

**Illinois Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.</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 93.96%. The State's FFY 2008 data were 94.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that it used data from a State database to report on this indicator. The State further reported that it did not use data for the full reporting period (July 1, 2009-June 30, 2010), and the State described how the time period in which the data were collected accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.</p> <p>The State reported that one of 21 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 was corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the State is in compliance with the timely service provision requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(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>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>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the remaining 20 uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2008 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 EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator and each EIS program with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2008: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR</p>

**Illinois Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		<p>§§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has initiated services, although late, for any child whose services were not initiated in a timely manner, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, 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>2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings. [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 92.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 92.2%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 89.5%.</p> <p>OSEP’s February 2011 verification letter noted that the State impermissibly had issued findings based solely on the number of children provided Part C services in natural environments and not on the compliance with the natural environments requirements in IDEA sections 632(G) and 636(d)(5) and 34 CFR §§303.12(b), 303.18, 303.342, 303.343, and 303.344(d)(1)(ii). In its FFY 2009 APR and revised SPP, the State included a new improvement activity that, “effective with the issuing of findings in the first quarter of [FFY 2011], the State would continue to track data on services in natural environments, but will discontinue the practice of issuing findings based strictly upon data.” The verification letter requires the State to confirm, with its FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that, it made findings of noncompliance when it found noncompliance with a legal requirement related to provision of Part C services in</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>With its FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State must confirm that it has made findings of noncompliance when it found noncompliance with a legal requirement related to provision of Part C services in natural environments and not solely based on the percentage of children receiving services in natural environments.</p>

**Illinois Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>																																
	natural environments and not solely based on the percentage of children receiving services in natural environments.																																	
<p>3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationship);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline using FFY 2008 data and targets for FFY 2010, and provided improvement activities through FFY 2012, and targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised FFY 2010 targets, and the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The revised FFY 2010 targets are less rigorous than the previously-established targets.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 561 1583 1500"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center">64.1</td> <td align="center">65.6</td> <td align="center">64.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center">78.0</td> <td align="center">77.0</td> <td align="center">78.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td align="center">75.3</td> <td align="center">75.5</td> <td align="center">75.5</td> </tr> <tr> <th><u>Summary Statement 2</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center">64.2</td> <td align="center">63.3</td> <td align="center">64.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center">52.4</td> <td align="center">49.6</td> <td align="center">52.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Outcome C:</b></td> <td align="center">56.8</td> <td align="center">56.0</td> <td align="center">57.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	64.1	65.6	64.5	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	78.0	77.0	78.5	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	75.3	75.5	75.5	<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	64.2	63.3	64.5	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	52.4	49.6	52.5	<b>Outcome C:</b>	56.8	56.0	57.0	<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> <p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR.</p>
<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>																															
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	64.1	65.6	64.5																															
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	78.0	77.0	78.5																															
<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	75.3	75.5	75.5																															
<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>																															
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	64.2	63.3	64.5																															
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	52.4	49.6	52.5																															
<b>Outcome C:</b>	56.8	56.0	57.0																															

**Illinois Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>				<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>																				
	<table border="1" data-bbox="548 196 1577 264"> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 196 957 264">Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 196 1163 264"></td> <td data-bbox="1163 196 1369 264"></td> <td data-bbox="1369 196 1577 264"></td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="548 282 1577 383">The State provided revised baseline data, using FFY 2009 data, therefore, OSEP is not comparing FFY 2009 data to FFY 2008 data. The State met part of its FFY 2009 targets for this indicator.</p>				Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)																				
Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)																									
<p data-bbox="92 417 512 548">4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:</p> <p data-bbox="92 570 348 597">A. Know their rights;</p> <p data-bbox="92 618 491 678">B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs; and</p> <p data-bbox="92 699 506 760">C. Help their children develop and learn.</p> <p data-bbox="92 781 312 808">[Results Indicator]</p>	<p data-bbox="548 417 1562 516">The State submitted 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 revised targets.</p> <p data-bbox="548 537 1220 565">The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 581 1577 954"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 581 978 678"></th> <th data-bbox="978 581 1155 678"><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1155 581 1310 678"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1310 581 1465 678"><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> <th data-bbox="1465 581 1577 678"><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 678 978 748">A. Know their rights (%)</td> <td data-bbox="978 678 1155 748">71.85</td> <td data-bbox="1155 678 1310 748">78.58</td> <td data-bbox="1310 678 1465 748">73.5</td> <td data-bbox="1465 678 1577 748">6.73%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 748 978 850">B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs (%)</td> <td data-bbox="978 748 1155 850">83.81</td> <td data-bbox="1155 748 1310 850">85.63</td> <td data-bbox="1310 748 1465 850">85</td> <td data-bbox="1465 748 1577 850">1.82%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 850 978 954">C. Help their children develop and learn (%)</td> <td data-bbox="978 850 1155 954">88.27</td> <td data-bbox="1155 850 1310 954">83.28</td> <td data-bbox="1310 850 1465 954">89</td> <td data-bbox="1465 850 1577 954">-4.99%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="548 976 1562 1068">These data represent progress for 4A and 4B and slippage for 4C from the FFY 2008 data. The State met its FFY 2009 targets for 4A and 4B and did not meet its target for 4C.</p> <p data-bbox="548 1089 1583 1393">Although the State does not have an approved sampling plan for this indicator, the State used sampling to collect FFY 2009 data for this indicator. On page 31 of the FFY 2009 APR, the State reported that, “Families were selected in the same way as they have been in the past, based upon a representative sample of children having a six-month review or annual IFSP coming due during a given span of time.” If the State intends to collect data for this indicator through sampling, it must submit its sampling methodology for this indicator as soon as possible to ensure that its FFY 2010 data, due February 1, 2012, will be valid and reliable. If the State does not intend to sample, but intends to gather census data, the State must inform OSEP and revise its SPP accordingly.</p>					<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. Know their rights (%)	71.85	78.58	73.5	6.73%	B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs (%)	83.81	85.63	85	1.82%	C. Help their children develop and learn (%)	88.27	83.28	89	-4.99%	<p data-bbox="1598 417 2003 613">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> <p data-bbox="1598 634 2011 1003">If the State intends to collect data for this indicator through sampling, the State must submit its sampling methodology for this indicator as soon as possible to ensure that its FFY 2010 data will be valid and reliable. If the State does not intend to sample, but intends to use census data, the State must inform OSEP and revise its SPP accordingly.</p>
	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																					
A. Know their rights (%)	71.85	78.58	73.5	6.73%																					
B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs (%)	83.81	85.63	85	1.82%																					
C. Help their children develop and learn (%)	88.27	83.28	89	-4.99%																					
<p data-bbox="92 1427 491 1487">5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to</p>	<p data-bbox="548 1427 1583 1520">The State submitted targets for FFY 2011 and for FFY 2012 and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised its FFY 2010 target, and OSEP accepts that revision. The State indicated that stakeholders were</p>				<p data-bbox="1598 1427 2003 1520">OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in</p>																				

**Illinois Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>national data. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 and the revised FFY 2010 target. The revised FFY 2010 target is less rigorous than the previously-established target.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 1.08%. The State's FFY 2008 data were 1.13%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 1.33%.</p>	<p>the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, a revised target for FFY 2010, 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 and the revised FFY 2010 target. The revised FFY 2010 target is less rigorous than the previously-established target.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 3.38%. The State's FFY 2008 data were 3.43%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 3.37%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>7. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline. [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 99.46%. The State's FFY 2008 data were 99.49%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 14 of 17 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</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 45-day timeline requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a). 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 three uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2008 were corrected.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must</p>

**Illinois Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		<p>report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator and each EIS program with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2008: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a) (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 conducted the initial evaluation, assessment, and IFSP meeting, although late, for any child for whom the 45-day timeline was not met, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, 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>8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community</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 98.2%. The State's FFY 2008 data were 98.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</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</p>

**Illinois Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>services by their third birthday including:</p> <p>A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that five of seven findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p>	<p>compliance with the IFSP transition content requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h) and 20 U.S.C. 1436(a)(3). 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 two uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2008 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 EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator and each EIS program with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2008: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h) and 20 U.S.C. 1436(a)(3) (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 an IFSP with transition steps and services for each child, unless the</p>

**Illinois Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		<p>child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program (i.e., the child has exited the State's Part C program due to age or other reasons), 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>8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:</p> <p>B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and</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 LEA notification requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1).</p>
<p>8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:</p> <p>C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.</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 99.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 98.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 18 of 21 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that one of two findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007</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 timely transition conference requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)). Because the</p>

**Illinois Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
[Compliance Indicator]	was corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.	<p>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>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>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, the remaining four uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2008 and the remaining one uncorrected noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2007 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>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator and each EIS program</p>

**Illinois Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		<p>with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 and FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)) (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 conducted a transition conference, although late, for any child potentially eligible for Part B whose transition conference was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, 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>9. 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 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 59.2%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 98.2%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 42 of 71 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner and that one finding was subsequently corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that one of two findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator was corrected.</p> <p>Regarding the 42 FFY 2008 findings that the State reported as being corrected, OSEP's</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the remaining 29 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 and the remaining one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 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</p>

**Illinois Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
	<p>February 15, 2011 verification letter found that the State's procedures for verifying the correction of noncompliance were not consistent with the guidance in IDEA and OSEP Memo 09-02 because the State has not been verifying correction by ensuring that each EIS program or provider 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. In its FFY 2009 APR, the State reported that it “has now added prong 2, ensuring that CFC offices have correctly implemented the specific regulatory requirement, as defined in OSEP Timely Correction Memo 09-02.” The State explained that while it did determine that 42 FFY 2008 findings of noncompliance had been timely corrected, based on what it understood to be required prior to OSEP’s November 2010 verification visit, those procedures were not consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02. The State further reported that, later than one year from the date of the findings, it verified the correction of these findings in a manner consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>OSEP’s February 15, 2011 verification letter required that the State provide, within 90 days of receipt of OSEP’s letter, an assurance that it has revised its procedures for verifying the correction of noncompliance so that it verifies that noncompliance has been corrected only if the EIS program or provider 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 EIS program or provider. The State provided the required assurance as part of its April 26, 2011 response to the verification letter. OSEP’s letter also required that the State describe, with its response, during the SPP/APR clarification period to OSEP’s FFY 2009 Illinois Part C SPP/APR Status Table, the extent to which it verified correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (for the two FFY 2007 findings of noncompliance for Indicator 8C not corrected in FFY 2008) and FFY 2008 under Indicators 1, 7, 8A, and 8C in a manner consistent with the guidance in OSEP Memo 09-02. The State provided the required description.</p>	<p>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 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 in accordance with IDEA section 635(a)(10)(A), 34 CFR §303.501, and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must report that it verified that each EIS program 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 EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-</p>

**Illinois Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		<p>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 9 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 9 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 1, 7, 8A, and 8C in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p>
<p>10. 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.</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 complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §303.512.</p>
<p>11. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.</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 reported that it did not receive any requests for due process hearings during the reporting period.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>12. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).</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 reported that no resolution sessions were held during the reporting period.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2009. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any fiscal year in which</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>

**Illinois Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
	<p>ten or more resolution sessions were held.</p> <p>OSEP's February 15, 2011 verification letter required that, within 90 days from the date of OSEP's letter, the State must confirm in writing which agency (the Lead Agency or the Child Family Connections (CFC) early intervention services program) is responsible for conducting the resolution meeting and provide documentation that it has implemented procedures for ensuring that within 15 days of receiving notice of the parent's due process complaint, and prior to the initiation of a due process hearing under 34 CFR §300.511, a resolution meeting is convened, unless one of the events specified in 34 CFR §300.510(a)(3) occurs. In its April 26, 2011 response to the verification letter, the State reported that the CFC will convene the resolution meeting.</p>	
<p>13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and 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 reported that the State received one mediation request during FFY 2009 that resulted in a mediation agreement signed during FFY 2010.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2009. The State is not required to meet its targets or provide improvement activities except in any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>14. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [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, 618, and 642 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 303.540. In reporting on Indicator 14 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 14 Data Rubric.</p>