

Illinois Part B FFY 2010 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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 78.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 78.1%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 80%.</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 looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013.</p> <p>In reporting data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR, States must use the same data they used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 4.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 5.1%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 5.0%.</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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 21.9%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 31.0%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 85.0%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 98.2% for reading and 98.2% for math. The State's FFY 2009 data for this indicator were 98.4% for reading and 98.3% for math. The State met its FFY 2010 targets of 95%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]	The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.	
<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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 41.2% for reading and 53.2% for math. The State’s FFY 2009 data for reading were 42% for reading and 53.8% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 42% for reading and met its FFY 2010 target of 40% for math.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	<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 2011 APR.</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 2010 reported data for this indicator are 2.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 2.54%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 5.0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that 20 districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with disabilities.</p> <p>The State reported that 59 of 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.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the districts’ 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 districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010 based on FFY 2009 data. The State identified noncompliance through this review.</p> <p>The State reported that it required the affected districts to revise the districts’ 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 districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010 based on FFY 2009 data.</p> <p>The State reported that while it found noncompliance in FFY 2009 through the review</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2010 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for districts identified with a significant discrepancy based upon FFY 2008 data and for districts identified with a significant discrepancy based upon FFY 2009 data.</p> <p>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</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) of districts identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2008 data, it issued the findings of noncompliance (six) in FFY 2010.</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 LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2011 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’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 0.69%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 0.0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that 13 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 reported that it reviewed the districts’ 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 districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010 based on FFY 2009 data. The State also reported that three 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 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.</p> <p>The State reported that it required the affected districts to revise the districts’ policies,</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator and looks forward to data in the FFY 2011 APR demonstrating compliance.</p> <p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2010 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for districts identified with a significant discrepancy based upon FFY 2009 data. The State must also report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>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 districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010 based on FFY 2009 data.</p> <p>Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2009, the State did not make any findings of noncompliance for this indicator during FFY 2009. The State explained that while it found noncompliance in FFY 2009 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) of districts identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2008 data, it issued the findings of noncompliance (six) in FFY 2010.</p>	<p>34 CFR §300.170(b) for districts identified with a significant discrepancy based on FFY 2008 data.</p> <p>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 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 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td align="center">51.3</td> <td align="center">52.7</td> <td align="center">49.9</td> <td align="center">1.40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">17.0</td> <td align="center">15.2</td> <td align="center">18.5</td> <td align="center">1.80%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td align="center">6.0</td> <td align="center">5.9</td> <td align="center">3.9</td> <td align="center">0.10%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data. The State met its FFY 2010 targets for 5A and 5B, but did not meet its FFY 2010 target for 5C.</p>						<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	51.3	52.7	49.9	1.40%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	17.0	15.2	18.5	1.80%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	6.0	5.9	3.9	0.10%	<p>and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																						
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	51.3	52.7	49.9	1.40%																						
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	17.0	15.2	18.5	1.80%																						
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	6.0	5.9	3.9	0.10%																						
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a: A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. [Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR.</p>					<p>The State must provide FFY 2011 baseline data, an FFY 2012 target, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 in the SPP that it submits with the FFY 2011 APR.</p>																				
<p>7. Percent of preschool children age 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills</td> <td align="center">86.9</td> <td align="center">85.7</td> <td align="center">90.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills	86.9	85.7	90.0	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR. The State must report progress data and actual target data for</p>												
<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																							
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills	86.9	85.7	90.0																							

Illinois Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]	(including social relationships) (%)				FFY 2011 with the FFY 2011 APR.
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	86.7	85.9	90.5	
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	86.4	86.1	91.0	
	<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	
	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	55.6	57.3	61.5	
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	86.4	56.0	62.0	
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	64.5	66.0	73.5	
	These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.				
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 FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 66%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 63.7%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 58%. In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.				OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.

Illinois Part B FFY 2010 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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that five 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.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported that 252 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 (2008-2009, 2009-2010, and 2010-2011).</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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data demonstrate progress from the FFY 2009 data of 0.1%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 67 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 280 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 (2008-2009, 2009-2010 and 2010-2011) in one of the six disability categories listed.</p> <p>Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2009, the State did not make any findings of noncompliance for this indicator during FFY 2009. The State reported that it made one finding of noncompliance based on FFY 2009 data in FFY 2010.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the district identified in FFY 2009 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic 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 (and for which the State made a finding of noncompliance in FFY 2010), including that the State verified that the district with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 based on FFY 2009 data: (1) is correctly implementing the</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 2011 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 2011 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 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 improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 99.1%. The State's FFY 2009 data for this indicator were 99.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 913 of 990 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner and that 77 findings were subsequently corrected by November 2011. OSEP's FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table, dated June 20, 2011, required the State to demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the remaining 77 uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2008 data were corrected. The State provided all of the required information.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirement in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 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 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 Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 98.1%. The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator were 98.4%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>birthdays. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 27 of 67 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>OSEP’s FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table, dated June 20, 2011, required the State to demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the remaining 40 uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2008 data were corrected. The State provided all of the required information, clarifying that these 40 findings represented 40 students in one LEA, and that the noncompliance in this LEA was not yet corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to correct the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>OSEP’s FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table also required the State to demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the remaining uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2007, FFY 2006, and FFY 2005 data was corrected. The State reported that this noncompliance was in the same LEA as the remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2008 data.</p>	<p>early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the remaining 40 uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2008 data and the remaining noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2009 based on 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 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator and the LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (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,</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<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</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 86.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 79.2%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 297 of 329 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner and that 31 findings were subsequently corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>OSEP's FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table, dated June 20, 2011, required the State to demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the remaining uncorrected noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2007 and FFY 2006 data was corrected. The State reported that the remaining uncorrected noncompliance finding was not corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, 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 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR that the remaining one uncorrected noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2009 was corrected.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps										
<p>of majority. [Compliance Indicator]</p>		<p>it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator and the LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (1) are correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 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) have 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 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 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 1385 1583 1518"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Enrolled in higher</td> <td align="center">29.5</td> <td align="center">41.2</td> <td align="center">35</td> <td align="center">11.70%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Enrolled in higher	29.5	41.2	35	11.70%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>								
A. % Enrolled in higher	29.5	41.2	35	11.70%								

Illinois Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	education					
	B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	56.5	64.4	56.5	7.90%	
	C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed	69.2	76.1	69.5	6.90%	
<p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data. The State met all of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</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 FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 94.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 93.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 1,613 of 1,700 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner and that 45 findings were subsequently corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that the two findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 for this indicator were not corrected. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p>					<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to ensure the timely correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State's data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 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>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR that the remaining 42 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009, and the remaining two findings of noncompliance</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>identified in FFY 2006 that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2010 APR were corrected.</p> <p>OSEP is concerned about the State's failure to correct longstanding noncompliance from FFY 2006. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2011 APR that it has corrected the remaining two findings identified in FFY 2006. If the State cannot report in the FFY 2011 APR that this noncompliance has been corrected, the State must report in the FFY 2011 APR: (1) the specific nature of the noncompliance; (2) the State's explanation as to why the noncompliance has persisted; (3) the steps that the State has taken to ensure the correction of each finding of the remaining findings of noncompliance, and any new or different actions the State has taken, since the submission of its FFY 2010 APR, to ensure such correction; and (4) any new or different actions the State will take to ensure such correction.</p> <p>When reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 and each</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (1) are 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) have 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 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 4A, 4B, 10, 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2011 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</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 98.7%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing the State's FFY 2011 IDEA section 618 data, demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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>in 34 CFR §300.152.</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 improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 58.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 27.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's FFY 2011 IDEA section 618 data, demonstrating that it 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 session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data, as of January 31, 2012, for this indicator are 31.3%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 44%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 45-65%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 71.6%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 78%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 75-85%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA</p>

Illinois Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
accurate. [Compliance Indicator]		sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.