

Board of Education Candidates Disability Questionnaire 2026**Candidate: Anthony Hargrove****District: 5b****Question 1:**

In no more than a paragraph, introduce yourself and why you are running to serve on the Board of Education.

Answer:

I'm Anthony Hargrove, a lifelong West Side Chicagoan, CPS parent, husband of a CPS educator, and an Dean and community leader with more than 20 years of experience working in and around our schools. I've served students and families as a dean, alternative education leader, giving me firsthand experience with both the challenges our schools face and the opportunities we can create. I'm running for the Chicago Board of Education in District 5B because our communities deserve a representative who understands our schools beyond reports and spreadsheets someone who has lived, worked, and raised a family here. I want to bring greater accountability, equitable resources, and stronger pathways to college, careers, and the trades while ensuring the voices of students, parents, educators, and communities are heard in every decision.

Question 2:

Many families of students with disabilities talk about the challenges they face trying to navigate the special education system in CPS. Why do you think families are so frustrated?

Answer:

Families are frustrated because navigating special education in CPS can feel unnecessarily complicated and inconsistent. Too often, parents have to fight for evaluations, services, accommodations, transportation, or simply clear communication about what their child is entitled to receive. Staffing shortages and inconsistent implementation of IEPs can make those challenges even greater. Families should not have to become experts in special education law just to advocate for their children. CPS must improve communication, strengthen staffing and accountability, and ensure every school has the resources to provide students with disabilities the services and supports outlined in their IEPs.

Background

Currently, over 60% of CPS schools are not fully ADA accessible. In practice, this means that "neighborhood schools" are not an option for many students with physical disabilities, let alone disabled

teachers, disabled parents, disabled voters, or other disabled community members visiting our schools. The 2023 CPS Facilities Master Plan identifies building accessibility as an important priority, but the district has not adopted a roadmap or plan to achieve better building accessibility.

Question 3:

What steps should the district take to address a lack of accessibility in its buildings?

Answer:

CPS needs to move from identifying accessibility as a priority to establishing a clear, funded plan for achieving it. The district should conduct and publicly report comprehensive ADA assessments of every school, prioritize buildings with the greatest barriers and highest community need, and establish measurable timelines for improvements such as accessible entrances, elevators, restrooms, classrooms, playgrounds, and emergency egress. Accessibility should also be incorporated into every major capital project rather than treated as a separate issue. Most importantly, students, families, educators, and community members with disabilities should have a meaningful role in setting priorities and evaluating progress. A neighborhood school cannot truly serve its neighborhood if members of that community cannot fully access the building.

Background:

A core tenet of The Federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act is “the right to a free and appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment.”

Despite this, CPS has a history of separating students with disabilities from their peers instead of including them in general education classrooms. A 1998 court settlement (Corey H.) required CPS to move toward *inclusion*, meaning students with disabilities should be taught alongside their non-disabled peers whenever they can make meaningful progress that way, rather than being placed in separate, more restrictive settings.

Since 2023, the number of "cluster classrooms" (separate, self-contained classrooms specifically for students with disabilities, apart from general education) has increased by over 250%.

Question 4:

As a board member, what questions would you ask to understand why the district is placing so many more students in these separate classrooms instead of general education settings?

Answer:

As a board member, I would ask for the data behind this increase Which students are being placed in cluster classrooms, at which schools, for what reasons, and how are those decisions being made? I would want to know whether each placement is based on the individual needs of the student and their

IEP not staffing shortages, scheduling, building limitations, or a lack of supports in general education classrooms. I would also ask whether families are being fully informed of less restrictive options, what outcomes students experience after placement, and whether race, disability type, neighborhood, or school resources reveal disparities. Most importantly, I would ask what investments in special education staffing, training, related services, and classroom supports are necessary to help more students successfully learn alongside their peers whenever appropriate.

Question 5:

In your opinion, what are the pros and cons of expanding cluster programming for students?

Answer:

There can be benefits to cluster programming when it is appropriate for an individual student. Smaller settings may provide more intensive instruction, specialized staff, individualized supports, and an environment better suited to some students' needs. The concern is that expanding cluster programs can lead to unnecessary segregation if placement becomes a response to staffing shortages or a lack of supports in general education rather than an individualized decision. Separate settings can also limit students' opportunities to learn and build relationships with their non-disabled peers. The goal should not be to expand or eliminate cluster programs simply based on numbers; it should be to ensure every student receives the services in their IEP in the least restrictive environment where they can meaningfully learn and succeed.

Background

Federal law allows certain students with intellectual disabilities to stay in school until they are 22. Ages 18-22 are known as the *transition years* where students focus on employment and independent living skills. Many students and families fear the "[disability cliff](#)," or lack of resources and career support that comes when students age out of the school system at the age of 22.

Question 6:

What can be done to ensure students with disabilities are well equipped for success in their career and lives after graduation?

Answer:

CPS should begin meaningful transition planning well before a student approaches graduation or age 22. Every student should have an individualized transition plan built around their strengths and goals, with access to career exploration, paid work-based learning, internships, vocational and CTE programs, independent-living skills, and connections to colleges or training programs when appropriate. CPS should also build stronger partnerships with employers, unions, community organizations, and state agencies so families are connected to adult services before students leave the district. Most importantly, families should have a clear point of contact who helps them navigate that transition. Our responsibility

should be to prepare students not simply to leave CPS, but to enter adulthood with a real pathway toward employment, independence, and a fulfilling life.

Background

According to the 2024-25 [Illinois State Report Card](#), 42% of CPS students overall were proficient in English language arts and 27% in math on the state test. Among students with IEPs (formal plans for students with disabilities), only 10.5% were proficient in ELA and 7.1% in math.

Question 7:

What is your top priority for improving educational outcomes for students with disabilities in CPS?

Answer:

My top priority would be ensuring that students with disabilities have access to strong, grade-level instruction with the individualized supports outlined in their IEPs. We cannot accept a system where having a disability predicts significantly lower academic outcomes. That means investing in qualified special education teachers and related-service providers, giving general education teachers the training and support to effectively serve students with disabilities, and closely monitoring whether IEP services are actually being delivered. I would also expect the Board to regularly review achievement, growth, attendance, and service-delivery data so we can identify gaps early, direct resources where they are needed most, and hold the district accountable for measurable improvement.