

IL Part C

FFY2016 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Executive Summary:

Illinois is pleased to indicate with the submission of the FFY16/SFY17 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Plan that in this reporting year, the budget crisis that began in FFY14/SFY15 came to an end with the signing of a budget in early July 2016. The state continues to move forward in ensuring the citizens are afforded appropriate and viable services with focus on those required by law. Early Intervention continues to be able to process referrals, authorize services, reimburse direct service providers and contract entities working for the Early Intervention Services System which ultimately serves the infants and toddlers and their families with disabilities and developmental delays.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part C requirements are met, e.g., monitoring systems, dispute resolution systems.

Illinois utilizes the Illinois Department of Human Services (Department) to serve as the Lead Agency. The Bureau of Early Intervention (Bureau) has staff allocated for the general administration and supervision for compliance with the requirements set forth in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C. Illinois enacted the Early Intervention Services System Act (Act) (325 ILCS20 et. seq.) which establishes a statewide system of coordinated, comprehensive, interagency and interdisciplinary programs to be used in planning, implementation, coordination and evaluation of the statewide system of locally based early intervention services. As authorized and required by the Act, the Department promulgated detailed rules and regulations to reflect the intent of federal regulations contained in IDEA Part C. They are set forth in the Illinois Administrative Code (89 IL Admin. Code 500 et. seq.)

The Department, through its EI Bureau, sets and disseminates policies and procedures for the provision of EI services through administrative rule, the Child and Family Connections (CFC) Procedure Manual, the EI Provider Handbook, administrative contracts and payee agreements, and the State of Illinois Infant/Toddler & Family Rights under IDEA booklet.

There are 25 CFC offices covering all geographic areas of Illinois and Cornerstone remains the statewide data system that collects and stores child and family information, generates authorizations for services, and provides interface with other systems to track and produce payments. The Bureau relies extensively on this data system to monitor performance of CFC offices through monthly review of performance measures that are, in turn, shared with the CFC offices. Annually, based on the review of these performance measures, the Bureau issues a letter of Findings of Noncompliance and Determinations to each CFC. Accordingly, each CFC office is required to address findings of noncompliance by developing and documenting a corrective action plan (CAP) to be implemented within one year. Additionally, each CFC office has a Determination Scorecard based on their performance. Each CFC is evaluated based on the scorecard for purposes of monitoring, technical assistance, training and CAP reporting.

Dispute Resolution is handled by the Bureau. Resources are provided to parents entering and continually while engaged in Early Intervention to assist them in understanding their rights for Dispute Resolution at any time. On-line forms and contact information are also part of the process to make information available through various avenues and translation for Spanish-speaking families is also available. The Bureau accepts and dispositions all Dispute Resolutions, including Mediation and Due Process Hearings. The Bureau has an inter-agency agreement with the Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services for impartial and unbiased leads when needed.

The State adopted mediation and Due Process procedures in 34 CFR §300.506 through §300.512, and developed procedures that meet the requirements of §303.425. A number of Legal staff within the Department are available to facilitate the development and negotiation of all resolution session agreements. An electronic database is in place to track Due Process complaints.

Multiple other functions of supervising the Early Intervention system are performed through contracted partners. There are five contracts covering the Illinois Early Intervention Monitoring, Credentialing, Clearinghouse, Training/Professional Development and Billing/Family Fees components.

The Illinois EI Monitoring Program (<http://www.earlyinterventionmonitoring.org/>) conducts monitoring activities of the CFC offices and EI direct service providers. CFC offices and credentialed and/or enrolled service providers are monitored through on and off-site file reviews. In a given year, all 25 CFC offices and approximately 65 percent of the approximately 4,500 EI direct service providers that billed for services during the preceding fiscal year are subject to the compliance monitoring process.

EI Monitoring additionally provides CFC office a focused verification monitoring review at a minimum of once every three years or upon the request of the Bureau. The focused verification monitoring review includes 1) an in-depth file review; 2) CFC Program Manager and CFC Service Coordinator interviews; and 3) Family, Service Provider, and Stakeholder surveys. Through file reviews (on and off-site), the EI Monitoring Program assesses compliance with determinations relating to administrative processes and procedures through annual compliance monitoring visits. The number of files to be reviewed is determined by the size of the CFC office's caseload for a one-month time period and the number of children transitioning from the EI program during the designated time period. In the course of this review, the EI Monitoring Program identifies any areas of noncompliance, documents the correction of noncompliance, and provides technical assistance when required. The provision of technical assistance is an integral part of this monitoring process, and issues are addressed immediately upon the completion of an onsite monitoring visit.

Annually, 65 percent of the EI service providers receive a compliance monitoring review. EI providers who were previously monitored could be scheduled for subsequent compliance monitoring based upon the outcome of the previous review. The EI Monitoring Program randomly selects 10% of the EI service provider caseload for file reviews for payees with less than 700 cases. EI Providers with caseloads of more than 700 cases are monitored annually using a random selection of 5% of their caseloads, with a minimum of 70 files reviewed.

The EI Monitoring Program also safeguards the rights of families to receive appropriate services and supports by investigating parent billing complaints submitted to the Bureau or to the EI Central Billing Office, who is our contracted billing agent, regarding the appropriate billing of services. The EI Monitoring Program is a major stakeholder in the work of SSIP as well which Illinois will explain within its SSIP submission in April 2018.

The Department contracts with the EI Central Billing Office, CBO, (<http://www.eicbo.info/>) to process paper and electronic service provider claims and to create provider claim summaries as part of the fee-for-service delivery system; generate vouchers; submit Medicaid claims to the Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services (HFS); and, prepare and forward claims for federal matching funds. In addition, the CBO maintains insurance coverage information, including waivers and exemptions, provides insurance billing services, and invoices, collects and updates the family participation fee accounts. They also provide the family with an Explanation of Benefits (EOB), which accounts for all provider claims to families on a monthly basis. The CBO maintains the linkage between EI data systems and Cornerstone for direct service authorizations.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove
illinois icc form ffy16sfy17.pdf	Kate Moran, PhD	4/5/2018 11:58 AM	

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to early intervention service (EIS) programs.

Illinois' system for technical assistance encompasses the Bureau and its contract entities. These vital partners support the delivery of high quality and evidence-based technical assistance. Monthly meetings with the EI
7/19/2018

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Contracted Partners provide current and informed supports to the various partners to disseminate within their interaction with EI participants, providers, local community partners and families currently being served or those interested in the program. Illinois benefits from its relationship with state and national recognized leaders in early childhood development and education that contribute a wealth of knowledge and expertise.

The Bureau supports technical assistance as a key function described in the contracts with the local CFC offices, the EI Training Program, the EI Monitoring Program, the EI Clearinghouse, the EI Central Billing Office, and the EI Credentialing program. The Bureau's website and its contractual partners' websites ensure the availability of Illinois-specific and national information and resources to EI providers, the CFCs, stakeholders and families.

Each CFC office houses Local Interagency Council activities to provide technical assistance to its provider community. The needs are assessed through current events and/or needs assessments. The technical assistance is supported through responses to phone calls and emails, providers meetings, and activities of its Local Interagency Council(s). In addition, each CFC office has a required contract with a developmental pediatric consultant for specific services to implement quality assurance activities such as periodic participation in IFSP meetings, consultation on requests for IFSP service changes, technical assistance and training to EI providers and services coordinators to address local system needs, specific disabilities, specific family situations, and outreach to primary referral sources. Each CFC also houses a social emotional consultant for the purposes of reflective consultation to the CFC Program Manager, individuals or groups consultation as well as coordination of components including overseeing the implementation of social emotional screening and specialized assessment and/or offering support to IFSP teams as needed.

Most functions of the EI Monitoring Program and the EI Central Billing Office are described in the General Supervision System section. Other partners, such as the EI Training Program, the EI Clearinghouse, and Provider Connections are described in the Professional Development section. All are very important sources of technical assistance for the Illinois EI system. In addition, the EI Training Program's contract includes an ombudsman position. The ombudsman works with the Bureau, CFC offices and EI providers to ensure fidelity with EI laws, rule, policies, practice and procedures, and promotes the highest attainable evidence based practices that support the key principles of Illinois' Early Intervention Program. Illinois EI Ombudsman is also thoroughly involved in multiple, national activities centered on early childhood development including such activities as the workgroup for establishing the DEC's Recommended Practices and was nominated and accepted as one of the original aRPY Representatives for the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center!

To best support our CFCs, Bureau staff meet monthly with CFC managers to provide clarification to policies and procedures and address questions and concerns. EI contract partners are also welcome to help support the CFCs as well on these call or face-to-face meetings monthly. EI contractual administrative entities (outside of the CFCs) and Bureau staff also meet on a monthly basis to leverage resources, coordinate efforts, and identify additional strategies to meet system needs for technical assistance. Designated Bureau staff provide responses to all inquiries from CFC offices and EI Providers usually via the telephone or email. Informational memos are posted on all available EI websites (DHS and contractual partners) and distributed via email to CFC managers. Updates to manuals and/or documents are provided to all partners and posted on partners websites to help support the population we serve.

The Bureau continues to request and receive technical assistance from a number of national and regional resources, including the IDEA Data Center (IDC), the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA), the Center for IDEA Early Childhood data Systems (DaSy), the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), the Early Childhood Personnel Center and the Office of Special Education Programs. The Bureau is a member of several cross-state learning collaboratives and other learning communities as well as intensive technical assistance partners for specific assistance in development and implementation of SSIP and SiMR actionable items.

The Bureau received on-site technical assistance with their OSEP State Lead to support resolving long standing noncompliance. The attached Response Table outlines the historical correction with a narrative of the practice Illinois has chosen to address noncompliance and ensure quality services are delivered in accordance with Part C regulations to all eligible Illinois children and families.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers are effectively providing services that improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

The Early Intervention Services System Act (Act) (325 ILCS20 et. seq.) and the Illinois Administrative Code (89 IL Admin. Code 500 et. seq.) require and define a system of personnel development and personnel standards to ensure that EI providers are effectively providing services that improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. EI families, service providers, and primary referral sources have access to a wealth of information provided through various EI specific websites as well as online and face-to-face training opportunities.

For credentialing practice, Illinois contracts with the EI Provider Connections office (<http://www.wiu.edu/ProviderConnections/>) to coordinate the credentialing process and the enrollment of service providers in compliance with state and federal requirements. The Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services, our Medicaid state lead, implemented a new enrollment system for all Medicaid providers in Illinois. This greatly impacted the EI providers and CFC offices who provide services to Medicaid-eligible children which the EI CBO submits reimbursement claims on their behalf as our fee-for-service practice. A dedicated Bureau staff member and EI Provider Connections meet quarterly to address system issues and support the smoothest transition to the new system for EI providers. The HFS system continues to be in Phase 1 of 3 with the state as cross-walk environments are still being built, updated or fixed during the implementation.

EI Provider Connections processes credential and enrollment applications within the compliance of the HFS system and maintains a system of credentialing which ensures new providers are qualified and prepared with appropriate pediatric experience and education to provide services to infants and toddlers with developmental delays or disabilities and their families. This office ensures that individuals providing EI services have documentation on file of all applicable licenses, degrees, education and/or certification, EI systems overview training, background checks, documentation of consultation, and all other requirements. In addition, they provide technical assistance on the credential and enrollment process and verify that the individuals maintain competencies through documentation of continuing professional education and ongoing professional development at credential renewal which is required every 3 years.

Illinois also contracts with the University of Illinois Early Intervention Training Program (EITP) (<http://eitp.education.illinois.edu/>) to provide a comprehensive system of personnel development, using a variety of methodology that includes face-to-face and online training modules, and to coordinate with other entities to offer a broad calendar of EI training events. These efforts ensure that service providers and CFC staff enter the EI system with an understanding of the basic components of the EI services system, evidence based practices and Illinois' EI key principles.

Additional and ongoing efforts are in place to focus on continuously expanding competencies and to provide information on evidence-based practices, specifically in four core knowledge areas of development of young children, working with families of young children with developmental disabilities and delays, innovative strategies and activities for young children with special needs, and assessment of young children with special needs. The EITP also works in coordinating with other professional entities to provide training on transition services for children exiting the EI system. The EITP develops, publishes and distributes a quarterly newsletter for EI service providers. The EITP coordinates the family outcome process which includes a project coordinator that compiles and mails surveys to all families who have exited the EI program and upon request, assist families in completing the survey (including those who are Spanish speaking). The coordinator also facilitates the Child and Family Outcomes Workgroup and represents the EI program on all child and family outcomes activities. The EITP is a major stakeholder in the work of SSIP as well which Illinois will explain within its SSIP submission in April 2018.

The EI Clearinghouse (<http://www.eiclearinghouse.org/>) collects research-based and best-practice early intervention information to share with families to support their children's growth and development. They provide current, up-to-date information and reference materials for parents to learn more about typical child development and specific disabilities content, and for educators and EI professionals to improve competencies in the evaluation and treatment of children with developmental disabilities and delays. Additional resources in English and in Spanish are available to EI families, providers, stakeholders and primary referral sources. They are tasked with maintaining Illinois' EI Central Directory, operate and maintain a free EI lending library, generate parent newsletters and information notes, podcasts, resources links to support evidence-based practices, and general contact and program information. The EI Clearinghouse serves as a communication link between the EI Program and the families served by the program through a family friendly, bilingual (English-Spanish) web-site. And, the EI Clearinghouse is a stakeholder in the work of SSIP as well which Illinois will explain within its SSIP submission in April 2018.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Stakeholder Involvement: apply this to all Part C results indicators

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Illinois Interagency Council on Early Intervention (IICEI):

Pursuant to 34 CFR §300.600 - 300.605, the IICEI is a Governor-appointed advisory board that meets the federal requirements for a State Interagency Coordinating Council. The membership of the council includes parents, public and private service providers of the Early Intervention (EI) system, a member from the State legislature, a personnel preparation representative, and representatives from various designated State agencies and programs. Its membership also includes representatives from advocate organizations, Child and Family Connections (CFC) managers, and a designee from the Illinois Early Learning Council. The IICEI discusses program and Bureau specific challenges and opportunities, reviews and approves the annual progress report (APR), helps determine the setting of SPP/APR target values, and advises the Bureau in the overall performance of the program. The IICEI also, as needed, creates ad-hoc workgroups composed of both council and other subject-matter experts on a variety of subjects to help develop any potential recommendations for consideration by the Bureau. Current work of the IICEI involves the development of a pilot for lead-poisoned eligibility in Illinois Early Intervention. Another movement is determining the possible use of tele-intervention in Illinois as a possible method of service delivery based on the unique needs of the infants and toddlers and their families.

Child and Family Outcomes Workgroup:

The Child and Family Outcomes workgroup is a stakeholder group tasked with the goal of reviewing processes that improve outcomes for children and families, as well as the quality of child and family outcomes data. The workgroup includes representation from the EI Bureau staff, EI providers, CFC managers, EI Ombudsman and the EI Training Program (EITP). The Child and Family Outcomes Workgroup target its efforts to:

- Ensure that valid and reliable data are collected with consistency by field staff;
- Improve the validity of data reported on child and family outcomes;
- Improve response rates for Family Outcomes surveys, to increase representativeness and validity;
- Promote public awareness and training of child and family outcome measures;
- Explore options for linking child and family outcome data;
- Support data review and analysis;
- Set baseline and target values; and
- Develop and implement improvement activities.

CFC Managers:

Illinois has 25 CFC offices that serve as the regional intake entities, and each CFC office is responsible for the implementation of the Early Intervention Services System within its specific geographic region. A CFC Program Manager is assigned to each CFC and they are the point of contact to disseminate information to be shared within the CFC and their community as appropriate. CFCs are responsible for ensuring all referrals to the Early Intervention Services System receive a timely response in a professional and family-centered manner. Other responsibilities of the CFCs include: child find activities; family-engaged intake; coordination of evaluation/assessment and eligibility determination activities for children; for eligible children-oversight of the development of timely individualized family service plans (IFSP); ongoing service coordination, and transitioning activities before a toddler exits the program or reaches three years of age and potentially eligible for Part B. CFC managers meet monthly with EI Bureau staff to review policy and procedures, provide statewide and local perspectives, offer feedback to the APR and SSIP, identify system challenges, and suggest input of improvement strategies.

Additionally, annual CFC Conferences are held to invite all CFC staff to network, learn from subject-matter experts and to meet directly with EI Partner contract entity staff. The CFC conferences are designed to respond to the specific needs conveyed by the Service Coordinators, CFC Managers, Social Emotional Consultants and others working in or with a CFC. Planning is organized through the EITP but multiple stakeholders are involved in the annual event.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2015 performance of each EIS Program or Provider located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2015 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2015 APR in 2017, is available.

The Illinois Annual Performance Report (APR) and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) (Phases I and II) reports are used to annually report to the public on the EI performance targets. The Illinois Interagency Council for Early Intervention (IICEI) is the principle stakeholder group that reviews and provides final approval to the APR. The APR is posted on the Department's website no later than 120 days following the State's submission. A hard copy of the APR is also available for public review at each of the 25 CFC offices. Most APR indicators include a table that compares the performance of each CFC office with statewide performance and target values.

The SSIP reports (Phases I and II) are also posted on the Department's and contractual partners' websites. Progress on SSIP is communicated through a SSIP Quarterly Summary which is widely distributed to stakeholders on a quarterly basis.

Document Posting:

The Illinois APR, SSIP, 618 data, Annual Federal Grant Applications, and Monthly Statistical reports are available online at <http://www.dhs.state.il.us/page.aspx?item=36192>. The EI Training Program website has links to the EI Reports and informational notices located at <https://uofi.illinois.edu/blog/view/6039/114615?count=1&ACTION=DIALOG&sort=asc>.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2016 and 2017 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 29, 2017 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2016 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2018, 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 provided the required information.

With its FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State was required to, in an attachment to the Introduction, report on the status of correction of the three remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011, the three remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010, and the three remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009. When reporting on the correction of the remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011, FFY 2010, and FFY 2009, the State must report that it has verified that the early intervention program with remaining noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 7/19/2018

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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 early intervention program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. The State did not provide the required information.

States were instructed to submit Phase III Year Two of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) by April 2, 2018. The State provided the required information.

In the FFY 2017 APR, the State must report FFY data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SIMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 2, 2018); and (3) a summary of the infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SIMR.

Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part C determination for both 2017 and 2018 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2018 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2017 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2019, 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.

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 1: Timely provision of services

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Compliance indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with Individual Family Service Plans (IFSPs) who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		98.53%	96.50%	95.31%	94.33%	93.96%	94.06%	95.76%	96.75%	97.68%	97.92%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	96.87%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
20243	20846	96.87%	100%	98.23%

<p>Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>This number will be added to the "Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive their early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.</i></p>	233
--	-----

Include your State's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated). Illinois Early Intervention considers a service to be timely if the services begin no later than 30 days from the IFSP creation with consent for services. Illinois has 25 regional points of entry called Child & Family Connections offices which house the Service Coordination component. Each of the 25 CFCs report monthly on IFSP consented services that have not yet started due to various factors including insufficient number of qualified early intervention direct service providers as well as family exceptional circumstances and delays. The data is collected and utilized to create monthly statistical reports on the status of each of the 25 CFCs service delays as well as other components of performance for each CFC. A Statewide statistical report is also prepared and shared so each CFC can compare their performance with the Statewide average for service delays and other components.

A few CFCs have historically had no delays while others have had long-standing issues representing the diversity of the population as well as the historical issue of recidivism of qualified interventionist. The recidivism issues are mostly attributed to the structure for reimbursement for services rendered. While private insurance rates assist the interventionist in maintaining a level of financial equality while also serving children at the Medicaid-agreed rate for services not covered by Private insurance, the most pressing issue is the timing of reimbursement. While Illinois did indeed have a signed budget for nearly all of FFY16/SFY17, the financial issues of the state are not fully resolved with many social services programs still working on delayed reimbursement schedules up to multiple months behind.

Other issues facing timely service provision is the inability to serve certain areas of the state that are perceived as safety issues with potential higher risk of personal safety to the interventionist and sometimes even the family agreeing to the services based on the specific neighborhoods families live in. While many stakeholders have come together to assist in strategies through the Access to Service Workgroup to assist the uniqueness of certain areas, overall the perceived risks have still outweighed the strategies but the community groups working with the local CFCs have done great work and will continue to chip away at the issues at the individual basis to move the needle in the direction of serving all children timely. The workgroup is preparing to choose one specific issue/strategy and implement a plan to change practice to then evaluate the process and determine validity of the change in practice that could support other areas before continuing the process to another issue/strategy. FFY17/SFY18 data should reflect some of this work.

As Illinois is preparing for intense outreach to the CFCs to make marked improvement in the long-standing non-compliance in this indicator, we do recognize that the state has improved again in FFY16 reporting to 98.23% which is more than 96.87% from FFY15.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Illinois continues to utilize the reporting period of October 1 - October 31 of the reporting FY. In the case of this APR, the reporting period is October 2016.

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Illinois has historically utilized the single month of October to represent our collection period. When comparing the full FY data, the October data still continues to reflect the average with consistency as well as overall data reporting on multiple indicators. Additionally, utilization of the 618 data to prepopulate multiple indicators also leads to a more consistent reporting as Illinois uses the October data from the reporting FY period for the 618 Child Count and Setting reporting.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Illinois also prepared the attached chart indicating the data breakdown by CFC. Additional breakdown by geographic regions of the state also help to show the areas with their unique issues such as rural areas which cause direct service providers to drive long distances or time to deliver services as well as very urban areas where the Safety Workgroup is focusing the efforts to support the innercity communities to assist in the safety of the direct service providers.

In response to OSEP's response, Illinois wants to further explain the FFY16/SFY17 correction of FFY15/SFY16 non-compliance. The state collects monthly data identifying individual children who encounter delays in receiving consented services according to the state's definition of timely. The same data collection also identifies when the delay is resolved, either through the child obtaining the consented service(s) or the child no longer being in the jurisdiction of the program. Illinois identified 21 CFCs who were noncompliant with timely service delivery while 4 CFCs either experienced no delays or resolved their delays by the next data collection period. One of the 21 non-compliant CFCs also showed they resolved all service delays during a subsequent data reporting and continued to meet the criteria of no further non-compliance.

Additionally, many of the individual children on the service delay report do receive their services, albeit untimely. There are efforts to provide strategies for the non-compliant CFCs under development. The outreach to provide individualized action steps to bring the CFCs into compliance should help achieve the compliance desired for serving children in Illinois.

Illinois plans to pull additional data for FFY14/SFY15, FFY13/SFY14, FFY12/SFY13, FFY11/SFY12, FFY10/SFY11 and FFY09/SFY10 from the respective CFCs issued the findings to determine whether the CFCs are now correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. The review will include evaluating the children who have left the program and those who are still under the jurisdiction of Part C to determine if the CFC has performed both prongs of compliance for 09-02. Illinois cannot close the findings of long-standing non-compliance until both the child-specific data shows the child did receive the services, albeit untimely, or the child is no longer under the jurisdiction of program AND reviews additional CFC child-specific data to show the CFCs are now correctly implementing regulatory requirements resulting in children no longer experiencing delays in services.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
21	1	0	20

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

In FFY16/SFY17 Illinois received intensive technical assistance from OSEP in clarification of findings of non-compliance, correction of non-compliance and correction of long-standing non-compliance. Illinois outlined a plan to ensure the CFCs are timely and properly informed of non-compliance as well as strategies to resolve and to capture accurate data on this indicator as well. Illinois devised new policy and procedure on reporting findings within the scope of IDEA, 20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442. Based on the revised procedures, Illinois was able to use child-specific data to conclude that 21 CFCs were non-compliant with the state's definition of timely services. Upon receipt of the monthly data, the Bureau is able to confirm for the FY those CFCs who find service timely, resolve service delays within the specified reporting period and those who are non-compliant within the reporting period.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

CFCs report monthly any child experience delays in IFSP consented services within the State-defined timeframe. While many children did have those delays resolved, per 09-02 the CFC must also ensure correction of non-compliance within the reporting period. Only four CFCs experienced compliance with both Prong 1 and 2 of 09-02.

FFY 2015 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Under the revised procedures, CFCs will receive their compliance data with increased frequency. The Bureau will also follow procedures to have CFCs enter into Corrective Action Plans outlining actions to be taken to resolve the non-compliance. Additionally, the Access to Service Workgroups activities will be shared more holistically across the CFCs to offer additional resources and strategies to combat the non-compliance.

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The finding from FFY15/SFY16 reporting period has been corrected per 09-02 definitions. The CFC both confirmed the services were provided, although delayed in starting, and the CFC met the state's criteria of compliance by reporting no new service delays for the required time frame.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

CFCs complete monthly listings of child-specific delays and the child was reported as no longer delayed in the FFY16/SFY17 APR reporting period.

Illinois is in intensive planning for strategies to address the long-standing non-compliance with this Indicator. Federal technical assistance was obtained as well as stakeholder input on defining the criteria for non-compliance along with available data and resources to assist the CFCs. The Access for All Workgroup is assisting with quantitative data collection on issues and resolutions to share with the rest of the state as well.

OSEP Response

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, 2016-June 30, 2017). The State described how the time 7/19/2018

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

period in which the data were collected accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

The State did not demonstrate that the EIS program or provider corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that that it verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2015: (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 or provider.

The State did not demonstrate that the EIS program or provider corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that that it verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 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.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that the remaining 21 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 and the remaining one uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 were corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 and each EIS program or provider with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 and FFY 2014: (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 or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

Required Actions

FFY16/SFY17 Illinois Annual Performance Report

Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

Compliance Indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

CFC #	Active IFSPs	Family Exceptional Circumstances	Net IFSPs (less Family Exceptional Circumstances)	No Delays (OSEP Reportable)	% of No Delays (No Delays + FEC / Active IFSP)
1	618	4	614	493	79.77%
**2	701	12	689	679	96.86%
3	354	0	354	347	98.02%
**4	1010	27	983	986	97.62%
**5	1236	5	1231	1232	99.68%
*6	1962	23	1939	1959	99.85%
*7	1267	2	1265	1251	98.74%
*8	1104	33	1071	1025	92.84%
*9	1202	8	1194	1165	96.92%
*10	965	12	953	922	95.54%
*11	2450	47	2403	2407	98.24%
*12	1342	9	1333	1325	98.73%
13	274	0	274	241	87.96%
14	671	23	648	646	96.27%
**15	1508	1	1507	1448	96.02%
16	660	12	648	638	96.67%
17	240	0	240	240	100.00%
18	397	2	395	397	100.00%
19	524	6	518	512	97.71%
20	463	4	459	462	99.78%
21	709	1	708	709	100.00%
22	395	0	395	395	100.00%
23	182	1	181	178	97.80%
24	165	0	165	160	96.97%
**25	447	1	446	426	95.30%
Statewide	20,846	233	20613	20243	97.11%
*Chicago - Cook County	5721	100	5621	5519	96.47%
*Suburban- Cook County	4571	34	4537	4535	99.21%
**Collar Counties (2, 4, 5, 15, & 25)	4,902	46	4856	4902	97.33%
Downstate (All Others)	5,652	53	5599	5652	95.86%
*Cook County Offices:			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CFC 9 - Central Chicago • CFC 10 - Southeast Chicago • CFC 11 - North Chicago • CFC 12 - South Suburban 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CFC 6 - North Suburban • CFC 7 - West Suburban • CFC 8 - Southwest Chicago 					

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments**

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			87.00%	88.00%	89.00%	89.50%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%
Data		88.80%	89.26%	89.90%	92.20%	92.90%	94.60%	95.47%	96.13%	88.13%	88.13%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	90.00%
Data	98.71%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input was provided and approval received from the Illinois Interagency Council on Early Intervention, the state Interagency Coordinating Council.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/12/2017	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	15,390	
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/12/2017	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	15,590	

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
15,390	15,590	98.71%	90.00%	98.72%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Illinois utilizes the prepopulated 618 data for consistency and accuracy of reporting as well as data from the Cornerstone system to indicate the place of service delivery. Attached is a chart showing the breakdown by CFC and geographic region across the State with a comparison from FFY15/SFY16 data to FFY16/SFY17 data. As a state, we exceeded the target and as individual CFCs, only one CFC fell just short of the target. Illinois will continue to work at ensuring the inclusive and natural environment standards expected under the federal regulations to the best of our ability.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY16/SFY17 Annual Performance Report

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Results Indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.

CASES IN PREDOMINATELY IN NATURAL SETTING BY CFC AND GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS						
CFC #	October 2015			October 2016		
	Home	Day Care/ Comm.	Natural Settings	Home	Day Care/ Comm.	Natural Settings
1	83.99%	9.04%	93.03%	88.14%	6.04%	94.18%
2**	96.26%	3.74%	100.00%	96.99%	2.40%	99.40%
3	74.07%	14.14%	88.22%	75.54%	13.31%	88.85%
4**	97.27%	2.73%	100.00%	97.48%	2.52%	100.00%
5**	95.66%	4.17%	99.82%	95.91%	3.98%	99.89%
6*	90.75%	9.25%	100.00%	94.25%	5.68%	99.93%
7*	94.77%	3.75%	98.52%	97.98%	1.91%	99.89%
8*	96.84%	2.67%	99.51%	96.32%	3.04%	99.37%
9*	92.88%	5.87%	98.75%	90.76%	7.53%	98.29%
10*	96.40%	0.12%	96.53%	95.77%	0.28%	96.05%
11*	97.06%	2.56%	99.62%	98.29%	1.55%	99.84%
12*	99.44%	0.56%	100.00%	98.65%	1.25%	99.90%
13	91.82%	5.91%	97.73%	90.61%	6.10%	96.71%
14	78.44%	19.92%	98.36%	84.00%	15.60%	99.60%
15**	88.42%	9.97%	98.39%	90.60%	7.51%	98.10%
16	64.72%	31.81%	96.53%	67.06%	28.43%	95.49%
17	88.55%	8.37%	96.92%	85.71%	7.69%	93.41%
18	38.10%	56.19%	94.29%	36.27%	61.11%	97.39%
19	80.76%	18.34%	99.11%	82.35%	15.86%	98.21%
20	98.68%	1.32%	100.00%	99.10%	0.90%	100.00%
21	99.19%	0.81%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
22	96.63%	3.37%	100.00%	95.00%	4.67%	99.67%
23	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
24	93.98%	6.02%	100.00%	92.00%	8.00%	100.00%
25**	91.44%	7.82%	99.27%	95.40%	3.68%	99.08%
Statewide	91.46%	7.25%	98.71%	92.36%	6.36%	98.72%
*Chicago - Cook County	95.24%	3.96%	99.2%	95.95%	2.85%	98.80%
*Suburban – Cook County	N/A	N/A	N/A	96.61%	3.30%	99.91%
**Collar Counties (2, 4, 5, 15, & 25)	93.41%	5.98%	99.4%	94.66%	4.55%	99.21%
Downstate (All Others)	82.77%	14.43%	97.2%	83.37%	13.88%	97.25%
*Cook County Offices: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CFC 6 - North Suburban • CFC 7 - West Suburban • CFC 8 - Southwest Chicago • CFC 9 - Central Chicago • CFC 10 - Southeast Chicago • CFC 11 - North Chicago • CFC 12 - South Suburban 						

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes**

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Does your State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i)? No

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2009	Target ≥						64.50%	65.60%	66.00%	66.50%	66.90%	67.30%
		Data					64.10%	65.60%	66.40%	68.22%	70.40%	70.55%	67.09%
A2	2009	Target ≥						64.50%	63.30%	63.30%	63.50%	63.50%	63.70%
		Data					64.20%	63.30%	63.10%	62.42%	64.40%	64.58%	60.92%
B1	2009	Target ≥						78.50%	77.00%	77.50%	78.00%	78.40%	78.80%
		Data					78.00%	77.00%	78.20%	78.47%	79.70%	80.17%	77.45%
B2	2009	Target ≥						52.50%	48.00%	49.00%	49.80%	50.00%	50.20%
		Data					52.40%	49.60%	50.30%	49.44%	51.60%	52.90%	48.05%
C1	2009	Target ≥						75.50%	74.50%	75.00%	75.70%	76.10%	76.50%
		Data					75.30%	75.50%	76.40%	76.57%	77.90%	77.60%	75.15%
C2	2009	Target ≥						57.00%	55.00%	55.50%	56.20%	56.40%	56.60%
		Data					56.80%	56.00%	56.80%	56.03%	57.90%	58.27%	53.98%

	FFY	2015
A1	Target ≥	67.70%
	Data	69.84%
A2	Target ≥	63.90%
	Data	61.82%
B1	Target ≥	79.20%
	Data	79.31%
B2	Target ≥	50.40%
	Data	50.80%
C1	Target ≥	76.90%
	Data	77.14%
C2	Target ≥	56.80%
	Data	56.33%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	68.10%	68.50%	68.90%
Target A2 ≥	64.10%	64.30%	64.50%
Target B1 ≥	79.60%	80.00%	80.40%
Target B2 ≥	50.60%	50.80%	51.00%
Target C1 ≥	77.30%	77.70%	78.10%
Target C2 ≥	57.00%	57.20%	57.40%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Illinois received stakeholder input via the Child & Family Outcomes workgroup and the Illinois Interagency Council on Early Intervention (IICEI). The Child & Family Outcomes workgroup helped set the targets that were approved by the IICEI. The workgroup routinely reviews the data and makes recommendations about improvement to the state's processes. For example, to address the large number of surveys returned to sender, we have made a change to the addressee which we hope will get more surveys into the hands of families.

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	8732.00
--	---------

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	59.00	0.68%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	2139.00	24.50%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1777.00	20.35%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2484.00	28.45%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	2273.00	26.03%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).	4261.00	6459.00	69.84%	68.10%	65.97%
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	4757.00	8732.00	61.82%	64.10%	54.48%

Reasons for A1 Slippage

Illinois feels that the slippage for all areas of this indicator are due to similar reasons. First, the SSIP's focus on child outcomes has brought increased attention to this process and greater awareness of how this process should be completed. Based on information in the pilot zones, it appears that many teams were not utilizing the process outlined in the training provided. When surveying pilot site stakeholders prior to implementing improvement strategies, many indicated the focus and intent of collecting these outcomes was not clear or conveyed well. With renewed training, teams have realized that they were rating many children inaccurately and often with inflated estimations of both their performance and progress. Child and Family Connections offices beyond those involved in SSIP have also been utilizing the DaSy modules and the SSIP materials and feel that their ratings are improving in accuracy even though they have not received the same support as the pilot sites. Two other factors have also been reported to be influencing the performance reflected in this year's APR data.

The first is improved eligibility determinations due to better understanding of program requirements. With improved wording in the Procedure Manual and additional training, teams are now more effectively utilizing a team approach to eligibility determination that utilizes domain level performance rather than independent decisions based on subdomain and isolated sub-test information. The second factor is likely a consequence of the lack of a state budget for two years. Due to payment uncertainty, some areas have reported a decrease in their provider pool. As a result, some children are receiving delayed services thereby impacting the amount of progress they make during their more limited time in the program.

Reasons for A2 Slippage

Illinois feels that the slippage for all areas of this indicator are due to similar reasons. First, the SSIP's focus on child outcomes has brought increased attention to this process and greater awareness of how this process should be completed. Based on information in the pilot zones, it appears that many teams were not utilizing the process outlined in the training provided. When surveying pilot site stakeholders prior to implementing improvement strategies, many indicated the focus and intent of collecting these outcomes was not clear or conveyed well. With renewed training, teams have realized that they were rating many children inaccurately and often with inflated estimations of both their performance and progress. Child and Family Connections offices beyond those involved in SSIP have also been utilizing the DaSy modules and the SSIP materials and feel that their ratings are improving in accuracy even though they have not received the same support as the pilot sites. Two other factors have also been reported to be influencing the performance reflected in this year's APR data.

The first is improved eligibility determinations due to better understanding of program requirements. With improved wording in the Procedure Manual and additional training, teams are now more effectively utilizing a team approach to eligibility determination that utilizes domain level performance rather than independent decisions based on subdomain and isolated sub-test information. The second factor is likely a consequence of the lack of a state budget for two years. Due to payment uncertainty, some areas have reported a decrease in their provider pool. As a result, some children are receiving delayed services thereby impacting the amount of progress they make during their more limited time in the program.

Outcome B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	38.00	0.44%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	2021.00	23.14%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2935.00	33.61%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3226.00	36.94%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	512.00	5.86%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).	6161.00	8220.00	79.31%	79.60%	74.95%
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	3738.00	8732.00	50.80%	50.60%	42.81%

Reasons for B1 Slippage

Illinois feels that the slippage for all areas of this indicator are due to similar reasons. First, the SSIP's focus on child outcomes has brought increased attention to this process and greater awareness of how this process should be completed. Based on information in the pilot zones, it appears that many teams were not utilizing the process outlined in the training provided. When surveying pilot site stakeholders prior to implementing improvement strategies, many indicated the focus and intent of collecting these outcomes was not clear or conveyed well. With renewed training, teams have realized that they were rating many children inaccurately and often with inflated estimations of both their performance and progress. Child and Family Connections offices beyond those involved in SSIP have also been utilizing the DaSy modules and the SSIP materials and feel that their ratings are improving in accuracy even though they have not received the same support as the pilot sites. Two other factors have also been reported to be influencing the performance reflected in this year's APR data.

The first is improved eligibility determinations due to better understanding of program requirements. With improved wording in the Procedure Manual and additional training, teams are now more effectively utilizing a team approach to eligibility determination that utilizes domain level performance rather than independent decisions based on subdomain and isolated sub-test information. The second factor is likely a consequence of the lack of a state budget for two years. Due to payment uncertainty, some areas have reported a decrease in their provider pool. As a result, some children are receiving delayed services thereby impacting the amount of progress they make during their more limited time in the program.

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Reasons for B2 Slippage

Illinois feels that the slippage for all areas of this indicator are due to similar reasons. First, the SSIP's focus on child outcomes has brought increased attention to this process and greater awareness of how this process should be completed. Based on information in the pilot zones, it appears that many teams were not utilizing the process outlined in the training provided. When surveying pilot site stakeholders prior to implementing improvement strategies, many indicated the focus and intent of collecting these outcomes was not clear or conveyed well. With renewed training, teams have realized that they were rating many children inaccurately and often with inflated estimations of both their performance and progress. Child and Family Connections offices beyond those involved in SSIP have also been utilizing the DaSy modules and the SSIP materials and feel that their ratings are improving in accuracy even though they have not received the same support as the pilot sites. Two other factors have also been reported to be influencing the performance reflected in this year's APR data.

The first is improved eligibility determinations due to better understanding of program requirements. With improved wording in the Procedure Manual and additional training, teams are now more effectively utilizing a team approach to eligibility determination that utilizes domain level performance rather than independent decisions based on subdomain and isolated sub-test information. The second factor is likely a consequence of the lack of a state budget for two years. Due to payment uncertainty, some areas have reported a decrease in their provider pool. As a result, some children are receiving delayed services thereby impacting the amount of progress they make during their more limited time in the program.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	44.00	0.50%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	2000.00	22.90%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2333.00	26.72%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3104.00	35.55%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1251.00	14.33%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$.	5437.00	7481.00	77.14%	77.30%	72.68%
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$.	4355.00	8732.00	56.33%	57.00%	49.87%

Reasons for C1 Slippage

Illinois feels that the slippage for all areas of this indicator are due to similar reasons. First, the SSIP's focus on child outcomes has brought increased attention to this process and greater awareness of how this process should be completed. Based on information in the pilot zones, it appears that many teams were not utilizing the process outlined in the training provided. When surveying pilot site stakeholders prior to implementing improvement strategies, many indicated the focus and intent of collecting these outcomes was not clear or conveyed well. With renewed training, teams have realized that they were rating many children inaccurately and often with inflated estimations of both their performance and progress. Child and Family Connections offices beyond those involved in SSIP have also been utilizing the DaSy modules and the SSIP materials and feel that their ratings are improving in accuracy even though they have not received the same support as the pilot sites. Two other factors have also been reported to be influencing the performance reflected in this year's APR data.

The first is improved eligibility determinations due to better understanding of program requirements. With improved wording in the Procedure Manual and additional training, teams are now more effectively utilizing a team approach to eligibility determination that utilizes domain level performance rather than independent decisions based on subdomain and isolated sub-test information. The second factor is likely a consequence of the lack of a state budget for two years. Due to payment uncertainty, some areas have reported a decrease in their provider pool. As a result, some children are receiving delayed services thereby impacting the amount of progress they make during their more limited time in the program.

Reasons for C2 Slippage

Illinois feels that the slippage for all areas of this indicator are due to similar reasons. First, the SSIP's focus on child outcomes has brought increased attention to this process and greater awareness of how this process should be completed. Based on information in the pilot zones, it appears that many teams were not utilizing the process outlined in the training provided. When surveying pilot site stakeholders prior to implementing improvement strategies, many indicated the focus and intent of collecting these outcomes was not clear or conveyed well. With renewed training, teams have realized that they were rating many children inaccurately and often with inflated estimations of both their performance and progress. Child and Family Connections offices beyond those involved in SSIP have also been utilizing the DaSy modules and the SSIP materials and feel that their ratings are improving in accuracy even though they have not received the same support as the pilot sites. Two other factors have also been reported to be influencing the performance reflected in this year's APR data.

The first is improved eligibility determinations due to better understanding of program requirements. With improved wording in the Procedure Manual and additional training, teams are now more effectively utilizing a team approach to eligibility determination that utilizes domain level performance rather than independent decisions based on subdomain and isolated sub-test information. The second factor is likely a consequence of the lack of a state budget for two years. Due to payment uncertainty, some areas have reported a decrease in their provider pool. As a result, some children are receiving delayed services thereby impacting the amount of progress they make during their more limited time in the program.

The number of infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program

The number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's part C exiting 618 data	
The number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.	4394

Please note that this data about the number of infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program is optional in this FFY16 submission. It will be required in the FFY17 submission.

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process? Yes

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

As stated above, Illinois uses the ECO Center's COS process. This involves using information collected from a variety of sources including parent report, observation, evaluation/assessment, and, for exits, intervention information. For evaluation/assessment, providers in Illinois are allowed to use any of the tools found on this list: http://www.dhs.state.il.us/OneNetLibrary/27896/documents/By_Division/DCHP/EI/EIAssessInstruments08-2016/LEIAppEvalAssessInstrR08-16.pdf

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

States must report the following data starting with the FFY 2017 SPP/APR submission, due February 2019: (1) the number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's Part C exiting data under Section 618 of the IDEA; and (2) the number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Required Actions

FFY15/SFY16 Illinois Annual Performance Report

Indicator 3: Early Child Outcomes

Results Indicator: Percent of infant and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

- A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships),
- B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication, and
- C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

SUMMARY STATEMENTS BY CHILD AND FAMILY CONNECTIONS (CFC)						
CFC #	Outcome A		Outcome B		Outcome C	
	Summary Statement 1	Summary Statement 2	Summary Statement 1	Summary Statement 2	Summary Statement 1	Summary Statement 2
1	67.9%	58.3%	71.6%	49.8%	67.2%	55.5%
**2	48.9%	36.2%	62.4%	34.4%	62.6%	36.6%
3	58.1%	63.9%	64.2%	47.2%	64.6%	62.0%
**4	52.7%	52.0%	71.9%	50.1%	65.3%	54.5%
**5	45.9%	54.8%	61.7%	44.7%	55.4%	57.7%
*6	69.6%	63.3%	80.9%	45.9%	75.4%	57.5%
*7	76.1%	51.6%	84.5%	39.9%	82.7%	42.8%
*8	79.2%	51.5%	80.5%	39.3%	80.4%	39.6%
*9	79.2%	59.4%	87.1%	43.9%	80.5%	48.1%
*10	72.3%	33.6%	77.3%	25.1%	79.3%	25.1%
*11	78.9%	65.9%	81.8%	49.6%	81.4%	54.7%
*12	62.8%	44.7%	77.8%	32.1%	74.9%	33.5%
13	55.3%	64.6%	61.3%	40.8%	56.0%	55.4%
14	62.3%	72.4%	69.7%	62.0%	68.3%	69.9%
**15	63.6%	60.3%	69.6%	50.7%	70.7%	61.0%
16	76.2%	40.8%	82.0%	36.2%	79.2%	38.2%
17	60.0%	49.4%	79.5%	46.0%	76.8%	42.5%
18	62.5%	35.4%	76.5%	21.7%	71.6%	31.3%
19	68.5%	63.4%	77.0%	52.7%	77.3%	68.3%
20	59.0%	52.2%	70.2%	42.9%	70.5%	49.1%
21	65.4%	55.1%	74.0%	40.2%	69.3%	43.3%
22	78.3%	50.7%	92.9%	38.4%	80.3%	49.3%
23	60.7%	29.5%	80.0%	24.6%	73.7%	29.5%
24	49.3%	46.5%	61.2%	27.9%	57.8%	51.2%
**25	53.9%	50.2%	54.9%	28.1%	57.9%	45.2%
Statewide	66.0%	54.5%	75.0%	42.8%	72.7%	49.9%
*Chicago – Cook County	77.4%	52.6%	81.7%	39.5%	80.4%	41.9%
*Suburban – Cook County	69.5%	53.2%	81.1%	39.3%	77.7%	44.6%
**Collar Counties (2, 4, 5, 15, & 25)	53.0%	50.7%	64.1%	41.6%	62.4%	51.0%
Downstate (All Others)	63.3%	52.5%	73.9%	40.8%	70.2%	49.7%
*Cook County Offices: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CFC 6 - North Suburban • CFC 7 - West Suburban • CFC 8 - Southwest Chicago • CFC 9 - Central Chicago • CFC 10 - Southeast Chicago • CFC 11 - North Chicago • CFC 12 - South Suburban 						

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4: Family Involvement**

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

- A. Know their rights;
- B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
- C. Help their children develop and learn.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2010	Target ≥			76.00%	76.00%	74.00%	73.50%	78.00%	78.50%	79.00%	69.20%	69.40%
		Data		76.80%	82.00%	75.00%	71.85%	78.58%	67.82%	67.60%	69.17%	65.69%	71.50%
B	2010	Target ≥			86.00%	86.00%	86.00%	85.00%	85.80%	86.20%	86.70%	77.40%	77.90%
		Data		86.50%	90.30%	87.10%	83.81%	85.63%	76.51%	75.70%	77.37%	74.15%	76.51%
C	2010	Target ≥			90.00%	90.00%	89.00%	89.00%	85.00%	87.00%	90.40%	74.00%	74.50%
		Data		90.20%	93.30%	90.80%	88.27%	83.28%	74.31%	73.20%	74.02%	73.34%	74.11%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	69.70%
	Data	74.14%
B	Target ≥	77.90%
	Data	79.03%
C	Target ≥	74.50%
	Data	77.30%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	70.00%	70.30%	70.60%
Target B ≥	78.20%	78.50%	78.80%
Target C ≥	74.80%	75.10%	75.40%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Illinois received stakeholder input via the Child & Family Outcomes workgroup and the Illinois Interagency Council on Early Intervention (IICEI). The Child & Family Outcomes workgroup helped set the targets that were approved by the IICEI. The workgroup routinely reviews the data and makes recommendations about improvement to the state's processes. For example, to address the large number of surveys returned to sender, we have made a change to the addressee which we hope will get more surveys into the hands of families.

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of families to whom surveys were distributed	18435.00
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	9.33% 1720.00
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	1258.00
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	1720.00
B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	1348.00
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	1720.00
C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	1326.00
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	1720.00

	FFY 2015	FFY 2016	FFY 2016
--	----------	----------	----------

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Data*	Target*	Data
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	74.14%	70.00%	73.14%
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	79.03%	78.20%	78.37%
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	77.30%	74.80%	77.09%

Was sampling used? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? No

The demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program. No

Describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Based on the poor response rate from this mailing process, we feel steps must be taken to gain more representative responses. Through our SSIP process, we have created some additional messaging pieces to share with families about outcomes. These materials are currently being piloted with families to see if raising awareness about the importance of outcomes measurement leads to better response rates. We recognize that we may also need to consider a sampling plan in the future so that fewer resources can be devoted to mailing and more resources can be devoted to targeted follow up with historically under-represented groups.

Recent work of the long-standing Child & Family Outcomes workgroup presented multiple options and discussions. For FFY17 survey distribution, the address data has been updated and improved through a better system of determining a legal address as well as the contact name was added to the data to help the United States Postal Service better match the dweller to the survey name. While this work is ongoing, Illinois also is currently developing additional data tools for the CFC offices to find misidentified addresses (spelling, truncated, non-existent or vague descriptions...).

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program.

Illinois mails surveys to every exiting family on a quarterly basis. Illinois has issues with representativeness due to a high number of undeliverable surveys. For this survey year alone, 2034 surveys were returned to sender and did not make it into the hands of the intended families. While this impacts all areas of the state to some degree, it has been reported that this issue is particularly problematic in the Cook County area. As a result, Illinois' responses are not as representative as we would like. Once again, we received proportionately fewer surveys back from families living in Chicago with our highest response rate from families living in the collar counties. This disproportionality impacts our representativeness in predictable ways. It primarily over-represents white families' responses and under-represents African American and Latino families. English speakers were more likely to return surveys than Spanish speakers or bilingual families. Responses were also more likely from families whose children had been in the system for 6 to 24 months than from families who had been in the system for less than six months or more than 24 months. Returned surveys were largely representative in terms of the child's gender and level of delay.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

In the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2016 response data represent the demographics of the State, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 OSEP response

Illinois has, once again, received a high number of undeliverable surveys. For this survey year alone, 2034 surveys were returned to sender and did not make it into the hands of the intended families. While this impacts all areas of the state to some degree, it has been reported that this issue is particularly problematic in the Cook County area. As a result, Illinois' responses are again not as representative as we would like. As in years past, we received proportionately fewer surveys back from families living in Chicago with our highest response rate from families living in the collar counties. This disproportionality impacts our representativeness in predictable ways. It over-represents white families' responses and under-represents African American and Latino families.

Based on the poor return rate of this mailing process, we feel steps must be taken to gain a more representative response. Moving forward, we will utilize a different way of addressing the surveys (using primary contact information from the data system) to see if that makes more surveys deliverable. In addition, through our SSIP process, we have created some messaging pieces to share with families about outcomes. These materials are currently being piloted with families to see if raising awareness about the importance of outcomes measurement leads to better response rates. CFCs will also be enlisted to remind families about the importance of completing the survey as they near exit. We recognize that we may also need to consider a sampling plan in the future so that fewer resources can be devoted to mailing and more resources can be devoted to targeted follow up with historically under-represented groups.

OSEP Response

The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a response group that was not representative of the population. OSEP notes that the State included strategies and improvement activities to address this issue in the future.

Required Actions

In the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2017 response data are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the population.

FFY16/SFY17 Illinois Annual Performance Report

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Results Indicator: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

- A. Know their rights,
- B. Effectively communicate their children's needs, and
- C. Help their children develop and learn.

FAMILY OUTCOMES SURVEY RESULTS - RETURN RATES & UNWEIGHTED RESULTS BY CFC									
CFC #	Surveys	Returns	Return Rate	Know Rights		Communicate Child's Needs		Help Child Develop & Learn	
				Scores 4 or >	Mean Score	Scores 4 or >	Mean Score	Scores 4 or >	Mean Score
1	661	50	7.56%	74.00%	4.07	78.00%	4.16	78.00%	4.14
**2	673	61	9.06%	80.33%	4.13	75.41%	4.15	75.41%	4.15
3	371	26	7.01%	80.77%	4.40	73.08%	4.40	80.77%	4.40
**4	998	88	8.82%	78.41%	4.31	84.09%	4.35	78.41%	4.31
**5	1228	157	12.78%	79.62%	4.32	82.80%	4.44	81.53%	4.38
*6	2038	211	10.35%	75.83%	4.26	79.62%	4.38	77.25%	4.29
*7	1249	96	7.69%	67.71%	4.02	75.00%	4.20	72.92%	4.12
*8	963	49	5.09%	75.51%	4.27	83.67%	4.40	81.63%	4.41
*9	1125	52	4.62%	65.38%	3.92	73.08%	4.15	82.69%	4.22
*10	811	38	4.69%	60.53%	3.90	63.16%	3.88	60.53%	3.87
*11	2385	167	7.00%	62.28%	3.83	70.66%	4.01	73.65%	3.96
*12	1316	92	6.99%	67.39%	4.05	71.74%	4.16	73.91%	4.16
13	245	21	8.57%	71.43%	4.25	85.71%	4.47	80.95%	4.38
14	732	53	7.24%	69.81%	4.16	77.36%	4.21	75.47%	4.12
**15	1437	149	10.37%	71.14%	4.11	75.17%	4.24	71.81%	4.15
16	736	71	9.65%	77.46%	4.19	84.51%	4.32	80.28%	4.29
17	214	25	11.68%	92.00%	4.58	88.00%	4.63	76.00%	4.32
18	373	33	8.85%	72.73%	4.29	84.85%	4.42	78.79%	4.17
19	520	43	8.27%	72.09%	4.32	79.07%	4.46	74.42%	4.46
20	457	49	10.72%	81.63%	4.33	87.76%	4.44	85.71%	4.38
21	694	74	10.66%	72.97%	4.24	81.08%	4.43	82.43%	4.43
22	405	34	8.40%	79.41%	4.50	85.29%	4.53	85.29%	4.55
23	181	14	7.73%	71.43%	3.99	71.43%	3.96	64.29%	3.95
24	181	15	8.29%	60.00%	3.73	73.33%	3.94	80.00%	4.03
**25	476	52	10.92%	78.85%	4.35	86.54%	4.45	80.77%	4.35
STATEWIDE	20469	1720	8.40%	73.14%	4.16	78.37%	4.28	77.09%	4.23
<i>*Chicago-Cook County</i>	5284	306	5.79%	64.71%	3.92	72.22%	4.08	74.84%	4.06
<i>*Suburban-Cook County</i>	4603	399	8.67%	71.93%	4.15	76.69%	4.28	75.44%	4.22
**Collar Counties (2, 4, 5, 15, & 25)	4812	507	10.53%	76.92%	4.24	80.28%	4.33	77.32%	4.27
Downstate (All Others)	5770	508	8.80%	75.39%	4.25	81.50%	4.36	79.53%	4.31
*Cook County Offices:						Data indicating Statewide Surveys is based on number sent. It is important to note that 2,034 of those sent were returned as undeliverable.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• CFC 6 - North Suburban</i> <i>• CFC 7 - West Suburban</i> <i>• CFC 8 - Southwest Chicago</i> <i>• CFC 9 - Central Chicago</i> <i>• CFC 10 - Southeast Chicago</i> <i>• CFC 11 - North Chicago</i> <i>• CFC 12 - South Suburban</i> 									

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			1.33%	1.36%	1.32%	1.33%	1.08%	1.08%	1.10%	1.25%	1.26%
Data		1.07%	1.17%	1.20%	1.13%	1.08%	1.09%	1.32%	1.26%	1.50%	1.54%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	1.27%
Data	1.24%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	1.28%	1.29%	1.30%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input was provided and approval received from the Illinois Interagency Council on Early Intervention, the state Interagency Coordinating Council.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/12/2017	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	2,021	null
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2016	6/22/2017	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	153,482	null
TBD			null	

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
2,021	153,482	1.24%	1.28%	1.32%

Compare your results to the national data

Illinois has reported losing population and births across all state agencies. Most theorize the long-standing issues of the budget impasse have resulted in many employers leaving the state which then has many families following. Regardless of issues with the decreasing population, efforts for Child Find continue and Illinois has many initiatives impacting the efforts to raise awareness of the Early Intervention program to the public.

Additional work with the SSIP Messaging workgroup updated current brochures for referral sources to distribute as well as a new brochure focused on helping the referral sources understand the Early Intervention program in the final stages. Illinois struggles with many healthcare entities making the required referral to Early Intervention for infants/toddlers with a suspected or known disability or developmental delay. The increase in electronic medical record programs within healthcare systems proves challenging for Child Find activities as many of these systems do not have the ability to create the proper referral for staff using those systems and many healthcare entities are referring to their own in-house therapy centers. Illinois continues to help build and locate supports to help the efforts of the CFCs to help market the Early Intervention program.

Illinois did meet their goal in FFY16/SFY17 and will continue to utilize the 618 prepopulated data for consistency of reporting.

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY15/SFY16 Annual Performance Report

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Results Indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.

PARTICIPATION RATE UNDER 1 HISTORY BY CFC & REGION					Nat Avg. 1.24% for FFY16/SFY17		
CFC #	FFY12/SFY13	FFY13/SFY14	FFY14/SFY15	FFY15/SFY16	FFY16/SFY17	*Compared to National Avg.	
1	1.71%	1.71%	2.41%	1.70%	1.14%	- .01	
**2	0.96%	1.06%	1.07%	0.91%	0.67%	- .57	
3	1.49%	1.47%	1.61%	2.02%	1.07%	- .17	
**4	1.08%	1.44%	1.11%	1.14%	1.25%	+ .01	
**5	1.04%	1.14%	1.19%	1.09%	0.90%	- .34	
*6	1.38%	1.68%	1.76%	1.51%	1.69%	+ .45	
*7	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1.67%	+ .43	
*8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1.65%	+ .41	
*9	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1.19%	- .05	
*10	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1.94%	+ .70	
*11	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1.22%	- .02	
*12	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1.35%	- .11	
13	0.85%	0.98%	0.79%	0.91%	0.79%	- .45	
14	1.15%	1.30%	1.00%	1.37%	1.22%	- .02	
**15	0.79%	1.06%	1.17%	1.10%	1.06%	- .18	
16	1.40%	1.31%	1.38%	1.13%	1.07%	- .17	
17	1.02%	1.49%	1.49%	1.52%	1.14%	- .10	
18	0.76%	1.23%	0.99%	1.14%	1.22%	- .02	
19	1.63%	2.66%	2.15%	1.79%	1.99%	+ .75	
20	1.95%	2.18%	2.39%	2.61%	2.70%	+ 1.46	
21	1.17%	1.23%	1.18%	1.30%	1.71%	+ .47	
22	1.03%	1.31%	1.74%	1.21%	1.32%	+ .08	
23	3.04%	2.62%	3.36%	3.28%	1.96%	+ .72	
24	1.34%	1.37%	1.01%	1.71%	1.57%	+ .33	
**25	1.14%	1.16%	1.77%	1.78%	0.95%	- .29	
Statewide	1.26%	1.50%	1.54%	1.40%	1.33%	+ .09	
*Suburban – Cook County	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1.39%	+ .15	
*Chicago – Cook County	1.38%	1.68%	1.76%	1.51%	1.40%	+ .16	
**Collar Counties (2, 4, 5, 15, & 25)	0.97%	1.17%	1.19%	1.12%	.99%	- .25	
Downstate (All Others)	1.34%	1.51%	1.53%	1.34%	1.46%	+ .22	
*Cook County Offices:		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CFC 9 - Central Chicago • CFC 10 - Southeast Chicago • CFC 11 - North Chicago • CFC 12 - South Suburban 			<i>"n/a" as data was not separated historically</i>		*Newly added for comparison to national average

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			3.24%	3.32%	3.38%	3.37%	3.37%	3.37%	3.37%	3.57%	3.65%
Data		3.00%	3.11%	3.31%	3.43%	3.38%	3.41%	3.70%	3.96%	4.23%	4.45%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	3.73%
Data	3.28%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	3.81%	3.89%	3.97%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input was provided and approval received from the Illinois Interagency Council on Early Intervention, the state Interagency Coordinating Council.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/12/2017	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	15,590	
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2016	6/22/2017	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	463,064	
TBD			null	

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
15,590	463,064	3.28%	3.81%	3.37%

Compare your results to the national data

As mentioned in Indicator 5, the population of Illinois has decreased with many theorizing the lack of financial stability for families as a main factor. The CFCs continue to support the location and obtain proper referrals for all infants and toddlers in Illinois through partnering with local community systems such as child care and home visiting programs. A cross-sector training began in the southern region of Illinois between Early Intervention, Maternal and Infant Early Childhood Home Visiting and Child Welfare partners in an effort to reduce confusion for the respective programs but also to build the relationships between the local community partners to help market the respective programs with consistency. Illinois also implemented an initiative for licensed child care centers for improved professional development, including a partnership with the local CFC in their area.

Illinois plans to continue to partner with other programs to reach every infant/toddler eligible for Early Intervention as well as build the relationship with the community partners for more consistent delivery of service for each of the programs involved with the families we serve.

Based on state news reporting as well as other state partners reporting the loss of population, Illinois theorizes this has been a major factor of the decrease in Participation for this indicator. While Illinois did increase from the FFY15/SFY16 reporting, we fell short of the targets set with the SSP initially.

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY15/SFY16 Annual Performance Report

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Results Indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.

PARTICIPATION RATE BIRTH TO THREE HISTORY BY CFC & REGION					Nat Avg 3.12% for FFY16/SFY17	
CFC #	FFY12/SFY 13	FFY13/SFY14	FFY14/SFY15	FFY15/SFY16	FFY16/SFY17	*Compared to National Avg.
1	4.09%	4.38%	4.62%	4.70%	4.32%	+ 1.20
**2	3.29%	3.22%	3.49%	3.25%	3.25%	+ 0.13
3	3.51%	3.74%	3.85%	5.38%	4.91%	+ 1.79
**4	3.37%	3.79%	3.83%	4.24%	4.52%	+ 1.40
**5	3.75%	3.61%	4.04%	4.44%	4.37%	+ 1.25
*6	4.39%	4.79%	4.99%	3.85%	5.94%	+ 2.82
*7	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	6.54%	+ 3.42
*8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	12.00%	+ 8.88
*9	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	10.78%	+ 7.66
*10	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	10.43%	+ 7.31
*11	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	9.77%	+ 6.65
*12	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	10.90%	+ 7.78
13	2.32%	2.86%	2.75%	3.17%	3.07%	- 0.05
14	3.36%	3.94%	3.65%	4.82%	4.69%	+ 1.57
**15	3.60%	4.04%	4.42%	4.18%	5.30%	+ 2.18
16	3.26%	3.47%	3.67%	3.34%	4.05%	+ 0.93
17	3.77%	3.77%	3.34%	4.12%	4.64%	+ 1.52
18	3.69%	3.55%	4.16%	4.51%	5.38%	+ 2.26
19	4.05%	4.63%	5.21%	4.94%	5.84%	+ 2.72
20	4.80%	4.77%	5.14%	5.91%	6.25%	+ 3.13
21	3.12%	3.08%	3.25%	3.24%	4.11%	+ 0.99
22	4.48%	4.44%	4.73%	4.21%	5.24%	+ 2.12
23	6.81%	5.38%	6.30%	6.50%	8.24%	+ 5.12
24	3.80%	3.91%	4.09%	5.22%	4.22%	+ 1.10
**25	4.54%	4.72%	5.10%	5.56%	5.06%	+ 1.94
Statewide	3.96%	4.23%	4.45%	4.05%	5.95%	+ 2.83
*Chicago - Cook County	4.39%	4.79%	4.99%	3.85%	10.45%	+ 7.33
*Suburban - Cook County	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	7.71%	+ 4.59
**Collar Counties (2, 4, 5, 15, & 25)	3.60%	3.77%	4.07%	4.19%	4.49%	+ 1.37
Downstate (All Others)	3.65%	3.91%	4.08%	4.32%	5.04%	+ 1.92
<p>*Cook County Offices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CFC 6 - North Suburban • CFC 7 - West Suburban • CFC 8 - Southwest Chicago • CFC 9 - Central Chicago • CFC 10 - Southeast Chicago • CFC 11 - North Chicago • CFC 12 - South Suburban 						*New column added to see mathematic comparison to national average

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 7: 45-day timeline**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		98.67%	99.03%	99.43%	99.49%	99.46%	99.77%	99.80%	99.92%	99.87%	99.82%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	99.83%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
20,087	20,128	99.83%	100%	99.98%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>This number will be added to the "Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.</i>	36
--	----

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Illinois continues to collect data on infants and toddlers eligible for Early Intervention who receive their IFSP within the required 45 days from referral based on a full fiscal year of July 1 through June 30.

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

The CFCs utilize the Cornerstone data system to collect referral, eligibility determination and IFSP period information. The Cornerstone system automatically calculates the 45 days from referral and if an eligible child has an IFSP that begin after the required 45 days, the system will require a reason for delay. Cornerstone, therefore, also captures the children who have Family Exceptional Circumstances. Additional steps by the Bureau to review the monthly data and confirm when a child goes over 45 days but not noted as an FEC are performed which results in some data corrections. If the CFC incorrectly enters a date, it could result in a child appearing to be over 45 when in fact they were timely. The review of the data helps to capture those as quickly as possible.

Illinois feels reviewing the data for the entire fiscal year and working with the CFCs on strategies to help avoid data corrections is more consistent with the intent and fidelity of the data collection process. Additionally, the Cornerstone system captures children who exceed the 45 days but do not have IFSPs written. These are now noted on the monthly data review done by the Bureau to inform the CFC to review for accuracy. In most cases the child is found not eligible but the record has not been closed out yet. This extra step of watching the Intake period along with the data system of reviewing the IFSP delays has helped bring Illinois to the closest possible compliance. Additional technical assistance is performed on any CFC who is not in compliance to create strategies to ensure future compliance to correct the long-standing non-compliance Illinois has had with Indicator 7.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Illinois was provided very valuable technical support directly from the OSEP state lead which led the Illinois EI program to focus on data driven decisions for ensuring compliance and addressing the long-standing non-compliance for this indicator. At a face-to-face meeting with the CFC Managers, an entire afternoon was spent collecting strategies. Both issues and strategies were collected by two facilitators and then prepared in a format to share back with the CFCs to be utilized.

Issues raised that specifically required the Bureau's interaction, such as data codes, etc, were gathered and utilized to prepare a process that would give CFCs the ability to receive monthly interaction with Bureau staff on their data. This process has helped Illinois implement compliance within this indicator by ensuring each delay in creating an IFSP is coded correctly and for those instances of non-compliance, that the CFC reported back that the child did receive their IFSP, although not timely. Further data collected after the non-compliance was identified indicated the CFC meets the definition of compliance with no further non-compliance for the reporting period.

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

In response to OSEP's response, Illinois provided a great amount of technical support to the 25 CFCs to provide strategies and actions to bring Illinois into compliance for FFY16/SFY17. While the elimination of non-compliance was accomplished in FFY16/SFY17, Illinois also reviewed the long-standing non-compliance for FFY11 with 1 Finding and FFY14 with 9 Findings. The second prong of 09-02 has been accomplished via all CFCs demonstrating 100% compliance. Illinois verified the individual child-specific corrections for FFY15 and FFY16, showing that the children ultimately received an IFSP even though it was delayed. Illinois can also clear out the FFY11 and FFY14 findings as the children from FFY11 and FFY14 are no longer under the jurisdiction of the program AND the CFCs are now correctly implementing the regulatory requirement of timely IFSP development (unless attributable to family exceptional circumstances or no consent granted).

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
4	4	null	0

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Illinois utilizes data from the Cornerstone system. As part of a new policy of tracking and correcting compliance within the CFCs, the Bureau has enacted additional data supports on a monthly basis. All instances of data pulled from Cornerstone is reviewed monthly and if showing non-compliance, the CFC is contacted to check the specific-child level for cause of the delay in creating the IFSP beyond the federally-required 45 day time frame. Most instances were simply not coded correctly in the system as the Family Exceptional Circumstances. Additional governance of policy/procedures are planned to assist the CFCs in properly coding the identified non-compliance.

Additionally, each of the CFCs who were found in non-compliance have verified the children did receive an appropriate IFSP, although late, and each of those CFCs also have been found in compliance through reviewing of additional data showing compliance under 09-02.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

As noted above, the CFCs found in non-compliance were provided the child-specific data to verify the issue was either improper coding showing Family Exceptional Circumstances or, in the case of CFC delay, that the child did receive an IFSP, although delayed and that the CFC also gained total compliance within 09-02 by having no child with a delayed IFSP written as well as the children who previously had delays not attributable to Family Exceptional Circumstances did have IFSP services implemented.

FFY 2014 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

In response to OSEP's response, Illinois provided a great amount of technical support to the 25 CFCs to provide strategies and actions to bring Illinois into compliance for FFY16/SFY17. While the elimination of non-compliance was accomplished in FFY16/SFY17, Illinois also reviewed the long-standing non-compliance for FFY11 with 1 Finding and FFY14 with 9 Findings. The second prong of 09-02 has been accomplished via all CFCs demonstrating 100% compliance. Illinois verified the individual child-specific corrections for FFY15 and FFY16, showing that the children ultimately received an IFSP even though it was delayed. Illinois can also clear out the FFY11 and FFY14 findings as the children from FFY11 and FFY14 are no longer under the jurisdiction of the program AND the CFCs are now correctly implementing the regulatory requirement of timely IFSP development (unless attributable to family exceptional circumstances or no consent granted).

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator: (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 or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

OSEP notes that, due to a technical difficulty, the State was unable to indicate in the text box that the nine FFY 2014 findings of noncompliance were verified as corrected, as indicated in the narrative. OSEP accepts the description of the verification of the correction of the noncompliance in the narrative.

Required Actions

FFY16/SFY17 Annual Performance Report

Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline

Compliance Indicator: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline.

IFSPS INITIATED WITHIN 45 DAYS				
CFC #	Total Initial IFSP	Exceptional Family Circumstances	Timely IFSP (with FEC)	Percent on time
1	632	0	632	100.00%
2**	619	0	619	100.00%
3	339	9	336	99.12%
4**	930	0	930	100.00%
5**	1199	0	1199	100.00%
6*	2042	0	2042	100.00%
7*	1169	1	1169	100.00%
8*	932	0	932	100.00%
9*	1174	0	1174	100.00%
10*	876	0	876	100.00%
11*	2321	11	2320	99.96%
12*	1373	0	1373	100.00%
13	236	5	236	100.00%
14	720	0	720	100.00%
15**	1484	3	1484	100.00%
16	684	4	682	99.71%
17	195	0	195	100.00%
18	359	1	359	100.00%
19	504	0	504	100.00%
20	456	0	456	100.00%
21	679	0	679	100.00%
22	393	0	393	100.00%
23	165	0	165	100.00%
24	184	0	184	100.00%
25**	463	1	462	99.78%
Statewide	20128	35	20121	99.97%
<i>*Chicago -Cook County</i>	5303	11	5302	99.98%
<i>*Chicago – Suburban</i>	4584	1	4584	100.00%
<i>**Collar Counties (2, 4, 5, 15, & 25)</i>	4695	4	4694	99.98%
Downstate (All Others)	5546	19	5541	99.91%
*Cook County Offices: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li style="width: 50%;"><i>• CFC 6 - North Suburban</i> <li style="width: 50%;"><i>• CFC 10 - Southeast Chicago</i> <li style="width: 50%;"><i>• CFC 7 - West Suburban</i> <li style="width: 50%;"><i>• CFC 11 - North Chicago</i> <li style="width: 50%;"><i>• CFC 8 - Southwest Chicago</i> <li style="width: 50%;"><i>• CFC 12 - South Suburban</i> <li style="width: 50%;"><i>• CFC 9 - Central Chicago</i> 				

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the State educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (LEA) where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		71.80%	100%	100%	98.90%	98.20%	92.30%	95.95%	93.90%	97.15%	92.54%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	97.97%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Explanation of Alternate Data

Illinois has utilized a sampling of files through our EI Monitoring Partner as displayed on the attached chart. The data reflects the number of files reviewed and the number of files properly showing the compliance and containing the transition steps and services on the IFSP in the required time frame.

Data include only those toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday.

- Yes
- No

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
780	821	97.97%	100%	95.01%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>This number will be added to the "Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.</i>	0
--	---

Reasons for Slippage

While not 100% compliant, Illinois did add additional focus to Transition overall and utilized updated tools for monitoring reviews. Additional plans for more consistent practice has begun using strategies collected within CFC offices who continually show compliance to provide additional technical assistance to those who have not. Within the discussions some CFC have expressed a need for a more data-driven system of ensuring compliance so Illinois has included that strategy at the Bureau level for requesting additional support from the Cornerstone application.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

Illinois monitors all 25 of their CFC offices. The number of files pulled is related to the number of children exiting within a month with the larger caseload CFCs having more files pulled. EI Monitoring also assists the CFCs
7/19/2018

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

with technical support to ensure understanding of policies and procedures. New policies for establishing Findings includes additional data for the CFCs to have an opportunity to pre-check before the final monitoring to ensure compliance.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

To respond to OSEP's response, Illinois plans to pull additional data for FFY14/SFY15, FFY13/SFY14, FFY12/SFY13, FFY11/SFY12, FFY10/SFY11 and FFY09/SFY10 from the respective CFCs issued the findings to determine whether the CFCs are now correctly implementing the regulatory requirements by ensuring Transition Steps and Services are entered timely on the IFSP or, even if children have not received timely transition services, they do receive them ultimately. Illinois cannot close the findings of long-standing non-compliance until both the child-specific data shows the child did receive the transition planning services, albeit untimely, or the child is no longer under the jurisdiction of program AND reviews additional CFC child-specific data to show the CFCs are now correctly implementing regulatory requirements resulting in children no longer experiencing delays or gaps in transition services.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
11	3	0	8

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

As reported in Indicators 1 and 7, Illinois received very valuable, intensive technical support, resources and examples to ensure clear understanding of non-compliance, correction of non-compliance and corection of long-standing non-compliance. With all of the information gathered Illinois proceeded with a very intensive data review and process to assit CFC offices with the same understanding. This resulted in a new procedure for Illinois to ensure CFCs are supported with child-specific data on a more frequent schedule to allow additional time for review and correction prior to issuing findings for SFY16. After the intensive data review that was our initial phase of addressing the long-standing non-compliance, it was evident the CFCs were not being supported with clear policy/procedures or data correction practices that would allow to prove compliance in a more timely manner.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

With the new procedures of correction of non-compliance being implemented, the CFCs were able to report compliance with 09-02 due to these children either 1) having the Transition Steps and Services entered in the record, although untimely, and 2) the CFC showed further compliance when monitored.

FFY 2015 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Illinois plans to utilize the second phase of the new Findings procedures to provide more frequent data and monitoring prior to completing the Findings data collection for the SFY16 APR. Illinois also intends to support the CFCs with enhanced fields within the data system that should produce enhanced data reports as well as provide data on a more frequent basis to support the long-standing non-compliance can be eliminated.

Explanation of Alternate Data

Illinois implemented updates to the procedures for reporting Findings within Indicator 8A. EI Monitoring follows a schedule of sampling and was able to provide verification of compliance by the CFCs as well as the CFC data shows the children were no longer under the jurisdiction of Part C as they had exited the program upon turning 3.

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Illinois improved the process of reporting Findings of non-compliance and is implementing additional data reviews to ensure implementation of compliance to meet 09-02 standards. The EI Monitoring program is increasing the frequency of reviews and utilizing improved collection tools to assit the CFCs with improved performance.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The CFCs verified that the children did recieve the Transition Steps and Services within the IFSP, although untimely, or were no longer under the jurisdiction of Part C due to exiting as well as the CFCs had continued compliance with subsequent monitoring to be in compliance with 09-02.

FFY 2014 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Illinois is implementing improvements in the data collection sytem, the sampling process to provide additional data to the CFCs, additional monitoring visits after intial monitoring data collection shows potential issues which will allow CFCs to ensure the documentation showing the Transition Steps and Services are completed in the IFSP and within the required timeframes.

FFY 2013 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Illinois is implementing improvements in the data collection system, the sampling process to provide additional data to the CFCs, additional monitoring visits after initial monitoring data collection shows potential issues which will allow CFCs to ensure the documentation showing the Transition Steps and Services are completed in the IFSP and within the required timeframes.

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Illinois improved the process of reporting Findings of non-compliance and is implementing additional data reviews to ensure implementation of compliance to meet 09-02 standards. The EI Monitoring program is increasing the frequency of reviews and utilizing improved collection tools to assist the CFCs with improved performance.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The CFCs verified that the children did receive the Transition Steps and Services within the IFSP, although untimely, or were no longer under the jurisdiction of Part C due to exiting as well as the CFCs had continued compliance with subsequent monitoring to be in compliance with 09-02.

FFY 2012 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Illinois is implementing improvements in the data collection system, the sampling process to provide additional data to the CFCs, additional monitoring visits after initial monitoring data collection shows potential issues which will allow CFCs to ensure the documentation showing the Transition Steps and Services are completed in the IFSP and within the required timeframes.

OSEP Response

The State did not demonstrate that it corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012, FFY 2013, FFY 2014, and FFY 2015 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that it verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2012, FFY 2013, FFY 2014, and FFY 2015: (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 for FFY 2013, and FFY 2015 (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that the remaining 11 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2015, three uncorrected findings identified in FFY 2014, one uncorrected finding identified in FFY 2013, and four uncorrected findings identified in FFY 2012 were corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 and each EIS program or provider with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2015, FFY 2014, FFY 2013, and FFY 2012: (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 or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

Required Actions

FFY16/SFY17 Annual Performance Report

Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Compliance Indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;

IFSP WITH TIMELY TRANSITION STEPS/SERVICES			
CFC #	Sampling of Toddlers Exiting in November 2016	Files with Transition Steps and Services	Percent with Transition Steps and Services
1	21	21	100.00%
2**	9	9	100.00%
3	6	5	83.33%
4**	56	56	100.00%
5**	79	76	96.20%
6*	73	72	98.63%
7*	51	51	100.00%
8*	41	34	82.93%
9*	27	26	96.30%
10*	22	22	100.00%
11*	106	90	84.91%
12*	59	55	93.22%
13	17	17	100.00%
14	27	23	85.19%
15**	67	67	100.00%
16	24	22	91.67%
17	11	11	100.00%
18	22	21	95.45%
19	21	21	100.00%
20	29	29	100.00%
21	24	24	100.00%
22	16	16	100.00%
23	3	3	100.00%
24	5	5	100.00%
25**	5	4	80.00%
Statewide	821	780	95.01%
<i>*Chicago – Cook County</i>	196	172	87.76%
<i>*Suburban - Cook County</i>	183	178	97.27%
<i>**Collar Counties (2, 4, 5, 15, & 25)</i>	216	212	98.15%
Downstate (All Others)	226	218	96.46%
*Cook County Offices: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CFC 6 - North Suburban • CFC 7 - West Suburban • CFC 8 - Southwest Chicago 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CFC 9 – Central Chicago • CFC 10 – Southeast Chicago • CFC 11- North Chicago • CFC 12 – South Suburban 	

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the State educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (LEA) where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		78.50%	93.40%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	95.70%	100%	100%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	100%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

- Yes
- No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
13,411	13,411	100%	100%	100%

Number of parents who opted out <i>This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.</i>	0
--	---

Describe the method used to collect these data

Illinois utilizes a data sharing agreement with the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE), the State Education Agency (SEA), to assure that every child who reached 27 months of age or who started EI services after the age of 27 months were made known to the local education agency (LEA). The Bureau of EI has confirmed that notifications were sent to the SEA and LEA at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for all toddlers who reached 27 months of age. The calculation excludes children who were referred to the program less than 90 days prior to their third birthday.

In FFY16/SFY17, Illinois demonstrated 100 percent compliance. An updated Data Sharing Agreement was implemented in April 2017 which brings Illinois into full compliance for the Federal Part C application/grant award. Our current strategy is to improve the sharing of the data to be more automated and easier to report to the LEAs in Illinois. These improvements also will reflect well on other functions of the Illinois Early Intervention Services System by ensuring accurate address collection and reporting. Creation of reports to CFCs indicating addresses not meeting United States Postal Service requirements is being created currently with release before the end of FFY17/SFY18.

Do you have a written opt-out policy? No

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Illinois continues to utilize a full FY of July 1 through June 30 annually to report to the Illinois State Board of Education, overseeing Part B, for all children turning 27 months of age and still active with Part C as part of the Child Find reporting.

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Utilizing the full fiscal year ensures Part C and Part B work closely together on a consistent basis. Additionally, a quarterly workgroup regarding transition meets to discuss ideas, concerns or questions from LEAs to help ensure federal compliance from both Part C and Part B regarding transition. Preparing reports for LEAs to know children who are approaching the Illinois definition of potentially eligible for Part B better prepares Part B for the collaborative work with the CFCs and the LEAs. Informing parents of the process throughout their time in Early Intervention assists the transition to be more timely, and a process which keeps the family engaged and makes the transition less stressful.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
null	null	null	0

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the State educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (LEA) where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		77.80%	96.10%	97.40%	98.60%	99.40%	99.10%	86.07%	77.15%	78.00%	81.81%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	83.70%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Data reflect only those toddlers for whom the Lead Agency has conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services

- Yes
- No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
9,510	13,411	83.70%	100%	83.76%

Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference <i>This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.</i>	932
Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>This number will be added to the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.</i>	943

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Illinois continues to utilize a full fiscal year of July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017 for the FFY16/SFY17 reporting period.

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Illinois believes continuing to use the full fiscal year of data provides for an accurate reflection of the infants and toddlers who should be transitioned appropriately. While the transition may include other programs and options for the family, this indicator focuses on those potentially eligible for Part B supports and services.

While Illinois has historically continued to have non-compliance in this indicator, it is good to note the continued improvement since FFY2012. Again in FFY16, Illinois did increase the number of infants and toddlers who were potentially eligible for Part B and who did complete the transition planning conference to assist in their eligibility determination for Part B.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Attached is a breakdown of the Transition Planning Conference Data by CFC as well as regional breakdown. Again, the unique needs of the CFC show the areas needing additional support. Illinois plans on addressing those supports through the data collected for FFY17/SFY18.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
11	0	0	11

FFY 2015 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Illinois began implementation of a improved process of reporting Findings of non-compliance, correction of non-compliance and correction of long-standing non-compliance after receiving invaluable technical support from our State Lead. Resources provided as well as samples allowed Illinois to create a procedure that supports the CFCs with additional data and period of correction to help support their efforts for improvement. Illinois now provides child-specific data to the CFCs to allow the CFCs the ability to correct any identified non-compliance to meet Prong 1 of 09-02. Furthermore, more frequent data reviews are planned moving forward with time for CFCs to look for trends in incorrect entry by their staff or other issues to report that could result in the Bureau updating data entry within the Cornerstone system in an effort for improvement.

FFY 2014 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Illinois plans on intensive outreach using data at a child-specific level as well as ensuring policies and procedures surrounding timely Transition Planning Conference. The Bureau also is gathering other supports through strategies developed through various workgroups to improve Indicator 8C. After receiving the child-specific data for the first time from the Bureau, many CFCs expressed a desire to receive the data more frequently as they noted trends and issues with following policy and procedures. Also, systematic issues of calculating the correct time period for children leaving and returning into the system were brought to the Bureau's attention, which is still under review for potential updates in the system and data reports. The Bureau is also researching potential new data reports on a more consistent basis to help support the management in the timely Transition Planning Conference steps at the CFCs in order to quickly show improvement in this Indicator.

While the process has displayed the struggle to meet 100% compliance, the improved process has also assisted the Bureau in improvements to the Cornerstone system, the data reports and ways to ensure the CFCs are supported to meet the goal of ensuring all children potentially eligible for Part B are provided with the Transition Planning Conference for a smooth transition for their child.

FFY 2013 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Illinois plans on intensive outreach using data at a child-specific level as well as ensuring policies and procedures surrounding timely Transition Planning Conference. The Bureau also is gathering other supports through strategies developed through various workgroups to improve Indicator 8C. After receiving the child-specific data for the first time from the Bureau, many CFCs expressed a desire to receive the data more frequently as they noted trends and issues with following policy and procedures. Also, systematic issues of calculating the correct time period for children leaving and returning into the system were brought to the Bureau's attention, which is still under review for potential updates in the system and data reports. The Bureau is also researching potential new data reports on a more consistent basis to help support the management in the timely Transition Planning Conference steps at the CFCs in order to quickly show improvement in this Indicator.

While the process has displayed the struggle to meet 100% compliance, the improved process has also assisted the Bureau in improvements to the Cornerstone system, the data reports and ways to ensure the CFCs are supported to meet the goal of ensuring all children potentially eligible for Part B are provided with the Transition Planning Conference for a smooth transition for their child.

FFY 2012 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Illinois plans on intensive outreach using data at a child-specific level as well as ensuring policies and procedures surrounding timely Transition Planning Conference. The Bureau also is gathering other supports through strategies developed through various workgroups to improve Indicator 8C. After receiving the child-specific data for the first time from the Bureau, many CFCs expressed a desire to receive the data more frequently as they noted trends and issues with following policy and procedures. Also, systematic issues of calculating the correct time period for children leaving and returning into the system were brought to the Bureau's attention, which is still under review for potential updates in the system and data reports. The Bureau is also researching potential new data reports on a more consistent basis to help support the management in the timely Transition Planning Conference steps at the CFCs in order to quickly show improvement in this Indicator.

While the process has displayed the struggle to meet 100% compliance, the improved process has also assisted the Bureau in improvements to the Cornerstone system, the data reports and ways to ensure the CFCs are supported to meet the goal of ensuring all children potentially eligible for Part B are provided with the Transition Planning Conference for a smooth transition for their child.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the 7/19/2018

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that the remaining 11 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2015, eight uncorrected findings identified in FFY 2014, six uncorrected findings identified in FFY 2013, and eight uncorrected findings identified in FFY 2012 were corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 and each EIS program or provider with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2015, FFY 2014, FFY 2013, and FFY 2012: (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 or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

Required Actions

FFY16/SFY17 Annual Performance Report

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

TIMELY TRANSITION					
CFC #	Potentially Eligible for Part B	Family did not provide consent to Transition	Exceptional Family Circumstances	Timely Transition Conferences (conducted at least 90 days before 3 rd birthday)	% of Timely Transition Conferences
1	403	24	17	343	94.99%
2**	474	8	13	399	88.41%
3	227	18	22	130	72.73%
4**	683	16	31	612	96.40%
5**	889	35	63	711	90.63%
6*	1270	119	119	987	96.09%
7*	845	51	48	641	86.78%
8*	676	34	77	315	60.59%
9*	781	63	167	389	77.44%
10*	549	93	16	411	93.64%
11*	1522	258	119	408	41.69%
12*	882	37	137	534	79.41%
13	162	43	10	105	96.64%
14	434	38	18	352	93.43%
15**	1020	40	28	856	90.20%
16	423	5	2	406	97.61%
17	136	4	0	128	96.97%
18	252	2	7	236	97.20%
19	325	11	2	307	98.41%
20	243	7	2	226	96.61%
21	416	6	1	346	84.63%
22	259	1	3	245	96.12%
23	93	3	8	66	82.22%
24	107	6	3	89	91.09%
25**	340	10	30	268	90.30%
Statewide	13411	932	943	9510	83.74%
*Chicago - Cook County	3528	448	379	1523	61.66%
*Suburban - Cook County	2997	207	304	2162	88.39%
**Collar Counties (2, 4, 5, 15, & 25)	3406	109	165	2846	91.33%
Downstate (All Others)	3480	168	95	2979	92.81%
*Cook County Offices: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li style="width: 50%;">• CFC 6 - North Suburban <li style="width: 50%;">• CFC 10 - Southeast Chicago <li style="width: 50%;">• CFC 7 - West Suburban <li style="width: 50%;">• CFC 11 - North Chicago <li style="width: 50%;">• CFC 8 - Southwest Chicago <li style="width: 50%;">• CFC 12 - South Suburban <li style="width: 50%;">• CFC 9 - Central Chicago 					

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures under section 615 of the IDEA are adopted).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data:

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥											
Data											

FFY	2015
Target ≥	
Data	

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥			

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	n	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	n	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	0			0%

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2016. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

--

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 10: Mediation**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			91.00%	92.00%	93.00%	94.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%		
Data			100%		100%			100%		100%	

FFY	2015
Target ≥	
Data	100%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥			

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	2.1 Mediations held	n	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	0	0	100%		

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2016. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

--

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan**

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016
Target		77.60%	77.60%	75.90%
Data	78.40%			

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline
Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	77.30%	78.50%

Key:

Description of Measure

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Overview

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., EIS program and/or EIS provider, geographic region, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender, etc.) As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in EIS programs and/or EIS providers to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and other early learning initiatives, such as Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge and the Home Visiting program and describe the extent that these new initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and Their Families

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Analyses and must be a child- or family-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increase the rate of growth in infants and toddlers demonstrating positive social-emotional skills) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increase the percentage reported under child outcome B under Indicator 3 of the SPP/APR (knowledge and skills) and increase the percentage trend reported for families under Indicator 4 (helping their child develop and learn)).

Statement

Description

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families. The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support EIS program and/or EIS provider implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified result(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build EIS program and/or EIS provider capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in EIS programs and/or EIS providers, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

Attached is the revised Theory of Action, Phase II plan will provide justification.

Infrastructure Development

- (a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- (d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

See attached plan.

Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

- (a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- (c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

See attached plan.

Evaluation

- (a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- (c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- (d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

See attached plan.

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

See attached plan.

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Certify and Submit your SPP/APR**

I certify that I am the Director of the State's Lead Agency under Part C of the IDEA, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Selected: Designated by the Lead Agency Director to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name: Ann Freiburg

Title: Part C Coordinator

Email: Ann.Freiburg@Illinois.gov

Phone: 217-557-5387