

Illinois Part B FFY 2008 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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table), baseline, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 81.2%. Because the State's actual target data for this indicator are from the same year as the data reported for this indicator in the State's FFY 2007 APR, OSEP cannot comment on whether there is progress or slippage. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 75%.</p> <p>The State provided a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet to graduate with a regular diploma.</p> <p>The State reported the required graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This means that the State submitted the most recent graduation data that the State reported to the Department as part of its Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). In its APR submitted February 1, 2010, the State reported FFY 2007 data for this indicator.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table), baseline, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 5.0%. Because the State's actual target data for this indicator are from the same year as the data reported for this indicator in the State's FFY 2007 APR, OSEP cannot comment on whether there is progress or slippage. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 5.5%.</p> <p>The State provided a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.</p> <p>The State reported the required dropout rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the ESEA. This means that the State submitted the most recent dropout data that the State reported to the Department as part of its CSPR. In its APR submitted February 1, 2010, the State reported FFY 2007 data for this indicator.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 40.3%. These data</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP targets for the disability subgroup.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 52.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 70%.</p>	<p>demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 98% for reading and 98% for math. The data source for this indicator has changed. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage from the State’s reported FFY 2007 data. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 95% for reading and 95% for math.</p> <p>The State provided a web link to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results.</p> <p>The Illinois State Report Card for reporting assessment data for students with and without disabilities is available at the following link:</p> <p>http://webprod.isbe.net/ereportcard/publicsite/getsearchcriteria.aspx</p> <p>The Illinois Annual Performance Report, Part B provides assessment data for students with disabilities at the following link:</p> <p>http://www.isbe.net/spec-ed/default.htm</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, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 41.6% for reading and 52.3% for math. The data source for this indicator has changed. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage from the State’s reported FFY 2007 data. The State met its FFY 2008 targets of 38% for</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]	<p>reading and 38% for math.</p> <p>The State provided a web link to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results.</p> <p>The Illinois State Report Card for reporting assessment data for students with and without disabilities is available at the following link:</p> <p>http://webprod.isbe.net/ereportcard/publicsite/getsearchcriteria.aspx</p> <p>The Illinois Annual Performance Report, Part B provides assessment data for students with disabilities at the following link:</p> <p>http://www.isbe.net/spec-ed/default.htm</p>	
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 2.07%. Because the State’s actual target data for this indicator are from the same year as the data reported for this indicator in the State’s FFY 2007 APR, OSEP cannot comment on whether there is progress or slippage. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 5%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed 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>The State reported that it 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, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2007.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in March 2009 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2005-2007 was partially corrected.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2005-2007 was partially corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s).</p>
4. Rates of suspension and	The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR.	Indicator 4B is new for FFY 2009. Baseline data from 2008-2009, targets

Illinois Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator; New]</p>		<p>(0%), and improvement activities must be submitted with the FFY 2009 APR.</p>																				
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:</p> <p>A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;</p> <p>B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or</p> <p>C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 998 1480 1466"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Target</th> <th>Progress</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td>49.2</td> <td>50.43</td> <td>49.30</td> <td>0.80%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td>18.4</td> <td>18.04</td> <td>19.30</td> <td>0.36%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td>5.9</td> <td>5.71</td> <td>4.58</td> <td>0.18%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	Progress	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	49.2	50.43	49.30	0.80%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	18.4	18.04	19.30	0.36%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	5.9	5.71	4.58	0.18%	<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 2009 APR.</p>
	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	Progress																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	49.2	50.43	49.30	0.80%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	18.4	18.04	19.30	0.36%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	5.9	5.71	4.58	0.18%																		

Illinois Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues			OSEP Analysis/Next Steps			
	<p>These data differ from the State's FFY 2008 data under IDEA section 618 for this indicator. The State provided an explanation for this difference.</p> <p>These data represent progress for 5A, 5B, and 5C. The State met its FFY 2008 targets for 5A and 5B, but did not meet its FFY 2008 target for 5C.</p>						
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:</p> <p>A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and</p> <p>B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR.</p>			<p>The instruction package for the FFY 2009 APR/SPP will provide guidance regarding the information that States must report for this indicator in their FFY 2009 APRs.</p>			
<p>7. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 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>The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State provided FFY 2008 baseline data, targets, and revised improvement activities for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State's submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1182 1444 1299"> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1182 919 1299">08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data</td> <td data-bbox="919 1182 1192 1299"><u>Summary Statement 1</u>¹</td> <td data-bbox="1192 1182 1444 1299"><u>Summary Statement 2</u>²</td> </tr> </table>			08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> ¹	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> ²	<p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2009 with the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> ¹	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> ²					

¹ Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.

² Summary Statement 2: The percentage of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.

Illinois Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues			OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	89.3	60.4	
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	89.4	60.9	
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	90.2	72.5	
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]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 62.3%. The State's FFY 2007 data was 62.4%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 56%. In its description of its FFY 2008 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.			OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.
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. [Compliance Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 0%. The State reported that nine districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that no districts were 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 its definition of disproportionate representation.			OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator. OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State's definition of disproportionate representation and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.
10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.			OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.

Illinois Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of .23%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 120 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of disproportionate representation.</p> <p>The State reported that three findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 and two findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 for this indicator were corrected.</p> <p>The State reported that both of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State's definition of disproportionate representation and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 97.7%. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator were 98.2%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2007, the State reported that it did not identify any noncompliance for this indicator during FFY 2007. The State reported that all 245 districts identified after FFY 2007 with noncompliance related to this indicator, based on FFY 2007 data, have corrected the noncompliance.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing, in the FFY 2009 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, 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). In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 98.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 98.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2007, the State reported that it did not identify any noncompliance for this indicator during FFY 2007. The State reported that 47 of 52 districts identified after FFY 2007 with noncompliance related to this indicator, based on FFY 2007 data, have corrected the noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that three districts with uncorrected noncompliance based on FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 data and one district with uncorrected noncompliance based on FFY 2006 data related to this indicator have not corrected the noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that it addressed the uncorrected noncompliance by making six findings of noncompliance in March 2010 based on FFY 2005, FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 data.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR that the remaining six uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in March 2010, based on FFY 2005, FFY 2006 and 2007 data, were</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>corrected.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2008 data the State reported for this indicator and the LEAs with the remaining six uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in March 2010, based on FFY 2005, FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 data: (1) are correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) have developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>The State’s failure to correct longstanding noncompliance raises serious questions about the effectiveness of the State’s general supervision system. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2009 APR, that it has corrected this noncompliance.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are</p>	<p>The State is not required to provide actual target data for FFY 2008 for this indicator.</p> <p>Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2007, the State reported that it did not identify any noncompliance for</p>	<p>In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must provide a revised baseline using data from 2009-2010. Targets must remain 100%. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>this indicator during FFY 2007. The State reported that 174 of the remaining 203 FFY 2007 districts identified after FFY 2007 with noncompliance related to this indicator, based on FFY 2007 data, have corrected the noncompliance. The State reported that 232 of the remaining 261 FFY 2006 districts with uncorrected noncompliance related to this indicator, based on FFY 2006 data, have corrected the noncompliance. There were a total of 29 LEAs with uncorrected noncompliance based on FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 data. The State reported that it addressed the uncorrected noncompliance by making 29 findings of noncompliance in October 2009 based on FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 data.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State’s FFYs 2006 and 2007 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2008 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 was also identified as being in need of assistance based on its FFY 2005 APR. In addition to reporting with the FFY 2008 APR on its use of technical assistance, the State was also required to report to OSEP by October 1, 2009 how the technical assistance selected by the State is addressing the factors contributing to the ongoing noncompliance. The State submitted the required information on October 2, 2009.</p>	<p>2009 APR that the remaining 29 uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in October 2009 based on FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 data were corrected.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in October 2009 based on FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 data: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.320(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>The State’s failure to correct longstanding noncompliance raises serious questions about the effectiveness of the State’s general supervision system. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2009 APR, that it has corrected this noncompliance.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:</p> <p>A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high</p>	<p>The State is not required to provide actual target data, targets or improvement activities for FFY 2008 for this indicator.</p>	<p>In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report a new baseline, targets, and, as needed, improvement activities.</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>school. B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school. C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</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 2008 reported data for this indicator are 80.26%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 76.23%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 183 of 228 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner and that 44 findings subsequently were corrected by February 1, 2010. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that 11 of 13 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2006 and 2007 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2008 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 was also identified as being in need of assistance based on its FFY 2005 APR. In addition to reporting with the FFY 2008 APR on its use of</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate in the FFY 2009 APR that the remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 and the two remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2008 APR were corrected.</p> <p>The State's failure to correct longstanding noncompliance raises serious questions about the effectiveness of the State's general supervision system. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2009 APR, that it has corrected this noncompliance.</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 2009 APR, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2008 in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e), and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>technical assistance, the State was also required to report to OSEP by October 1, 2009 how the technical assistance selected by the State is addressing the factors contributing to the ongoing noncompliance. The State submitted the required information on October 2, 2009.</p>	<p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2008: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 4A, 11, 12 and 13 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described 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, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>		
<p>17. Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 95.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 92.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 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 2006 and 2007 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2008 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 was also identified as being in need of assistance based on its FFY 2005 APR. In addition to reporting with the FFY 2008 APR on its use of technical assistance, the State was also required to report to OSEP by October 1, 2009 how the technical assistance selected by the State is addressing the factors contributing to the ongoing noncompliance. The State submitted the required information on October 2, 2009.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</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 2008 reported data for this indicator are 54%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 33.8%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 45-65%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</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 2008 reported data for this indicator are 74%. These data</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 69%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 75-85%.	
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 95.5%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>