State made that determination (e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures, etc.). The State did not provide complete FFY 2005 baseline data and FFY 2006 progress data. The State reported it would complete the self-assessment process with the remaining districts that were found to have underrepresentation in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 by the end of the 2008 calendar year to determine if the disproportionality was due to inappropriate identification. The State must provide, in its FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, valid and reliable baseline data from FFY 2005 and data from FFY 2006 on the percent of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that demonstrate that the State has in effect policies and procedures as required by 34 CFR 34 CFR §300.173 and that the LEAs identified in FFY 2005 and 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline). [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 98.1%.</p> <p>OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State used a different measurement to report on this indicator in FFY 2005. The State's FFY 2005 data for this indicator were based on 60 calendar days rather than the State established timeline of 60 school days. Additionally, in FFY 2005, the State collected data for reevaluations as well as initial evaluations. The State's FFY 2006 data for this indicator were based on the State established timeline and initial evaluations only.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>In Appendix 3, the State reported that four of four findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>through 300.311.</p> <p>As required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State accounted for children whose initial evaluation was not completed within the State established timeline by indicating the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and reported the reasons for the delay.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely evaluations requirements in 34 CFR 300.301(c)(1) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>12. 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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 95.11%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 80.21%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 237 of the 308 districts with noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 demonstrated timely correction by meeting the target of 100% for FFY 2006. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that it provided targeted technical assistance to the districts through the State's LEA determinations process.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b),</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 24.3%. The FFY 2005 data were 24.5%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator was not corrected in a timely manner; however the finding was subsequently corrected.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported baseline data for this indicator are 74.1%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to address the representativeness of the response group based on gender, race/ethnicity, exit reason and primary disability.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 92.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 86.22%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 146 of 158 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner. Ten of the remaining 12 findings were corrected and closed. For the uncorrected noncompliance,</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, clarification that the State includes findings of noncompliance made through due process hearings, data on the correction of outstanding noncompliance identified in FFY 2003 and data on the correction of outstanding noncompliance identified</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>the State reported that two findings remain open in a very complicated case involving both district and parent delays. In an effort to resolve the situation, the district agreed to a parental request for an independent music therapy evaluation and observation by an outside entity of the parent's choice. The length of time awaiting the results caused a delay in resolution of the case. ISBE is currently awaiting reports from the district to close the case.</p>	<p>through the complaint process in FFY 2004. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State has corrected the remaining noncompliance identified in Indicator 15 from FFY 2005.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 (2006-2007) under this indicator in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 10, 11, 12 and 13, the State must specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 90.5%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 95.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 93.1%. These</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1,</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party. [Compliance Indicator]	data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 90.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.	2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely due process hearing resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.
18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]	The State revised the targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 50%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 45-65%.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.
19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]	The State revised the targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 79.3%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 75-85%.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.
20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 94.6%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 92.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.	The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely and accurate data requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).