The Challenge in Illinois: Implementing I.D.E.A.  
( Individuals With Disabilities Education Act P.L. 105-17 )

Achieving Results through Goal-setting, Comprehensive Efforts, and Monitoring Data in Our State
Federal Review of Compliance

1. Self-Assessment by ISBE & Steering Committee sent to Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)
2. Development of Improvement Plan
3. Refinement of Plan at OSEP’s request by ISBE Workgroup
4. Submission of Improvement Plan to OSEP
5. Review & On-site Verification by OSEP
6. Issuance of Written Report of Findings
7. OSEP Periodic Review & Monitoring of Progress
OSEP’s Comments on Initial Draft

- Three or four areas should be determined CRITICAL (measurable) GOALS
- Student/Family Outcomes/Results should be the result of activities.
- Data has to substantiate any observed change.
- Activities should be based on regulations and preferred practices.
- Corey H. & public comments should be integrated within the Implementation Plan.
- Non-compliance noted in the Self-Assessment must be addressed in the Improvement Plan.
Workgroup’s Commitment

- Commit to attending all six days of meetings
- Work within deadline of 12/14 to ISBE (12/21 to OSEP)
- Represent diverse nature of Steering Committee and Illinois’ families
- Consider the requirements of Cory H. where applicable
- Incorporate comments from Public Forums
- Develop measurable goals and activities with evidence of change for Part B
- ISBE staff will develop resources and timelines section
Workgroup’s Values

Do Not Throw Anything Away but develop a plan based on the Steering Committee ‘Vision Document’ that:

• Recommends things that are “Doable”
• Develops measurable, incremental steps or activities
• Plan should be “doable” in a max of 5 years, (2007), but progress measurable in less time (smaller increments of time - quarterly)
• Always first use Steering Committee input
• Plan must be Results-Oriented: Impact on students’ lives
• Live with the data Illinois currently has
Workgroup Premises

✓ What gets counted gets done.
✓ Attention paid indicates relative importance.
✓ Current federal legislation broadened the emphasis.
✓ We know more than we know.
✓ A Goal that can’t be measured is just a Slogan.
What Should Be Addressed

• Students with disabilities:
  - are successful recipients of public education
  - receive a free, appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment
  - are served by fully-qualified personnel

• Families of children with disabilities are meaningfully involved in their children’s education

• ISBE provides effective administrative supervision for the implementation of federal law.
Illinois Challenge: students with disabilities Achieve Results in public education.
How well do Students Read?

The GAP is increasing

Students w/disabilities taking tests

2001 ISAT

Percent of students who meet/exceed the standard.

84.7%
How well do Students Calculate?

The GAP is increasing

Percent of students who meet/exceed the standard.

2001 ISAT
How well do Students Write?

The GAP is increasing

Percent of students who meet/exceed the standard.

2001 ISAT
Exit with a Diploma

Most Recent Data
* Greene, 2001

Diploma  Dropout

Regular*  All  LD  ED  OHI

Disabilities

22nd Annual Report to Congress
Students Achieve Results Goal

1. Illinois will increase by 4.5 percent per year the number of youth with disabilities who exit school with a standard diploma and employment and/or post-secondary education, as measured by:
   • a) the percentage of students ages 17 to 21 with disabilities who exit with a standard diploma;
   • b) the percentage of students with disabilities who participate in state-wide assessment;
   • c) the percentage of students with disabilities who perform at the acceptable level or above on state-wide assessment
Illinois’ Challenge:

Students with Disabilities receive a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment
What are “Class Settings”?

- “Regular” = 20% or less of school day
  Outside of the regular class. At least
  80% of day in the regular class.

- “Separate” = 61% or more of the
  school day Outside of the regular class.

- “Resource” = 21% to 60% of school day
  Outside the regular class.

Now, just use the numbers.
80%+ v. - 40%
Settings - Where time is spent

Outside the Regular Classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0 to 20%</th>
<th>21 to 60%</th>
<th>61 to 100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Regular”</td>
<td>“Resource”</td>
<td>“Separate”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Self-contained)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Settings for Five Years

< All Disabilities - Time in Regular Class >

ISBE Data Report
Comparing Percent of Children Ages 6-21 Served in Different Educational Environments
Under IDEA, Part B, During the 1996-97 School Year

**ALL DISABILITIES**, Sorted by % in **Regular Class** (lowest to highest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>REGULAR CLASS</th>
<th>RESOURCE ROOM</th>
<th>SEPAR CLASS</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLINOIS</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENNSYLVANIA</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW YORK</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 STATES, D.C. &amp; P.R.</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table AB2-7*
Trends in Percent of Children Ages 6-21 Served in Different Educational Environments in Illinois Under IDEA, Part B, During the 95-96 to 98-99 School Years

ALL DISABILITIES (20-23rd Reports to Congress)

Other = PUBLIC SEPAR FACIL + PRIVATE SEPAR FACIL + PUBLIC RESID FACIL + PRIVATE RESID FACIL + HOME HOSP ENVIR

Numbers in parenthesis indicate IL ranking with respect to all 50 states + DC and Puerto Rico. Higher numbers, lowest performing states.
Settings for Three Years

< Learning Disabilities - Time in Regular Class>

Annual Reports to Congress
Table AB2-7
Percent of Children Ages 6-21 Served in Different Educational Environments
Under IDEA, Part B, During the 1996-97 School Year
SPECIFIC LEARNING DISAB, Sorted by % in Regular Class (lowest to highest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>REGULAR CLASS</th>
<th>RESOURCE ROOM</th>
<th>SEPAR CLASS</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLINOIS</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENNSYLVANIA</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 STATES, D.C. &amp; P.R.</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW YORK</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other = PUBLIC SEPAR FACIL + PRIVATE SEPAR FACIL + PUBLIC RESID FACIL + PRIVATE RESID FACIL + HOME HOSP ENVIR
Settings for Three Years

< Emotional Disturbance - Time in Regular Class>

Annual Reports to Congress
Table AB2-7
Percent of Children Ages 6-21 Served in Different Educational Environments
Under IDEA, Part B, During the 1996-97 School Year
EMOTIONAL DISTURBANCE, Sorted by % in Regular Class (lowest to highest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>REGULAR CLASS</th>
<th>RESOURCE ROOM</th>
<th>SEPAR CLASS</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLINOIS</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENNSYLVANIA</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW YORK</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 STATES, D.C. &amp; P.R.</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other = PUBLIC SEPAR FACIL + PRIVATE SEPAR FACIL + PUBLIC RESID FACIL + PRIVATE RESID FACIL + HOME HOSP ENVIR
Settings for Three Years

<Mental Retardation - Time in Regular Class>

Annual Reports to Congress
Settings for Three Years

< Speech-Impaired - Time in Regular Class >

Annual Reports to Congress
Children in Regular Settings

2. Illinois will increase by five percentage points each year the percentage of students with disabilities who are educated in general education classrooms (80%+ time) in the school they would attend if not disabled, as measured by:

- a. the percentage of students with disabilities (6-21) who are in regular education settings 80%+ time;
- b. a decreasing percentage of students with disabilities who are in general education 40% or less time
Illinois’ Challenge: Personnel serving students with disabilities should be fully qualified.
Need for Fully-Certified Personnel

Actual Numbers of Teachers

- **Fully Certified**
- **NOT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fully Certified</th>
<th>NOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99-00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percent NOT Fully Certified

Critical Shortage Areas

Psych & SocWrk for 99-00 only

# for 99-00

(976)

Total SpEd (180)
MR (251)
Speech (251)
ED (156)
Oimp (58)
LD (314)
Psych (92)
SocWrk (208)
Illinois Has Qualified Personnel

3. Illinois will increase by 1 percent per year the number of fully-certified or licensed general and special education teachers, administrators, and related services personnel that are prepared to educate all students in the Least Restrictive Environment with individualized supplementary aids and services, as measured by:

a. the percentage of fully-certified general education teachers
b. the percentage of fully certified special education teachers
c. (decrease) the percentage of vacancies in related services positions
Illinois’ Challenge:
The families of students with disabilities should be meaningfully involved throughout the educational process.
Family Involvement

- There is little consensus on what constitutes effective measures of meaningful family involvement.
- No systematic data are collected concerning family involvement.
- There is general consensus that some measure should be developed and used.
Families Are Involved

Illinois will increase the meaningful, effective involvement of families in the educational process of children with disabilities, as measured by analyses of survey data and progress from baselines to be established in 2002-03.
Illinois’ Challenge:

The Illinois State Board of Education has a duty to demonstrate administrative supervision over the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and ensure citizens of full compliance.
Monitoring

- NCD has reported a lack of compliance in all states and territories (2000).
- OSEP often cites a state for the same violation over repeated visits.
- Public input reported dissatisfaction with monitoring and enforcement.
- OSEP is considering changes to its continuous improvement process (manual & criteria for selection).
Illinois will have a general supervision and monitoring system that improves student outcomes, as measured by:

a. The percentage of LEAs monitored who are identified in the lower quartile on a goal measure;

b. Annual progress of monitored LEAs on the Critical Indicators.
Workgroup’s Achievement

- Attended all six days of meetings
- Worked within deadline of 12/14 to ISBE
- Represented diverse nature of Steering Committee and Illinois’ families
- Considered the requirements of Cory H. where applicable
- Incorporated comments from Public Forums
- Developed measurable goals and activities with evidence of change for Part B
5
Most Important Priorities/goals

1. Students with disabilities achieve results
2. Students learn in the LRE
3. Personnel are fully qualified
4. Families are meaningfully involved
5. Monitoring supports continuous improvement in priorities/goals
Questions and Comments ????
References


