WI
Part B

FFY2017
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) 2017 APR targets, results, slippage from the previous APR, and verification of correction of all previous findings of all noncompliance found in FFY 2016 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 continues to maintain substantial compliance in most compliance indicators (9, 10, 12, and 13). Additionally, WDPI, has developed the "College and Career Ready IEP Framework", which allows districts to continuously monitor 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. WDPI staff, as well as staff funded through discretionary grants, continue to support districts around this framework through technical assistance and training, grant activities, and the development of additional resources.

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. WDPI believes that the balanced monitoring approach under Results Driven Accountability (RDA) is beginning to yield results that are visible at the statewide level. Of particular note are the 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. WDPI nearly maintained the percentage of exiters enrolled in higher education (measure A), and continued to exceed the targets for the percentage of exiters enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of graduation (measure B) as well as exiters pursuing some other training program (measure C). The overall response rate was 49.8% for this year's survey within the sampling population, which is primarily due to outreach efforts by the Transition Improvement Grant (TIG) staff.

WDPI also saw gains in the Indicator 8 Family Engagement Survey. The FFY 2017 data represent 88.94% combined agreement on survey questions. The results show that the gains made in FFY 2016 (our baseline year for the new survey) were not an aberration, and that the new targets set by Wisconsin's State Superintendent's Advisory Council on Special Education are both rigorous and attainable. WDPI has intentionally leveraged family engagement as a means to improving literacy outcomes, and has utilized the Wisconsin Statewide Parent Educator Initiative (WSPEI), the Wisconsin Regional Special Education 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 few years of reporting, year-to-year comparisons of reading and math performance have been problematic. Now with three years of data available, professional development and technical assistance have been increasingly directed towards districts and schools that significantly underperform statewide averages. WDPI will continue to focus on statewide reading assessment as it is Wisconsin's area of focus under our State System Improvement Plan (SSIP). Many of the improvement strategies in our SSIP involve in-depth systems change. Finally, there is continued growth in Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) Indicator 5 data. For FFY 2017 reporting, there was a 1.5% increase in the number of students inside the regular classroom more than 80% of the day, and Wisconsin exceeded its target by 0.5%.

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 2016, improving from previous years and surpassing the target by 1%.

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 special education law. WDPI developed Model Local Educational Agency Special Education Policies and Procedures, as well as Sample Individualized Education Program (IEP) Forms and Guide, to help districts meet their obligation to comply with all special education requirements. All districts are required to either submit an assurance to the department that they have adopted the WDPI model policies and procedures and model forms or submit local versions 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 Family Engagement Survey, Post High School Outcomes Survey, Special Education Web Portal, and the WISEgrants federal grant management system. Each school year, all Wisconsin districts, including independent charter schools, complete, and submit an annual budget to the WDPI for review through the WISEgrants system. WISEgrants is a web based application and it is the IDEA flow-through and preschool funding mechanism that must be completed in an approvable form before a district may encumber and expend federal monies. Through WISEgrants, districts submit their IDEA flow-through and preschool budgets and provide an assurance to WDPI of compliance with state and federal special education requirements. Both the budgets and assurances are reviewed by a WDPI staff member assigned to work with the individual district. Through the WISEgrants system, maintenance of effort (MOE) eligibility and compliance is monitored for every Wisconsin school district every year. 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 Wisconsin 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 calendar days of receiving the hearing request, or 7 calendar 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, WDPI 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 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 timely identification and correction of noncompliance.

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 reviews data from the database for the reporting year and

identifies noncompliance. 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 and compliance with the requirements of IDEA and state special education law. In addition, each week WDPI sends an email to all districts that includes updates on new guidance materials, grants and other supports, as well as technical assistance opportunities. 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 staff.

Additionally, WDPI has a number of IDEA discretionary grant initiatives in place to systematically provide general and targeted, evidence-based professional learning and technical assistance to districts based upon area of need. Examples include:

- The Wisconsin Regional Special Education Network (RSN) (https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/educators/initiatives/regional-special-education-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/)
- Independent 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)
- Technical Assistance Network for Improvement (https://dpi.wi.gov/continuous-improvement/resources-supports/ta-network)
- Research to Practice Inclusive Communities Project (https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/research-practice-inclusive-communities-rpic-project)

Finally, WDPI is an Active Scaling Up State with the OSEP-funded State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-Based Practices (SISEP) Center. Through this partnership, WDPI infuses 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 coach DITs from districts who need assistance, identified through a coordinated system with Title I and Educator Effectiveness, focusing on an evidence-based district improvement planning process through WISExplore. 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 Regional Special Education Network (RSN) (https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/educators/initiatives/regional-special-education-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)
- Independent 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 (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 representatives 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, the Title I Team, and the Educator Development and Support 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 2016 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 2016 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 2016 APR in 2018, 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 https://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 that would result in the disclosure of personally identifiable information about individual children. 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.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

OSEP Response

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

States were instructed to submit Phase III Year Three of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) by April 1, 2019.   The State provided the required information.

Required Actions

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2018 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 in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year 4; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2019); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including 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; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities are impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

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	2016
Target ≥	85.00%	85.00%
Data	67.51%	68.54%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	85.00%	85.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

☑ Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

> Indicator 1 targets are the same as the annual graduations rate targets for children with disabilities 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 2016-17 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/28/2018	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	5,090	
SY 2016-17 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/28/2018	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	7,459	null
SY 2016-17 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	9/28/2018	2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	68.24%	Calculate ☐

FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
5,090	7,459	68.54%	85.00%	68.24%

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 requirements for obtaining a regular diploma in Wisconsin for FFY 2017 reporting are the same for students with disabilities and students without disabilities with one exception. Under Wisconsin State Statute §118.33(1m), students without IEPs must take and pass the high school civics test before they may be awarded a high school diploma. Students with IEPs must take the high school civics test, unless the IEP team determines that it is not appropriate to administer the test, but students with IEPs are not required to pass the high school civics test in order to receive a high school diploma. This statutory requirement went into effect beginning in the 2016-2017 school year.

Otherwise, the requirements below apply to students both with and without IEPs.

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 §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 Wisconsin State Statute §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?   Yes
Explain the difference in conditions that youth with IEPs must meet.

The requirements for obtaining a regular diploma in Wisconsin for FFY 2017 reporting are the same for students with disabilities and students without disabilities with one exception. Under Wisconsin State Statute §118.33(1m), students without IEPs must take and pass the high school civics test before they may be awarded a high school diploma. Students with IEPs must take the high school civics test, unless the IEP team determines that it is not appropriate to administer the test, but students with IEPs are not required to pass the high school civics test in order to receive a high school diploma. This statutory requirement went into effect beginning in the 2016-2017 school year.

Actions required in FFY 2016 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	2016
Target ≤	1.70%	1.60%
Data	2.24%	2.14%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≤	1.50%	1.40%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

☑ Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

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 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs grades 7 - 12 who dropped out.	Number of youth with IEPs grades 7 - 12 expected to complete the school term.	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
1,255	51,258	2.14%	1.50%	2.45%

☑ **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.

Consistent with the methodology used in FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, and in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data, WDPI uses the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving in a single year. The calculation is the percentage of youth with IEPs previously enrolled in grades 7 - 12 who exit special education as a result of dropping out, divided by the total number of youths with IEPs in grades 7 - 12 who are expected to complete the school term. WDPI is reporting 2016-2017 data for FFY 2017.

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 is available at https://dpi.wi.gov/wisedash/about-data/dropouts.

WDPI 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

Reasons for Slippage

The increased dropout rate cannot be attributed to a significant increase among particular districts. The 2016-17 school year was a transition year between data systems, with the implementation of a new statewide data system (WISEdata). Consequently, districts and their vendors were adapting to the new system. An analysis of non-certified current data using the last known record of each student shows a dropout rate among students with IEPs of 2.18% for the 2016-17 school year. Unfortunately those corrections did not come prior to the snapshot used for Federal reporting. This corrected rate of 2.18% does not demonstrate progress toward Wisconsin's target, but does decrease slippage to 0.04% from the previous year's performance.

WDPI will continue to monitor this data to ensure full implementation of the new WISE Data system. In addition, WDPI will provide additional targeted training to districts on how to use the Dropout Early Warning System (DEWS). This system assists districts in identifying students with IEPs that have a possibility of dropping out so that additional resources and supports can be provided to those identified students. Training is also provided through the Transition Improvement Grant (TIG) staff on the Graduation Rate Improvement Planning (GRIP) process. This process utilizes nationally recognized evidence-based dropout and graduation rate improvement strategies. For more information see https://www.wigrip.org/.

Actions required in FFY 2016 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	2016
Reading	A Grade 3	Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%
		Data	97.37%	97.78%
	B Grade 4	Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%
		Data	96.85%	97.33%
	C Grade 5	Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%
		Data	97.14%	97.67%
	D Grade 6	Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%
		Data	97.21%	97.10%
	E Grade 7	Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%
		Data	96.62%	97.08%
	F Grade 8	Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%
		Data	95.55%	96.03%

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

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Group Name	FFY	2015	2016
Math	G Grade 11	Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%
		Data	86.64%	91.37%
	A Grade 3	Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%
		Data	97.30%	97.82%
	B Grade 4	Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%
		Data	96.76%	97.53%
	C Grade 5	Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%
		Data	97.10%	97.70%
	D Grade 6	Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%
		Data	97.07%	97.21%
	E Grade 7	Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%
		Data	96.46%	97.17%
	F Grade 8	Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%
		Data	95.67%	95.97%
	G Grade 11	Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%
		Data	92.16%	91.52%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Grade 3	95.00%	95.00%
	B ≥ Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%
	C ≥ Grade 5	95.00%	95.00%
	D ≥ Grade 6	95.00%	95.00%
	E ≥ Grade 7	95.00%	95.00%
	F ≥ Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%
	G ≥ Grade 11	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A ≥ Grade 3	95.00%	95.00%
	B ≥ Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%
	C ≥ Grade 5	95.00%	95.00%
	D ≥ Grade 6	95.00%	95.00%
	E ≥ Grade 7	95.00%	95.00%
	F ≥ Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%
	G ≥ Grade 11	95.00%	95.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

☑ Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

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 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2017 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? yes

Data Source: SY 2017-18 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) **Date:** 3/28/2019

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	9134	9069	9165	8812	8543	8836	n	n	8304	n	n
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	2362	1802	1478	1297	1129	1098			772		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	6000	6454	6810	6601	6488	6641			5812		
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	544	573	613	601	620	703			663		

Data Source: SY 2017-18 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C185; Data Group: 588) **Date:** 3/28/2019

Math assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	9146	9082	9175	8821	8550	8844	n	n	8305	n	n
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	2364	1805	1478	1297	1129	1097			776		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	6013	6464	6825	6604	6491	6643			5830		
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	543	573	613	602	620	700			663		

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Grade 3	9,157	8,929	97.78%	95.00%	97.51%
B Grade 4	9,088	8,848	97.33%	95.00%	97.36%
C Grade 5	9,171	8,907	97.67%	95.00%	97.12%
D Grade 6	8,828	8,515	97.10%	95.00%	96.45%
E Grade 7	8,549	8,243	97.08%	95.00%	96.42%
F Grade 8	8,847	8,453	96.03%	95.00%	95.55%
G Grade 11	8,333	7,276	91.37%	95.00%	87.32%

Reasons for Group G Slippage

The slippage observed among grade 11 statewide assessment participants is attributed to a 54% increase in students being absent throughout the testing window and a 109% increase in parents/guardians opting-out of testing from the previous year. These increases account for 3% of the slippage observed. Similar decreases in participation among students without IEPs were observed and attributed to the same factors, although not to the same degree as students with IEPs. WDPI will partner with school districts, families and parent advocacy organizations, as well as with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent Educator Initiative (WSPEI) to promote the importance of statewide testing, with an emphasis on eleventh grade, in order to encourage and increase participation. Our Office of Student Assessment (OSA) has also developed a talking point resource on test participation and parent opt-outs. This

resource is shared with all District Assessment Coordinators (DAC) to help them in their communication with parents about the importance and benefits of testing. WDPI is also making sure that school districts are aware that there are three windows available for schools to use for the 11th grade statewide assessment to ensure all students have an opportunity to test.

In addition, we include absenteeism measures in both our state and ESSA accountability systems, and for the specific purpose of informing local conversations about student engagement and attendance in school. In providing technical assistance, we send information to school districts about efforts to increase attendance for students, often referencing "Attendance Works". We believe that these efforts will lead to an increase in participation in statewide assessments.

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Grade 3	9,165	8,939	97.82%	95.00%	97.53%
B Grade 4	9,101	8,861	97.53%	95.00%	97.36%
C Grade 5	9,182	8,923	97.70%	95.00%	97.18%
D Grade 6	8,836	8,518	97.21%	95.00%	96.40%
E Grade 7	8,556	8,246	97.17%	95.00%	96.38%
F Grade 8	8,855	8,451	95.97%	95.00%	95.44%
G Grade 11	8,334	7,298	91.52%	95.00%	87.57%

Reasons for Group G Slippage

The slippage observed among grade 11 statewide assessment participants is attributed to a 54% increase in students being absent throughout the testing window and a 109% increase in parents/guardians opting-out of testing from the previous year. These increases account for 3% of the slippage observed. Similar decreases in participation among students without IEPs were observed and attributed to the same factors, although not to the same degree as students with IEPs. WDPI will partner with school districts, families and parent advocacy organizations, as well as with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent Educator Initiative (WSPEI) to promote the importance of statewide testing, with an emphasis on eleventh grade, in order to encourage and increase participation. Our Office of Student Assessment (OSA) has also developed a talking point resource on test participation and parent opt-outs. This resource is shared with all District Assessment Coordinators (DAC) to help them in their communication with parents about the importance and benefits of testing. WDPI is also making sure that school districts are aware that there are three windows available for schools to use for the 11th grade statewide assessment to ensure all students have an opportunity to test.

In addition, we include absenteeism measures in both our state and ESSA accountability systems, and for the specific purpose of informing local conversations about student engagement and attendance in school. In providing technical assistance, we send information to school districts about efforts to increase attendance for students, often referencing "Attendance Works". We believe that these efforts will lead to an increase in participation in statewide assessments.

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 2016 response

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2017 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	2016
Reading	A Grade 3	Target ≥	43.80%	19.01%
		Data	19.01%	18.71%
	B Grade 4	Target ≥	43.80%	18.00%
		Data	18.00%	18.97%
	C Grade 5	Target ≥	43.80%	14.80%
		Data	14.77%	15.30%
	D Grade 6	Target ≥	43.80%	13.60%
		Data	12.42%	12.30%
	E Grade 7	Target ≥	43.80%	13.60%
		Data	12.51%	12.00%
	F Grade 8	Target ≥	43.80%	13.60%
		Data	11.06%	10.46%

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

	Group Name	FFY	2015	2016
Math	G Grade 11	Target ≥	43.80%	13.60%
		Data	11.83%	10.23%
	A Grade 3	Target ≥	57.80%	24.20%
		Data	24.12%	23.90%
	B Grade 4	Target ≥	57.80%	20.70%
		Data	20.66%	19.37%
	C Grade 5	Target ≥	57.80%	17.40%
		Data	17.37%	16.30%
	D Grade 6	Target ≥	57.80%	13.60%
		Data	13.05%	12.70%
	E Grade 7	Target ≥	57.80%	13.60%
		Data	9.86%	9.65%
	F Grade 8	Target ≥	57.80%	13.60%
		Data	7.27%	6.59%
	G Grade 11	Target ≥	57.80%	13.60%
		Data	6.12%	6.82%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Grade 3	19.01%	21.20%
	B ≥ Grade 4	18.00%	21.20%
	C ≥ Grade 5	17.40%	21.20%
	D ≥ Grade 6	17.40%	21.20%
	E ≥ Grade 7	17.40%	21.20%
	F ≥ Grade 8	17.40%	21.20%
	G ≥ Grade 11	17.40%	21.20%
Math	A ≥ Grade 3	24.20%	24.20%
	B ≥ Grade 4	20.70%	21.00%
	C ≥ Grade 5	17.40%	21.00%
	D ≥ Grade 6	17.30%	21.00%
	E ≥ Grade 7	17.30%	21.00%
	F ≥ Grade 8	17.30%	21.00%
	G ≥ Grade 11	17.30%	21.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

☑ Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

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. Council revisited the targets during its September 2018 meeting and unanimously agreed to maintain the targets adopted on December 8, 2017.

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2017 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? yes

Data Source: SY 2017-18 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C178; Data Group: 584) **Date:** 3/28/2019

Reading proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	8906	8829	8901	8499	8237	8442	n	n	7247	n	n
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	900	811	574	399	333	243			98		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	462	687	594	420	453	293			420		
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	82	94	143	107	202	226			199		

Data Source: SY 2017-18 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C175; Data Group: 583) **Date:** 3/28/2019

Math proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	8920	8842	8916	8503	8240	8440	n	n	7269	n	n
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1237	852	640	448	322	240			88		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	849	762	805	503	380	303			338		
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	78	116	76	59	40	59			47		

FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Grade 3	8,929	1,450	18.71%	19.01%	16.24%
B Grade 4	8,848	1,592	18.97%	18.00%	17.99%
C Grade 5	8,907	1,311	15.30%	17.40%	14.72%
D Grade 6	8,515	929	12.30%	17.40%	10.91%
E Grade 7	8,243	988	12.00%	17.40%	11.99%
F Grade 8	8,453	762	10.46%	17.40%	9.01%
G Grade 11	7,276	724	10.23%	17.40%	9.95%

Reasons for Group A Slippage

Grade-level slippage from FFY 2016 to FFY 2017 may be the result of several factors, including the cohort nature of assessment data (ie. slippage does not reflect cohort level changes). WDPI observed a substantial increase in economically disadvantaged students across grade levels (measured by Free and Reduced Price Lunch eligibility), with average increases ranging from 3% to 5% among students with IEPs. WDPI has made closing achievement gaps a priority focus. As part of this effort, WDPI has been increasing its cross-team coordination with Title 1 services, collaborating and unifying its messaging, professional development, and resources with Title 1 services. We have also added two items to our procedural compliance monitoring system around ensuring that accommodations on assessments are properly considered, documented in the IEP, and implemented.

WDPI will continue to focus on student performance on the statewide reading assessment as it is Wisconsin's area of focus under our State System Improvement Plan (SSIP). Many of the improvement strategies in our SSIP involve in-depth systems change. We know from our work with implementation science that systems change efforts can take multiple years to yield student-level outcomes. Our SSIP includes capacity and implementation data that shows an increase in adult practices that are highly correlated with increased student-level results. Our focus on coaching, coordinating continuous improvement with Title 1 and educator effectiveness, and college and career ready IEPs and related monitoring will continue to be a focus of our systems-change work going forward. 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).

Reasons for Group D Slippage

Grade-level slippage from FFY 2016 to FFY 2017 may be the result of several factors, including the cohort nature of assessment data (ie. slippage does not reflect cohort level changes). WDPI observed a substantial increase in economically disadvantaged students across grade levels (measured by Free and Reduced Price Lunch eligibility), with average increases ranging from 3% to 5% among students with IEPs. WDPI has made closing achievement gaps a priority focus. As part of this effort, WDPI has been increasing its cross-team coordination with Title 1 services, collaborating and unifying its messaging, professional development, and resources with Title 1 services. We have also added two items to our procedural compliance monitoring system around ensuring that accommodations on assessments are properly considered, documented in the IEP, and implemented.

WDPI will continue to focus on student performance on the statewide reading assessment as it is Wisconsin's area of focus under our State System Improvement Plan (SSIP). Many of the improvement strategies in our SSIP involve in-depth systems change. We know from our work with implementation science that systems change efforts can take multiple years to yield student-level outcomes. Our SSIP includes capacity and implementation data that shows an increase in adult practices that are highly correlated with increased student-level results. Our focus on coaching, coordinating continuous improvement with Title 1 and educator effectiveness, and college and career ready IEPs and related monitoring will continue to be a focus of our systems-change work going forward. 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).

Reasons for Group F Slippage

Grade-level slippage from FFY 2016 to FFY 2017 may be the result of several factors, including the cohort nature of assessment data (ie. slippage does not reflect cohort level changes). WDPI observed a substantial increase in economically disadvantaged students across grade levels (measured by Free and Reduced Price Lunch eligibility), with average increases ranging from 3% to 5% among students with IEPs. WDPI has made closing achievement gaps a priority focus. As part of this effort, WDPI has been increasing its cross-team coordination with Title 1 services, collaborating and unifying its messaging, professional development, and resources with Title 1 services. We have also added two items to our procedural compliance monitoring system around ensuring that accommodations on assessments are properly considered, documented in the IEP, and implemented.

WDPI will continue to focus on student performance on the statewide reading assessment as it is Wisconsin's area of focus under our State System Improvement Plan (SSIP). Many of the improvement strategies in our SSIP involve in-depth systems change. We know from our work with implementation science that systems change efforts can take multiple years to yield student-level outcomes. Our SSIP includes capacity and implementation data that shows an increase in adult practices that are highly correlated with increased student-level results. Our focus on coaching, coordinating continuous improvement with Title 1 and educator effectiveness, and college and career ready IEPs and related monitoring will continue to be a focus of our systems-change work going forward. 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 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Grade 3	8,939	2,176	23.90%	24.20%	24.34%
B Grade 4	8,861	1,730	19.37%	20.70%	19.52%
C Grade 5	8,923	1,521	16.30%	17.40%	17.05%
D Grade 6	8,518	1,013	12.70%	17.30%	11.89%
E Grade 7	8,246	742	9.65%	17.30%	9.00%
F Grade 8	8,451	602	6.59%	17.30%	7.12%
G Grade 11	7,298	479	6.82%	17.30%	6.56%

Reasons for Group E Slippage

Grade-level slippage from FFY 2016 to FFY 2017 may be the result of several factors, including the cohort nature of assessment data (ie. slippage does not reflect cohort level changes). WDPI observed a substantial increase in economically disadvantaged students across grade levels (measured by Free and Reduced Price Lunch eligibility), with average increases ranging from 3% to 5% among students with IEPs. WDPI has made closing achievement gaps a priority focus. As part of this effort, WDPI has been increasing its cross-team coordination with Title 1 services, collaborating and unifying its messaging, professional development, and resources with Title 1 services. We have also added two items to our procedural compliance monitoring system around ensuring that accommodations on assessments are properly considered, documented in the IEP, and implemented.

While Wisconsin's area of focus under our State System Improvement Plan (SSIP) is on reading outcomes, many of the improvement strategies in our SSIP involve in-depth systems change, leading to improvement across all academic areas, including math. We know from our work with implementation science that systems change efforts can take multiple years to yield student-level outcomes. Our SSIP includes capacity and implementation data that shows an increase in adult practices that are highly correlated with increased student-level results. Our focus on coaching, coordinating continuous improvement with Title 1 and educator effectiveness, and college and career ready IEPs and related monitoring will continue to be a focus of our systems-change work going forward. 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).

Reasons for Group G Slippage

Grade-level slippage from FFY 2016 to FFY 2017 may be the result of several factors, including the cohort nature of assessment data (ie. slippage does not reflect cohort level changes). WDPI observed a substantial increase in economically disadvantaged students across grade levels (measured by Free and Reduced Price Lunch eligibility), with average increases ranging from 3% to 5% among students with IEPs. WDPI has made closing achievement gaps a priority focus. As part of this effort, WDPI has been increasing its cross-team coordination with Title 1 services, collaborating and unifying its messaging, professional development, and resources with Title 1 services. We have also added two items to our procedural compliance monitoring system around ensuring that accommodations on assessments are properly considered, documented in the IEP, and implemented.

While Wisconsin's area of focus under our State System Improvement Plan (SSIP) is on reading outcomes, many of the improvement strategies in our SSIP involve in-depth systems change, leading to improvement across all academic areas, including math. We know from our work with implementation science that systems change efforts can take multiple years to yield student-level outcomes. Our SSIP includes capacity and implementation data that shows an increase in adult practices that are highly correlated with increased student-level results. Our focus on coaching, coordinating continuous improvement with Title 1 and educator effectiveness, and college and career ready IEPs and related monitoring will continue to be a focus of our systems-change work going forward. 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).

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 2016 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	2016
Target ≤	2.50%	2.50%
Data	2.45%	2.45%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≤	2.50%	2.50%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

☑ Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

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 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
20	444	2.45%	2.50%	4.50%

Reasons for Slippage

The increased rate of districts experiencing disproportionate discipline is due to a number of very small districts who reported a single student with an IEP suspended or expelled in excess of 10 days. Due to the comparatively small population of students with IEPs in those districts, however, this was enough to identify them as having a significant discrepancy. Of the 20 districts with a significant discrepancy, 12 reported a single student as their numerator. In contrast, of the 11 districts with a significant discrepancy reported last year, only 2 reported a single student as their numerator.

To determine if this increase is an aberration, WDPI performed the same analysis as described in the accompanying methodology section, but with aggregated data over the past three years. With this larger sample size, only 2 of these 12 small districts still meet the criteria for a significant discrepancy. This result is much more consistent with Wisconsin's past performance on this indicator and would result in meeting our target with a statewide rate of 2.25%. WDPI will continue to closely monitor this data, and provide supports to districts identified with significant discrepancy. These supports include targeted technical assistance, access to the Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports (PBIS) Network, and participation in grant funded activities designed to assist educators working in district-level teams to learn how to implement evidence based improvement strategies in the areas of sensory, social and emotional and self-regulation skills.

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 2017 reporting (using data from the 2016-17 school year), the average statewide risk was 0.171 and the standard deviation was 0.471%. Thus, districts with a rate of suspension or expulsion greater than 1.11% were identified with significant discrepancy for FFY 2017 reporting.

Actions required in FFY 2016 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 2016 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2017 using 2016-2017 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 2017 with significant discrepancy (using 2016-17 data), a review was conducted of the district's 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, WDPI staff review a sample of records, conduct interviews using standard protocols, and review IDEA state complaint decisions and due process decisions. 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 2016

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	2016
Target	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%

Key: [ ] Gray – Data Prior to Baseline   [ ] Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
37	1	444	0%	0%	0.23%

Reasons for Slippage

For districts identified in FY 2017 with significant discrepancy (using 2016-2107 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 was one district with a practice that contributed to the significant discrepancy and did not comply with a procedural safeguard provision under 34 CFR § 300.530. Specifically, WDPI determined that the district did not provide educational services when a student was removed from school for violating a code of conduct for more than 10 cumulative school days in a school year. Consistent with OSEP memo 09-02, WDPI verified that the district is (1) now correctly implementing this provision (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, including the provision of compensatory services.

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

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

DPI 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 2017 reporting (using 2016-2017 data) the statewide risk was 0.171% and the standard deviation was 0.471%. Thus, districts with a rate of suspension or expulsion greater than 1.111% within one or more

race/ethnicity reporting categories were identified with a significant discrepancy.

Actions required in FFY 2016 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 2016 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2017 using 2016-2017 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 2017 with significant discrepancy (using 2016-2107 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 was one district with a practice that contributed to the significant discrepancy and did not comply with a procedural safeguard provision under 34 CFR § 300.530. Specifically, WDPI determined that the district did not provide services when a student was removed from school for violating a code of conduct for more than 10 cumulative school days in a school year. Consistent with OSEP memo 09-02, WDPI verified that the district is (1) now correctly implementing this provision (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, including the provision of compensatory services.

○ 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:

◉ The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Consistent with OSEP memo 09-02, WDPI verified that the district is (1) currently providing services when a student is removed from school for violating a code of conduct for more than 10 cumulative school days in a school year (ie. achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through monitoring; and (2) has corrective each individual case of noncompliance, including the provision of compensatory services.

To verify current compliance, WDPI staff examined a separate sample of current student records, and reviewed evidence demonstrating the provision of services after the 10th day of a disciplinary removal. WDPI found 100% compliance with this requirement. To verify each instance of individual student noncompliance was corrected, WDPI staffed reviewed a randomly drawn sample of student records found to be in noncompliance with this requirement, and verified that each instance was corrected. Correction included submission of evidence that the district had considered compensatory services by holding an IEP team meeting, or with agreement of the parent developed a written document to amend or modify the student's IEP to reflect compensatory services. The district submitted the corrected records for review by WDPI staff.

WDPI reviewed the district's policies and procedures and determined that they were consistent with and in compliance with the applicable requirements, including those under 34 CFR §300.530, and therefore the district was not required to revise its policies or procedures.

○ The State did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

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

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2017, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2017 have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (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 district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2018 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 2017, although its FFY 2017 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017.

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	2016
A	Target ≥	65.20%	66.80%
	Data	66.22%	67.39%
B	Target ≤	9.10%	8.70%
	Data	9.16%	8.84%
C	Target ≤	1.10%	1.05%
	Data	1.50%	1.43%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	68.40%	70.00%
Target B ≤	8.30%	7.90%
Target C ≤	1.00%	0.95%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

☑ Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

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 Advisory 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 based on the individual needs of a child.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	105,235	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	72,550	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	8,925	null

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	1,071	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	224	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	221	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	72,550	105,235	67.39%	68.40%	68.94%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	8,925	105,235	8.84%	8.30%	8.48%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,516	105,235	1.43%	1.00%	1.44%

Actions required in FFY 2016 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	2016
A	Target ≥	34.50%	35.50%
	Data	35.91%	32.43%
B	Target ≤	20.25%	19.25%
	Data	16.75%	19.36%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	36.50%	37.50%
Target B ≤	18.25%	17.25%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

☑ Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

> 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 based on the individual needs of a child.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	16,081	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	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	5,573	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	2,811	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b2. Number of children attending separate school	54	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	n	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	5,573	16,081	32.43%	36.50%	34.66%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	2,865	16,081	19.36%	18.25%	17.82%

☐ **Use a different calculation methodology**

Actions required in FFY 2016 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	2016
A1	Target ≥	78.90%	79.10%
	Data	80.68%	73.98%
A2	Target ≥	73.50%	74.00%
	Data	65.10%	61.34%
B1	Target ≥	80.20%	80.55%
	Data	83.87%	77.55%
B2	Target ≥	61.40%	61.60%
	Data	54.00%	51.08%
C1	Target ≥	79.30%	79.70%
	Data	83.07%	77.56%
C2	Target ≥	81.90%	82.10%
	Data	74.77%	72.27%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	79.30%	79.50%
Target A2 ≥	74.50%	75.00%
Target B1 ≥	80.90%	81.25%
Target B2 ≥	61.80%	62.00%
Target C1 ≥	80.10%	80.50%
Target C2 ≥	82.30%	82.50%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

☑ Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

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 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	7,352

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	64	0.87%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,582	21.52%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,150	15.64%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,575	35.02%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,981	26.95%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 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)	3725.00	5371.00	73.98%	79.30%	69.35%
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)	4556.00	7352.00	61.34%	74.50%	61.97%

Reasons for A1 Slippage

WDPI introduced during the 2016-17 school year a web-based application for the reporting of child outcomes. This 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. Additionally, statewide training has been provided throughout the state specific to the three early childhood indicators. For Indicator 7, this training focused on the use of an age-anchoring assessment tool to accurately rate a child, as well as the need for ongoing assessment to inform instruction.

WDPI, through discretionary grants, provides both targeted and statewide 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 regional discretionary grant staff members provide professional development statewide, as well as targeted to specific districts, and are directly involved in supporting WDPI's work related to College and Career Ready IEPs. The professional development provided by the regional discretionary grant focuses on the development and implementation of quality IEPs at the early childhood level.

The WDPI has also launched a statewide initiative focusing on preschool inclusion. Focus districts have been identified through the use of data. The regional discretionary grant staff are directly working with these focus districts to increase opportunities for young children to receive special education and related services in inclusive settings. It is expected that expanded access to high quality preschool inclusion will lead to more positive outcomes for young children.

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	50	0.68%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,685	22.92%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,799	24.47%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,199	43.51%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	619	8.42%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 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)	4998.00	6733.00	77.55%	80.90%	74.23%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
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)	3818.00	7352.00	51.08%	61.80%	51.93%

Reasons for B1 Slippage

WDPI introduced during the 2016-17 school year a web-based application for the reporting of child outcomes. This 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. Additionally, statewide training has been provided throughout the state specific to the three early childhood indicators. For Indicator 7, this training focused on the use of an age-anchoring assessment tool to accurately rate a child, as well as the need for ongoing assessment to inform instruction.

WDPI, through discretionary grants, provides both targeted and statewide 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 regional discretionary grant staff members provide professional development statewide, as well as targeted to specific districts, and are directly involved in supporting WDPI's work related to College and Career Ready IEPs. The professional development provided by the regional discretionary grant focuses on the development and implementation of quality IEPs at the early childhood level.

WDPI has also launched a statewide initiative focusing on preschool inclusion. Focus districts have been identified through the use of data. The regional discretionary grant staff are directly working with these focus districts to increase opportunities for young children to receive special education and related services in inclusive settings. It is expected that expanded access to high quality preschool inclusion will lead to more positive outcomes for young children.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	50	0.68%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,156	15.72%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	864	11.75%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,722	37.02%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,560	34.82%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 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)	3586.00	4792.00	77.56%	80.10%	74.83%
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)	5282.00	7352.00	72.27%	82.30%	71.84%

Reasons for C1 Slippage

WDPI introduced during the 2016-17 school year a web-based application for the reporting of child outcomes. This 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. Additionally, statewide training has been provided throughout the state specific to the three early childhood indicators. For Indicator 7, this training focused on the use of an age-anchoring assessment tool to accurately rate a child, as well as the need for ongoing assessment to inform instruction.

WDPI, through discretionary grants, provides both targeted and statewide 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 regional discretionary grant staff members provide professional development statewide, as well as targeted to specific districts, and are directly involved in supporting WDPI's work related to College and Career Ready IEPs. The professional development provided by the regional discretionary grant focuses on the development and implementation of quality IEPs at the early childhood level.

WDPI has also launched a statewide initiative focusing on preschool inclusion. Focus districts have been identified through the use of data. The regional discretionary grant staff are directly working with these focus districts to increase opportunities for young children to receive special education and related services in inclusive settings. It is expected that expanded access to high quality preschool inclusion will lead to more positive outcomes for young

children.

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 17, WDPI continued to use the individual child web-based application for the purpose of reporting Indicator 7 child outcomes that was introduced during the 2016-17 school year. This application uses the Child Outcomes Decision Tree developed by the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center to guide the child outcomes team through the child outcomes process for both the entry and exit rating. When using the application, the child outcomes team identifies the sources of information obtained and responds to a series of questions using the Child Outcomes Decision Tree. In using the application, the child outcomes team is required to document evidence supporting the responses provided. Based on the responses provided by the child outcomes team, the child's entry or exit rating for each outcome area is determined by the application relative to the 7-point scale used in the child outcomes process. This 7-point scale compares the child's level of current functioning to that of same-age typically developing peers. The ratings using the 7-point scale are then converted for the purpose of reporting the child outcomes progress categories and summary statements.

Actions required in FFY 2016 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	2016
Target ≥	86.00%	86.50%
Data	83.75%	88.52%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	88.75%	89.00%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

Using FFY 2016 data as a new baseline, the State Superintendent's Council on Special Education set new targets in September 2018 that are appropriate given the increased performance using the revised Parental Involvement Survey implemented the previous year.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

☑ Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

During its December 2017 meeting, the State Superintendent's Council on Special Education unanimously agreed that FFY 2016 data should be considered baseline data due to revisions in the survey questions. At its September 2018 meeting, the Council reviewed this baseline data and, by majority vote, set new targets appropriate to the increased performance rate observed in the baseline data. These targets increase 0.25% annually instead of the previous annual increase of 0.5%, as expectations of annual improvement must necessarily decrease as performance approaches 100%.

FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
2,073	2,331	88.52%	88.75%	88.94%

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.	10.05%	23189.00

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.

As part of the revisions to the survey questions that was implemented in FFY 2016, the questions for school-age and preschool surveys were examined and paired to ensure that the subject matter of each question were comparable. As a result of this effort, respondents of both surveys complete the same number of questions covering the same types of family engagement, articulated in a manner that is most applicable to the student population being considered.

WDPI uses the following methodology for calculating Indicator 8 results: the mean rate of agreement is calculated for each completed survey, which is then summed across all respondent data and then divided by the total number of survey's submitted. All included surveys are weighted equally, and all partially completed surveys are counted so long as more than 50% of the survey questions were answered.

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.

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. 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 that is calculated for each district based on the number of students with IEPs in the district. Because of an expanded population from which to solicit responses, many districts exceeded their minimum response rates requirements. The FFY 2017 response rate of 10.05% yields a margin of error of 1.22% (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

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. No

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

Additional outreach efforts are being planned with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent Educator Initiative (WSPEI) funded by WDPI discretionary grants, using data on race/ethnicity and disability category broken out by region (Cooperative Educational Service Agency), to better target specific groups, and improve response rates for underrepresented groups. This will include providing WSPEI coordinator assistance to individual districts to ensure the district has equitable representation of respondents. In addition, WDPI will monitor district response rates during the survey window. WDPI will also review how the survey is distributed and collected to determine if additional changes are required in order to ensure that in the future the response data are representative.

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.

DPI'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. 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, DPI 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 2017 response rate of 10.05% yields a margin of error of 1.22% (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. 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 "Indicator 8 response demographics.xls" compares the disability and racial/ethnic makeup of students with completed surveys with statewide demographics. For FFY 2017, the sample fails to meet the 3% threshold in several areas. Among disability reporting categories, students with specific learning disabilities were underrepresented by 0.1%, and students with speech & language impairments were overrepresented by 0.4%. Among race reporting categories, Black students are underrepresented by 6.6%, and Hispanic students are underrepresented by 2.8%. White students are overrepresented by 15.1%.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

OSEP Response

The State revised its targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

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: 2016

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	2016
Target	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Has the State established a minimum n and/or cell 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. 23

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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
4	0	421	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. **A Weighted or Alternate 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 the Weighted Risk Ratio: the risk for the racial/ethnic group within the disability category divided by the risk for the comparison group to be in special education, weighted to the racial/ethnic demographics of the state.

   When the local comparison group does not meet the state's minimum cell and n sizes, WDPI uses the Alternate Risk Ratio for its calculation, as is recommended by the Westat technical assistance guidance. This calculation is the local risk for the racial/ethnic group divided by the statewide risk for the comparison group.

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 locally exceeds the statewide 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.

3. **Cell size**: To be identified for over-representation, a racial or ethnic group must have at least ten students with IEPs 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.

4. **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 WDPI 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 WDPI'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 WDPI 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 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.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

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

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.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2016 response, not including correction of findings

WDPI indicated in the "Historical Data" table that the baseline was revised in FFY 2016. WDPI revised its baseline in FFY 2016 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 included the number of districts that met WDPI's established cell size as required by the Measurement Table.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

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

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: 2016

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	2016
Target	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Has the State established a minimum n and/or cell 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. 83

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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
35	0	361	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. **A Weighted or Alternate 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 the Weighted Risk Ratio: the risk for the racial/ethnic group within the disability category divided by the risk for the comparison group within the disability category, weighted to the racial/ethnic demographics of the state.

   When the local comparison group does not meet the state's minimum cell and n sizes, WDPI uses the Alternate Risk Ratio for its calculation, as is recommended by the Westat technical assistance guidance. This calculation is the local risk for the racial/ethnic group divided by the statewide risk for the comparison group.

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 locally exceeds the statewide 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.

3. **Cell size**: To be identified for over-representation, a racial or ethnic group must have at least ten students with IEPs 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.

4. **Consecutive Years**: Acknowledging changing demographics, potential anomalies in data collection, and other factors, DPI 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 WDPI 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 WDPI'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 WDPI 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 WDPI.

Through the review described above, 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.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

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

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.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2016 response, not including correction of findings

DPI indicated in the "Historical Data" table that the baseline was revised in FFY 2016. WDPI revised its baseline in FFY 2016 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 included the number of districts that meet WDPI's established cell size as required by the Measurement Table.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

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

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	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	97.72%	98.93%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
8,104	7,397	98.93%	100%	91.28%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	707

Reasons for Slippage

WDPI conducted a review of this data, and determined that the slippage identified in FFY 2017 from the FFY 2016 data is attributable to one district. Without the inclusion of this district's data in the statewide calculation, the overall state compliance rate for indicator 11 would be 98.22%. The district conducted an extensive analysis of its Indicator 11 data, which was reviewed by WDPI, and it was determined that 94% of the untimely evaluations was primarily due to a change in school calendar that resulted in the district being significantly understaffed between May and June, 2018. The district also experienced an increase in special education referrals. The other reason for this slippage was that there was an unusually high rate of staff turnover in this district for FFY 2017.

To address this slippage, the district will ensure that they will always be adequately staffed, and will provide training on evaluation timelines for new staff. In addition, the district will monitor this data on a monthly basis, and report on it to the school board, as well as share with WDPI staff to ensure that special education evaluations are timely conducted.

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 149. Reasons for the delay include: Timeline calculation errors, change in school calendar, staff turnover, scheduling calculations, weather, unavailability of interpreters, and unavailability of staff or parents.

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 2017, 88 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 2017 was 91.28%.

Actions required in FFY 2016 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 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
85	85	0	0

FFY 2016 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 2016: (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 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 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, WDPI determined all districts found in noncompliance during FFY 2016 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 and the number of noncompliant files. 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 2016 was corrected.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2017, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 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 2018 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 2017, although its FFY 2017 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017.

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	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	99.11%	98.71%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	3,613
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.	528
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,621
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.	392
e. Number of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	33
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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 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	2,621	2,660	98.71%	100%	98.53%

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	39

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 32 children found eligible for Part B whose IEPs were implemented after their third birthdays and 7 children found not eligible for Part B whose eligibility was not determined until after their third birthdays. Of these 32 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 113 days. Reasons for the delays include staff not available, difficulties coordinating meetings, referrals to Part B less than 90 days prior to the child's third 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.

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 2016 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 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
35	35	0	0

FFY 2016 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 2016: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a quarterly 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 2016 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. In instances when the IEP was implemented after the child's birthday, each record was reviewed to ensure compensatory services had been considered. Consistent with OSEP memo 09-02, WDPI verified each district with noncompliance identified in FFY 2016: (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 and compensatory services were considered.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2017, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 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 2018 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 2017, although its FFY 2017 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017.

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	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	99.83%	99.93%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
27,463	27,501	99.93%	100%	99.86%

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 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 are required to use the PTP application when developing postsecondary transition plans for students with disabilities aged 16 years and above. Indicator 13 data is collected through the online application on an ongoing basis.

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 2016 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 2016

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

FFY 2016 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, 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 2016 has been corrected.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2017, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 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 2018 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 2017, although its FFY 2017 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017.

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	2016
A	Target ≥	30.80%	31.30%
	Data	31.44%	28.40%
B	Target ≥	63.50%	65.50%
	Data	68.39%	71.12%
C	Target ≥	77.00%	79.00%
	Data	81.05%	83.15%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	31.80%	32.30%
Target B ≥	67.50%	69.50%
Target C ≥	81.00%	83.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

☑ Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

> 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 2017 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	1058.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	294.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	428.00
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)	60.00
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).	85.00

	Number of	Number of	FFY 2016	FFY 2017	FFY 2017

	respondent youth	respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	Data	Target	Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	294.00	1058.00	28.40%	31.80%	27.79%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	722.00	1058.00	71.12%	67.50%	68.24%
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)	867.00	1058.00	83.15%	81.00%	81.95%

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.

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 around the median was used to construct the five-year cohort cycle.

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

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

For the FFY 2017 survey of 2016-17 exiters, the cohort included the required one-fifth of the districts (77), representing 20% of the 380 districts with an exiter population in Wisconsin. The FFY 2017 survey meets the three percent threshold recommended by the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) for all race/ethnic and primary disability categories except in the following areas: Respondents with emotional behavioral disabilities were underrepresented by 0.6%; respondents with other health impairments were overrepresented by 0.5%; White respondents were underrepresented by 5.2%; Black respondents were overrepresented by 7.9%. Please see the attached document "ffy 2017 indicator 14 demographics.csv" for a detailed demographic breakdown of statewide exiters and sampled respondents.

To help ensure survey results are 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 2017, WDPI reports a response rate of 49.8% among in-cycle districts, the resulting sample resulting in 12.9% of the statewide exiter population. This response rate yields a margin of error of 2.02% (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? No
Describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Additional outreach efforts are being planned with the Transition Improvement Grant (TIG) network, funded by WDPI discretionary grants, using data on race/ethnicity and disability category, broken out by region (Cooperative Educational Service Agency), to better target specific groups, and improve response rates among underrepresented groups. This will include working closely with each district to complete pre-survey activities in which the most current phone number is located and all former students receive a preparation letter prior to the survey starting. In addition, WDPI will monitor district response rates during the survey window. WDPI will also review how the survey is distributed and collected to determine if additional changes are required in order to ensure that in the future the response data are representative.

Actions required in FFY 2016 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	2016
Target ≥	42.00%	42.00%
Data	44.44%	16.67%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	42.00%	42.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

☑ Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

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 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/8/2018	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	n	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/8/2018	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	20	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
4	20	16.67%	42.00%	20.00%

Actions required in FFY 2016 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	2016
Target ≥	76.00%	76.00%
Data	86.36%	93.98%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	76.00%	76.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

☑ Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

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 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	7	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	81	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	2.1 Mediations held	94	null

FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
7	81	94	93.98%	76.00%	93.62%

Actions required in FFY 2016 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	2017
Target ≥		29.00%	30.00%	31.00%	31.00%
Data	29.00%	31.70%	31.67%	32.09%	30.12%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline   Yellow – Baseline

Blue – Data Update

FFY 2018 Target

FFY	2018
Target ≥	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 - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

☑ Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

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. Detailed information on stakeholder engagement related to each of Wisonsin's improvement strategies can be found within the attached Phase III, Year III 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.

Internal Stakeholders

- 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. WISEExplore is a common data inquiry process for teachers and school leaders statewide (http://dpi.wi.gov/wisexplore). Using WISEExplore 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.

This indicator is not applicable.