

Illinois Part B FFY 2007 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 and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are a 5.3% gap between the graduation rate for students with disabilities and the graduation rate for all students. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 14%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of a gap of no more than 10.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</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 and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are a 0.3% gap between the dropout rate for students with disabilities and the dropout rate for all students. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 2.1%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of a gap of no more than 1.3%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 52.6%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 60.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 62.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 97.9% for reading and 97.9% for math. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State changed its calculation method for this indicator. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 95% for reading and math.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</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 and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 39.8% for reading and 50.3% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 36.8% for reading and 48.4% for math.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 targets of 36% for reading and 37% for math.</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>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 2.1%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State changed its definition of significant discrepancy.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 5%.</p> <p>The State described how the State reviewed, and if appropriate, revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise), the LEA's 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 2007.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, 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 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). The State described the review and if appropriate, revision of</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State reported that it identified findings of noncompliance in March 2009 based on the review of policies, procedures and practices of districts identified with a significant discrepancy in FFY 2005, FFY 2006 and FFY 2007. The State must demonstrate in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011, that the noncompliance was corrected by reporting that each LEA with noncompliance identified in March 2009 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement.</p> <p>As noted in the revised Part B Indicator Measurement Table, in reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must again describe the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008). In addition, the State must again</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps					
	<p>policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards for the 26 districts identified with a significant discrepancy in FFY 2005 and the 20 districts identified in FFY 2006.</p> <p>The State explained that it did not make findings of noncompliance based on the review under 34 CFR §300.170(b) for districts identified with a significant discrepancy in FFY 2005, FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 until March 2009.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State’s FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>describe the review, and if appropriate, revision of policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of the IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2007, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p>					
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts identified by 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>States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</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>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1284 1467 1430"> <tr> <td></td> <td>FFY 2006 Data</td> <td>FFY 2007 Data</td> <td>FFY 2007 Target</td> <td>Progress</td> </tr> </table>		FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress	<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 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress			

Illinois Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps								
<p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</p>	<p>49.2</p>	<p>49.2</p>	<p>49</p>	<p>0.00%</p>									
	<p>B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</p>	<p>18.4</p>	<p>18.4</p>	<p>19.7</p>	<p>0.00%</p>									
	<p>C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p>	<p>6.2</p>	<p>5.9</p>	<p>4.91</p>	<p>0.30%</p>									
	<p>The State's data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data for 5A and 5B and represent progress from the FFY 2006 data for 5C.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 targets for 5A and 5B and did not meet its target for 5C.</p>													
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special 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>States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.</p>					<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</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</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1166 1419 1409"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 1166 1062 1341">07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1062 1166 1178 1341">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1178 1166 1293 1341">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1293 1166 1419 1341">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1341 1062 1409">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 1341 1178 1409">3.8</td> <td data-bbox="1178 1341 1293 1409">3.5</td> <td data-bbox="1293 1341 1419 1409">3.1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	3.8	3.5	3.1	<p>The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide baseline data, targets and improvement activities with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior											
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	3.8	3.5	3.1											

Illinois Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>meet their needs. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</p>	<p>3.4</p>	<p>3.2</p>	<p>2.7</p>	
	<p>c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</p>	<p>31.3</p>	<p>30.9</p>	<p>19.5</p>	
	<p>d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</p>	<p>41.1</p>	<p>40.9</p>	<p>45.3</p>	
	<p>e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</p>	<p>20.4</p>	<p>21.4</p>	<p>29.4</p>	
	<p>Total (approx. 100%)</p>	<p>100.00 %</p>	<p>99.90%</p>	<p>100.00 %</p>	
	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>				
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 62.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 56.6%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 55%.</p> <p>The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a response group that was not representative of the population. The State provided improvement activities to address this issue.</p>				<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State reported that the data for this indicator were based on a parent survey response group that is not representative of the State's population. The State provided improvement activities to address this issue. In the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must continue to indicate whether its response group is representative of the State's population and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.</p>
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that</p>	<p>The State provided valid and reliable baseline data and revised improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data</p>				<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>remain unchanged from the revised FFY 2006 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>OSEP’s June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, valid and reliable baseline data from FFY 2005 and progress data from FFY 2006 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. The State provided valid and reliable FFY 2005 baseline data and progress data from FFY 2006.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2007, FFY 2006 and FFY 2005 to have disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State’s FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	
<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 provided valid and reliable baseline data and revised improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0.23%. These data represent progress from the revised FFY 2006 data of 0.46%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2007, FFY 2006 and FFY 2005 to have disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>OSEP’s June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, valid and reliable</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 and 2006 with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.173, 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311 was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that demonstrate that the State has in effect the policies and procedures required by 34</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>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. The State provided valid and reliable FFY 2005 baseline data and progress data from FFY 2006.</p> <p>The State was also required to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, that districts identified in FFY 2005 and FFY 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 of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311. The State reported that in January 2009, it informed four districts identified in FFY 2005 and four districts identified in FFY 2006 with disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification that such disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification constituted a finding of noncompliance, requiring evidence of timely correction to be demonstrated within one year. The State reported that two of the four districts that were identified in FFY 2005 and one of the four districts that were identified in FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p> <p>The State reported that the two remaining districts that were identified in FFY 2005 and the three remaining districts that were identified in FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification are in the process of completing corrective actions that will bring them into compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p> <p>The State indicated that it will report on the correction of noncompliance in FFY 2005, FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 in its FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received</p>	<p>CFR §300.173 and that the LEAs identified in FFY 2007 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311. The State must demonstrate in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the noncompliance was corrected by reporting that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007, each of the three LEAs with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2006, and each of the two LEAs with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2005: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	
<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 and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 98.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 98.1%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2006, the State reported that it made no FFY 2006 findings of noncompliance related to this indicator. The State indicated that noncompliance was being addressed through the use of individualized district improvement plans and the State’s LEA Determinations Process.</p> <p>However, the State reported that 28 of 50 districts with FFY 2006 noncompliance demonstrated correction by meeting the target of 100% in FFY 2007 data submissions. OSEP cannot determine whether there was timely correction, because the State did not issue notification of noncompliance which began the one-year timeline for correction. The State reported the remaining 22 districts with FFY 2006 noncompliance demonstrated correction by meeting the target of 100% in FFY 2008 data submissions.</p>	<p>Although the State did not make findings of noncompliance for this indicator in FFY 2006, the State reported that all districts with noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the timely initial evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) demonstrated compliance by meeting the target of 100% in FFY 2007 and/or FFY 2008 data submissions.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State’s data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has completed the initial evaluation, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.
<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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 98.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 95.11%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2006, the State reported that it made no FFY 2006 findings of noncompliance related to this indicator. However, the State reported that 72 of 94 districts with FFY 2006 noncompliance demonstrated correction by meeting the target of 100% in FFY 2007 data submissions. OSEP cannot determine whether there was timely correction, because the State did not issue notification of noncompliance which began the one-year timeline for correction. The State reported that 17 of the remaining 22 districts with FFY 2006 noncompliance demonstrated correction by meeting the target of 100% in FFY 2008 data submissions. The State reported that it did not make findings of noncompliance for this indicator in FFY 2006 because the noncompliance was being addressed through the use of individualized district improvement plans and the State’s LEA Determinations Process.</p> <p>OSEP’s June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, that uncorrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was corrected. The State reported that 237 of 308 districts with FFY 2005 noncompliance demonstrated correction by meeting the target of 100% in FFY 2006 data submissions. OSEP cannot determine whether there was timely correction, because the State did not issue notification of noncompliance which began the one-year timeline for correction. The State reported that 52 of the remaining 71 districts with FFY 2005 noncompliance demonstrated correction by meeting the target of 100% in FFY 2007 data submissions. The State reported that 16 of the remaining 19 districts with FFY 2005 noncompliance demonstrated correction by meeting the target of 100% in FFY 2008 data submissions. The State reported that it did not make findings of noncompliance for this indicator in FFY 2005</p>	<p>Although the State did not make findings of noncompliance for this indicator in FFY 2005 or FFY 2006, the State reported that 305 of 308 districts with noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 and 89 of 94 districts with noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) demonstrated compliance by meeting the target of 100% in FFY 2006, FFY 2007 and/or FFY 2008 data submissions. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the remaining uncorrected noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State’s data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR, each of the five LEAs with remaining noncompliance reported in the FFY 2006 APR, and each of the three LEAs with remaining noncompliance reported in the FFY 2005 APR: (1) are correctly implementing the specific</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>because the noncompliance was being addressed through the use of individualized district improvement plans and the State’s LEA Determinations Process.</p>	<p>regulatory requirements; and (2) have developed and implemented the IEP, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<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 postsecondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 69%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 24.3%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2006, the State reported that it made no FFY 2006 findings of noncompliance related to this indicator. However, the State reported that 183 of 445 districts with FFY 2006 noncompliance demonstrated correction by meeting the target of 100% in FFY 2007 data submissions. OSEP cannot determine whether there was timely correction, because the State did not issue notification of noncompliance which began the one-year timeline for correction. The State reported that one of the remaining 262 districts with FFY 2006 noncompliance demonstrated correction by meeting the target of 100% in FFY 2008 data submissions. The State reported that it did not make findings of noncompliance because the noncompliance was being addressed through the use of individualized district improvement plans and the State’s LEA Determinations Process.</p>	<p>Although the State did not make findings of noncompliance for this indicator in FFY 2006, the State reported that 184 of 445 districts with noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) demonstrated compliance by meeting the target of 100% in FFY 2007 and/or FFY 2008 data submissions. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the remaining uncorrected noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>Although the State is not required to report data for this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must report on the timely correction of the noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR. The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR and each of the 261 LEAs with remaining noncompliance reported in the FFY 2006 APR: (1) are correctly implementing the</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>specific regulatory requirements; and (2) have developed an IEP that includes the required transition content for each youth, unless the youth is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 83.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 74.1%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 74%.</p> <p>The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a response group that was not representative of the population. The State provided improvement activities to address this issue.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</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 and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 76.23%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 92.4%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 93 of 122 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner and that 16 findings subsequently were corrected by February 2, 2009. The State reported that five findings remain open as a result of a complaint investigation, which required corrective action and that eight findings identified through the focused monitoring system remain open as the State awaits documentation that correction of the noncompliance has occurred.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the State has corrected the remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 that the State reported were not corrected under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance, the State must report that it has: (1) corrected all instances of noncompliance (including noncompliance identified through the State's monitoring system, through the State's data system and by the Department); and (2) verified that</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>The State reported that a misunderstanding developed among staff members in the Division of Special Education and Support Services regarding the timelines for correction of noncompliance. The State reported that some staff members believed that the date the district submitted evidence of compliance to the State constituted timely correction. The State reported that the misunderstanding had been clarified and it would be addressing the timelines by which districts under monitoring status need to submit quarterly reports.</p> <p>Although the State reported on the correction of 122 findings of noncompliance from FFY 2006 identified through the dispute resolution process and focused monitoring, the State reported in Indicators 11, 12, and 13 that it did not make findings of noncompliance based on data gathered from its database for SPP/APR compliance reporting because it was addressing issues through the use of individualized district improvement plans and the State’s LEA Determinations Process. The State also reported that it did not make findings of noncompliance for Indicators 4, 9 and 10 because it was addressing issues through the use of individualized district improvement plans and the State’s LEA Determinations Process.</p> <p>The State reported that it would make findings of noncompliance based on Federal regulations aligned with Indicators 11, 12 and 13 annually, after the data have been verified on these indicators by the State each September. The State reported that it would make findings of noncompliance based on Federal regulations aligned with Indicators 4, 9 and 10 annually, after the data have been verified on these indicators by the State and a review of district policies, procedures and practices are conducted each January.</p> <p>OSEP’s June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, that the State has corrected the remaining noncompliance identified in Indicator 15 from FFY 2005. The State reported that the remaining two findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were subsequently corrected.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State’s FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which</p>	<p>each LEA with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</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 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2007, in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e) and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 10, 11, 12 and 13 in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</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 and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 90.5%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving 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 properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 92.6%. The FFY 2006 data were 93.1%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</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 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 33.8%. These data</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]	represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 50%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 45-65%.	February 1, 2010.
19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 69%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 79.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 75-85%.	OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.
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 and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 95.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 of 94.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.