WI
Part B

FFY2016
State Performance Plan /
Annual Performance Report

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) is required to submit an Annual Performance Report (APR) which measures and reports on the State of Wisconsin's (Wisconsin) progress in meeting the targets and goals for students with disabilities specified in the Wisconsin State Performance Plan (SPP). This report is submitted each year on February 1, to the United States Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). The State is monitored on 17 indicators reflecting a mix of compliance and results indicators.

The Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2016 APR targets, results, slippage from the previous APR, and verification of correction of all previous findings of all noncompliance found in FFY 2015 are compiled in the report that follows. Procedurally compliant individualized education programs (IEP) form the basis for practices that drive improved results for students with IEPs, and WDPI has undertaken efforts to maintain substantial compliance on the set of 6 compliance indicators (4b, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13). Additionally, it has launched a large initiative, supported by professional development from WDPI staff and Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Discretionary Grants, known as *College and Career Ready IEPs.* College and Career Ready IEPs allow districts to continuously monitor the practices that lead to procedural compliance while at the same time improving key areas in developing and implementing IEPs that are correlated with improvement in academic and functional performance.

In aggregate, the results indicators (i.e. 1, 2, 3, 4a, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14) offer a snapshot of how students with IEPs are performing throughout their educational lives. The WDPI believes that the balanced monitoring approaching under Results Driven Accountability (RDA) is beginning to yield results that are visible at the statewide level. Of particular note are results for Indicator 14 which captures post-secondary education and employment outcomes. In October 2014, Wisconsin's State Superintendent's Advisory Council on Special Education set rigorous targets for all components of Indicator 14, and directed the department to increase the extent to which survey results are representative of student exiters. The WDPI is pleased to have exceeded the target for the percentage of exiters enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of graduation by approximately 5%, and with 2% growth relative to FFY 2015 data. Similarly, the percentage of exiters that reported engagement in Category C of Indicator 14 exceeded the target by approximately 4%, with 2% growth from FFY 2015. The WDPI is encouraged by outreach efforts to gather exit data, and credits the Transition Improvement Grant (TIG), an IDEA discretionary grant, for their provision of technical assistance and professional development. The overall response rate was 55% for this year's survey, and the results are demographically representative, within tenths of a percentage point in most cases, in terms of both race/ethnicity and primary disability.

The representativeness of the Indicator 8 Family Engagement Survey mirrored that of the Post-High School Outcomes survey, and is a credit to both districts and the Wisconsin Statewide Parent Educator Initiative (WSPEI), an IDEA discretionary grant focused on improving family engagement in districts. Although new survey questions were developed and utilized for FFY 2016 reporting, and represent baseline data, the results show strong agreement by families that schools facilitate parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with disabilities. The FFY 2016 data represent 88.52% combined agreement on survey questions. The WDPI has intentionally leveraged family engagement as a means to improving literacy outcomes, and has utilized WSPEI, the Regional Services Network (RSN), and the Wisconsin Family Assistance Center for Education, Training and Support (WI FACETS) grants to offer an array of literacy-specific technical assistance and professional development. In addition, our College and Career Ready IEP Forms prompt IEP teams to consider how the district and school staff will engage families in the education of the student.

Due to frequent changes in statewide assessments during the last four years of reporting, year-to-year comparisons of reading performance have been problematic. FFY 2016 data are the first where a direct comparison is possible. Professional development and technical assistance have been increasingly directed towards districts and schools that significantly underperform statewide averages. Finally, there is continued growth in Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) Indicator 5 data. For FFY 2016 reporting, there was a 1.17% increase in the number of students inside the regular classroom more than 80% of the day, and Wisconsin exceeded its target by 0.50%.

Indicator 17, to be submitted in early April, will discuss Wisconsin's continuing effort to improve the Statewide Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) as Phase III of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The SIMR is a points-based reading proficiency measure for students with disabilities in grades 3-8 based on three consecutive years of data from annual statewide assessments on reading (English Language Arts). The state met indicator 17 (SIMR) targets in FFY 2015, with negligible (0.30) slippage from the previous year.

## Attachments

| File Name | Uploaded By | Uploaded Date |
|---|---|---|
| No APR attachments found. | | |

444

**General Supervision System:**

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

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) has a general supervision system to ensure the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B requirements are met. The system is based on seven critical elements:

## 1) Establishment of effective model policies, procedures, and practices

WDPI ensures all districts have adopted policies, procedures and practices that comply with IDEA and state law. WDPI developed Model Local Educational Agency Special Education Policies and Procedures, as well as Sample Individualized Education Program (IEP) Forms, to help districts meet their obligation to establish and implement special education requirements. All districts are required to assure the department they have adopted the model policies, procedures and practices, or submit local examples to the WDPI for review and approval. In addition, districts identified with racial disproportionality conduct a review of their policies, procedures, and practices to determine and address any inappropriate identification associated with Indicators 4B, 9, and 10.

## 2) Data collection and fiscal monitoring

WDPI collects data related to SPP indicators and priority areas through the Wisconsin Student Assessment System, the WISEdata Collection System, Indicator 7 Child Outcomes Decision Tree Application, Indicator 8 Parent Involvement Survey, Post High School Outcomes Survey, Special Education Web Portal, and the WISEgrants federal grant management system. Each school year, all Wisconsin districts, including charter schools, complete, and submit an annual budget to the WDPI for review through the WISEgrants system. WISEgrants is a web based application and is the IDEA flow-through and preschool funding mechanism that must be completed in approvable form a district may encumber and expend federal monies. Through WISEgrants, districts submit their IDEA flow-through and preschool budgets and provide assurance to WDPI of compliance with state and federal special education requirements. Both the budgets and assurances are reviewed by a WDPI consultant assigned to work with the individual district. Risk-based monitoring is conducted when warranted.

## 3) Targeted training and technical assistance

WDPI develops information bulletins, training documents and modules, as well as provides statewide and regional training to ensure understanding of the requirements of IDEA and state law. Identified districts receive targeted training and technical assistance to improve results for children with disabilities, correct noncompliance or fiscal mismanagement, and address inappropriate identification resulting in racial disproportionality.

## 4) Effective, responsive dispute resolution process

WDPI has established effective, responsive systems for IDEA complaints, due process hearings, and mediation.

### IDEA Complaints

WDPI is responsible for investigating complaints and issuing decisions within 60 calendar days of receipt of the complaint. WDPI staff review all relevant information and make an independent determination about whether the district has met the Part B requirement. WDPI's decision includes findings of fact, a conclusion for each issue, and the reasons that support the decision. The complaint is closed when the WDPI verifies the district: 1) corrected each individual case of student-specific noncompliance; and 2) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s). WDPI has developed a model form to assist parents and other parties in filing an IDEA state complaint.

### Due Process

A due process hearing is requested by sending a letter or a completed sample form to WDPI. WDPI acknowledges receipt of a hearing request in a letter describing district responsibilities including the holding of a resolution session within 15 days of receiving the hearing request, or 7 days if it is an expedited due process hearing. When a hearing is requested, WDPI, by contract with the Wisconsin Department of Administration--Division of Hearings and Appeals (DHA), appoints an impartial hearing officer to conduct the hearing.

### Mediation

WDPI provides mediation, as a dispute resolution option, through the nationally recognized Wisconsin Special Education Mediation System (WSEMS). WSEMS maintains a list of mediators who are from a wide range of professional backgrounds. The system also provides a facilitated IEP meeting process. Mediation and the IEP meeting facilitation are provided at no cost to the parties. Survey data consistently indicates that participants are overwhelmingly satisfied with these processes.

## 5) Procedural Compliance Self-Assessment

WDPI uses a Procedural Compliance Self-Assessment (PCSA) to identify and correct noncompliance. Items in the PCSA are aligned with and support Wisconsin's results driven accountability system, with its focus on improving literacy outcomes for students with disabilities. Annually, the state gathers monitoring data from approximately one-fifth of the districts in the state through the PCSA. Each cohort of districts is representative of the state considering such variables as geography, disability categories, age, race, and gender. WDPI includes every district in the PCSA at least once during the five-year cycle and each district with an average daily membership greater than 50,000 every year. To assure valid and reliable data, the PCSA checklist includes standards and directions for reviewing the procedural requirements and WDPI requires all district staff conducting the assessment to complete a training and certification e-course. Information about the PCSA is posted on the WDPI website at https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/educators/rdapcsa.

## 6) Early Childhood Transition System

WDPI and the Wisconsin Department of Health Services (WDHS), the Part C lead agency, worked collaboratively to develop an electronic referral and reporting system to ensure children participating in county Birth to 3 programs (Part C) experience a smooth and effective transition to early childhood programs (Part B). County Birth to 3 programs use the Program Participation System (PPS) to refer children in county Birth to 3 programs to the district for special education. Districts receive these referrals electronically and submit data for Indicator 12 through PPS. In addition to ensuring a smooth and effective transition, this data collection system promotes accurate reporting of data. Districts report child-specific data on a real-time basis. This allows for monitoring of progress on Indicator 12 by the district and WDPI. The electronic system detects and alerts districts of noncompliance so that errors can be corrected immediately.

## 7) Postsecondary Transition Plan Application

WDPI utilizes a web-based Postsecondary Transition Plan (PTP) application to collect Indicator 13 data from all districts with students aged 16 and above with an IEP. The PTP ensures every student's IEP meets state and federal transition requirements. IEP teams develop a student's transition plan using the PTP application in real time during an IEP team meeting. Indicator 13 data is collected through the online application on an ongoing basis. The PTP application is the state data system for monitoring Indicator 13 requirements. WDPI identifies a point in time during the APR reporting period when it reviews compliance data from the database and identifies noncompliance. In making compliance decisions, WDPI reviews all data it has received since the last time the WDPI examined data from the database and made compliance decisions. WDPI makes findings of noncompliance and notifies districts when the data indicates noncompliance with the Indicator 13 transition requirements. WDPI verifies all identified noncompliance is corrected within one year.

## Attachments

| File Name | Uploaded By | Uploaded Date |
|---|---|---|
| No APR attachments found. | | |

**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 LEAs.

WDPI has a number of mechanisms in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to districts. As indicated above, within Wisconsin's general supervision system, WDPI develops information bulletins, training documents and modules, as well as provides statewide and regional training designed to improve results for children with disabilities and to ensure understanding of the requirements of IDEA and state special education law. Identified districts receive targeted training and technical assistance to improve results for children with disabilities, correct noncompliance or fiscal mismanagement, and address inappropriate identification resulting in racial disproportionality.

WDPI also has a system of supports available to those that provide professional learning opportunities in the area of special education and IEP supports. Technical assistance including webinars, conferences, trainings, communities of practice, and web based resources are systematically provided on a regular basis by WDPI Support and Special Education Services consultants.

Additionally, WDPI has a number of IDEA discretionary grant initiatives, as well as a State Personnel Development Grant focused on coaching and Professional Learning Communities, in place to systematically provide general and targeted, evidence-based technical assistance to districts based upon area of need. Examples include:

- The Wisconsin Special Education Regional Service Network (http://dpi.wi.gov/sped/educators/initiatives/regional-services-network)
- Wisconsin Statewide Parent Educator Initiative (http://wspei.org/)
- Disproportionality Technical Assistance Network (http://www.thenetworkwi.com/)
- Early Childhood Program Support and Leadership (http://dpi.wi.gov/sped/early-childhood)
- Wisconsin RtI Center (http://www.wisconsinrticenter.org/)
- Wisconsin Special Education Mediation System (http://www.wsems.us/)
- Transition Improvement Grant (http://www.witig.org/)
- 2r Charter School Special Education Capacity Building Initiative (http://dpi.wi.gov/sped/educators/discretionary-grants/summaries)
- Universal Design for Learning (http://dpi.wi.gov/universal-design-learning)
- WI Family Assistance Center for Education, Training and Support (WI FACETS) Milwaukee Public Schools Initiative (www.wifacets.org)

Finally, WDPI is an Active Scaling State with the OSEP-funded State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-Based Practices (SISEP) Center. Through this partnership, WDPI has begun to infuse principles of implementation science within its professional learning and technical assistance and has established regional implementation teams (RITs) to provide coaching to district implementation teams (DITs). RITs will coach DITs from districts who need assistance, identified through a coordinated system with Title I, and will focus on an evidence-based district improvement planning process. This coordinated process is one improvement strategy outlined in Wisconsin's State Systemic Improvement Plan.

## 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 have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

To ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities, WDPI has prioritized IDEA discretionary funds for creating, scaling up, and sustaining systems change initiatives with a focus on improved results for students with disabilities. Through these initiatives, WDPI funds professional development providers regionally throughout the state in order to equitably address the unique needs within different areas of the state. With a focus on the principles of implementation science, each initiative has mechanisms for ensuring fidelity of professional development provision, as well as evaluation processes to determine impact on service providers' practice, and where available, impact on

student-level outcomes. Each initiative has a focus on unique results for students with disabilities, while each is currently increasing its capacity to additionally address Wisconsin's State Identified Measurable Result: literacy outcomes for students with disabilities.

Examples of Wisconsin systems change initiatives with a focus on high quality professional development include:

- The Wisconsin Special Education Regional Service Network (http://dpi.wi.gov/sped/educators/initiatives/regional-services-network)
- Wisconsin RtI Center (http://www.wisconsinrticenter.org/)
- Wisconsin Statewide Parent Educator Initiative (http://wspei.org/)
- Transition Improvement Grant (http://www.witig.org/)
- Disproportionality Technical Assistance Network (http://www.thenetworkwi.com/)
- Early Childhood Program Support and Leadership (http://dpi.wi.gov/sped/early-childhood)
- State Personnel Develoment Grant: A Focus On Professional Learning Communities (http://dpi.wi.gov/sped/educators/consultation/state-personnel-development-grant)
- 2r Charter School Special Education Capacity Building Initiative (http://dpi.wi.gov/sped/educators/discretionary-grants/summaries)
- Universal Design for Learning (http://dpi.wi.gov/universal-design-learning)

---

### Attachments

| File Name | Uploaded By | Uploaded Date |
|---|---|---|
| No APR attachments found. | | |

---

**Stakeholder Involvement:** ☐ apply this to all Part B results indicators

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

WDPI has a State Superintendent's Advisory Council on Special Education (hereafter the Council) for obtaining broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets. The Council represents a diverse stakeholder group including parents of children with disabilities, regular and special education teachers, and represenatives of school boards, charter schools, private schools, institutions of higher education, the Wisconsin Department of Corrections, and the Wisconsin Department of Health Services Birth to 3 Programs. Using trend data, WDPI determined, with broad stakeholder input, the annual measurable and rigorous targets for the SPP results indicators. WDPI meets quarterly with the Council to analyze data, set targets if needed, review and revise the SPP and give updates on Wisconsin's progress. In addition to working with the Council to develop the SPP, the WDPI Special Education Team works collaboratively with the WDPI Office of Educational Accountability, the Content and Learning Team, the Literacy and Mathematics Team, and the Title I Team.

---

### 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 LEA 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 §300.602(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.

Through the Special Education District Profile, WDPI reports annually to the public on the performance of each district located in Wisconsin on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following submission of the APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A). The District Profile is posted on the WDPI website at http://dpi.wi.gov/sped/educators/local-performance-plans/profile. The District Profile includes district data, state data, the target for each indicator, sources of data, and links to additional information about each indicator. WDPI includes the most recently available performance data on each district and the date the data were obtained. WDPI does not report to the public any information on performance that would result in the disclosure of personally identifiable information about individual children or where the available data is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information. For Indicators 8, 11, and 14, WDPI uses a 5-year monitoring cycle to identify cohorts of districts for data collection. WDPI collects and reports on the performance of each district on each of the sampling indicators at least once during the course of the SPP. For all other indicators for which WDPI is required to report at the district level, WDPI reports annually on every district. Copies of the SPP and APR are posted on the WDPI website at https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/about/state-performance-plan and https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/about/state-performance-plan/apr.

To provide clarification regarding the public reporting of FFY 2015 and/or FFY 2014 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR, the Special Education District profile on WDPI's website provides data by source year and not reporting year. Indicators 1, 2, 4A and 4B are lag indicators, and therefore, the data publically posted by source year is current. WDPI will update the site to reflect both the reporting year and data source year for each of the indicators to avoid confusion.

---

### Attachments

| File Name | Uploaded By | Uploaded Date |
|---|---|---|

| File Name | Uploaded By | Uploaded Date |
|---|---|---|

No APR attachments found.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

## OSEP Response

While the State has publicly reported on the [FFY 2015 (July 1, 2015-June 30, 2016) and/or FFY 2014 (July 1, 2014-June 30, 2015)] performance of each local educational agency (LEA) located in the State on the targets in the State's performance plan as required by section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) of IDEA, those reports do not contain the required information. Specifically, the web site states that there is no data available on the State or local level for indicators 1, 2, 4A, and 4B.

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

While the State has publicly reported on the FFY 2015 (July 1, 2015-June 30, 2016) performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the State's performance plan as required by section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) of IDEA, those reports did not contain, as specified in the OSEP Response, all of the required information. With its FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the State must provide a Web link demonstrating that the State has fully reported to the public on the performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR for FFY 2015. In addition, the State must report with its FFY 2017 SPP/APR, how and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2016 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR.

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

**Results indicator:**
**Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma.**

**(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))**

---

### Historical Data

*Baseline Data: 2011*

| FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Target ≥ | | | 84.08% | 84.08% | 80.00% | 80.00% | 85.00% | 87.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% |
| Data | | 81.40% | 80.39% | 79.20% | 79.20% | 79.30% | 79.75% | 67.10% | 68.60% | 68.70% | 68.99% |

| FFY | 2015 |
|---|---|
| Target ≥ | 85.00% |
| Data | 67.51% |

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

### FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Target ≥ | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% |

Key:

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Indicator 1 targets are the same as the annual graduations rate targets set under Title I of the ESEA. WDPI meaningfully engaged and solicited input from a variety of stakeholders during the development of the Wisconsin ESEA Flexibility Request. A description of broad stakeholder involvement is found on pages 11-26 of the Wisconsin ESEA Flexibility Request. Input from advocates and educators of Special Populations is specifically covered on page 13 of the document found at https://www2.ed.gov/policy/eseaflex/approved-requests/wi2amend814.pdf#page=19.

### Prepopulated Data

| Source | Date | Description | Data | Overwrite Data |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SY 2015-16 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696) | 10/12/2017 | Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma | 4,720 | |
| SY 2015-16 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696) | 10/12/2017 | Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate | 6,886 | null |
| SY 2015-16 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695) | 10/12/2017 | 2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table | 68.54% | Calculate ☐ |

### FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

| Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma | Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate | FFY 2015 Data | FFY 2016 Target | FFY 2016 Data |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4,720 | 6,886 | 67.51% | 85.00% | 68.54% |

### Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:   4-year ACGR
Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

The four-year graduation cohort rate for FFY 2016 reporting (SY 2015-16) is 68.54%, which is a 1 percent increase relative to FFY 2015.

The requirements for obtaining a regular diploma in Wisconsin for FFY 2016 reporting are the same for students with disabilities and students without disabilities. A graduate is defined as a student who has met the requirements established by a school board for a prescribed course of study.

Wisconsin State Statute 118.33(1)(a) defines the requirements for receipt of a high school diploma as: except as provided in sec. 118.33(1)(d) (see below), a school board may not grant a high school diploma to any pupil unless the pupil has earned:

1. In the high school grades, at least 4 credits of English including writing composition, 3 credits of social studies including state and local government, 3 credits of mathematics, 3 credits of science and 1.5 credits of physical education.

2. In grades 7 to 12, at least 0.5 credit of health education.

Under Wisconsin State Statute 118.33(1)(d), a school board may grant a high school diploma to a pupil who has not satisfied the requirements under 118.33(1)(a) if all of the following apply:

1. The student was enrolled in an alternative education program, as defined in sec. 115.28(7)(e)

2. The school board determines that the student has demonstrated a level of proficiency in the subjects listed in par. (a) equivalent to that which he or she would have attained if he or she had satisfied the requirements under par. (a).

**Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above?**   No

---

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

**Results indicator:**
**Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.**

**(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))**

### Historical Data

*Baseline Data: 2005*

| FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target ≤ | | | 1.67% | 1.67% | 1.67% | 2.49% | 2.39% | 2.29% | 2.19% | 1.90% | 1.80% |
| Data | | 2.13% | 2.61% | 2.59% | 2.59% | 2.38% | 2.67% | 2.46% | 1.96% | 1.75% | 2.29% |

| FFY | 2015 |
|-----|------|
| Target ≤ | 1.70% |
| Data | 2.24% |

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

### FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|-----|------|------|------|
| Target ≤ | 1.60% | 1.50% | 1.40% |

Key:

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

WDPI staff presented background information and target options for Indicators 2, 5, 6, 15, and 16 at the April 2014 meeting of the State Superintendent's Council on Special Education (see Introduction to the SPP/APR for more information on the Council). Following analysis and discussion, stakeholders approved these targets by consensus.

**Please indicate whether you are reporting using Option 1 or Option 2.**

○ Option 1
◉ Option 2

**Has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2 when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012?** No

### FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

| Number of youth with IEPs age 14-21 who exit special education as a result of dropping out. | Number of youth with IEPs age 14-21 who are expected to graduate in a given year. | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1,093 | 51,122 | 2.24% | 1.60% | 2.14% |

☑ **Use a different calculation methodology**
   ☑ Change numerator description in data table
   ☑ Change denominator description in data table

**Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.**

WDPI uses the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving in a single year in accordance with the National Center for Educational Statistics guidance. The calculation is the percentage of youth with IEPs age 14-21 who exit special education as a result of dropping out relative to all youth with IEPs age 14-21 who are expected to graduate in a given year. WDPI is reporting 2015-2016 data for FFY 2016.

**Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth.**

The dropout rate is the number of students who dropped out during the school term divided by the total expected to complete that school term in that school or district. "Total expected to complete the school term" is the denominator used to calculate all dropout rates and is the sum of (a) students who completed the school term plus (b) dropouts.

The "total expected to complete the school term" may be more or less than the enrollment count because this "total" adjusts for student transfers in and out after the enrollment count date. More information available at https://dpi.wi.gov/wisedash/about-data/dropouts.

The department calculates the dropout rate uniformly across all students and subgroups, including students with IEPs.

**Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs?**    No

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

**Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:**

    A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
    B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
    C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

**(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))**

## Historical Data

| | Group Name | Baseline Year | FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reading | A Grade 3 | 2015 | Target ≥ | | | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| | | | Data | | 99.15% | 98.34% | 98.30% | 98.96% | 99.00% | 99.00% | 99.00% | 99.20% | 99.20% | 96.30% |
| | B Grade 4 | 2015 | Target ≥ | | | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| | | | Data | | 99.13% | 98.64% | 98.19% | 99.04% | 99.00% | 99.00% | 99.00% | 99.50% | 99.35% | 96.09% |
| | C Grade 5 | 2015 | Target ≥ | | | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| | | | Data | | 99.57% | 98.75% | 98.81% | 99.25% | 99.00% | 99.00% | 99.00% | 99.40% | 99.49% | 96.96% |
| | D Grade 6 | 2015 | Target ≥ | | | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| | | | Data | | 99.22% | 98.98% | 98.68% | 99.20% | 99.00% | 99.00% | 99.00% | 99.20% | 99.14% | 96.50% |
| | E Grade 7 | 2015 | Target ≥ | | | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| | | | Data | | 98.99% | 98.98% | 98.55% | 99.21% | 99.00% | 99.00% | 99.00% | 99.20% | 99.20% | 95.47% |
| | F Grade 8 | 2015 | Target ≥ | | | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| | | | Data | | 98.71% | 98.45% | 98.17% | 99.01% | 99.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% | 98.90% | 98.92% | 94.70% |
| | G Grade 11 | 2015 | Target ≥ | | | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| | | | Data | | 96.33% | 96.61% | 96.00% | 97.40% | 97.00% | 97.00% | 97.00% | 97.80% | 97.85% | 84.09% |
| Math | A Grade 3 | 2015 | Target ≥ | | | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| | | | Data | | 99.14% | 99.20% | 99.14% | 99.52% | 99.00% | 99.00% | 99.00% | 99.40% | 99.23% | 96.11% |
| | B Grade 4 | 2015 | Target ≥ | | | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| | | | Data | | 99.26% | 99.24% | 98.68% | 99.42% | 99.00% | 99.00% | 99.00% | 99.60% | 99.32% | 95.74% |
| | C Grade 5 | 2015 | Target ≥ | | | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| | | | Data | | 99.46% | 99.33% | 98.97% | 99.42% | 99.00% | 100% | 99.00% | 99.40% | 99.44% | 96.57% |
| | D Grade 6 | 2015 | Target ≥ | | | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| | | | Data | | 99.30% | 98.90% | 98.69% | 99.44% | 99.00% | 99.00% | 99.00% | 99.30% | 99.11% | 95.62% |
| | E Grade 7 | 2015 | Target ≥ | | | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| | | | Data | | 98.98% | 99.20% | 98.57% | 99.42% | 99.00% | 99.00% | 99.00% | 99.30% | 99.17% | 94.73% |
| | F Grade 8 | 2015 | Target ≥ | | | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| | | | Data | | 98.61% | 98.55% | 98.08% | 99.30% | 99.00% | 99.00% | 99.00% | 98.90% | 98.97% | 93.94% |
| | G Grade 11 | 2015 | Target ≥ | | | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| | | | Data | | 96.42% | 96.70% | 95.96% | 97.44% | 97.00% | 97.00% | 97.00% | 97.40% | 97.57% | 86.10% |

| | Group Name | FFY | 2015 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Reading | A Grade 3 | Target ≥ | 95.00% |
| | | Data | 97.37% |
| | B Grade 4 | Target ≥ | 95.00% |
| | | Data | 96.85% |
| | C Grade 5 | Target ≥ | 95.00% |
| | | Data | 97.14% |
| | D Grade 6 | Target ≥ | 95.00% |
| | | Data | 97.21% |
| | E Grade 7 | Target ≥ | 95.00% |
| | | Data | 96.62% |
| | F Grade 8 | Target ≥ | 95.00% |
| | | Data | 95.55% |

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

| | Group Name | FFY | 2015 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Math | G<br>Grade 11 | Target ≥ | 95.00% |
| | | Data | 86.64% |
| | A<br>Grade 3 | Target ≥ | 95.00% |
| | | Data | 97.30% |
| | B<br>Grade 4 | Target ≥ | 95.00% |
| | | Data | 96.76% |
| | C<br>Grade 5 | Target ≥ | 95.00% |
| | | Data | 97.10% |
| | D<br>Grade 6 | Target ≥ | 95.00% |
| | | Data | 97.07% |
| | E<br>Grade 7 | Target ≥ | 95.00% |
| | | Data | 96.46% |
| | F<br>Grade 8 | Target ≥ | 95.00% |
| | | Data | 95.67% |
| | G<br>Grade 11 | Target ≥ | 95.00% |
| | | Data | 92.16% |

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

## FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| | FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reading | A ≥<br>Grade 3 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| | B ≥<br>Grade 4 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| | C ≥<br>Grade 5 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| | D ≥<br>Grade 6 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| | E ≥<br>Grade 7 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| | F ≥<br>Grade 8 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| | G ≥<br>Grade 11 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | A ≥<br>Grade 3 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| | B ≥<br>Grade 4 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| | C ≥<br>Grade 5 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| | D ≥<br>Grade 6 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| | E ≥<br>Grade 7 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| | F ≥<br>Grade 8 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| | G ≥<br>Grade 11 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |

Key:

## Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

These targets align with the requirements under the Every Student Succeeds Act. These targets were unanimously agreed upon and formally approved by Council at the December 2017 meeting of the State Superintendent's Council on Special Education.

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| Group Name | Number of Children with IEPs | Number of Children with IEPs Participating | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A Grade 3 | 8,937 | 8,739 | 97.37% | 95.00% | 97.78% |
| B Grade 4 | 9,212 | 8,966 | 96.85% | 95.00% | 97.33% |
| C Grade 5 | 9,020 | 8,810 | 97.14% | 95.00% | 97.67% |
| D Grade 6 | 8,644 | 8,393 | 97.21% | 95.00% | 97.10% |
| E Grade 7 | 8,722 | 8,467 | 96.62% | 95.00% | 97.08% |
| F Grade 8 | 8,599 | 8,258 | 95.55% | 95.00% | 96.03% |
| G Grade 11 | 8,251 | 7,539 | 86.64% | 95.00% | 91.37% |

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| Group Name | Number of Children with IEPs | Number of Children with IEPs Participating | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A Grade 3 | 8,943 | 8,748 | 97.30% | 95.00% | 97.82% |
| B Grade 4 | 9,217 | 8,989 | 96.76% | 95.00% | 97.53% |
| C Grade 5 | 9,031 | 8,823 | 97.10% | 95.00% | 97.70% |
| D Grade 6 | 8,645 | 8,404 | 97.07% | 95.00% | 97.21% |
| E Grade 7 | 8,723 | 8,476 | 96.46% | 95.00% | 97.17% |
| F Grade 8 | 8,596 | 8,250 | 95.67% | 95.00% | 95.97% |
| G Grade 11 | 8,251 | 7,551 | 92.16% | 95.00% | 91.52% |

**Public Reporting Information**

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

Public reports of assessment results are posted on the WDPI website: WISEdash (Wisconsin Information System for Education Data Dashboard) at http://wisedash.dpi.wi.gov/Dashboard/portalHome.jsp.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

# FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
# Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

**Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:**

    A.  Indicator 3A -- Reserved
    B.  Participation rate for children with IEPs.
    C.  Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

**(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))**

## Historical Data

| | Group Name | Baseline Year | FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Reading** | A Grade 3 | 2015 | Target ≥ | | | 67.50% | 74.00% | 74.00% | 74.00% | 80.50% | 19.80% | 25.80% | 31.80% | 37.80% |
| | | | Data | | 50.37% | 50.64% | 51.47% | 50.85% | 51.00% | 51.00% | 17.00% | 17.40% | 17.98% | 27.88% |
| | B Grade 4 | 2015 | Target ≥ | | | 67.50% | 74.00% | 74.00% | 74.00% | 80.50% | 19.80% | 25.80% | 31.80% | 37.80% |
| | | | Data | | 52.94% | 52.35% | 50.20% | 51.43% | 51.00% | 53.00% | 17.00% | 15.60% | 16.74% | 25.28% |
| | C Grade 5 | 2015 | Target ≥ | | | 67.50% | 74.00% | 74.00% | 74.00% | 80.50% | 19.80% | 25.80% | 31.80% | 37.80% |
| | | | Data | | 49.76% | 52.74% | 52.60% | 47.59% | 46.00% | 54.00% | 15.00% | 15.60% | 14.62% | 22.89% |
| | D Grade 6 | 2015 | Target ≥ | | | 67.50% | 74.00% | 74.00% | 74.00% | 80.50% | 19.80% | 25.80% | 31.80% | 37.80% |
| | | | Data | | 47.00% | 50.98% | 50.95% | 48.07% | 51.00% | 53.00% | 14.00% | 13.30% | 13.18% | 16.54% |
| | E Grade 7 | 2015 | Target ≥ | | | 67.50% | 74.00% | 74.00% | 74.00% | 80.50% | 19.80% | 25.80% | 31.80% | 37.80% |
| | | | Data | | 47.12% | 49.47% | 49.53% | 51.67% | 53.00% | 53.00% | 14.00% | 13.90% | 13.89% | 16.88% |
| | F Grade 8 | 2015 | Target ≥ | | | 67.50% | 74.00% | 74.00% | 74.00% | 80.50% | 19.80% | 25.80% | 31.80% | 37.80% |
| | | | Data | | 49.19% | 47.85% | 46.97% | 50.48% | 48.00% | 53.00% | 11.00% | 13.30% | 12.22% | 18.97% |
| | G Grade 11 | 2015 | Target ≥ | | | 67.50% | 74.00% | 74.00% | 74.00% | 80.50% | 19.80% | 25.80% | 31.80% | 37.80% |
| | | | Data | | 32.10% | 33.40% | 31.82% | 35.84% | 38.00% | 36.00% | 14.00% | 13.90% | 13.79% | 14.00% |
| **Math** | A Grade 3 | 2015 | Target ≥ | | | 47.50% | 58.00% | 58.00% | 58.00% | 68.50% | 28.20% | 35.60% | 43.00% | 50.40% |
| | | | Data | | 49.65% | 52.97% | 53.90% | 55.40% | 57.00% | 54.00% | 32.00% | 28.80% | 30.46% | 29.14% |
| | B Grade 4 | 2015 | Target ≥ | | | 47.50% | 58.00% | 58.00% | 58.00% | 68.50% | 28.20% | 35.60% | 43.00% | 50.40% |
| | | | Data | | 48.21% | 53.21% | 51.72% | 58.88% | 58.00% | 55.00% | 30.00% | 27.60% | 28.76% | 24.49% |
| | C Grade 5 | 2015 | Target ≥ | | | 47.50% | 58.00% | 58.00% | 58.00% | 68.50% | 28.20% | 35.60% | 43.00% | 50.40% |
| | | | Data | | 43.00% | 46.54% | 46.66% | 51.10% | 51.00% | 51.00% | 26.00% | 25.10% | 25.18% | 16.62% |
| | D Grade 6 | 2015 | Target ≥ | | | 47.50% | 58.00% | 58.00% | 58.00% | 68.50% | 28.20% | 35.60% | 43.00% | 50.40% |
| | | | Data | | 37.35% | 42.36% | 41.07% | 43.12% | 44.00% | 46.00% | 20.00% | 22.40% | 20.35% | 14.24% |
| | E Grade 7 | 2015 | Target ≥ | | | 47.50% | 58.00% | 58.00% | 58.00% | 68.50% | 28.20% | 35.60% | 43.00% | 50.40% |
| | | | Data | | 36.27% | 42.55% | 40.62% | 42.81% | 47.00% | 44.00% | 18.00% | 17.80% | 18.82% | 13.25% |
| | F Grade 8 | 2015 | Target ≥ | | | 47.50% | 58.00% | 58.00% | 58.00% | 68.50% | 28.20% | 35.60% | 43.00% | 50.40% |
| | | | Data | | 34.86% | 36.64% | 36.73% | 43.02% | 42.00% | 43.00% | 16.00% | 16.10% | 16.52% | 10.66% |
| | G Grade 11 | 2015 | Target ≥ | | | 47.50% | 58.00% | 58.00% | 58.00% | 68.50% | 28.20% | 35.60% | 43.00% | 50.40% |
| | | | Data | | 28.38% | 28.80% | 25.79% | 29.25% | 29.00% | 31.00% | 14.00% | 14.40% | 13.33% | 7.67% |

| | Group Name | FFY | 2015 |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Reading** | A Grade 3 | Target ≥ | 43.80% |
| | | Data | 19.01% |
| | B Grade 4 | Target ≥ | 43.80% |
| | | Data | 18.00% |
| | C Grade 5 | Target ≥ | 43.80% |
| | | Data | 14.77% |
| | D Grade 6 | Target ≥ | 43.80% |
| | | Data | 12.42% |
| | E Grade 7 | Target ≥ | 43.80% |
| | | Data | 12.51% |
| | F Grade 8 | Target ≥ | 43.80% |
| | | Data | 11.06% |

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

| | Group Name | FFY | 2015 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **G**<br>Grade 11 | Target ≥ | 43.80% |
| | | Data | 11.83% |
| Math | **A**<br>Grade 3 | Target ≥ | 57.80% |
| | | Data | 24.12% |
| | **B**<br>Grade 4 | Target ≥ | 57.80% |
| | | Data | 20.66% |
| | **C**<br>Grade 5 | Target ≥ | 57.80% |
| | | Data | 17.37% |
| | **D**<br>Grade 6 | Target ≥ | 57.80% |
| | | Data | 13.05% |
| | **E**<br>Grade 7 | Target ≥ | 57.80% |
| | | Data | 9.86% |
| | **F**<br>Grade 8 | Target ≥ | 57.80% |
| | | Data | 7.27% |
| | **G**<br>Grade 11 | Target ≥ | 57.80% |
| | | Data | 6.12% |

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

| | FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reading | **A ≥**<br>Grade 3 | 19.01% | 19.01% | 21.20% |
| | **B ≥**<br>Grade 4 | 18.00% | 18.00% | 21.20% |
| | **C ≥**<br>Grade 5 | 14.80% | 17.40% | 21.20% |
| | **D ≥**<br>Grade 6 | 13.60% | 17.40% | 21.20% |
| | **E ≥**<br>Grade 7 | 13.60% | 17.40% | 21.20% |
| | **F ≥**<br>Grade 8 | 13.60% | 17.40% | 21.20% |
| | **G ≥**<br>Grade 11 | 13.60% | 17.40% | 21.20% |
| Math | **A ≥**<br>Grade 3 | 24.20% | 24.20% | 24.20% |
| | **B ≥**<br>Grade 4 | 20.70% | 20.70% | 21.00% |
| | **C ≥**<br>Grade 5 | 17.40% | 17.40% | 21.00% |
| | **D ≥**<br>Grade 6 | 13.60% | 17.30% | 21.00% |
| | **E ≥**<br>Grade 7 | 13.60% | 17.30% | 21.00% |
| | **F ≥**<br>Grade 8 | 13.60% | 17.30% | 21.00% |
| | **G ≥**<br>Grade 11 | 13.60% | 17.30% | 21.00% |

Key:

**Explanation of Changes**

Updated targets reflect stakeholder consensus that, given new baseline data from the Forward Exam, performance goals should be aligned with Wisconsin's Consolidated State Plan under Every Student Suceeds Act, which aims to close achivement gaps between students with and without IEPs by 50% by 2022-2023.

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

These targets align with Wisconsin's Consolidated State Plan under the Every Student Succeeds Act, which was approved on January 16, 2018. The department meaningfully engaged and solicited extensive input from a variety of stakeholders during the development of Wisconsin's Consolidated State

Plan. Additionally, these targets were formally approved and adopted by Council on December 8, 2017. These targets allow for a 3.8% aggregate yearly increase in reading proficiency and a 3.7% aggregate yearly increase in math proficiency. Council also voted to revisit the targets before submission of the FFY 2017 APR.

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| Group Name | Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned | Number of Children with IEPs Proficient | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A Grade 3 | 8,739 | 1,635 | 19.01% | 19.01% | 18.71% |
| B Grade 4 | 8,966 | 1,701 | 18.00% | 18.00% | 18.97% |
| C Grade 5 | 8,810 | 1,348 | 14.77% | 14.80% | 15.30% |
| D Grade 6 | 8,393 | 1,032 | 12.42% | 13.60% | 12.30% |
| E Grade 7 | 8,467 | 1,016 | 12.51% | 13.60% | 12.00% |
| F Grade 8 | 8,258 | 864 | 11.06% | 13.60% | 10.46% |
| G Grade 11 | 7,539 | 771 | 11.83% | 13.60% | 10.23% |

**Reasons for Group G Slippage**

Grade-level specific slippage from FFY 2015 to FFY 2016 may be the result of several factors including the cohort nature of assessment data (i.e. slippage does not reflect cohort level changes) and changes in the number of students taking the assessment. For FFY 2016, there was a 4.9% decrease in the number of students scoring proficient or advanced in 11th grade, and a 10% increase in the number of students taking the assessment.

The WDPI will continue to focus on student performance on the statewide reading assessment as it is the state's area of focus under our State System Improvement Plan (SSIP). Many of the improvement strategies in our SSIP involve in-depth systems change. In addition, the WDPI has undergone substantial efforts to improve results using regional, district, and school-level directed professional development and technical assistance (e.g. through discretionary grants). As we are implementing these strategies, we will be evaluating the effectiveness of the strategies in accordance with our SSIP evaluation plan. (See Indicator 17 for more information).

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| Group Name | Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned | Number of Children with IEPs Proficient | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A Grade 3 | 8,748 | 2,091 | 24.12% | 24.20% | 23.90% |
| B Grade 4 | 8,989 | 1,741 | 20.66% | 20.70% | 19.37% |
| C Grade 5 | 8,823 | 1,438 | 17.37% | 17.40% | 16.30% |
| D Grade 6 | 8,404 | 1,067 | 13.05% | 13.60% | 12.70% |
| E Grade 7 | 8,476 | 818 | 9.86% | 13.60% | 9.65% |
| F Grade 8 | 8,250 | 544 | 7.27% | 13.60% | 6.59% |
| G Grade 11 | 7,551 | 515 | 6.12% | 13.60% | 6.82% |

**Reasons for Group B Slippage**

Grade-level specific slippage from FFY 2015 to FFY 2016 may be the result of several factors including the cohort nature of assessment data (i.e. slippage does not reflect cohort level changes) and changes in the number of students taking the assessment. For FFY 2016, there was a 4.7% increase in the number of students scoring proficient or advanced in 4th grade, and a 9.6% increase in the number of students taking the assessment.

The WDPI will continue to focus on student performance on the statewide math assessment. Many of the improvement strategies in our State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) involve in-depth systems change, leading to improvement across all acadmic areas, including math. As we are implementing these strategies, we will be evaluating the effectiveness of the strategies in accordance with our SSIP. In addition, the WDPI has undergone substantial efforts to improve results across all academic areas using regional, district, and school-level directed professional development and technical assistance (e.g. through discretionary grants). This has included increasing special education staff positions to focus on improvement activities, including using data to identify improvement strategies at the school level.

**Reasons for Group C Slippage**

Grade-level specific slippage from FFY 2015 to FFY 2016 may be the result of several factors including the cohort nature of assessment data (i.e. slippage does not reflect cohort level changes) and changes in the number of students taking the assessment. For FFY 2016, there was a 3.8% decrease in the number of students scoring proficient or advanced in 5th grade, and a 7.6% increase in the number of students taking the assessment.

The WDPI will continue to focus on student performance on the statewide math assessment. Many of the improvement strategies in our State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) involve in-depth systems change, leading to improvement across all acadmic areas, including math. As we are implementing these strategies, we will be evaluating the effectiveness of the strategies in accordance with our SSIP. In addition, the WDPI has undergone substantial efforts to improve results across all academic areas using regional, district, and school-level directed professional development and technical assistance (e.g. through discretionary grants). This has included increasing special education staff positions to focus on improvement activities, including using data to identify improvement strategies at the school level.

**Reasons for Group E Slippage**

Grade-level specific slippage from FFY 2015 to FFY 2016 may be the result of several factors including the cohort nature of assessment data (i.e. slippage does not reflect cohort level changes) and changes in the number of students taking the assessment. For FFY 2016, there was a 2.4% increase in the number of students scoring proficient or advanced in 7th grade, and a 4.6% increase in the number of students taking the assessment.

The WDPI will continue to focus on student performance on the statewide math assessment. Many of the improvement strategies in our State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) involve in-depth systems change, leading to improvement across all acadmic areas, including math. As we are implementing these strategies, we will be evaluating the effectiveness of the strategies in accordance with our SSIP. In addition, the WDPI has undergone substantial efforts to improve results across all academic areas using regional, district, and school-level directed professional development and technical assistance (e.g. through discretionary grants). This has included increasing special education staff positions to focus on improvement activities, including using data to identify improvement strategies at the school level.

**Reasons for Group F Slippage**

Grade-level specific slippage from FFY 2015 to FFY 2016 may be the result of several factors including the cohort nature of assessment data (i.e. slippage does not reflect cohort level changes) and changes in the number of students taking the assessment. For FFY 2016, there was a 7.4% decrease in the number of students scoring proficient or advanced in 8th grade, and a 2.0% increase in the number of students taking the assessment.

The WDPI will continue to focus on student performance on the statewide math assessment. Many of the improvement strategies in our State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) involve in-depth systems change, leading to improvement across all acadmic areas, including math. As we are implementing these strategies, we will be evaluating the effectiveness of the strategies in accordance with our SSIP. In addition, the WDPI has undergone substantial efforts to improve results across all academic areas using regional, district, and school-level directed professional development and technical assistance (e.g. through discretionary grants). This has included increasing special education staff positions to focus on improvement activities, including using data to identify improvement strategies at the school level.

**Public Reporting Information**

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

Public reports of assessment results are posted on the WDPI website: WISEdash (Wisconsin Information System for Education Data Dashboard) at http://wisedash.dpi.wi.gov/Dashboard/portalHome.jsp.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

**Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:**

    A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

    B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

**(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))**

## Historical Data

*Baseline Data: 2005*

| FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Target ≤ | | | 3.19% | 2.96% | 2.96% | 2.73% | 2.51% | 2.28% | 2.05% | 2.50% | 2.50% |
| Data | | 4.00% | 1.14% | 0.68% | 0.68% | 0.68% | 0.45% | 0.90% | 1.13% | 1.57% | 2.24% |

| FFY | 2015 |
|---|---|
| Target ≤ | 2.50% |
| Data | 2.45% |

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

### FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Target ≤ | 2.50% | 2.50% | 2.50% |

Key:

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

WDPI staff presented background information and target options for Indicator 4A at the July 2014 meeting of the State Superintendent's Council on Special Education (see Introduction to the SPP/APR for more information on the Council). WDPI identifies districts as having a significant discrepancy if the percent of students with IEPs suspended or expelled for greater than ten days is two standard deviations above the statewide average. Given the nature of this calculation, WDPI recommended a static target of 2.50% of districts, which aligns with the criterion of two standard deviations greater than the state mean. Council unanimously approved these targets.

### FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement?   ○ Yes  ● No

| Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy | Number of districts in the State | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11 | 449 | 2.45% | 2.50% | 2.45% |

**Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a)):**

● Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State

○ The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

### State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

WDPI defines significant discrepancy as a district rate of suspension or expulsion for students with IEPs of greater than ten days that is two standard deviations above the average statewide rate (statewide risk). For FFY 2016 reporting (using data from the 2015-16 school year), the average statewide risk was 0.171 and the standard deviation was 0.656%. Thus, districts with a rate of suspension or expulsion greater than 1.48% were identified with significant discrepancy for FFY 2016 reporting.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

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.

**FFY 2015 Identification of Noncompliance**

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices** (completed in FFY 2016 using 2015-2016 data)
Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

For districts identified in FFY 2016 with significant discrepancy (using 2015-2016 data), a review was conducted of the districts' policies, procedures, and practices that impact suspension and expulsion rates, including the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). Based on WDPI's review, it was determined that the policies, procedures, and practices were in compliance for all districts identified under Indicator 4A.

◉ The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

○ The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

**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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

**Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:**

    A.  Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

    B.  Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

**(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))**

## Historical Data

*Baseline Data: 2009*

| FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | | | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | | | | | | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

| FFY | 2015 |
|-----|------|
| Target | 0% |
| Data | 0% |

Key:   ☐ Gray – Data Prior to Baseline   ☐ Yellow – Baseline

## FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|-----|------|------|------|
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% |

## FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement?   ○ Yes   ◉ No

| Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity | Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements | Number of districts in the State | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 35 | 0 | 449 | 0% | 0% | 0% |

☑ **All races and ethnicities were included in the review**

### State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

WDPI defines significant discrepancy as districts with a rate of suspension or expulsion of greater than 10 days for students with IEPs within each racial/ethnic subgroup that is two standard deviations above the average statewide rate. For FFY 2016 reporting (using data from the 2015-16 school year) the statewide risk was 0.171% and the standard deviation was 0.656%. Thus, districts with a rate of suspension or expulsion greater than 1.484% were identified with significant discrepancy.

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

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.

**FFY 2015 Identification of Noncompliance**

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices** (completed in FFY 2016 using 2015-2016 data)

For districts identified in FFY 2016 with significant discrepancy (using 2015-2016 data), WDPI conducted a review of the districts' policies, procedures, and practices that impact suspension and expulsion rates, including the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). The districts have either adopted WDPI's model policies and procedures or have submitted policies and procedures that have been reviewed and approved by WDPI staff. Likewise, with IEP forms, the districts have either adopted the department's model IEP forms or use forms approved by WDPI. In addition, identified districts conduct a Disproportionality Procedural Compliance Self-Assessment where districts review a sample of student records, disaggregated by race, and assess related compliance items as identified by OSEP, which is verified by the department. WDPI also reviewed IDEA State complaint decisions, due process decisions, and pupil nondiscrimination appeals, and conducted additional record reviews and interviews using standard protocols.

Based on the review as described above, there were 0 districts with policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

◉ The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

◯ The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

**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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

**Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:**

- A. **Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;**
- B. **Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and**
- C. **In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.**

**(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))**

**Historical Data**

|   | Baseline Year | FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **A** | 2005 | Target ≥ |  |  | 52.00% | 53.00% | 55.00% | 57.50% | 60.00% | 62.50% | 65.00% | 62.00% | 63.60% |
|   |   | Data |  | 50.83% | 51.09% | 53.57% | 54.74% | 54.58% | 56.11% | 59.42% | 61.91% | 63.54% | 65.10% |
| **B** | 2005 | Target ≤ |  |  | 11.20% | 10.90% | 10.60% | 10.30% | 10.00% | 9.70% | 9.40% | 9.90% | 9.50% |
|   |   | Data |  | 12.09% | 12.01% | 11.24% | 11.20% | 10.97% | 10.56% | 10.01% | 9.97% | 9.75% | 9.56% |
| **C** | 2005 | Target ≤ |  |  | 1.20% | 1.15% | 1.10% | 1.05% | 1.00% | 0.95% | 0.90% | 1.20% | 1.15% |
|   |   | Data |  | 1.43% | 1.35% | 1.26% | 1.25% | 1.21% | 1.20% | 1.20% | 1.23% | 1.40% | 1.43% |

|   | FFY | 2015 |
|---|---|---|
| **A** | Target ≥ | 65.20% |
|   | Data | 66.22% |
| **B** | Target ≤ | 9.10% |
|   | Data | 9.16% |
| **C** | Target ≤ | 1.10% |
|   | Data | 1.50% |

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

| FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Target A ≥ | 66.80% | 68.40% | 70.00% |
| Target B ≤ | 8.70% | 8.30% | 7.90% |
| Target C ≤ | 1.05% | 1.00% | 0.95% |

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

WDPI staff presented background information and target options for Indicators 2, 5, 6, 15, and 16 at the April 2014 meeting of the State Superintendent's Council on Special Education (see Introduction to the SPP/APR for more information on the Council). Following analysis and discussion, stakeholders approved Indicator 5 targets by consensus. In selecting these targets, stakeholders recognized the least restrictive environment decision is made by an IEP team and is determined in recognition of the individual needs of a child.

**Prepopulated Data**

| Source | Date | Description | Data | Overwrite Data |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74) | 7/13/2017 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 | 103,230 | null |
| SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74) | 7/13/2017 | A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 69,562 | null |
| SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74) | 7/13/2017 | B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 9,124 | null |
| SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74) | 7/13/2017 | c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools | 992 | null |

| Source | Date | Description | Data | Overwrite Data |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74) | 7/13/2017 | c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities | 241 | null |
| SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74) | 7/13/2017 | c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements | 242 | null |

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

| | Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served | Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 69,562 | 103,230 | 66.22% | 66.80% | 67.39% |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 9,124 | 103,230 | 9.16% | 8.70% | 8.84% |
| C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3] | 1,475 | 103,230 | 1.50% | 1.05% | 1.43% |

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

**Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending a:**

    A.  Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and

    B.  Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

**(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))**

## Historical Data

| | Baseline Year | FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **A** | 2011 | Target ≥ | | | | | | | | | 32.00% | 32.50% | 33.50% |
| | | Data | | | | | | | | 30.98% | 32.56% | 34.33% | 35.16% |
| **B** | 2011 | Target ≤ | | | | | | | | | 25.00% | 22.25% | 21.25% |
| | | Data | | | | | | | | 25.89% | 22.25% | 20.34% | 18.53% |

| | FFY | 2015 |
|---|---|---|
| **A** | Target ≥ | 34.50% |
| | Data | 35.91% |
| **B** | Target ≤ | 20.25% |
| | Data | 16.75% |

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

## FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Target A ≥ | 35.50% | 36.50% | 37.50% |
| Target B ≤ | 19.25% | 18.25% | 17.25% |

Key:

## Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

WDPI staff presented background information and target options for Indicators 2, 5, 6, 15, and 16 at the April 2014 meeting of the State Superintendent's Council on Special Education (see Introduction to the SPP/APR for more information on the Council). Following analysis and discussion, stakeholders approved Indicator 6 targets by consensus. In selecting these targets, stakeholders recognized the least restrictive environment decision is made by an IEP team and is determined in recognition of the individual needs of a child.

## Prepopulated Data

| Source | Date | Description | Data | Overwrite Data |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613) | 7/13/2017 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 | 15,121 | null |
| SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613) | 7/13/2017 | a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program | 4,904 | null |
| SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613) | 7/13/2017 | b1. Number of children attending separate special education class | 2,883 | null |
| SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613) | 7/13/2017 | b2. Number of children attending separate school | 45 | null |
| SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613) | 7/13/2017 | b3. Number of children attending residential facility | n | null |

## FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

| | Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending | Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program | 4,904 | 15,121 | 35.91% | 35.50% | 32.43% |
| B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 2,928 | 15,121 | 16.75% | 19.25% | 19.36% |

☐ **Use a different calculation methodology**

**Reasons for A Slippage**

Slippage in indicators 6A and 6B are driven by two major factors: first, relative to FFY 2016 there was a reported 9% increase in students attending separate special education classes from FFY 2015 to 2016, and second, FFY 2016 was the first year that child count was collected through the WDPI's WISEdata System, which required new training for district staff and vendors.

To address this slippage, WDPI will monitor this data and continue to work with vendors and districts to ensure accurate data reporting. In addition, preschool inclusion continues to be a state-wide initiative. For FFY 2017, WDPI identified through a data matrix thirteen districts for the purpose of receiving focused assistance related to increasing preschool inclusion. This focused district work is being led by the discretionary grant funded early childhood program support teachers located regionally throughout the state and is expected to continue for several years. Another twelve districts will be added during FFY 2018. Additionally, the WDPI is working with the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) for the purpose of promoting preschool inclusive practices.

**Reasons for B Slippage**

Slippage in indicators 6A and 6B are driven by two major factors: first, relative to FFY 2016 there was a reported 9% increase in students attending separate special education classes from FFY 2015 to 2016, and second, FFY 2016 was the first year that child count was collected through the WDPI's WISEdata System, which required new training for district staff and vendors. To address this slippage, WDPI will monitor this data and continue to work with vendors and districts to ensure accurate data reporting.

Preschool inclusion continues to be a state-wide initiative. For FFY 2017, WDPI identified through a data matrix thirteen districts for the purpose of receiving focused assistance related to increasing preschool inclusion. This focused district work is being led by the discretionary grant funded early childhood program support teachers located regionally throughout the state and is expected to continue for several years. Another twelve districts will be added during FFY 2018. Additionally, the WDPI is working with the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) for the purpose of promoting preschool inclusive practices.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

**Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:**

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

**(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))**

**Historical Data**

| | Baseline Year | FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A1 | 2012 | Target ≥ | | | | | | 79.20% | 79.40% | 79.60% | | 78.50% | 78.70% |
| | | Data | | | | | 79.00% | 78.40% | 79.30% | 80.50% | 78.20% | 79.25% | 79.13% |
| A2 | 2012 | Target ≥ | | | | | | 69.70% | 69.90% | 70.10% | | 72.50% | 73.00% |
| | | Data | | | | | 69.50% | 67.00% | 65.70% | 69.10% | 72.50% | 68.75% | 64.55% |
| B1 | 2012 | Target ≥ | | | | | | 82.10% | 82.30% | 82.50% | | 79.50% | 79.85% |
| | | Data | | | | | 81.90% | 82.10% | 80.70% | 82.80% | 79.50% | 82.58% | 82.08% |
| B2 | 2012 | Target ≥ | | | | | | 61.90% | 70.10% | 70.30% | | 61.00% | 61.20% |
| | | Data | | | | | 61.70% | 59.60% | 54.70% | 59.20% | 60.80% | 58.03% | 53.20% |
| C1 | 2012 | Target ≥ | | | | | | 82.00% | 82.20% | 82.40% | | 78.50% | 78.90% |
| | | Data | | | | | 81.80% | 83.40% | 82.10% | 83.50% | 78.20% | 80.71% | 81.34% |
| C2 | 2012 | Target ≥ | | | | | | 80.40% | 80.50% | 80.60% | | 81.50% | 81.70% |
| | | Data | | | | | 80.30% | 79.50% | 78.60% | 79.70% | 81.30% | 78.87% | 75.41% |

| | FFY | 2015 |
|---|---|---|
| A1 | Target ≥ | 78.90% |
| | Data | 80.68% |
| A2 | Target ≥ | 73.50% |
| | Data | 65.10% |
| B1 | Target ≥ | 80.20% |
| | Data | 83.87% |
| B2 | Target ≥ | 61.40% |
| | Data | 54.00% |
| C1 | Target ≥ | 79.30% |
| | Data | 83.07% |
| C2 | Target ≥ | 81.90% |
| | Data | 74.77% |

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

| FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Target A1 ≥ | 79.10% | 79.30% | 79.50% |
| Target A2 ≥ | 74.00% | 74.50% | 75.00% |
| Target B1 ≥ | 80.55% | 80.90% | 81.25% |
| Target B2 ≥ | 61.60% | 61.80% | 62.00% |
| Target C1 ≥ | 79.70% | 80.10% | 80.50% |
| Target C2 ≥ | 82.10% | 82.30% | 82.50% |

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

WDPI staff presented background information and target options for Indicator 7 at the July 2014 meeting of the State Superintendent's Council on Special Education (see Introduction to the SPP/APR for more information on the Council). Following analysis and discussion stakeholders approved Indicator 7 targets by consensus.

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

| Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed | 6790.00 |
|---|---|

**Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)**

| | Number of Children | Percentage of Children |
|---|---|---|
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 61.00 | 0.90% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 1250.00 | 18.41% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 1314.00 | 19.35% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 2414.00 | 35.55% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1751.00 | 25.79% |

| | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d) | 3728.00 | 5039.00 | 80.68% | 79.10% | 73.98% |
| A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e) | 4165.00 | 6790.00 | 65.10% | 74.00% | 61.34% |

**Reasons for A1 Slippage**

WDPI introduced during the 2016-17 a new web-based application for the reporting of child outcomes. This new application guides the child outcomes team through the rating process by use of the Child Outcomes Decision Tree. This guided approach has led to more accurate rating reporting, which has resulted in slippage.

WDPI, through discretionary grants, provides both targeted and state-wide technical assistance to improve early childhood outcomes. WDPI funds twelve regional early childhood program support teachers, a position working directly with our largest school district, and a statewide early childhood coordinator. These staff provide professional development state-wide, as well as targeted to specific districts. This professional develoment and targeted assistance includes a focus on IEP development and effective teaching strategies for children ages 3-5. Additionally, the child outcome areas have been aligned to the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards as part of the WDPI's revised IEP guidance.

**Reasons for A2 Slippage**

WDPI introduced during the 2016-17 a new web-based application for the reporting of child outcomes. This new application guides the child outcomes team through the rating process by use of the Child Outcomes Decision Tree. This guided approach has led to more accurate rating reporting, which has resulted in slippage.

WDPI, through discretionary grants, provides both targeted and state-wide technical assistance to improve early childhoold outcomes. WDPI funds twelve regional early childhood program support teachers, a position working directly with our largest school district, and a statewide early childhood coordinator. These staff provide professional development state-wide, as well as targeted to specific districts. This professional develoment and targeted assistance includes a focus on IEP development and effective teaching strategies for children ages 3-5. Additionally, the child outcome areas have been aligned to the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards as part of the WDPI's revised IEP guidance.

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

| | Number of Children | Percentage of Children |
|---|---|---|
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 46.00 | 0.68% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 1354.00 | 19.94% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 1922.00 | 28.31% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 2915.00 | 42.93% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 553.00 | 8.14% |

| | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d) | 4837.00 | 6237.00 | 83.87% | 80.55% | 77.55% |
| B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e) | 3468.00 | 6790.00 | 54.00% | 61.60% | 51.08% |

**Reasons for B1 Slippage**

WDPI introduced during the 2016-17 a new web-based application for the reporting of child outcomes. This new application guides the child outcomes team through the rating process by use of the Child Outcomes Decision Tree. This guided approach has led to more accurate rating reporting, which has resulted in slippage.

WDPI, through discretionary grants, provides both targeted and state-wide technical assistance to improve early childhoold outcomes. WDPI funds twelve regional early childhood program support teachers, a position working directly with our largest school district, and a statewide early childhood coordinator. These staff provide professional development state-wide, as well as targeted to specific districts. This professional develoment and targeted assistance includes a focus on IEP development and effective teaching strategies for children ages 3-5. Additionally, the child outcome areas have been aligned to the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards as part of the WDPI's revised IEP guidance.

**Reasons for B2 Slippage**

WDPI introduced during the 2016-17 a new web-based application for the reporting of child outcomes. This new application guides the child outcomes team through the rating process by use of the Child Outcomes Decision Tree. This guided approach has led to more accurate rating reporting, which has resulted in slippage.

WDPI, through discretionary grants, provides both targeted and state-wide technical assistance to improve early childhoold outcomes. WDPI funds twelve regional early childhood program support teachers, a position working directly with our largest school district, and a statewide early childhood coordinator. These staff provide professional development state-wide, as well as targeted to specific districts. This professional develoment and targeted assistance includes a focus on IEP development and effective teaching strategies for children ages 3-5. Additionally, the child outcome areas have been aligned to the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards as part of the WDPI's revised IEP guidance.

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

| | Number of Children | Percentage of Children |
|---|---|---|
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 41.00 | 0.60% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 954.00 | 14.05% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 888.00 | 13.08% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 2551.00 | 37.57% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 2356.00 | 34.70% |

| | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d) | 3439.00 | 4434.00 | 83.07% | 79.70% | 77.56% |
| C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e) | 4907.00 | 6790.00 | 74.77% | 82.10% | 72.27% |

**Reasons for C1 Slippage**

WDPI introduced during the 2016-17 a new web-based application for the reporting of child outcomes. This new application guides the child outcomes team through the rating process by use of the Child Outcomes Decision Tree. This guided approach has led to more accurate rating reporting, which has resulted in slippage.

WDPI, through discretionary grants, provides both targeted and state-wide technical assistance to improve early childhoold outcomes. WDPI funds twelve regional early childhood program support teachers, a position working directly with our largest school district, and a statewide early childhood coordinator. These staff provide professional development state-wide, as well as targeted to specific districts. This professional develoment and targeted assistance includes a focus on IEP development and effective teaching strategies for children ages 3-5. Additionally, the child outcome areas have been aligned to the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards as part of the WDPI's revised IEP guidance.

**Reasons for C2 Slippage**

WDPI introduced during the 2016-17 a new web-based application for the reporting of child outcomes. This new application guides the child outcomes team through the rating process by use of the Child Outcomes Decision Tree. This guided approach has led to more accurate rating reporting, which has resulted in slippage.

WDPI, through discretionary grants, provides both targeted and state-wide technical assistance to improve early childhoold outcomes. WDPI funds twelve regional early childhood program support teachers, a position working directly with our largest school district, and a statewide early childhood coordinator. These staff provide professional development state-wide, as well as targeted to specific districts. This professional develoment and targeted assistance includes a focus on IEP development and effective teaching strategies for children ages 3-5. Additionally, the child outcome areas have been aligned to the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards as part of the WDPI's revised IEP guidance.

**Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years?** Yes

**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.**

During FFY 16, WDPI introduced a new web-based application for the purpose of reporting Indicator 7 child outcomes. In using this new application, the child outcomes team is guided through the rating process by responding to a series of questions using the Child Outcomes Decision Tree. The responses provided by the child outcomes team determine the specific rating category for each outcome category on the 7-point scale. Attached is a copy of the questions used in determining the child outcomes ratings.

Prior to the release of the new application, the Child Outcome Summary Form was used by the child outcomes team for documenting a child's rating for each outcome category using the 7-point scale. These ratings were then reported to WDPI using a web-based application. Records reported to WDPI using

the former application were migrated to the new application to facilitate the reporting of exit outcome ratings for children continuing to receive special education services.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

**Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.**

**(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))**

**Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?    No**

## Historical Data

*Baseline Data: 2016*

| FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Target ≥ | | | 72.30% | 76.10% | 79.90% | 70.00% | 72.50% | 75.00% | 77.50% | 85.00% | 85.50% |
| Data | | 72.04% | 73.57% | 73.41% | 72.77% | 70.99% | 78.27% | 78.30% | 78.00% | 86.09% | 84.66% |

| FFY | 2015 |
|---|---|
| Target ≥ | 86.00% |
| Data | 83.75% |

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

## FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Target ≥ | 86.50% | 87.00% | 87.50% |

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The State Superintendent's Council on Special Education, during the December 2017 meeting, unanimously agreed that FFY 2016 data should be considered baseline data due to revisions in the survey. The attached revised survey questions were developed through extensive stakeholder input that included council as well as Wisconsin's family support and advocacy organizations and representatives from Wisconsin's Council of Aministrators of Special Services.

The revisions align with Results Driven Accountability (RDA), the Department of Education Dual Capacity Building Framework for Family and School Partnerships, and WDPI Promoting Excellence for All: Family and Community Engagement. The number of questions asked to families was reduced from twenty-five to twenty-two questions and response options were set from six choices to four choices to rate level of agreement to each item. The survey has a strong focus on using language at a universal level of understanding and family engagement practices that are linked to improved student outcomes for students with IEPs. The revised parent survey supports high expectations, positive student-adult relationships, communication of grade level standards, and connecting families to learning.

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

| Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities | Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 40781.00 | 46072.00 | 83.75% | 86.50% | 88.52% |

| The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed. | 16.62% | 277208.00 |
|---|---|---|

*The percentage shown is the number of respondent parents divided by the number of parents to whom the survey was distributed.*

**Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.**

WDPI uses the following methodology for calculating Indicator 8 results: number of respondents reporting agreement with questions 1 through 22 divided by number of total responses to questions 1 through 22. For FFY 2016 reporting, parents reported agreement on 40,781 of 46,072 items answered, which results in an 88.52% agreement rate for this indicator. However, as the survey items were changed from FFY 2015 to FFY 2016 reporting, the WDPI,

based on unanimous agreement by Council, is considering FFY 2016 results as baseline. New targets will be set by Council before the submission of the FFY 2017 APR.

**The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.** Yes

**Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.**

WDPI's Family Engagement Survey is conducted between February and July with roughly one-fifth of the districts in the state conducting the survey each year. Milwaukee Public Schools, with an average daily enrollment of over 50,000, conducts the survey on an annual basis. The sample of districts within each cycle are representative of the following statewide characteristics: geographic regions, total enrollment of students with disabilities, racial/ethnic makeup of the students with disabilities subgroup, and distribution of primary disabilities (see Introduction to the SPP/APR for more information). For relevant demographics, a 95% confidence interval about the median was used to construct the five-year cohort cycle.

To help ensure that results of the survey are valid and reliable, WDPI requires that districts meet a minimum response rate. Because of an expanded population from which to solicit reponses, many districts exceeded their minimum response rates requirements. The FFY 2016 response rate of 16.62% yields a margin of error of 1.96% (95% CI), which is in line with the conventional measure of rigor for survey research.

Districts report the race/ethnicity and primary disability status of their students on the annual October 1st count of children with disabilities, which is used to determine the race/ethnicity and primary disability of students for Indicator 8. This data is used to determine the race/ethnicity and primary disability of students whose family members completed an Indicator 8 survey. A benchmark of 3% (in line with National Post-School Outcomes Center guidance for indicator 14) is used to assess the extent to which survey data reflect the demographics of the state; namely, that parents who responded to the survey have students of diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds and primary disabilities.

The attached table "representativeness of indicator 8.pdf" compares the makeup of students about whom family engagement data were collected and statewide demographics. For FFY 2016, the sample is representative of racial/ethnic background of respondents within 3% of the state with the exception of Native American students who are over-represented by 0.06%. The survey results are also representative of the primary disabilities for which students receive services. In all cases, the survey results are within 3% of the primary disability demographics of students statewide. (Please see "representativeness of indicator 8" attached below). WDPI is pleased that outreach activities have been successful for FFY 2016 reporting such that demographics of the parents responding are represenative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

**Was sampling used?** Yes
**Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?** No
**Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.**

To help ensure that results of the survey are valid and reliable, WDPI requires that districts meet a minimum response rate. Because of an expanded population from which to solicit reponses, many districts exceeded their minimum response rates requirements. The FFY 2016 response rate of 16.62% yields a margin of error of 1.96% (95% CI), which is in line with the conventional measure of rigor for survey research.

**Was a survey used?** Yes
**Is it a new or revised survey?** No

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

**OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2016, and OSEP accepts that revision.

**Required Actions**

*Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation*

**Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.**

**(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))**

**Historical Data**

*Baseline Data: 2005*

| FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | | | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

| FFY | 2015 |
|-----|------|
| Target | 0% |
| Data | 0% |

Key:  ☐ Gray – Data Prior to Baseline   ☐ Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

| FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|-----|------|------|------|
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement?  ⦿ Yes  ◯ No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 31

| Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services | Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification | Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | 0 | 413 | 0% | 0% | 0% |

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?  ⦿ Yes  ◯ No

**Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).**

**Definition of Disproportionate Representation:**

1. **Weighted Risk Ratio of 2.0 or Greater**: In calculating the weighted risk ratio for over-representation, WDPI uses the Westat technical assistance guidance for calculating disproportionality based on weighted risk ratio: the risk for a racial/ethnic group to be in special education divided by the risk for a comparison group to be in special education, weighted to the racial/ethnic demographics of the state.

2. **Calculating Risk**: Because White students have been the unit of comparison used by the National Research Council in their analysis of this issue, White student risk level for the state is used as the comparison group for this second factor.

   For each racial group, over-representation may be considered where the risk level for the given group exceeds the state's risk level of White students in that category by at least one percent. This additional measure also ensures that districts will not be considered for the highest level of review where the risk for a given group is low. To ensure that White students in a district could also be identified as over-represented, district level risk is compared with state level risk for White students, in the same manner as every other racial or ethnic group.

3. **Cell size**: To be identified for over-representation based on statistical data, a racial or ethnic group must have at least ten students with disabilities in a given cell used for risk ratio analysis, and a total enrollment of 100 students in the given racial or ethnic group. A district can be identified when one racial or ethnic group has a total enrollment of 100 students, even if the other racial or ethnic groups in the district have a total enrollment of less than 100 students.

**Consecutive Years**: Acknowledging changing demographics, potential anomalies in data collection, and other factors, WDPI requires districts to meet the above criteria for three consecutive years.

**Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.**

Once districts are identified based on data for disproportionate representation, district and department staff review policies, procedures, and practices used in identification to determine whether students are appropriately identified, and that all policies, procedures, and practices are race neutral and in compliance with state special education law and Part B of IDEA 2004, including the requirements of 34 CFR 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311.

The districts have either adopted WDPI's model policies and procedures or have submitted policies and procedures that have been reviewed and approved by WDPI staff. The districts also have either adopted the department's model IEP forms or use forms approved by WDPI. In determining eligibility for special education, the districts use state eligibility criteria. In determining whether a district's disproportionality was a result of inappropriate identification, the department also reviews IDEA State complaint decisions, due process decisions, and pupil nondiscrimination appeals. Finally, identified districts conduct a Disproportionality Procedural Compliance Self-Assessment. Districts review a sample of student records, disaggregated by race, and assess compliance items identified by OSEP as related to disproportionality, which is verified by the WDPI.

Through the review described above, the WDPI determined that there were zero districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

☑ **Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The state is revising its baseline because the denominator used for indicator 9 in its FFY 2015 SPP/APR included all districts, and the denominator used for indicator FFY 2016 SPP/APR only includes the number of districts that meet WDPI's established cell size as required by the Measurement Table. Through its review, the WDPI determined that there were zero districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification for both FFY 15 and FFY 16. Therefore, the percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification is zero for both reporting years.

The total number of districts (444) reported for indicator 9 is accurate. The FFY 2016 introduction erroneously included 5 entities that are not districts responsible for providing a free appropriate public education (FAPE). All student data is reported through the responsible FAPE agency. These 5 entities were not included in the indicator calculations, and the number of districts reported in the introduction has been corrected.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2016, and OSEP accepts that revision.

**Required Actions**

In its FFY 2017 SPP/APR submission, the State must indicate in the "Historical Data" table that the baseline year has been revised.

*Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation*

**Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.**

**(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))**

---

### Historical Data

*Baseline Data: 2005*

| FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Target | | | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

| FFY | 2015 |
|---|---|
| Target | 0% |
| Data | 0% |

Key:  ☐ Gray – Data Prior to Baseline   ☐ Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% |

---

### FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement?  ⦿ Yes  ○ No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 54

| Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories | Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification | Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 32 | 0 | 390 | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**  ⦿ Yes  ○ No

**Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).**

**Definition of Disproportionate Representation:**

1. **Risk Ratio of 2.0 or Greater**: In calculating the risk ratio for over-representation, WDPI uses the Westat technical assistance guidance for calculating disproportionality based on risk ratio: the risk for a racial/ethnic group for a disability category divided by the risk for a comparison group for a disability category, weighted to the racial/ethnic demographics of the state.

2. **Calculating Risk**: Because White students have been the unit of comparison used by the National Research Council in their analysis of this issue, White student risk level for the state is used as the comparison group for this second factor.

   For each racial group, over-representation may be considered where the risk level for the given group exceeds the state's risk level of White students in that category by at least one percent. This additional measure also ensures that districts will not be considered for the highest level of review where the risk for a given group is low. To ensure that White students in a district could also be identified as over-represented, district level risk is compared with state level risk for White students, in the same manner as every other racial or ethnic group.

3. **Cell size**: To be identified for over-representation based on statistical data, a racial or ethnic group must have at least ten students with disabilities in a given cell used for risk ratio analysis, and a total enrollment of 100 students in the given racial or ethnic group. A district can be identified when one racial or ethnic group has a total enrollment of 100 students, even if the other racial or ethnic groups in the district have a total enrollment of less than

100 students.

**Consecutive Years**: Acknowledging changing demographics, potential anomalies in data collection, and other factors, WDPI requires districts to meet the above criteria for three consecutive years.

**Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.**

Once districts are identified based on data for disproportionate representation, district and department staff review policies, procedures, and practices used in identification to determine whether students are appropriately identified, and that all policies, procedures, and practices are race neutral and in compliance with state special education law and Part B of IDEA 2004, including the requirements of 34 CFR 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311.

The districts have either adopted WDPI's model policies and procedures or have submitted policies and procedures that have been reviewed and approved by WDPI staff. The districts also have either adopted the department's model IEP forms or use forms approved by WDPI. In determining eligibility for special education, the districts use state eligibility criteria. In determining whether a district's disproportionality was a result of inappropriate identification, the department also reviews IDEA State complaint decisions, due process decisions, and pupil nondiscrimination appeals. Finally, identified districts conduct a Disproportionality Procedural Compliance Self-Assessment. Districts review a sample of student records, disaggregated by race, and assess compliance items identified by OSEP as related to disproportionality, which is verified by the department.

Through the review described above, the department determined that there were zero districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

☑ **Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The state is revising its baseline because the denominator used for indicator 10 in its FFY 2015 SPP/APR included all districts, and the denominator used for indicator FFY 2016 SPP/APR only includes the number of districts that meet WDPI's established cell size as required by the Measurement Table. Through its review, the WDPI determined that there were zero districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification for both FFY 15 and FFY 16. Therefore, the percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification is zero for both reporting years.

The total number of of districts (444) reported for indicator 10 is accurate. The FFY 2016 introduction erroneously includes 5 entities that are not local educational agencies responsible for providing a free appropriate public education. All student data is reported through the responsible FAPE agency. These 5 entities were not included in the indicator calculations, and the number of districts reported in the introduction has been corrected.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2016, and OSEP accepts that revision.

**Required Actions**

In its FFY 2017 SPP/APR submission, the State must indicate in the "Historical Data" table that the baseline year has been revised.

*Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find*

**Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.**

**(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))**

## 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 | | 88.41% | 96.48% | 98.20% | 98.39% | 98.78% | 97.67% | 98.91% | 98.80% | 98.67% | 98.64% |

| FFY | 2015 |
|---|---|
| Target | 100% |
| Data | 97.72% |

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

| (a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received | (b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline) | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7,964 | 7,879 | 97.72% | 100% | 98.93% |

| Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b] | 85 |
|---|---|

**Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.**

The range of days beyond the timeline was 1 to 138 days. Reasons for the delays include: unavailability of staff or parents, scheduling conflicts, and timeline calculation errors.

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used**

◉ **The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.**

○ **The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.**

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

○ **State monitoring**

◉ **State database that includes data for the entire reporting year**

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

WDPI used the Indicator 11: Timely Initial Evaluations application to collect student-level data from districts from the selected cohort. Wisconsin's districts are divided into 5 groups (cohorts), and roughly one-fifth of the districts in the state report the data through the Indicator 11 application each year, with Milwaukee Public Schools, with average daily membership of over 50,000, reporting on an annual basis. The sample of districts within each cycle year are representative of the following statewide characteristics: geographic regions, total enrollment of students with disabilities, racial/ethnic makeup of the students with disabilities subgroup, and distribution of primary disabilities. For relevant demographics, a 95% confidence interval about the median was used to construct the five-year cohort cycle. See Introduction to the SPP/APR for more information. For FFY 2016, 87 districts reported on the percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 calendar days. The percent of children with parental consent to evaluate who

were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days during FFY 2016 was 98.93%. The State demonstrated substantial compliance for this indicator.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

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 |
|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|
| 198 | 198 | 0 | 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*

Consistent with OSEP memo 09-02, WDPI verified each district 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 subsequently collected through monitoring; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district.

To verify current compliance, WDPI staff examined a separate sample of current student records. Districts provided the WDPI with a list of students whose initial evaluations were completed during a specified time period. For each student on the list, districts were directed to indicate the date parental consent was received and the date the evaluation was completed. From this list, WDPI selected records for a specific number of students with the most recently completed initial evaluations. The exact number of records to be submitted for review was determined by the WDPI and was dependent upon the size of the district and the number of initial evaluations completed by the district. WDPI staff reviewed the records to determine whether the evaluations were completed within 60 days of receiving parental consent. If all reviewed evaluations were completed within the required timeline, WDPI determined the district is currently in compliance.

If one or more of the evaluations were not completed within 60 days, WDPI staff reviewed the regulatory requirement with the district, and for students who had been found eligible for special education and related services, directed correction of the error(s) within 20 days. Correction involved submission of evidence that the district had considered compensatory services by holding an IEP team meeting, or, with the agreement of the parent: (1) developed a written document to amend or modify the student's IEP to reflect compensatory services, or (2) discussed with the student's parent and documented an agreement that no compensatory services were necessary. The district submitted the corrected record(s) for review by WDPI staff.

In addition, when one or more evaluations were not completed within 60 days, the district then submitted a new separate sample of the next new initial evaluation records generated within a given timeframe after making the previous corrections. These records were then reviewed by WDPI staff to verify that the evaluations had been completed within 60 days. In the event that one or more of the records did not meet the regulatory requirement, the process continued until the district corrected each individual case of noncompliance, and the district was found in current compliance.

Following these two-pronged verification procedures, which are consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, the WDPI determined all districts found in noncompliance during FFY 2015 have corrected each individual case of noncompliance and are currently in compliance with 34 CFR 300.301(c) and the exceptions at 34 CFR 300.301(d) and 34 CFR 300.309(c).

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

To verify each instance of individual student noncompliance was corrected, WDPI staff reviewed a randomly drawn sample of initial evaluation records of students whose evaluations were not completed within 60 days. The size of the sample of records reviewed was dependent upon the size of the district, the number of noncompliant files, and whether the students were still within the jurisdiction of the district. For most districts, the sample included all records. Each record was reviewed to verify the evaluation was completed, although late. In instances when students were found eligible for special education services, each record was reviewed to ensure compensatory services had been considered. All records demonstrated the evaluation(s) had been completed and compensatory services had been considered. WDPI determined, based on this review of records, each individual instance of noncompliance found in FFY 2015 was corrected.

**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 LEA 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 LEA, 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**

*Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition*

**Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.**

**(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))**

### 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 | | 65.60% | 74.35% | 89.00% | 96.78% | 98.72% | 99.03% | 99.23% | 99.33% | 98.81% | 98.85% |

| FFY | 2015 |
|-----|------|
| Target | 100% |
| Data | 99.11% |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination. | 3,667 |
| b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays. | 514 |
| c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. | 2,668 |
| d. Number of children for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied. | 405 |
| e. Number of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays. | 45 |
| f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option. | 0 |

| | Numerator (c) | Denominator (a-b-d-e-f) | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. [c/(a-b-d-e-f)]x100 | 2,668 | 2,703 | 99.11% | 100% | 98.71% |

| | |
|---|---|
| Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f | 35 |

**Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.**

Children not accounted for above include 26 children found eligible for Part B whose IEPs were implemented after their third birthdays and 9 children found not eligible for Part B whose eligibility was not determined until after their third birthdays. Of these 26 children found eligible for Part B whose IEPs were implemented after their third birthdays, the range of days for late implementation of the IEP was from 2 days to 110 days. Reasons for the delays include staff not available, difficulties coordinating meetings, referrals to Part B less than 90 days prior to 3rd birthday, and scheduling errors.

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**
○ **State monitoring**
● **State database that includes data for the entire reporting year**

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

The WDPI and the Wisconsin Department of Health Services (WDHS), the Part C lead agency, worked collaboratively to develop an electronic referral and reporting system known as the Program Participation System (PPS) to ensure children participating in county Birth to 3 programs (Part C) experience a smooth and effective transition to early childhood programs (Part B). County Birth to 3 programs use the PPS to refer children in county Birth to 3 Programs to the district for special education. Districts receive these referrals electronically and submit data for Indicator 12 through the PPS. In addition to ensuring a smooth and effective transition, this data collection system promotes accurate reporting of data. Districts report child-specific data on a real-time basis. This allows for monitoring of progress on Indicator 12 by the district and WDPI.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

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 |
|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|
| 24 | 24 | 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*

Consistent with OSEP memo 09-02, WDPI verified each district with noncompliance identified in FFY 2015: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of current year district records; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance by ensuring that eligibility was determined, and if eligible, an IEP was developed.

To verify current compliance, WDPI staff examined all current referrals for each district with noncompliance. WDPI staff reviewed the records to determine whether the evaluations were completed by the student's third birthday, and if eligible, an IEP was developed and implemented by the student's third birthday. If all reviewed evaluations and IEPs were completed and implemented by the student's third birthday, WDPI determined that the district is currently in compliance.

Following this verification procedure, which is consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, the WDPI determined all districts found in noncompliance during FFY 2015 have corrected each individual case of noncompliance and are currently in compliance with 34 CFR 300.124.

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

To verify each instance of individual student noncompliance was corrected, WDPI staff reviewed each student record to determine that the evaluation was completed, and if eligible, that an IEP was developed and implemented for the child (although late). WDPI reviewed all records with noncompliance to ensure correction.

Consistent with OSEP memo 09-02, WDPI verified each district 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 subsequently collected through a review of district referrals, evaluations, and IEPs; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance by ensuring that eligibility was determined, and if eligible, an IEP was developed.

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

**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 LEA 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 LEA, 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**

*Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition*

**Compliance indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.**

**(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))**

## Historical Data

*Baseline Data: 2009*

| FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | | | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | | | 26.90% | 39.35% | | 71.21% | 72.16% | 79.28% | 98.75% | 98.92% | 99.65% |

| 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 youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition | Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 27,631 | 27,651 | 99.83% | 100% | 99.93% |

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**
○ **State monitoring**
◉ **State database that includes data for the entire reporting year**

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

The WDPI utilizes an online Postsecondary Transition Plan (PTP) application. The PTP application enables WDPI to efficiently collect Indicator 13 data and help ensure each student's IEP is in compliance with Indicator 13 requirements. The PTP application contains electronic edit checks designed to prevent IEP documentation errors commonly resulting in noncompliance, while enhancing the discussion about transition and allowing the flexibility needed for student individualization in postsecondary transition planning. All districts were required to use the PTP application when developing postsecondary transition plans for students with disabilities aged 16 years and above.

Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?
◉ Yes  ○ No

Did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age?  ○ Yes  ◉ No

## Actions required in FFY 2015 response

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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 48 | 48 | 0 | 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*

Verification is consistent with the two-pronged approach established by OSEP memo 09-02.

To verify current compliance, WDPI staff examined a separate sample of current student IEP records created after training and technical assistance of staff occurred. LEAs provided WDPI with a list of students with IEPs age 16 years old or older. From this list, WDPI selected a sample of IEPs of students with IEP meeting dates during the relevant time period and directed LEAs to submit the IEPs to WDPI for review. The exact number of IEPs to be submitted for review was dependent upon the size of the district and the number of IEPs developed and revised by the district. WDPI staff reviewed the IEPs to determine whether the Indicator 13 transition regulatory requirements had been met. If all reviewed IEPs met the transition regulatory requirements, WDPI determined the district currently in compliance. If one or more of the IEPs did not meet one or more of the transition regulatory requirements, WDPI staff reviewed the regulatory requirement(s) with the district and directed correction of the error(s) within 20 days. The district submitted the corrected IEP(s) for review. WDPI staff reviewed the IEP(s) to verify the district has corrected each individual case of noncompliance. The district then submitted a new, separate sample of the next new IEPs generated within a given timeframe after making the previous corrections. These records were then reviewed by WDPI staff to verify that the transition regulatory requirements were currently in compliance. In the event that one or more of the IEPs did not meet one or more of the transition regulatory requirements, the process continued until the district corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, and the district was found in current compliance.

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

To verify each individual case of noncompliance had been corrected, WDPI staff reviewed a random sample of IEPs of students who were in the district's sample and whose IEPs were not compliant with the respective Indicator 13 regulatory requirements. The size of the sample of IEPs reviewed was dependent upon the size of the district, the number of noncompliant files, whether students' IEPs had previously been corrected and whether the students were still within the jurisdiction of the district. Each IEP was reviewed to verify it was compliant with the transition regulatory requirements. If all of the selected IEPs met the regulatory requirements, WDPI determined each individual case of noncompliance had been corrected. If one or more of the selected IEPs did not meet one or more of the regulatory requirements, WDPI staff reviewed the regulatory requirement(s) with the district, directed the district to correct the IEP(s) within 20 days and submit the corrected IEP(s) to WDPI for review. WDPI determined, based on this review of IEPs, each individual case of noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 has been corrected.

**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 LEA 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 LEA, 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**

*Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition*

**Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:**

    A. **Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.**
    B. **Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.**
    C. **Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.**

**(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))**

## Historical Data

| | Baseline Year | FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **A** | 2012 | Target ≥ | | | | | | | 41.50% | 42.80% | 44.50% | 29.80% | 30.30% |
| | | Data | | | | | | 39.44% | 41.52% | 34.62% | 29.80% | 27.51% | 27.15% |
| **B** | 2012 | Target ≥ | | | | | | | 69.60% | 70.00% | 71.50% | 59.50% | 61.50% |
| | | Data | | | | | | 66.52% | 69.57% | 64.52% | 59.40% | 64.94% | 64.51% |
| **C** | 2012 | Target ≥ | | | | | | | 83.30% | 82.00% | 83.00% | 73.00% | 75.00% |
| | | Data | | | | | | 79.89% | 83.26% | 78.83% | 72.90% | 77.56% | 77.81% |

| | FFY | 2015 |
|---|---|---|
| **A** | Target ≥ | 30.80% |
| | Data | 31.44% |
| **B** | Target ≥ | 63.50% |
| | Data | 68.39% |
| **C** | Target ≥ | 77.00% |
| | Data | 81.05% |

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

## FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Target A ≥ | 31.30% | 31.80% | 32.30% |
| Target B ≥ | 65.50% | 67.50% | 69.50% |
| Target C ≥ | 79.00% | 81.00% | 83.00% |

Key:

## Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

WDPI staff presented background information and target options for Indicator 14 at the October 2014 meeting, of the State Superintendent's Council on Special Education (see Introduction for more information on the Council). Following analysis and discussion, stakeholders approved Indicator 14 targets by consensus.

## FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

| | |
|---|---|
| Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school | 2285.00 |
| 1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school | 649.00 |
| 2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school | 976.00 |
| 3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed) | 42.00 |
| 4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed). | 233.00 |

| | | Number of respondent youth | Number of respondent youth who are no longer in | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A. Enrolled in higher education (1) | 649.00 | 2285.00 | 31.44% | 31.30% | 28.40% |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2) | 1625.00 | 2285.00 | 68.39% | 65.50% | 71.12% |
| C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4) | 1900.00 | 2285.00 | 81.05% | 79.00% | 83.15% |

**Please select the reporting option your State is using:**

◉ Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

○ Option 2: Report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a "part-time basis" under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

**Reasons for A Slippage**

From FFY 15 to FFY 16, the Indicator 14 data show a small decrease in participation in programs of higher education from 31.44% to 28.40% (a difference of 3.02%). Slippage likely resulted from the following factors:

- Between FFY 15 and FFY 16, each of the three types of higher education programs included in Category A of Indicator 14 (2-year college, 4-year college or university, and 2-year technical college) had uniform 1% decreases in enrollment. This led to an aggregate 3% decrease in Category A for indicator 14.
- During the FFY 16 survey year, participation in competitive employment increased 5.75%, as more youth selected employment over higher education immediately following high school. This reduced the number of youth available to enter higher education. Relative to FFY 15, the percentage of youth *planning* on participating in higher education decreased from 52% to 47%; the percentage of students *planning* on entering the work force increased from 49% to 51%.

To increase the participation in programs of higher education, WDPI will seek additional ways to forge partnerships with institutes of higher education in Wisconsin to inform students with disabilities and their family members about available college options throughout the state, and emphasize option for and benefits of participation in higher education through the SEA-sponsored processional development opportunities afforded teachers, administrators, and students and family members. WDPI will further engage vocational rehabilitation in a partnership to support college enrollment and attendance as an element of the provision of Pre-Employment Transition Service to students.

**Was a survey used?**   No

**Was sampling used?**   Yes
**Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?**   No

**Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.**

The Wisconsin Post School Outcomes Survey is conducted as a within-district census so all exiters from participating districts have an opportunity to complete the survey. Wisconsin's districts are divided into 5 groups (cohorts), and roughly one-fifth of districts in the state are required to participate in the survey each year. One exception is that Milwaukee Public Schools, with average daily enrollment over 50,000, participates in the survey on an annual basis.

The cyclical sampling plan ensures the set of participating districts within each year is representative of the following statewide characteristics: geographic regions, total enrollment of students with disabilities, racial/ethnic makeup of the students within the disability subgroups, and distribution of primary disabilities. For relevant demographics, a 95% confidence interval about the median was used to construct the five-year cohort cycle. See Introduction to the SPP/APR for more information.

For the FFY 16 survey of 2015-16 exiters, the cohort included the required one-fifth of the districts (87), representing 22% of the 394 districts with an exiter population in Wisconsin. WDPI is pleased to report that the representativeness of the survey meets the three percent threshold recommended by the National Post School Outcomes Center for all race/ethnic and primary disability categories. Please see the attached document "representativeness of indicator 14.pdf" for this analysis.

To help ensure survey results are indeed representative, WDPI requires that each district meet a minimum response rate of 20% of its total number of exiters from the previous year. For FFY 2016, WDPI reports a response rate of 55% on the Wisconsin Post School Outcomes Survey. This response rate yields a margin of error of 1.38% (95% CI), which is in line with the conventional measure of rigor for survey research.

**Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school?**   Yes

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

*Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision*

**Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.**

**(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B))**

## Historical Data

*Baseline Data: 2012*

| FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Target ≥ | | | 51.00% | 52.00% | 53.00% | 54.00% | 55.00% | 56.00% | 57.00% | 42.00% | 42.00% |
| Data | | 50.00% | 67.00% | 76.00% | 60.00% | 66.70% | 55.56% | 50.00% | 41.18% | 63.64% | 50.00% |

| FFY | 2015 |
|---|---|
| Target ≥ | 42.00% |
| Data | 44.44% |

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

## FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Target ≥ | 42.00% | 42.00% | 42.00% |

Key:

## Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

WDPI staff presented background information and target options for Indicator 15 at the April 2014 meeting of the State Superintendent's Council on Special Education (see Introduction to the SPP/APR for more information on the Council). Following analysis and discussion, stakeholders approved Indicator 15 targets by consensus.

## Prepopulated Data

| Source | Date | Description | Data | Overwrite Data |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B 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 B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/1/2017 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 12 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | 12 | 44.44% | 42.00% | 16.67% |

**Reasons for Slippage**

The slippage reflected in the FFY 2016 data is anomalous. From 2005 to 2015 the average percentage of resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements was 53.13%, with a minimum of 41.18% in FFY 2012. Because of the small n size of the denominator small annual changes are inflated. WDPI recognizes that resolution sessions are voluntary, as is any settlement agreement between parties. Stakeholders were conscientious about setting targets that would avoid any coercive effects on the resolution and mediation processes. WDPI will monitor this data to determine if additional supports are required in this area.

## Actions required in FFY 2015 response

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

*Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision*

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

**(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B))**

## Historical Data

*Baseline Data: 2012*

| FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target ≥ | | | 76.00% | 77.00% | 78.00% | 79.00% | 80.00% | 81.00% | 82.00% | 76.00% | 76.00% |
| Data | | 83.33% | 88.00% | 92.00% | 92.59% | 91.30% | 86.54% | 82.86% | 75.51% | 81.40% | 92.54% |

| FFY | 2015 |
|-----|------|
| Target ≥ | 76.00% |
| Data | 86.36% |

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

## FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|-----|------|------|------|
| Target ≥ | 76.00% | 76.00% | 76.00% |

Key:

## Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

WDPI staff presented background information and target options for Indicator 16 at the April 2014 meeting of the State Superintendent's Council on Special Education. Following analysis and discussion, stakeholders approved Indicator 16 targets by consensus.

## Prepopulated Data

| Source | Date | Description | Data | Overwrite Data |
|--------|------|-------------|------|----------------|
| SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/1/2017 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 5 | null |
| SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/1/2017 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 73 | null |
| SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/1/2017 | 2.1 Mediations held | 83 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | 73 | 83 | 86.36% | 76.00% | 93.98% |

## Actions required in FFY 2015 response

## OSEP Response

**Required Actions**

*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 ≥ | | 29.00% | 30.00% | 31.00% |
| Data | 29.00% | 31.70% | 31.67% | 32.09% |

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

## FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2017 | 2018 |
|---|---|---|
| Target ≥ | 31.00% | 31.50% |

Key:

## Description of Measure

This measure is a point-based measurement of student-level proficiency that accounts for three years of data and controls for annual changes in the number of students tested.

## Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) staff presented background information and target options for Indicator 17 at the January 2015 meeting of the State Superintendent's Council on Special Education. Following analysis and discussion, stakeholders approved these targets by consensus. Stakeholders are continually updated on progress toward the SiMR, and are engaged in any needed decision-making. More information on stakeholder engagement can be found within the attached Phase III, Year II report.

## 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 Children with Disabilities, 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., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, 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.

### Stakeholder Involvement

One of the most important principles of Results Driven Accountability (RDA) is involvement and input of internal and external stakeholders in the development of the RDA system. In fact, this is the first of the Office of Special Education Programs' (OSEPs) core principles which underlies and guides the RDA work. The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) has a long and rich history of working collaboratively with stakeholders in the development of the former State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Reports (APR). Since 2005, WDPI has involved the State Superintendent's Council on Special Education in obtaining broad stakeholder input related to the SPP indicators. The Council represents a diverse stakeholder group including parents of children with disabilities; regular and special educators in rural and urban districts; and representatives of school boards, charter schools, private schools, institutions of higher education, and the Departments of Corrections, Vocational Rehabilitation, and Health Services. Beginning in November 2013, and quarterly since then, WDPI has met with the Council on the development of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Arlene Russell of North Central Regional Resource Center helped facilitate the Council meetings.

In addition to the Council, WDPI met with other stakeholders, including:

- Executive Board of the Wisconsin Council of Administrators of Special Services (WCASS), which represents local directors of special education, as well as directors serving multiple districts through a Cooperative Educational Service Agency (CESA);
- WI Family Assistance Center for Education, Training and Support (FACETS), the state's Parent Training and Information Center funded by OSEP;
- Disability Rights Wisconsin, a protection and advocacy agency for people with disabilities;
- WI Board for People with Development Disabilities, established to advocate on behalf of individuals with developmental disabilities;
- The Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI), initiative for parents, educators, and others interested in parent-educator partnerships for

children with disabilities;

- Early Childhood Program Support Teachers, providers of technical assistance to local early childhood special education teachers;
- Directors of Special Education (DSEs) and Regional Service Network Directors (RSNs) in CESAs 11 and 12, located in the northern rural areas of Wisconsin; and
- Department of Health Services (DHS) Birth to 3 Programs, the state's lead agency for Part C.

<u>Internal Stakeholders</u>

- Title I Team
- Content and Learning Team, American Indian Studies Program
- Literacy and Mathematics Team
- Special Education Team

From November 2013 through June 2014, WDPI conducted data analysis activities with these stakeholders until a focus area was identified. The data analysis process described below, with some minor variations, was used with each stakeholder group. The process of gathering stakeholder input was highly effective, and stakeholders were genuinely appreciative to be involved in the development of Wisconsin's RDA system with a focus on improving student outcomes.

**Data Analysis Process**

WDPI began with a broad analysis of data, then disaggregated the data to narrow the focus, and finally developed the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). Borrowing from Glenn Singleton's "Courageous Conversation's Compass" and the four quadrants of Thinking, Feeling, Believing, and Acting, discussions about the data, values, resources, and leverage points emerged. These discussions occurred through a layering process.

In Layer 1, stakeholders were asked to consider, "What does the data tell us?" Indicator data reported in the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2012 APR were analyzed at a broad level to determine, per indicator, which of four scenarios occurred: (1) met target and made progress; (2) met target and failed to make progress; (3) missed target and made progress; and (4) missed target and failed to make progress. Stakeholders were free to discuss the implications of all quadrants with respect to narrowing in on an area of focus, as there is not necessarily an objective ranking structure (*e.g.* council may recommend ambitious targets that are not met even though annual progress is made).

It was noted the state missed the targets and failed to make progress in reading and mathematics achievement, as well as postsecondary outcomes. Although the state missed the graduation target, progress had occurred. The state met the targets related to decreasing dropout, suspensions, and expulsions (see attached Indicator Data Analysis Matrix).

While compliance indicators were not the focus of the discussion with external stakeholders, an internal analysis of several compliance indicators as a part of root cause analysis yielded many interesting findings. First, while the state has met the substantial compliance benchmarks on most indicators for several years (and for all indicators in FFY 2012), such compliance is uncorrelated with several results areas, including academic achievement (*i.e.* Indicator 3c). Secondly, no specific procedural compliance requirements (as monitored through the Procedural Compliance Self-Assessment (PCSA), part of the state's general oversight, and formerly a component of Indicator 15) had a statistically significant association with academic achievement. Thirdly, while overall levels of procedural compliance within a Local Education Agency (LEA) were significantly and positively associated with higher academic achievement, the effect sizes were substantially small. Additionally, when other covariates were introduced into the model, such as percentage of students with disabilities, size of district, and percentage of total students eligible for free and reduced lunch, the previous association was negated.

In Layer 2, stakeholders responded to the question, "What do we value?" by depicting graphically and in a single word what success looks like for students with disabilities (see attached Wordle). Terms such as "engagement," "opportunity," and "independent" emerged as important themes. Stakeholders also discussed what they valued as important components of Wisconsin's RDA system, and what should be avoided. Through this process, the following Core Values were identified:

- family engagement;
- cultural responsiveness;
- effective educators using research-based approaches;
- early intervention;
- positive, proactive social-emotional support; and
- systems-wide approach.

It was clear, no matter what the focus area, these values would be important components of Wisconsin's RDA system.

In Layer 3, the question, "Where is our impact?" was considered. In small groups, stakeholders were asked to consider the effect of one indicator upon another, and how strong the relationship/correlation between two indicators. Stakeholders rated the impact as high, medium, or low. This activity helped to identify, for example, that reading proficiency has a positive impact on graduation outcomes, and suspensions/expulsions have a negative impact on student outcomes.

In Layer 4, stakeholders were asked to consider, "What are our resources?" "What are the current statewide resources that could be leveraged to improve each indicator?" Through an analysis of the SPP and APR, as well as personal knowledge of other statewide initiatives, a determination was made as to whether the state has a high, medium, or low level of statewide resources associated with each indicator.

In light of these activities, a final strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) analysis was conducted to synthesize information and determine a broad area of focus. Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats were identified for each indicator. It was determined academic achievement should be the broad area of focus based on the following factors: very low levels of reading and mathematics performance; indicator targets not met and no progress made in multiple grade levels; alignment with the State Superintendent's Agenda 2017 priorities and resources; and high impact on other indicators.

WDPI then borrowed from Edward de Bono's "6 Thinking Hats" to facilitate structured parallel thinking and to select from two proposals: 1) focus on reading achievement, or 2) focus on mathematics achievement. The proposals were considered from six different perspectives.

6 Thinking Hats:

1. Thinking – What are the facts?
2. Thinking about Thinking – Where are we now?
3. Feelings – How do I feel about this?

4. Creativity – What new ideas are possible?
5. Benefits – Why is this a good thing?
6. Cautions – What are the challenges, barriers, risks?

Analysis of the data across grade levels shows mathematics achievement is consistently higher than reading achievement; however mathematics achievement declines more significantly over time. Statewide data from the 2012 Wisconsin Student Assessment System shows approximately 29% of students with disabilities in third grade are proficient in mathematics, compared to 17% in reading. However, at the eighth grade level, both areas are nearly equal at 14% proficiency. This trend is consistent over time.

Each of the six perspectives were considered and discussed, then stakeholders were asked to vote on focusing on reading or mathematics achievement. Stakeholders selected reading achievement, citing overall lower performance, and the impact of reading ability on other content areas, including mathematics.

**Data Disaggregation**

Next the data were disaggregated in order to assess root cause, and potentially narrow the broad focus. Potential root causes were further examined during the infrastructure analysis process as outlined in the corresponding section. WDPI has created the Wisconsin Information System for Education (WISE), which consists of a variety of online tools and resources for reporting, understanding, and using data to improve student outcomes. WISEdash is a data portal that uses "dashboards," or visual collections of graphs and tables, to provide multi-year education data about Wisconsin schools ( http://wisedash.dpi.wi.gov/). Data reported in WISEdash is of high quality and numerous data quality measures are performed to assure the data is accurately reported by local educational agencies. WISExplore is a common data inquiry process for teachers and school leaders statewide (http://dpi.wi.gov/wisexplore). Using WISExplore and WISEdash, Dr. Judy Sargent facilitated a data navigation and inquiry process at WDPI. The process included four steps:

1. Question: Pose a meaningful data question.
2. Investigate: Examine data closely to determine patterns and trends.
3. Clarify: Describe and prioritize data findings.
4. Hypothesize: Interpret patterns and trends to develop hypotheses of teacher and leader practices as possible root causes.

WDPI posed the following question:

How did students with disabilities perform on statewide reading assessments for the past five years compared to students without disabilities?

Data were disaggregated by primary disability, race/ethnicity, grade level, gender, CESA regions, district enrollment, and economic disadvantage. Data were also cross-tabulated. Participants made observations about the data that deepened understanding of the status of reading achievement in Wisconsin.

Summary of Findings:

- Students with disabilities in all grade levels perform at low reading levels and reading proficiency decreases between grades 3 and 10.
- There is not significant variance in reading achievement by gender, district enrollment size, or geographic (CESA) region.
- In general, students with disabilities who are economically disadvantaged have lower reading achievement than students who are not economically disadvantaged; however, students without disabilities who are economically disadvantaged outperform students with disabilities who are not economically disadvantaged.
- Students with disabilities who are Black, Hispanic, and American Indian tend to have lower reading achievement than White or Asian students. However, these racial patterns also hold true for students without disabilities.
- Students with Specific Learning Disabilities have the lowest proficiency rates within the students with disabilities subgroup (4%). Students with Other Health Impairments and Emotional and Behavioral Disabilities are second and third lowest performing (10% and 13%, respectively). While these data point to variance by disability category, when compared to students without disabilities (40%), significant gaps exist notwithstanding the category of impairment.

Based upon these findings, as well as strong stakeholder input, WDPI opted not to narrow its focus to a particular subgroup (*e.g.* race/ethnicity, disability category, or grade level) as the need for improvement exists across all subgroups, and spans all districts. Wisconsin's SIMR is built upon this premise (see SIMR section for more detail), but identifies how the state will measure the results of improved literacy for students with disabilities. The state's system of support must make resources available to all districts while providing targeted technical assistance for improving the achievement of low performing subgroups such as students of color with disabilities and students with Specific Learning Disabilities.

Information from the data analysis, as well as a "tiered universal" approach for technical assistance which the state plans to execute through the SSIP, was shared with various internal and external stakeholders. While it is clear that reading achievement stands out as a main concern for students with disabilities in Wisconsin, stakeholders suggested that WDPI's RDA plan also include a greater outcomes-based focus, such as making a strong, concrete connection to the impact of reading on college and career outcome measures for all students with disabilities. The focus area should, therefore, link to eventual improvement in American College Test (ACT) scores for students with disabilities, and postsecondary outcomes data. Stakeholders also continued to emphasize the importance of early intervention (both in early age and at the first sign of academic struggle), family engagement, culturally responsive practices, and the impact of behavior on the acquisition of reading proficiency.

**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 LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. 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 initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these 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.

After establishing reading as Wisconsin's area of focus, WDPI continued to work with stakeholders (as outlined in the Data Analysis section) to analyze the state's capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based

practices with fidelity to improve literacy results for students with disabilities. Stakeholders were heavily involved in each step of Phase I development, and are committed to working with DPI moving forward to impact reading results for students with disabilities in Wisconsin. A framework (attached) was developed to outline the process and ensure relevant systems, structures, and stakeholders were included in the analysis. The framework laid out a plan for gathering information on what LEAs were accessing and implementing; what services CESAs and professional organizations were offering and who was accessing these services; and what supports, data, and processes were currently in existence throughout the various teams within WDPI, including existing IDEA discretionary grant initiatives. This information was analyzed and stakeholders provided input to identify areas for alignment, capacity-building, and refinement based on Wisconsin's area of focus.

**LEA Survey-** professional development, technical assistance, quality standards

All Wisconsin LEAs were surveyed to determine what they were currently accessing and implementing to increase literacy results for students with disabilities. LEA representatives were asked what strategies, resources, or interventions they have employed to increase reading outcomes for students with disabilities in the last two years as well as their perceived effectiveness. Responses indicated that respondents largely thought in terms of packaged interventions rather than available supports to refine their systems or service delivery, or supports to increase meaningful access to general education curriculum and instruction. However, respondents rated services from WDPI projects and systems approaches as more effective than products and individual strategies. This led to the conclusion that additional supports may be needed to assist LEAs in selecting the most effective evidence-based practices.

**CESA Survey-** professional development, technical assistance

Each CESA was surveyed about the professional development and technical assistance they provide that may impact literacy outcomes for students with disabilities. CESA staff were instructed to collaborate among special education, literacy, and Title I departments to submit one spreadsheet to WDPI outlining their relevant services. Respondents were also asked to provide information on who had accessed their services, specifically special and/or general educators, as well as if they provide follow-up or coaching supports.

Results showed tremendous variance among CESAs with respect to number of offerings and content and breadth of supports, indicating inequitable district access to professional learning. There was somewhat representative involvement by special educators in many professional learning opportunities, but that was not the case for more in-depth literacy-focused opportunities such as disciplinary literacy. Lastly, while LEAs largely focused on purchased programs when citing their efforts toward increasing reading outcomes for students with disabilities, CESAs offered a broader mix of systems-based approaches along with specific interventions. However, very few cited supports focused on meaningful access to general education curriculum and instruction for students with disabilities. These results pointed to a need to ensure equitable access to professional learning opportunities throughout the state as well as to ensure both general and special educators have access to relevant high quality resources. Additionally, the lack of educator knowledge and skills related to strategies to increase meaningful access to rich, standards-based, general education curriculum and instruction began to emerge as a potential root cause.

**Professional Organization Survey-** professional development, technical assistance

Representatives from 53 state professional organizations were surveyed about the professional development and technical assistance they provide that may impact literacy outcomes for students with disabilities. Identified representatives received an email invitation to provide input, and the survey link was also posted on the WDPI Special Education Team's website in an effort to be as transparent as possible and gather input from organizations that may have been missed through the targeted invitation.

Responses indicated that few organizations provide supports that are specifically focused on increasing literacy outcomes for students with disabilities. The exceptions were those organizations that have literacy central to their mission, though very little was mentioned to support struggling readers. Most respondents cited broadly focused annual conferences and supports and indicated segregated targeted audiences.

**State Education Agency (SEA) Interviews-** governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, technical assistance, data capacity, accountability

Interviews were conducted and supporting documents and resources were examined with representatives from 13 teams at WDPI. Representative teams included Special Education, Teacher Education Professional Development and Licensing, Content and Learning, Office of Educational Accountability, Title I and School Support, Educator Effectiveness, Public Library Development, Resources for Libraries and Lifelong Learning, Office of Student Assessment, Career and Technical Education, Literacy and Mathematics, Student Services Prevention and Wellness, and Instructional Media and Technology. Interviewees were asked to provide information on the following as it relates to the work of their teams:

- **supports** provided that may impact reading outcomes for students with disabilities (general supports offered, requirements of specific programs/grants, etc.)
- **data** or other resources that may support RDA efforts (student-level data, district/school access of specific services, program research/evaluation, district/school identification status, etc.)
- **processes** used that may align with RDA work (monitoring and accountability, fiscal oversight, spotlighting, data collections, local/state/federal network connections, etc.)

General conclusions are that WDPI currently offers a wealth of quality supports that may be leveraged to assist schools in increasing literacy results for students with disabilities. However, these supports generally are not coordinated across divisions and are typically accessed by singular audiences, again indicating a "siloed" approach to service delivery in Wisconsin.

Monitoring processes also happen in isolation, often resulting in burdensome requirements for districts, such as multiple required improvement plans and unrealistic professional development expectations. This disparate system was identified as another potential root cause due to the multitude of requirements and focus areas. In particular, both internal and external stakeholders identified aligning with Title I monitoring and developing common supports as having high potential for improving efficiency and effectiveness of both systems. With Wisconsin's renewed waiver application for flexibility under No Child Left Behind (NCLB), the opportunity to align systems is timely, particularly as it relates to monitoring and supports for Focus and Priority schools and districts. Work toward coordinating federal fiscal monitoring and electronic application systems through WISEgrants (https://dpi.wi.gov/sites/default/files/imce/wisegrants/pdf/wisegrants-intro-ho-ffc15.pdf) was underway at the time of analysis, and may serve as a model for integration of other processes.

Through this analysis, some key areas to leverage and collaborate with were identified. The alignment to WDPI's overarching vision of Every Child a Graduate College and Career Ready, as outlined by State Superintendent Tony Evers (http://dpi.wi.gov/statesupt), and the goals and focus areas within, are direct links to increasing outcomes for students with disabilities. Agenda 2017 goals include:

- increasing graduation rates

- increasing college and career readiness
- closing graduation and college and career readiness gaps
- increasing proficiency rates in third grade reading and eighth grade mathematics
- adopting the Fair Funding for Our Future plan

Agenda 2017 focus areas include:

- standards and instruction: what and how should kids learn?
- assessments and data systems: how do we know if they learned it?
- school and educator effectiveness: how do we ensure kids have highly effective teachers and schools?
- school finance reform: how should we pay for schools?

Additionally, WDPI recently released its Promoting Excellence for All initiative (http://dpi.wi.gov/excforall). Promoting Excellence for All provides information and strategies successfully used by Wisconsin educators to raise the achievement of students of color, closing the gap between them and their peers. Strategies are categorized within four focus areas:

- effective instruction
- student-teacher relationships
- family and community engagement
- school and instructional leadership

These four categories now serve as a framework for much of the work within WDPI, and many of the outlined strategies within these materials are supported through research for their effectiveness for students with disabilities as well. This initiative has opened a door for spotlighting additional promising practices that have led to greater reading outcomes for students with disabilities, using a similar systematic data-based decision-making and showcasing process.

Another high leverage area identified for use in Wisconsin's RDA efforts is the existing professional learning materials and implementation data in the content area of literacy. These high-quality resources supporting evidence-based practices are currently largely accessed by general education audiences, but lay the foundation for effective literacy systems. An area of need within these resources is specific professional learning on reaching struggling readers, around both strategies for meaningful access and literacy-specific content, as well as greater access for both general and special education audiences. Literacy-specific professional learning opportunities was one of the most often-cited suggestions by external stakeholders for RDA support development, due to the potential root cause related to lack of teacher skills in the area of high quality reading instruction.

Although no specific requirements currently monitored through the indicators or the districts' PCSA correlated with improved reading outcomes, stakeholders asked whether the state was monitoring requirements using the lens of improved reading achievement. It was determined that the Individualized Education Program (IEP) could be leveraged to have a greater impact through a revised PCSA focused on improving reading outcomes for students whose disability impacts reading. Due to Wisconsin's SIMR, the PCSA is currently under redevelopment to focus on reading outcomes. Monitoring data will be collected using this new tool in 2016-17.

Other systems in place that are currently driving education in Wisconsin include the new Educator Effectiveness system that uses the Charlotte Danielson framework, changes in assessment systems, the implementation of Common Core State Standards, and required Academic and Career Plans. Additionally, as described in the data analysis section, WDPI has developed a new data dashboard system, WISEdash (http://wisedash.dpi.wi.gov/), and contracted for the development of a standardized data inquiry process, WISExplore (http://dpi.wi.gov/wisexplore), to use in continuous improvement planning. WISElearn (http://dpi.wi.gov/wiselearn) will be a single sign-in portal to online professional learning through which LEAs will access all professional learning materials developed by and associated with WDPI. Both internal and external stakeholders emphasized aligning to and utilizing these newly standardized systems within RDA processes and improvement supports.

**Individuals with Disabilites Act (IDEA) Discretionary Grant and State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) analysis-** quality standards, professional development, technical assistance, data capacity, fiscal

WDPI has reviewed and prioritized IDEA discretionary funding to support state-wide systems change grant projects. Those projects are outlined here: http://dpi.wi.gov/sped/educators/discretionary-grants/summaries. A few of these projects, with the addition of SPDG, provide a particular foundation upon which supports for Wisconsin's SIMR can be built and disseminated.

The Wisconsin Response to Intervention (RtI) Center (http://www.wisconsinrticenter.org/) is Wisconsin's largest discretionary grant project, offering regional professional development and technical assistance on culturally responsive multi-level systems of support (Response to Intervention and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports) equitably throughout the state. Professional learning opportunities also include training in Leadership and Coaching and Reviewing K-5 Universal Reading Instruction. The Wisconsin RtI Center also employs a coordinator position specifically focused on supports for students with disabilities. Implementation and outcome data are routinely collected, analyzed, and reported. An area of need is to infuse intentional content on supports to reach higher outcomes for students with disabilities within all professional learning offered through the Center.

The Special Education RSN (http://dpi.wi.gov/sped/educators/initiatives/regional-services-network) has shifted its focus the last two years to provide direct supports to school teams identified based on low graduation rates or reading achievement for students with disabilities. Each RSN Director serves as a coach to assist school teams in action planning processes to increase identified areas for improvement. While this regional, targeted approach holds much promise to impact outcomes, there is a need for increased coordination of the project, professional learning around identified core competencies for those serving in a coaching role, and processes for schools to identify and implement evidence-based practices with fidelity to increase reading outcomes for students with disabilities. To address these areas of need, WDPI has increased funding within this project to hire an RSN Coordinator.

Wisconsin's SPDG ( http://dpi.wi.gov/sped/educators/consultation/state-personnel-development-grant) has been developed to support schools identified due to low performance in reading or mathematics with professional learning on Professional Learning Communities (PLC) formation, function, and improvement in learner outcomes. Each identified school is provided with a coach to guide implementation efforts. The SPDG also supports research to practice partnerships with institutes of higher education (IHE), and supports continuous improvement planning around outcomes within the Early Childhood Program Support and Leadership project. Future SPDG cohorts will be chosen based on need aligned to Wisconsin's SIMR, and improvement planning will align to the coordinated system of support outlined in the Coherent Improvement Strategies section.

WSPEI (http://dpi.wi.gov/sped/families) assists Wisconsin school districts and parents of children with disabilities to develop and maintain ongoing, positive communication about their children's education. WSPEI helps parents and school districts find or create the resources to build positive working relationships that lead to shared decision making and children's learning. In an effort to align supports to Wisconsin's SIMR, WSPEI now provides supports for families to

meaningfully discuss reading strategies and approaches with educators, as well as provides tools for families to work with their children on literacy-specific content. WSPEI serves as a structure to support families and school-family partnerships, while implementing new evidence-based practices to impact literacy outcomes.

The Early Childhood Program Support and Leadership project supports SPP early childhood indicators and initiatives. These grants support best practices and community collaborations in early education. An early childhood literacy consultant was added to the project this year to develop and deliver professional learning opportunities around early literacy practices. An early literacy training package has also been developed.

## State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

*Statement*

The State will increase the performance of students with IEPs on the statewide literacy assessment, grades 3-8.

*Description*

Wisconsin will utilize a point based-measure of growth in proficiency on the statewide literacy assessment that accounts for three years of data and controls for annual changes in the number of students tested.  Points are award for each student who falls into each category of proficiency  (i.e. minimal/below basic, basic, proficient, and advanced) (see attached SIMR Methodology).

Wisconsin envisions its SIMR to consist of both a result and measurement component.

### Result

WDPI aims to improve the performance results of students with disabilities on the statewide literacy assessment, grades three through eight. This decision was made as a result of meetings with multiple stakeholder groups focused on a broad analysis of indicator data, the establishment of core values within Wisconsin's RDA system, an analysis of leverage points within and between indicators, and an in-depth exploration of data. Reading performance data was disaggregated by multiple subgroups, geographic regions, and district sizes. For details of each of these components, please see the Data Analysis section.

### Measurement

Wisconsin is committed to improving literacy results for students with IEPs ages 3-21. However, the measure by which progress will be judged is slightly narrower; a function of tested grades three through eight in the statewide assessment. In selecting a SIMR, WDPI considered several factors, including alignment with stakeholder input throughout Phase I of RDA and the likelihood that the chosen SIMR will promote broad buy-in (*e.g.* across grade levels, disability category areas, and impact on other indicators). Furthermore, the metric chosen had to be sensitive enough to show annual changes while also aligning with an indicator reported in the APR. In addition to meeting these criteria more effectively than several alternatives, WDPI believes this particular SIMR is advantageous for the following reasons:

- this SIMR is a growth metric distinct from any Part B indicator and separate from any targets set under Wisconsin's flex waiver;
- the point based proficiency index is reported on school and district report cards in Wisconsin and will continue to be as Wisconsin transitions between assessment systems;
- points are awarded for moving each student to a higher level of proficiency in the current year, regardless of a student's proficiency level in the past;
- three years of data are considered with the most recent data given the highest weight. This will incentivize districts to improve annually, while smoothing volatility in results;
- the index controls for annual changes in the number of students taking the assessment;
- the minimum cell size for reporting is 20 students with disabilities in a district. In the case that there are not 20 students with disabilities ($n$=18), a supergroup is utilized for reporting consisting of students with disabilities, students eligible for free and reduced lunch, or English Language Learners; and
- this SIMR creates alignment with metrics used by the Office of Educational Accountability and Title I.

### Operationalization

Wisconsin will utilize a point-based measure of student-level growth in proficiency on the statewide literacy assessment, which directly encompasses results reported in Indicators 3b and 3c for reading. Points are awarded for student performance in each of the four categories of proficiency:  minimal/below basic, basic, proficient, and advanced. Point values are equally weighted between categories, *i.e.* 0 points for minimal/below basic, 0.5 points for basic, 1 point for proficient, and 1.5 points for advanced (please see equation 1 in attached SIMR Methodology).

The measure will include the three previous years of test data referred to as "Current Year, Prior Year 1, and Prior Year 2." The annual point values are adjusted in the following two ways. First, annual weights are applied; the weights are structured so that the current year results count most heavily in the measure. Second, a test participation multiplier is included to control for annual changes in the number of students tested. In addition to the test participation control, the use of three years of data helps smooth inter-year volatility such that the score is a better representation of true progress/regress than year-to-year changes alone. Lastly, the SIMR is halved to account for the fact that the point based proficiency measure on the report card combines both reading and mathematics assessment data. (Please see equation 2 in attached SIMR Methodology).

The SIMR is directly related to Wisconsin's area of focus—reading achievement for students with disabilities. Additionally, the SIMR spans all tested grades, disability categories, and race/ethnicities, and will ensure that all LEAs are accountable under Results Driven Accountability, including receiving data on a local SIMR. The importance of this breadth, stemming from both data analysis and stakeholder input is discussed in detail in the data analysis section.

WDPI believes that the SIMR is supported by the current statewide infrastructure. For example, the Wisconsin RtI center has been working with LEAs across Wisconsin to scale up multi-level systems of support at increasing levels of fidelity, with a particular focus on literacy. Similarly, Wisconsin's SPDG and RSN project foci, as outlined in the Infrastructure Analysis section, help address low reading performance for students with disabilities, including data and root cause analysis, the design and implementation of improvement plans, and evaluation of progress. Finally, an analysis of the professional learning offered within each CESA showed a focus on literacy for both students with and without disabilities. As CESAs are one of WDPI's main conduits to LEAs, an alignment with their professional development and technical assistance offerings is both advantageous and necessary for systemic improvement. While this alignment provides a sound foundation upon which Wisconsin can build, additional areas to address are outlined in the Infrastructure Analysis and Coherent Improvement Strategies sections.

Wisconsin's SIMR is closely aligned with State Superintendent Tony Evers' Agenda 2017, which focuses on increasing the percentage of students scoring proficient in third grade reading, and decreasing reading achievement gaps for historically under-achieving subgroups such as students with disabilities and students of color. While Wisconsin's SIMR extends to all tested grades, the third grade reading proficiency is of paramount importance. For example, students who do not read at grade-level proficiency in third grade are four times less likely to graduate than those who do. This points to the need to have systems in place to impact early literacy skills. The choice to focus on all tested grades rather than a single grade, however, stems both from broad stakeholder input and trend data, which illustrate an intransigent decline in achievement between third and eighth grade. Thus, improving third grade reading results without addressing the decline that occurs in later grades would be insufficient in addressing the broader problems—one of both low performance and performance gaps. Indeed, each grade-level must increase or maintain gains in performance occurring in earlier grades.

As reading performance relates to the likelihood of graduation, the SIMR connects to another important component of Agenda 2017: narrowing graduation rate gaps by 50 percent for at-risk subgroups. While the graduation rate for students with disabilities in Wisconsin is nearly 70 percent, the gap between students with and without disabilities is 20 percent. As described in the data analysis section, stakeholders acknowledged the need to improve graduation rates for students with disabilities, but believed focusing on reading would yield significant leverage to that end.

The SIMR is also aligned with a growth measurement currently reported on school and district report cards. Importantly, both the SIMR and the report card metric will be reportable as WDPI transitions from the Wisconsin Statewide Assessment System (WSAS) to the Badger Exam (Smarter Balanced), and then to the Forward Exam. The choice of this SIMR creates alignment between the Special Education Team, the Office of Educational Accountability, and the Title I team.

Because every student tested is counted in Wisconsin's SIMR, and the weights are evenly distributed across proficiency categories, the SEA, LEAs, and schools, have a strong incentive to design and implement improvement strategies that reach all students, regardless of proficiency level. Similarly, the year-based weighting structure incentivizes efforts to ensure individual student growth in the "Current Year," regardless of a student's performance in prior years.

**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 result(s). 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 LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Based on the data analysis, the determination that reading achievement for students with disabilities is unacceptably low across the state, across grade levels, across race and ethnicity categories, and across disability categories, lead stakeholders to agree that Wisconsin's Theory of Action and improvement strategies should focus on practices that will lead to broad systemic change, as well as provide educators and families with concrete supports to impact reading outcomes. Because the infrastructure analysis indicated there were definite areas of strength, namely high quality foundational materials in the content area of reading; and solid content, staffing, and service delivery through discretionary projects and CESAs, stakeholders recommended building upon these strengths where possible, and developing content and processes where there is a need for improvement.

Areas for improvement identified through the infrastructure analysis included the current isolated monitoring and support systems throughout the various WDPI divisions. This disconnect can contribute to increased burden in a time of rapidly changing requirements; inequitable access to professional learning opportunities throughout the state; and a lack of professional learning content on some key evidence-based practices, such as Universal Design for Learning (UDL), collaborative teaching structures, and reading-specific frameworks and strategies for struggling readers.

Stakeholders played a central role in determining improvement strategies. Based on their areas of expertise and experiences, groups of stakeholders, including members of the State Superintendent's Special Education Council (see Data Analysis section for membership), principals, reading teachers and specialists, directors of special education and pupil services, special education program support teachers, parent advocates, representatives from institutes of higher education, and internal WDPI teams and RDA workgroups provided input on successful strategies, barriers, and suggestions for improvement strategies and Wisconsin's Theory of Action. Stakeholders were walked through a logic modeling process to examine the likelihood that strategies will impact actions within LEAs and lead to identified outcomes. Examples of stakeholder activities are attached (see documents Determining a Direction-Stakeholder Input Template and Improvement Strategy Note Taking Logic Model Template-Stakeholder Input). All input was synthesized and rank ordered based on frequency of suggestion. The most frequently cited suggestions were:

- literacy-specific professional development;
- professional learning on strategies for meaningful access to standards-based curriculum and instruction (most frequent suggestions were UDL, co-teaching, and effective collaboration between general and special educators);
- supports to help teams implement systemic change (e.g. coaching, collaboration structures, scheduling, etc.);
- examination of teacher preparation programs so special educators are more prepared to teach reading;
- examples of successful practices;
- supports for effectively written IEPs that are based on grade level expectations and can bring about positive results; and
- integration of requirements and supports with other priorities and initiatives from WDPI.

Within the collaborative stakeholder process, there was much discussion about existing initiatives. Like many states, over the last few years Wisconsin has adopted new academic standards, prepared and built the infrastructure for new state-wide assessments, implemented a new teacher and principal evaluation system (Educator Effectiveness), provided systematic supports to focus and priority schools, and supported schools through the phases of implementation of multi-level systems of support for both academics and behavior as a framework for increasing outcomes for all students. Stakeholders repeatedly emphasized

that educators are experiencing initiative fatigue, and that any new requirements and supports should be well-integrated with existing effective initiatives. Stakeholders also emphasized that Wisconsin's RDA messaging and supports should focus both on special and general education staff and structures in order to make meaningful and sustained change to outcomes.

To help address the initiative fatigue issue as well as the potential root cause of disparate and frequently-changing priority areas, the state superintendent and his cabinet have determined that monitoring and improvement supports should be aligned across the various divisions of WDPI, beginning with the Special Education and Title I teams. In order to develop, implement, and scale-up the most effective and efficient system, WDPI is in the process of applying for intensive supports through the State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-Based Practices Center (SISEP).

Through this collaborative system and regional structures, identified districts will receive supports to help identify local potential root causes through WISE and local data examination processes, designate a district implementation team, use a continuous improvement approach to planning and implementation, and participate in professional learning to address potential root causes. Districts would no longer have multiple potentially unaligned improvement plans resulting in burdensome duplication of effort and less effective implementation due to an unmanageable number of priorities.

These supports will be enhanced through a coaching model to provide increased opportunity for effective implementation, scale-up, and sustainability of evidence-based practices with fidelity throughout the district using the implementation science framework. Through the root cause analysis process, districts will identify areas for increased professional learning. WDPI will provide resources for creating and/or scaling up professional learning for the evidence-based practices most frequently cited by stakeholders. A visual explanation of the proposed system of support and professional learning available or in various stages of development is attached in the document Wisconsin's RDA Improvement Strategies.

It was determined that the potential root cause related to skill deficits in effective literacy instruction and strategies for increasing meaningful access to standards-based curriculum and instruction would be addressed through providing specific professional learning opportunities on identified evidence-based practices, as well as providing concrete examples of practices that have made an impact on reading outcomes. In some cases existing professional learning materials will be leveraged in new ways and additional content will be added. For example, through the infrastructure analysis process, it was discovered that the Literacy and Mathematics team at WDPI has many existing standards-based professional learning modules and offerings specific to effective literacy instruction that were largely targeted at general education audiences. This material will now be cross-marketed to teams of general and special educators and include time to jointly plan for implementation. Additional content will be added around diagnosing specific reading deficits and processes for determining the most effective corresponding interventions, as this was identified as an area for improvement.

In addition to literacy-specific professional learning, professional learning opportunities and resources on strategies for increasing meaningful access to standards-based curriculum and instruction will be enhanced or created. Two emerging endeavors to address this area of need are supports for implementing UDL and next-generation IEPs. Professional learning on co-teaching and effective collaboration structures will also be developed.

WDPI has been providing UDL overviews for the past two years. While these overviews have been effective in spreading the message about UDL principles, for schools across Wisconsin to have the in-depth professional learning they would need to effectively scale up practices, it was determined that increased capacity to provide this professional learning was necessary. WDPI has partnered with the Center for Applied Special Technology (CAST) to host a UDL Presenters Academy, at which two representatives from each CESA and ten large school districts in the state participated in a train-the-trainer model. Trainers will be provided with ongoing support and access to training materials. Each participating CESA and district will partner with a school to implement UDL practices, become a demonstration site for other schools, and provide videos of best practices for state-wide spotlighting. School sites will be provided mini-grants for these purposes over at least a two-year period. Trainers will also agree to host trainings for multiple schools in their regions.

Guidance for establishing next-generation IEPs is in the process of being developed. Next Generation IEPs provide IEP teams with a framework to accelerate growth of students with disabilities with a focus on closing achievement gaps. To do this, IEP teams must have high expectations for students and utilize a standards-based lens when determining students' academic and functional needs. In addition to a focus on accelerated growth and achievement of standards, Next Generation IEPs enhance the capacity of IEP teams to produce results by providing guidance on collaboration, development of strength-based and student-centered IEPs, utilization of universal design for learning concepts, and the provision of frameworks to connect academic and functional disability-related needs to services, accommodations, goals, and supports.

Concrete examples of strategies that have increased reading achievement for students with disabilities will also be provided. As outlined in the Infrastructure Analysis section, WDPI's Promoting Excellence for All materials provide concrete examples of practices that have worked in Wisconsin to increase achievement for students of color. Not only does research point to the effectiveness of many of these strategies for students with disabilities, but the process and framework used for determining and spotlighting these strategies can be replicated to focus specifically on strategies that have had a positive impact on reading outcomes for students with disabilities in Wisconsin. Additional examples of promising practices will be provided through the UDL partner schools described above.

In addition to newly created or adapted professional learning opportunities, each activity within the IDEA discretionary grant projects was examined and categorized to determine alignment with Wisconsin's SIMR. Categories included "impact on literacy outcomes", "impact on other outcomes", and "general grant requirements". In preparing for next year's project guidelines, grant directors worked collaboratively with grant-specific stakeholders to examine activities and eliminate those that may be inefficient or ineffective and mindfully examine how activities can shift toward a focus on general or literacy-specific outcomes. Many grant projects have completed this planning and are making the changes outlined in the Infrastructure Analysis section.

**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 LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

**Submitted Theory of Action:** No Theory of Action Submitted

☑ **Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)**

Description of Illustration

As described in the Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies section, based on information from the data and infrastructure analyses, stakeholders

agreed that Wisconsin's Theory of Action and improvement strategies should focus on practices that will lead to broad systems change as well as provide educators and families with concrete supports to impact reading outcomes.

Three areas were identified for Wisconsin's Theory of Action:

- provide a common framework and supports for improvement planning and implementation of evidence-based practices through a cross-divisional coordinated improvement-planning process;
- develop and provide resources and professional learning on evidence-based practices to address:

    - meaningful access
    - literacy-specific needs
    - examples of promising practices; and

- implement a coaching model to support identified LEAs' district improvement plans with fidelity.

The coordinated monitoring and improvement-planning system and the development and provision of professional learning in the areas identified above are outlined in more detail in the Coherent Improvement Strategies section. Including a coaching component within the improvement support system was identified as a high-leverage, evidence-based practice that would lead to more effective implementation, scale-up, and sustainability of improvement practices. Stakeholders emphasized that without this, the other two areas within Wisconsin's Theory of Action would be less impactful, and that this should be a third component.

Stakeholders simultaneously focused on the Theory of Action and Coherent Improvement Strategies, as described in the Coherent Improvement Strategies section. Wisconsin stakeholders believe that implementing the Theory of Action will lead to greater literacy outcomes for students with disabilities. WDPI's collaborative system of improvement planning supports will help reduce duplications and an unnecessary number of focus areas so LEAs can eliminate duplication of effort, engage families in priority areas, and allocate resources to impact change. If district-level staff are communicating multiple and disparate priorities, school staff may become overwhelmed in a system that feels disconnected and unable to concentrate deeply on an area for improved practice. This is currently happening in many Wisconsin schools. The coordinated system of support will help district implementation teams align systems and requirements with desired student outcomes by focusing on the most effective supports, eliminating duplications, and decreasing burdens on school staff and providing a cohesive framework for families.

Resources provided by WDPI and allocated by LEAs for targeted professional learning supports on evidence-based practices in areas of identified need will help increase the specific skills identified as areas of need through the district's root cause analysis process. Increasing these skills will have a direct impact on the instructional experience students receive on a daily basis. Additionally, providing concrete examples of practices that have resulted in greater outcomes will provide teachers with strategies that can be implemented immediately.

Providing coaching supports will help ensure that the improvement-planning processes use a continuous improvement approach, that processes are implemented for LEA priorities being effectively communicated to schools, and that practices are implemented with fidelity.

Two documents are attached that help depict Wisconsin's Theory of Action. The first is a basic graphic that outlines the three main areas of focus, directionally showing impact on LEAs, schools, and teachers to impact literacy outcomes for students with disability. The second more thoroughly, yet concisely, maps the consequent actions of LEAs, schools, and teachers to impact Wisconsin's SIMR. These documents, along with the attached "Wisconsin's SSIP Improvement Strategies Outline" articulate Wisconsin's focus going forward for improving literacy outcomes for Wisconsin's students with disabilities.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

**Selected:** Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name:     Patricia Williams

Title:     Assistant Director

Email:     patricia.williams@dpi.wi.gov

Phone:     608-266-1781