

Illinois Part B FFY 2009 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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 78.1%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 81.2%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 75%.</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).</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 5.1%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 5.0%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 5.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: 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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 31.0%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 40.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 77.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 98.4% for reading and 98.3% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 98% for reading and</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>math. The State met its FFY 2009 targets of 95%.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results.</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>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 42.0% for reading and 53.8% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 41.6% for reading and 52.3% for math. The State met its FFY 2009 targets of 40% for reading and 39% for math.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results.</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 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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 2.54%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 2.07%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 5.00%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that 59 of the 97 districts, which reported at least one child with an IEP with suspensions or expulsions greater than ten days in a school year, did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of at least five students with IEPs suspended or expelled and were excluded from the calculation.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the LEAs’ 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 based on FFY 2008 data. The State identified noncompliance through this review.</p> <p>The State reported that it required the affected LEAs to revise the LEAs’ policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2008 data as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b). When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified by the State: (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</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>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 noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 based on FFY 2007 data, through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was corrected.</p>	<p>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). In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and 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]</p>	<p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline, using FFY 2008 data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are 0.69%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that 71 of the 97 districts, which reported at least one child with an IEP with suspensions or expulsions greater than ten days in a school year, did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of at least five students with IEPs suspended or expelled in a particular race/ethnicity and were excluded from the calculation.</p> <p>The State reported that 20 districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs. The State also reported that six districts were identified as having 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>The State reported that it reviewed the LEAs’ 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 based on FFY 2008 data. The State identified noncompliance through this review.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator and looks forward to data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, demonstrating compliance.</p> <p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance based on FFY 2008 data have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps										
	<p>The State reported that it required the affected LEAs to revise the LEAs’ 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 noncompliance.</p>	<p>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 district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State’s methodology for identifying “significant discrepancy” and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</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>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1349 1583 1502"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2008</u> <u>Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class</td> <td align="center">50.43</td> <td align="center">51.27</td> <td align="center">49.60</td> <td align="center">0.84%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>FFY 2008</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Inside the regular class	50.43	51.27	49.60	0.84%	<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 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
	<u>FFY 2008</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>								
A. % Inside the regular class	50.43	51.27	49.60	0.84%								

Illinois Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>[Results Indicator]</p>	80% or more of the day					
	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	18.04	16.97	18.90	1.07%	
	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	5.71	5.96	4.25	-0.25%	
	<p>These data represent progress for 5A and 5B and slippage for 5C from the FFY 2008 data. The State met its FFY 2009 targets for 5A and 5B, but did not meet its FFY 2009 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 2009 APR.</p>					<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>7. Percent of preschool children age 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>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p>					<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> <p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR.</p>
	<p align="center"><u>Summary Statement 1</u></p>	<p align="center"><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></p>	<p align="center"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></p>	<p align="center"><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></p>		
	<p>Outcome A:</p>	89.3	86.9	89.5		

Illinois Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</p>				
	<p>Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</p>	89.4	86.7	90.0	
	<p>Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</p>	90.2	86.4	90.5	
	<p align="center"><u>Summary Statement 2</u></p>	<p align="center"><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></p>	<p align="center"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></p>	<p align="center"><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></p>	
	<p>Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</p>	60.4	55.6	61.0	
	<p>Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</p>	60.9	54.5	61.5	
	<p>Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</p>	72.5	64.5	73.0	
	<p>These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 targets for this indicator.</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 63.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 62.3%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 57.0%.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2009 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p>				<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 18 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that no district was identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of "disproportionate representation."</p> <p>The State reported that 263 of 868 districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement of at least ten students with IEPs ages 6-21 for the past three school years (2007-2008, 2008-2009 and 2009-2010) and were excluded from the calculation.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</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 targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 0.12%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 0%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 123 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that one district was 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 288 of 868 districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement of at least ten students with IEPs ages 6-21 for the past three school years (2007-2008, 2008-2009 and 2009-2010) in one of the six disability categories listed and were excluded from the calculation.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, demonstrating compliance.</p> <p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the district identified in FFY 2009 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that the district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (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 district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 99.3%. These data represent</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR,</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>progress from the FFY 2008 data of 97.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2008, the State reported under Indicator 15 that it did not identify any findings of noncompliance for this indicator during FFY 2008 and that it began issuing findings for Indicator 11 in October 2009. The State reported that 913 of 990 findings of noncompliance based on the FFY 2008 data the State reported for this indicator were corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>OSEP’s January 26, 2011 verification visit letter required that the State, during the FFY 2009 SPP/APR clarification period, provide a description of the extent to which it verified correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (for findings not corrected in FFY 2008) and FFY 2008 under Indicators 11, 12, and 13 in a manner consistent with the guidance in OSEP Memo 09-02. The State provided the required information in its FFY 2009 APR.</p>	<p>due February 1, 2012, 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 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR that the remaining 77 uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2008 data were corrected.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2008 data: (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 through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 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 2010 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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 98.4%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 98.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2008, the State reported under Indicator 15 that it did not identify any findings of noncompliance for this indicator during FFY 2008 and that it began issuing findings for Indicator 12 in March 2010. The State reported that 27 of 67 findings of noncompliance based on the FFY 2008 data the State reported for this indicator were corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that the five of the six districts with uncorrected noncompliance identified in March 2010 based on FFY 2007, FFY 2006 and FFY 2005 data related to this indicator have corrected the noncompliance. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>OSEP's January 26, 2011 verification visit letter required that the State, during the FFY 2009 SPP/APR clarification period, provide a description of the extent to which it verified correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (for findings not corrected in FFY 2008) and FFY 2008 under Indicators 11, 12, and 13 in a manner consistent with the guidance in OSEP Memo 09-02. The State provided the required</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, 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 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR that the remaining 40 uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2008 data and the remaining uncorrected noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2009</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>information in its FFY 2009 APR.</p>	<p>based on FFY 2007, FFY 2006 and FFY 2005 data were corrected.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator, the LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2008 data, and the LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2007, FFY 2006 and FFY 2005 data: (1) is 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) has 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 2010 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 2010</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.
<p>13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency 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>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State's submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported baseline data for this indicator are 79.2%.</p> <p>The State reported under Indicator 15 that 28 of 29 LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 data corrected the noncompliance. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>OSEP's January 26, 2011 verification visit letter required that the State, during the FFY 2009 SPP/APR clarification period, provide a description of the extent to which it verified correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (for findings not corrected in FFY 2008) and FFY 2008 under Indicators 11, 12, and 13 in a manner consistent with the guidance in OSEP Memo 09-02. The State provided the required information in its FFY 2009 APR.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the State is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the remaining uncorrected noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2007 and FFY 2006 data were corrected.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator and the LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2007 and FFY 2006 data: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>300.321(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 2010 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 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</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 school;</p> <p>B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s reported FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <p>A. 29.47% enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;</p> <p>B. 56.53% enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school; and</p> <p>C. 69.21% 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>The State must report actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>of leaving high school. [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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 93.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 80.26%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 238 of 254 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner and that the 16 remaining findings subsequently were corrected by February 1, 2011. The State reported that it verified correction of findings consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 after the conclusion of the one-year timeline. The State reported as timely corrected the findings verified as corrected after the conclusion of the one-year timeline.</p> <p>The State reported that the finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 was corrected.</p> <p>The State reported that the two remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 have not been 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 FFY 2007 and FFY 2008 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2009 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 2006 APR and FFY 2005 APR. In addition to reporting with the FFY 2009 APR on its use of technical assistance, the State was also required to report to OSEP by October 1, 2010 how the technical assistance selected by the State is addressing the factors contributing to the ongoing noncompliance. The State submitted the required information on September 27, 2010.</p> <p>OSEP's January 26, 2011 verification visit letter required that the State provide an</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the remaining two findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2009 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 2010 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 2010 APR, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2009 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> <p>In reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>assurance, within 90 days from the date of that letter, that it revised its procedures for verifying the correction of noncompliance for Indicators 11, 12, and 13 so that it verifies that noncompliance has been corrected only if the LEA is: (1) 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 noncompliance for each child, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. The State provided the required assurance on April 26, 2011.</p>	<p>report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (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 2010 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 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 4A, 4B, 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2010 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</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2009 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 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative 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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 27.3%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 95.2%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 reported data for this indicator in Table 7. The State provided an explanation and submitted revised 618 data.</p> <p>OSEP's January 26, 2011 verification visit letter required that the State, during the FFY 2009 SPP/APR clarification period, provide a description of the extent to which the data that the State reported in the State's FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011, for Indicator 17 are consistent with the timeline requirements in 34 CFR §300.515(c) (i.e., the State counts a due process hearing decision as reached within an extended timeline only if there is documentation that the hearing officer: (1) extended the decision timeline in a timely manner (i.e., within 45 days from the end of the resolution period, or the adjusted time periods described in 34 CFR §300.510(c), or – in the case of additional extensions – before the expiration of the prior extension); and (2) specified either the length of the extension or the new date by which the decision must be reached and mailed to the parties). The State provided the required information in its FFY 2009 APR during the clarification period and does not need to provide any additional information.</p> <p>OSEP's January 26, 2011 verification visit letter also required that the State provide an assurance, within 90 days from the date of that letter, that it revised its procedures so that the State requires hearing officers: (1) to grant only timely extensions of the timeline for due process hearing decisions; and (2) in granting an extension of the timeline, to grant specific extensions (i.e., the new due date for the hearing decision is clearly established). The State provided the required assurance on April 26, 2011.</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 44%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 54%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 45-65%.</p> <p>OSEP's January 26, 2011 verification visit letter also required that the State provide an assurance that it has revised its procedures so that the State collects information regarding the timeliness of resolution meetings directly from LEAs, and issues findings of noncompliance when an LEA does not conduct a timely resolution meeting. The State provided the required assurance on April 26, 2011.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 78%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 74%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 75-85%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2009 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). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>