

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

**For reporting on
FFY 2021**

Wisconsin



PART B DUE February 1, 2023

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI) 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) 2021 APR targets, results, slippage from the previous APR, and verification of correction of all previous findings of all noncompliance found in FFY 2020 are compiled in the report that follows.

Procedurally compliant individualized education programs (IEPs) form the basis for practices that drive improved results for students with IEPs, and the DPI demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators. Additionally, the DPI continues to support district implementation of 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. The DPI, as well as staff funded through discretionary grants, provide ongoing technical assistance and training, grant activities, and the development of additional resources.

In aggregate, the results indicators (1, 2, 3, 4a, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14) offer a snapshot of how students with IEPs are performing throughout their educational lives. During this reporting period, the DPI is reporting that Wisconsin met target and/or did not experience slippage in the following areas: graduation, assessment participation for children with IEPs, suspension/expulsion, education environments for children aged 5 and in kindergarten through 21, parent involvement, and post-school outcomes. The DPI is reporting slippage in the following areas: dropout, proficiency for children with IEPs as measured by grade level academic and alternate achievement standards, gap in proficiency rates as measured by grade level academic achievement standards, preschool environments, and preschool outcomes.

The DPI invests IDEA discretionary funds in improvement activities designed, in part, to accelerate academic growth for students with IEPs. Specifically, the DPI is building capacity in implementation science and is measuring how quickly and how effectively that investment can change adult practices and improve student outcomes. In Wisconsin, stakeholders asked the DPI to focus on early literacy for students with IEPs. More detail and information on this investment is included in Indicator 17.

If indicator data are impacted due to COVID-19, the DPI includes in the narrative:

- (1) The impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator;
- (2) An explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and
- (3) Any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Data collection and reporting continue to be affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. During this reporting period, Wisconsin LEAs offered full academic years of in-person instruction, as compared to virtual instruction provided March 18-June 30, 2020 (see Wisconsin Department of Health Secretary-designee Andrea Palm's Order for Statewide School Closure), and then instruction in-person, virtual, and hybrid during the 2020-21 school year. While the return to school amid the COVID-19 pandemic was – for many districts - safe, efficient, and equitable, it was not without challenges that affected data collecting and reporting.

First, the Wisconsin Statewide Student Assessment System (WSAS) exams given to students during the 2020-21 school year saw a decline in participation. Assessments were administered to students in spring 2021 following standard in-person test taking procedures amid the COVID-19 pandemic. Participation improved substantially during the 2021-22 school year but remains below pre-COVID 19 levels. The DPI anticipates it will take several more years to fully rebound.

The DPI worked with districts to improve statewide assessment participation from the previous school year, providing suggestions for family messaging that emphasized the assessments' importance to oversight and accountability. Wisconsin includes this indicator in its IDEA LEA Determination criteria to encourage all LEAs to keep their participation rates at or above 95%.

Second, the Indicator 14 Post School Outcome survey demonstrated the lasting impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on post school activities for students with disabilities. Results of the survey, finalized in Fall 2022, gathered information on postsecondary activities of former students with disabilities. Of those respondents, 23% had completed at least one term of postsecondary education and training. This was a slight increase from the 2021 survey where 22% of respondents had completed postsecondary education, and both years represented a decrease from the 2020 survey where 26% of respondents had completed postsecondary education.

Third, the Indicator 7 Preschool Outcome data also demonstrated the growing and long-term impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the youngest learners with disabilities. In this reporting period, 4,894 students exited early childhood programs as compared to 11,210 during FFY2020 and 7,739 in FFY2019. While this shift also reflects the changes in reporting for five year old learners, the largest attribution to this drop in numbers is the school closures during COVID-19 and then learning that relied on remote and/or hybrid learning, which was not developmentally appropriate for the youngest learners and many parents withdrew consent for special education and related services when in-person learning was not available.

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

449

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 (DPI) 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

The DPI ensures all districts have adopted policies, procedures, and practices that comply with IDEA and state special education law. The DPI 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 DPI model policies and procedures and model forms or submit local versions to the DPI 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

The DPI 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 DPI 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 the DPI of compliance with state and federal special education requirements. Both the budgets and assurances are reviewed by a DPI 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

The DPI 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

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

4a) IDEA Complaints

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

4b) Due Process

A due process hearing is requested by sending a letter or a completed sample form to the DPI. The DPI 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, the DPI, by contract with the Wisconsin Department of Administration-Division of Hearings and Appeals (DHA), appoints an impartial hearing officer to conduct the hearing.

4c) Mediation

The DPI 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

The DPI 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, as well as determined through a review of our IDEA complaints, stakeholder contacts, and general supervision reviews. Annually, the DPI 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. The DPI 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 the DPI requires all district staff conducting the assessment to complete a training and certification e-course. Information about the PCSA is posted on the DPI website at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/educators/rdapcsa>.

6) Early Childhood Transition System

The DPI and the Wisconsin Department of Health Services (DHS), 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 program data is daily uploaded into the Indicator 12 web-based application for districts; the application then notifies districts of the referral from county Birth to 3 programs. Finally, districts submit data for Indicator 12 through the application. 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

The DPI 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. The DPI reviews data from the database for the reporting year and identifies noncompliance. The DPI makes findings of noncompliance and notifies districts when the data indicates noncompliance with the Indicator 13 transition requirements. The DPI verifies all identified noncompliance is corrected within one year.

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.

The DPI has a number of mechanisms in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidence based technical assistance and support to districts. As indicated above, within Wisconsin's general supervision system, the DPI 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 the DPI sends an email to all districts and stakeholders 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.

The DPI also has a system to support those that provide professional learning opportunities in the area of special education and IEP development and implementation. Technical assistance, including webinars, conferences, trainings, communities of practice, and web-based resources, is systematically provided on a regular basis by the DPI.

Additionally, the DPI 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 (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/early-childhood>)

Wisconsin Rtl Center (<http://www.wisconsinrtlcenter.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

Universal Design for Learning (<https://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, the DPI is engaged with multiple OSEP-funded national technical assistance centers (i.e., IDEA Data Center, the OSEP-funded State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-Based Practices (SISEP) Center, Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting, the National Center for Systemic Improvement, the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center, and the Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education). Through these technical assistance partnerships, the DPI is up to date on - and can ensure timely delivery of - high quality, evidence based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

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 children with disabilities.

To ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities, the DPI has prioritized IDEA discretionary funds for creating, scaling up, and sustaining systems change initiatives with a focus on improved results for students with IEPs.

Through these initiatives, the DPI 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 IEPs.

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 Rtl Center (<http://www.wisconsinrtlcenter.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

Universal Design for Learning (<http://dpi.wi.gov/universal-design-learning>)

Technical Assistance Network for Improvement (<https://dpi.wi.gov/continuous-improvement/resources-supports/ta-network>)

Broad Stakeholder Input:

The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

CURRENT REPORTING PERIOD:

The DPI used the Wisconsin Council on Special Education (the Council, <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council>) to solicit ongoing stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR, any subsequent revisions that the state has made to those targets, development and implementation of Indicator 17, and improvement activities. The Council met four times during this reporting period: September 24, 2021; December 3, 2021; March 11, 2021; and June 17, 2022. The twenty-five members of Council includes the representation required in the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004.

SOLICITING BROAD STAKEHOLDER INPUT ON THE STATE'S TARGETS IN THE SPP/APR:

The DPI used both universal and targeted approaches to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). During the year-long process, the DPI reviewed input provided by 3,719 stakeholders. During this year-long process, the DPI structured the data, discussion, and target-setting around four key questions: (1) How well is Wisconsin preparing students with IEPs for life after high school? (2) Are Wisconsin learners with IEPs learning in the same spaces as their peers? (3) How engaged are Wisconsin families in the learning of their children with IEPs? and (4) How are Wisconsin learners with IEPs performing in key areas?

1. Universal strategy: Open invitation to input sessions

The DPI scheduled five synchronous input sessions to solicit input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP): June 19, 2020; March 12, 2021; June 25, 2021; September 24, 2021; and December 3, 2021.

The DPI distributes a weekly news update related to special education and pupil services; this update serves as the official notification to directors of special education and is distributed to more than 1,000 unique contacts. In advance of each of the input sessions, the DPI included an open invitation to participate in the input sessions. These news updates are archived online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/news>. In addition, an open invitation to attend the input sessions was sent out on the CollabSupport listserve, announced at various conferences and stakeholder meetings, and posted online (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>) in May 2021 and remained online until after the final input session.

2. Universal strategy: Open invitation to submit asynchronous, web-based input

The DPI developed a series of webpages to solicit input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The web pages provided data analysis, recommended targets and rationale, and information on improvement strategies and evaluation. The web pages included this information via video or slide deck format. The web pages linked to Google forms for each of the results indicators and Indicator 17. The Google forms collected recommendations for target-setting and improvement activities and allowed stakeholders to provide additional and relevant feedback related to each of the results indicators and Indicator 17. To see the web pages, please visit <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>.

The DPI distributes a weekly news update related to special education and pupil services; this update serves as the official notification to directors of special education and is distributed to more than 1,000 unique contacts. Beginning in May 2021, the DPI included regularly an open invitation to submit input asynchronously through the web. These news updates are archived online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/news>. In addition, an invitation to participate was sent out on the CollabSupport listserve, announced at various conferences and stakeholder meetings, and posted online.

3. Targeted strategy: State Advisory Panel input sessions

The DPI conducted five input sessions with the State Advisory Panel to gather input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The dates of these sessions were June 19, 2020; March 12, 2021; June 25, 2021; September 24, 2021; and December 3, 2021. The agendas and minutes for these sessions are available online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council/agendas-and-minutes>. For details related to these input sessions, see, below, section on parent and family engagement.

4. Targeted strategy: Customized invitations to stakeholders

The DPI invited targeted stakeholders for input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The State Director sent personalized invitations to representatives of Wisconsin organizations with an interest in special education (state association of special education directors, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, SEA employees, representatives from grants funded by discretionary IDEA funds, etc.) to participate in the input sessions (described, above) or to submit input via the website.

5. Targeted strategy: Customized surveys of families

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI developed customized surveys and partnered with Green Bay Area Public Schools and Milwaukee Public Schools to collect data during parent-teacher conferences in the spring of 2021. The surveys were paper-and-pencil; families of color were specifically targeted to participate in the survey.

6. Targeted strategy: Contract to review data collected via Indicator 8 parent surveys

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI contracted with an independent researcher to review Indicator 8 survey data for themes related to the results indicators and Indicator 17. The researcher harvested these themes for the data and submitted a written report summarizing their research findings.

Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)

YES

Number of Parent Members:

25

Parent Members Engagement:

Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

CURRENT REPORTING PERIOD:

The DPI used the Wisconsin Council on Special Education (the Council, <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council>) to solicit ongoing stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR, any subsequent revisions that the state has made to those targets, development and implementation of Indicator 17, and improvement activities. The Council met four times during this reporting period: September 24, 2021; December 3, 2021; March 11, 2021; and June 17, 2022. The twenty-five members of Council includes the representation required in the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004.

SOLICITING BROAD STAKEHOLDER INPUT ON THE STATE'S TARGETS IN THE SPP/APR:

In a variety of different ways, the DPI engaged parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress. During this year-long process, the DPI structured the data, discussion, and target-setting around four key questions: (1) How well is Wisconsin preparing students with IEPs for life after high school? (2) Are Wisconsin learners with IEPs learning in the same spaces as their peers? (3) How engaged are Wisconsin families in the learning of their children with IEPs? and (4) How are Wisconsin learners with IEPs performing in key areas?

1. Input sessions (agendas and minutes online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council/agendas-and-minutes>)

On June 19, 2020, the DPI used a portion of the State Advisory Panel's regular meeting to set targets related to the SSIP. The DPI presented on the stakeholder engagement process, SEA Annual Determinations, and the SSIP. The DPI then engaged SAP members in what WI should be looking at as a focus, with two specific points of discussion and engagement: (1) should the SiMR remain focused on grades 3-8 or be narrowed, and (2) What strategies have the greatest likelihood of improving outcomes for learners with IEPs?

On March 12, 2021, the DPI used a portion of the State Advisory Panel's regular meeting to provide information and preview the stakeholder engagement process related to the SPP/APR for FFY 2020-2025. The DPI provided an overview and update on the State Performance Plan, Annual Performance Report, and the State Systemic Improvement Plan. Council members asked questions and presenters provided answers.

On June 25, 2021, the DPI used most of the State Advisory Panel's regular meeting to gather input on targets, analyze data, develop improvement strategies, and determine evaluation metrics related to one key question: How well is Wisconsin preparing students with IEPs for life after high school? This key question is related to Indicators 1, 2, and 14. The input session included data analysis and recommended targets and rationale; discussion of the improvement activities offered through the Transition Improvement Grant, which is funded through IDEA discretionary dollars; and then time for SAP members and other stakeholders to complete Google forms related to Indicators 1 and 2 and Indicator 14.

On September 24, 2021, the DPI used most of the State Advisory Panel's regular meeting to gather input on targets, analyze data, develop improvement strategies, and determine evaluation metrics related to two key questions.

The first question was, Are Wisconsin learners with IEPs learning in the same spaces as their peers? This key question is related to Indicators 5 and 6. The September 24, 2021, input session included data analysis and recommended targets and rationale; discussion of the improvement activities offered through the Research to Practice Inclusive Communities Project (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/educators/discretionary-grants/rpic-project>) and the Early Childhood Special Education project (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/early-childhood>), both of which are funded through IDEA discretionary dollars; and then time for SAP members and other stakeholders to complete Google forms related to Indicators 5 and 6.

The second question was How engaged are Wisconsin families in the learning of their children with IEPs? and is related to Indicator 8. The June 25, 2021, input session included data analysis and recommended targets and rationale; discussion of the improvement activities offered through the Wisconsin Parent-Educator Initiative (<https://wspei.org/>), which is funded through IDEA discretionary dollars; and then time for SAP members and other stakeholders to complete a Google form related to Indicator 8.

On December 3, 2021, the DPI used most of the State Advisory Panel's regular meeting to gather input on targets, analyze data, develop improvement strategies, and determine evaluation metrics related to one key question: How are Wisconsin learners with IEPs performing in key areas? and is related to Indicators 3, 7, and 17. The December 3, 2021, input session included data analysis and recommended targets and rationale; discussion of the improvement activities offered through the Wisconsin Rtl Center (<https://www.wisconsinrtlcenter.org/>), the the Early Childhood Special Education project (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/early-childhood>), the Research to Practice Inclusive Communities project (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/educators/discretionary-grants/rpic-project>), and the Transformation Zone, all projects funded through IDEA discretionary dollars; and then time for SAP members and other stakeholders to complete Google forms related to Indicator 3a, Indicator 3b, Indicator 7, and Indicator 17.

2. Web-based input

The SPP/APR stakeholder engagement website is <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>. The website is organized in family-friendly, plain language. The website translates the results indicators into four key questions, as listed in the section, above. For each of the key questions and related indicators, the website includes a section to learn more about the data and recommended targets and rationale, a section to learn about related improvement activities, and then a link to Google forms to collect input related to the indicators.

3. Customized surveys

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI developed customized surveys and partnered with Green Bay Area Public Schools and Milwaukee Public Schools to collect data during parent-teacher conferences in the spring of 2021. The surveys were paper-and-pencil; families of color were specifically targeted to participate in the survey. Over three hundred survey results were collected from this engagement strategy.

4. Indicator 8 parent survey research contract

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI contracted with an independent researcher to review Indicator 8 survey data for themes related to the results indicators and Indicator 17, as organized by the four key questions: How well is Wisconsin preparing students with IEPs for life after high school? Are Wisconsin learners with IEPs learning in the same spaces as their peers? How engaged are Wisconsin families in the learning of their children with IEPs? How are Wisconsin learners with IEPs performing in key areas? The researcher harvested these themes for the data and submitted a written report summarizing their research findings. 3,391 parent surveys were reviewed under this contract.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

CURRENT REPORTING PERIOD:

The DPI used the Wisconsin Council on Special Education (the Council, <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council>) to solicit ongoing stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR, any subsequent revisions that the state has made to those targets, development and implementation of Indicator 17, and improvement activities. The Council met four times during this reporting period: September 24, 2021; December 3, 2021; March 11, 2021; and June 17, 2022. The twenty-five members of Council includes the representation required in the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004.

SOLICITING BROAD STAKEHOLDER INPUT ON THE STATE'S TARGETS IN THE SPP/APR:

The DPI conducted universal and targeted activities to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents and families to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. During this year-long process, the DPI structured the data, discussion, and target-setting around four key questions: (1) How well is Wisconsin preparing students with IEPs for life after high school? (2) Are Wisconsin learners with IEPs learning in the same spaces as their peers? (3) How engaged are Wisconsin families in the learning of their children with IEPs? and (4) How are Wisconsin learners with IEPs performing in key areas?

The targeted activities were developed after beginning to implement the universal activities and, during initial review of the data, recognizing that the DPI was not fully engaging racially diverse parents and families. The DPI learned two key lessons from this process and our ultimate success in using feedback from almost 4,000 racially diverse parents and families. First, going forward, when planning to engage stakeholders in decisions, the DPI will start with enough time to review data and revise plans along the way. Second, going forward, the DPI will begin with both universal and targeted strategies as part of the engagement plan.

1. Universal activity: Plain language, values-based input sessions

As the DPI designed the input session content, they made several key decisions to build capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. First, the DPI limited the input sessions to results indicators only to minimize cognitive load on stakeholders. Second, the DPI provided few, powerful, data analytics that aligned with key agency values around racial equity and organizational change. Third, the DPI asked for target setting recommendations using a “Goldilocks” metric: that the recommended targets were too ambitious, just about right, or not ambitious enough. Fourth, the DPI asked values-based questions related to improvement activities such as, “Given the race-based patterns, are you in support of targeted investments in groups to close the gaps?” Finally, the DPI asked open-ended questions about improvement activities in plain language.

2. Universal activity: Plain language website

The SPP/APR stakeholder engagement website is <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>. The website is organized in family-friendly, plain language. The website translates the results indicators into four key questions, as listed, below. For each of the key questions and related indicators, the website includes a section to learn more about the data and recommended targets and rationale, a section to learn about related improvement activities, and then a link to Google forms to collect input related to the indicators.

Key question 1: “How well is Wisconsin preparing students with IEPs for life after high school?” is the key question related to Indicators 1, 2, and 14. The website includes a section to learn more about the data and recommended targets and rationale; a section to learn about improvement activities offered through the Transition Improvement Grant (<https://witig.org/>), which is funded through IDEA discretionary dollars; and then a link to Google forms to collect input related to Indicators 1, 2, and 14.

Key question 2: “Are Wisconsin learners with IEPs learning in the same spaces as their peers?” is the key question related to Indicators 5 and 6. The website includes a section to learn more about the data and recommended targets and rationale; a section to learn about improvement activities offered through the Research to Practice Inclusive Communities Project (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/educators/discretionary-grants/rpic-project>) and the Early Childhood Special Education project (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/early-childhood>), both of which are funded through IDEA discretionary dollars; and then a link to Google forms to collect input related to Indicators 5 and 6.

Key question 3: “How engaged are Wisconsin families in the learning of their children with IEPs?” is the key question related to Indicator 8. The website includes a section to learn more about the data and recommended targets and rationale; a section to learn about improvement activities offered through the Wisconsin Parent-Educator Initiative (<https://wspei.org/>), which is funded through IDEA discretionary dollars; and then a link to a Google form to collect input related to Indicator 8.

Key question 4: “How are Wisconsin learners with IEPs performing in key areas?” is the key question related to Indicators 3, 7, and 17. The website includes a section to learn more about the data and recommended targets and rationale; a section to learn about improvement activities offered through the Wisconsin RtI Center (<https://www.wisconsinrticenter.org/>), the Early Childhood Special Education project (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/early-childhood>), The Research to Practice Inclusive Communities project (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/educators/discretionary-grants/tpic-project>), and the Transformation Zone, all projects funded through IDEA discretionary dollars; and then a link to Google forms to collect input related to Indicator 3a, Indicator 3b, Indicator 7, and Indicator 17.

3. Targeted activity: Customized surveys

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State’s targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State’s Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI developed customized surveys and partnered with Green Bay Area Public Schools and Milwaukee Public Schools to collect data during parent-teacher conferences in the spring of 2021. The surveys were paper-and-pencil; families of color were specifically targeted to participate in the survey. Over three hundred survey results were collected from this engagement strategy.

4. Targeted activity: Indicator 8 parent survey research contract

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State’s targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State’s Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI contracted with an independent researcher to review Indicator 8 survey data for themes related to the results indicators and Indicator 17, as organized by the four key questions: How well is Wisconsin preparing students with IEPs for life after high school? Are Wisconsin learners with IEPs learning in the same spaces as their peers? How engaged are Wisconsin families in the learning of their children with IEPs? How are Wisconsin learners with IEPs performing in key areas? The researcher harvested these themes for the data and submitted a written report summarizing their research findings. 3,391 parent surveys were reviewed under this contract.

Soliciting Public Input:

The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

CURRENT REPORTING PERIOD:

The DPI used the Wisconsin Council on Special Education (the Council, <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council>) to solicit ongoing stakeholder input on the State’s targets in the SPP/APR, any subsequent revisions that the state has made to those targets, development and implementation of Indicator 17, and improvement activities. The Council met four times during this reporting period: September 24, 2021; December 3, 2021; March 11, 2021; and June 17, 2022. The twenty-five members of Council includes the representation required in the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004.

SOLICITING BROAD STAKEHOLDER INPUT ON THE STATE’S TARGETS IN THE SPP/APR:

The DPI used synchronous input sessions and asynchronous (web-based) mechanisms to solicit public input in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress. During this year-long process, the DPI structured the data, discussion, and target-setting around four key questions: (1) How well is Wisconsin preparing students with IEPs for life after high school? (2) Are Wisconsin learners with IEPs learning in the same spaces as their peers? (3) How engaged are Wisconsin families in the learning of their children with IEPs? and (4) How are Wisconsin learners with IEPs performing in key areas?

1. Input sessions (agendas and minutes online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council/agendas-and-minutes>)

On June 19, 2020, the DPI used a portion of the State Advisory Panel’s regular meeting to set targets related to the SSIP. The DPI presented on the stakeholder engagement process, SEA Annual Determinations, and the SSIP. The DPI then engaged SAP members in what WI should be looking at as a focus, with two specific points of discussion and engagement: (1) should the SiMR remain focused on grades 3-8 or be narrowed, and (2) What strategies have the greatest likelihood of improving outcomes for learners with IEPs?

On March 12, 2021, the DPI used a portion of the State Advisory Panel’s regular meeting to provide information and preview the stakeholder engagement process related to the SPP/APR for FFY 2020-2025. The DPI provided an overview and update on the State Performance Plan, Annual

Performance Report, and the State Systemic Improvement Plan. Council members asked questions and presenters provided answers.

On June 25, 2021, the DPI used most of the State Advisory Panel's regular meeting to gather input on targets, analyze data, develop improvement strategies, and determine evaluation metrics related to one key question: How well is Wisconsin preparing students with IEPs for life after high school? This key question is related to Indicators 1, 2, and 14. The input session included data analysis and recommended targets and rationale; discussion of the improvement activities offered through the Transition Improvement Grant, which is funded through IDEA discretionary dollars; and then time for SAP members and other stakeholders to complete Google forms related to Indicators 1 and 2 and Indicator 14.

On September 24, 2021, the DPI used most of the State Advisory Panel's regular meeting to gather input on targets, analyze data, develop improvement strategies, and determine evaluation metrics related to two key questions. The first question was, Are Wisconsin learners with IEPs learning in the same spaces as their peers? This key question is related to Indicators 5 and 6. The September 24, 2021, input session included data analysis and recommended targets and rationale; discussion of the improvement activities offered through the Research to Practice Inclusive Communities Project (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/educators/discretionary-grants/rpic-project>) and the Early Childhood Special Education project (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/early-childhood>), both of which are funded through IDEA discretionary dollars; and then time for SAP members and other stakeholders to complete Google forms related to Indicators 5 and 6. The second question was How engaged are Wisconsin families in the learning of their children with IEPs? and is related to Indicator 8. The June 25, 2021, input session included data analysis and recommended targets and rationale; discussion of the improvement activities offered through the Wisconsin Parent-Educator Initiative (<https://wspei.org/>), which is funded through IDEA discretionary dollars; and then time for SAP members and other stakeholders to complete a Google form related to Indicator 8.

On December 3, 2021, the DPI used most of the State Advisory Panel's regular meeting to gather input on targets, analyze data, develop improvement strategies, and determine evaluation metrics related to one key question: How are Wisconsin learners with IEPs performing in key areas? and is related to Indicators 3, 7, and 17. The December 3, 2021, input session included data analysis and recommended targets and rationale; discussion of the improvement activities offered through the Wisconsin RtI Center (<https://www.wisconsinrticenter.org/>), the Early Childhood Special Education project (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/early-childhood>), the Research to Practice Inclusive Communities project (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/educators/discretionary-grants/rpic-project>), and the Transformation Zone, all projects funded through IDEA discretionary dollars; and then time for SAP members and other stakeholders to complete Google forms related to Indicator 3a, Indicator 3b, Indicator 7, and Indicator 17.

2. Web-based input

The SPP/APR stakeholder engagement website is <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>. The website is organized in family-friendly, plain language. The website translates the results indicators into four key questions. For each of the key questions and related indicators, the website includes a section to learn more about the data and recommended targets and rationale, a section to learn about related improvement activities, and then a link to Google forms to collect input related to the indicators.

Making Results Available to the Public:

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

CURRENT REPORTING PERIOD:

The DPI used the Wisconsin Council on Special Education (the Council, <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council>) to solicit ongoing stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR, any subsequent revisions that the state has made to those targets, development and implementation of Indicator 17, and improvement activities. The Council met four times during this reporting period: September 24, 2021; December 3, 2021; March 11, 2021; and June 17, 2022. The twenty-five members of Council includes the representation required in the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004. Agendas and minutes are online.

SOLICITING BROAD STAKEHOLDER INPUT ON THE STATE'S TARGETS IN THE SPP/APR:

The DPI is utilizing multiple strategies and timelines to make available publicly the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation.

1. Agendas, materials, and minutes for all input sessions

The five input sessions conducted by the DPI were open to the public; the input sessions were held on the following dates: June 19, 2020; March 12, 2021; June 25, 2021; September 24, 2021; and December 3, 2021. The agendas for each of the sessions were posted electronically ahead of time and the minutes posted electronically shortly after each session (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council/agendas-and-minutes>). During each session, a Google folder was shared with everyone in attendance and included data analysis, recommended targets and considerations, information on related improvement strategies, and evaluation metrics.

2. Website

After each of the input sessions, the DPI updated the SPP/APR stakeholder engagement website at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>. The website is organized in family-friendly, plain language. The website includes the following resources developed by OSEP and/or national technical assistance centers: Summary of Changes to the New FFY 2020-2025 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report, State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) Universal Technical Assistance for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2020-2025, and the Federal Fiscal Years 2020 through 2025 SPP/APR Package due 02/22.

The website translates the results indicators into four key questions: How well is Wisconsin preparing students with IEPs for life after high school? Are Wisconsin learners with IEPs learning in the same spaces as their peers? How engaged are Wisconsin families in the learning of their children with IEPs? How are Wisconsin learners with IEPs performing in key areas? For each key question, the website includes data, recommended targets and rationale, improvement strategies, and evaluation metrics.

How well is Wisconsin preparing students with IEPs for life after high school? is the key question related to Indicators 1, 2, and 14. The website describes this key question as, "Wisconsin schools have a responsibility to prepare students with IEPs for college, career, and community. How well are schools doing that? Where do YOU want Wisconsin schools to be in six years? The statewide data we use to answer these questions are graduation data, dropout data, and survey data from students with IEPs who have exited high school." The website includes a section to learn more about the data and recommended targets and rationale; a section to learn about improvement activities offered through the Transition Improvement Grant, which is funded through IDEA discretionary dollars; and then a link to Google forms to collect input related to Indicators 1 and 2 and Indicator 14.

Are Wisconsin learners with IEPs learning in the same spaces as their peers? is the key question related to Indicators 5 and 6. The website describes this key question as, "Wisconsin schools have a responsibility to teach learners with IEPs in the "least restrictive environment." This means they should spend as much time as possible with peers who do not receive special education. How well are schools doing that? Where do YOU want Wisconsin schools to be in six years? The statewide data we use to answer these questions are called 'educational environment' data and is submitted annually by districts." The website includes a section to learn more about the data and recommended targets and rationale; a section to learn about improvement

activities offered through the Research to Practice Inclusive Communities Project (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/educators/discretionary-grants/rpic-project>) and the Early Childhood Special Education project (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/early-childhood>), both of which are funded through IDEA discretionary dollars; and then a link to Google forms to collect input related to Indicators 5 and 6.

How engaged are Wisconsin families in the learning of their children with IEPs? is the key question related to Indicator 8. The website describes this key question as, "Wisconsin schools have a responsibility to engage families in the education of their children served by individualized education programs (IEPs). How well are schools doing that? Where do YOU want Wisconsin schools to be in six years? The data we use to answer these questions are collected from parent surveys. All districts survey parents at least once every five years." The website includes a section to learn more about the data and recommended targets and rationale; a section to learn about improvement activities offered through the Wisconsin Parent-Educator Initiative (<https://wspei.org/>), which is funded through IDEA discretionary dollars; and then a link to a Google form to collect input related to Indicator 8.

How are Wisconsin learners with IEPs performing in key areas? is the key question related to Indicators 3, 7, and 17. The website describes this key question as, "One way of measuring the success of special education and related services that are provided to Wisconsin learners served by individualized education programs (IEPs) is how they perform on tests that all students take. How well are schools doing that? Where do YOU want Wisconsin schools to be in six years? The data we use to answer these questions are statewide assessment data from the Wisconsin Forward exams and assessment data for preschoolers." The website includes a section to learn more about the data and recommended targets and rationale; a section to learn about improvement activities offered through the Wisconsin RtI Center (<https://www.wisconsinrticenter.org/>), the the Early Childhood Special Education project (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/early-childhood>), The Research to Practice Inclusive Communities project (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/educators/discretionary-grants/rpic-project>), and the Transformation Zone, all projects funded through IDEA discretionary dollars; and then a link to Google forms to collect input related to Indicator 3a, Indicator 3b, Indicator 7, and Indicator 17.

3. IDEA Part B SPP/APR FFY 2020

The DPI submitted the Wisconsin IDEA Part B SPP/APR FFY 2020 no later than February 1, 2022. This document includes the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation; this document will be publicly posted on <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/about/state-performance-plan/apr> after submitting clarification, if required by OSEP.

4. State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2020-2025: Stakeholder engagement final report
The DPI posted online a final report that details stakeholder engagement in the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The website is <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2020 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 2020 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/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2020 APR in 2022, is available.

Through the Special Education District Profile, the DPI 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).

Wisconsin Information System for Education Data Dashboard (WISEdash) is a data portal that uses "dashboards," or visual collections of graphs and tables, to provide multi-year education data about Wisconsin schools. The Special Education District Profile is a dashboard within WISEdash, posted on the DPI website at <https://wisedash.dpi.wi.gov/Dashboard/dashboard/22326>. The District Profile includes district data, state data, the target for each indicator, sources of data, and links to additional information about each indicator. The DPI includes the most recently available performance data on each district and the date the data were obtained. The DPI 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, the DPI uses a 5-year monitoring cycle to identify cohorts of districts for data collection. The DPI 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 the DPI is required to report at the district level, the DPI reports annually on every district.

Copies of the SPP and APR are posted on the DPI website at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/about/state-performance-plan/apr>.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Intro - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that the State submitted verification that the attachment complies with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508). However, one or more of the attachments included in the State's FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508.

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

Measurement

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2020 | 85.32% |

| FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target >= | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.32% |
| Data | 68.54% | 68.24% | 68.59% | 69.76% | 85.32% |

Targets

| FFY | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target >= | 85.50% | 85.80% | 86.20% | 86.70% | 87.40% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

CURRENT REPORTING PERIOD:

The DPI used the Wisconsin Council on Special Education (the Council, <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council>) to solicit ongoing stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR, any subsequent revisions that the state has made to those targets, development and implementation of Indicator 17, and improvement activities. The Council met four times during this reporting period: September 24, 2021; December 3, 2021; March 11, 2021; and June 17, 2022. The twenty-five members of Council includes the representation required in the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004.

SOLICITING BROAD STAKEHOLDER INPUT ON THE STATE'S TARGETS IN THE SPP/APR:

The DPI used both universal and targeted approaches to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). During the year-long process, the DPI reviewed input provided by 3,719 stakeholders. During this year-long process, the DPI structured the data, discussion, and target-setting around four key questions: (1) How well is Wisconsin preparing students with IEPs for life after high school? (2) Are Wisconsin learners with IEPs learning in the same spaces as their peers? (3) How engaged are Wisconsin families in the learning of their children with IEPs? and (4) How are Wisconsin learners with IEPs performing in key areas?

1. Universal strategy: Open invitation to input sessions

The DPI scheduled five synchronous input sessions to solicit input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP): June 19, 2020; March 12, 2021; June 25, 2021; September 24, 2021; and December 3, 2021.

The DPI distributes a weekly news update related to special education and pupil services; this update serves as the official notification to directors of special education and is distributed to more than 1,000 unique contacts. In advance of each of the input sessions, the DPI included an open invitation to participate in the input sessions. These news updates are archived online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/news>. In addition, an open invitation to attend the input sessions was sent out on the CollabSupport listserv, announced at various conferences and stakeholder meetings, and posted online (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>) in May 2021 and remained online until after the final input session.

2. Universal strategy: Open invitation to submit asynchronous, web-based input

The DPI developed a series of webpages to solicit input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The web pages provided data analysis, recommended targets and rationale, and information on improvement strategies and evaluation. The web pages included this information via video or slide deck format. The web pages linked to Google forms for each of the results indicators and Indicator 17. The Google forms collected recommendations for target-setting and improvement activities and allowed stakeholders to provide additional and relevant feedback related to each of the results indicators and Indicator 17. To see the web pages, please visit <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>.

The DPI distributes a weekly news update related to special education and pupil services; this update serves as the official notification to directors of special education and is distributed to more than 1,000 unique contacts. Beginning in May 2021, the DPI included regularly an open invitation to submit input asynchronously through the web. These news updates are archived online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/news>. In addition, an invitation to participate was sent out on the CollabSupport listserve, announced at various conferences and stakeholder meetings, and posted online.

3. Targeted strategy: State Advisory Panel input sessions

The DPI conducted five input sessions with the State Advisory Panel to gather input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The dates of these sessions were June 19, 2020; March 12, 2021; June 25, 2021; September 24, 2021; and December 3, 2021. The agendas and minutes for these sessions are available online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council/agendas-and-minutes>. For details related to these input sessions, see, below, section on parent and family engagement.

4. Targeted strategy: Customized invitations to stakeholders

The DPI invited targeted stakeholders for input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The State Director sent personalized invitations to representatives of Wisconsin organizations with an interest in special education (state association of special education directors, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, SEA employees, representatives from grants funded by discretionary IDEA funds, etc.) to participate in the input sessions (described, above) or to submit input via the website.

5. Targeted strategy: Customized surveys of families

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI developed customized surveys and partnered with Green Bay Area Public Schools and Milwaukee Public Schools to collect data during parent-teacher conferences in the spring of 2021. The surveys were paper-and-pencil; families of color were specifically targeted to participate in the survey.

6. Targeted strategy: Contract to review data collected via Indicator 8 parent surveys

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI contracted with an independent researcher to review Indicator 8 survey data for themes related to the results indicators and Indicator 17. The researcher harvested these themes for the data and submitted a written report summarizing their research findings.

Prepopulated Data

| Source | Date | Description | Data |
|---|------------|--|-------|
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 6,233 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) | |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | 93 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 25 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 1,035 |

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

| Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma | Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) | FFY 2020 Data | FFY 2021 Target | FFY 2021 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| 6,233 | 7,386 | 85.32% | 85.50% | 84.39% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

Graduation Conditions

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

The requirements for obtaining a regular diploma in Wisconsin 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/no)

YES

If yes, explain the difference in conditions that youth with IEPs must meet.

The requirements for obtaining a regular diploma in Wisconsin 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 apply to students both with and without IEPs.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that in describing the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma, the State references FFY 2019, instead of 2021.

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Measurement

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2020 | 12.37% |

| FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| Target <= | 1.60% | 1.50% | 1.40% | 1.40% | 12.37% |
| Data | 2.14% | 2.45% | 2.42% | 2.40% | 12.37% |

Targets

| FFY | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target <= | 12.20% | 11.90% | 11.50% | 11.00% | 10.30% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

CURRENT REPORTING PERIOD:

The DPI used the Wisconsin Council on Special Education (the Council, <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council>) to solicit ongoing stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR, any subsequent revisions that the state has made to those targets, development and implementation of Indicator 17, and improvement activities. The Council met four times during this reporting period: September 24, 2021; December 3, 2021; March 11, 2021; and June 17, 2022. The twenty-five members of Council includes the representation required in the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004.

SOLICITING BROAD STAKEHOLDER INPUT ON THE STATE'S TARGETS IN THE SPP/APR:

The DPI used both universal and targeted approaches to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). During the year-long process, the DPI reviewed input provided by 3,719 stakeholders. During this year-long process, the DPI structured the data, discussion, and target-setting around four key questions: (1) How well is Wisconsin preparing students with IEPs for life after high school? (2) Are Wisconsin learners with IEPs learning in the same spaces as their peers? (3) How engaged are Wisconsin families in the learning of their children with IEPs? and (4) How are Wisconsin learners with IEPs performing in key areas?

1. Universal strategy: Open invitation to input sessions

The DPI scheduled five synchronous input sessions to solicit input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP): June 19, 2020; March 12, 2021; June 25, 2021; September 24, 2021; and December 3, 2021.

The DPI distributes a weekly news update related to special education and pupil services; this update serves as the official notification to directors of special education and is distributed to more than 1,000 unique contacts. In advance of each of the input sessions, the DPI included an open invitation to participate in the input sessions. These news updates are archived online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/news>. In addition, an open invitation to attend the input sessions was sent out on the CollabSupport listserve, announced at various conferences and stakeholder meetings, and posted online

(<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>) in May 2021 and remained online until after the final input session.

2. Universal strategy: Open invitation to submit asynchronous, web-based input

The DPI developed a series of webpages to solicit input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The web pages provided data analysis, recommended targets and rationale, and information on improvement strategies and evaluation. The web pages included this information via video or slide deck format. The web pages linked to Google forms for each of the results indicators and Indicator 17. The Google forms collected recommendations for target-setting and improvement activities and allowed stakeholders to provide additional and relevant feedback related to each of the results indicators and Indicator 17. To see the web pages, please visit <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>.

The DPI distributes a weekly news update related to special education and pupil services; this update serves as the official notification to directors of special education and is distributed to more than 1,000 unique contacts. Beginning in May 2021, the DPI included regularly an open invitation to submit input asynchronously through the web. These news updates are archived online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/news>. In addition, an invitation to participate was sent out on the CollabSupport listserve, announced at various conferences and stakeholder meetings, and posted online.

3. Targeted strategy: State Advisory Panel input sessions

The DPI conducted five input sessions with the State Advisory Panel to gather input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The dates of these sessions were June 19, 2020; March 12, 2021; June 25, 2021; September 24, 2021; and December 3, 2021. The agendas and minutes for these sessions are available online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council/agendas-and-minutes>. For details related to these input sessions, see, below, section on parent and family engagement.

4. Targeted strategy: Customized invitations to stakeholders

The DPI invited targeted stakeholders for input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The State Director sent personalized invitations to representatives of Wisconsin organizations with an interest in special education (state association of special education directors, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, SEA employees, representatives from grants funded by discretionary IDEA funds, etc.) to participate in the input sessions (described, above) or to submit input via the website.

5. Targeted strategy: Customized surveys of families

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI developed customized surveys and partnered with Green Bay Area Public Schools and Milwaukee Public Schools to collect data during parent-teacher conferences in the spring of 2021. The surveys were paper-and-pencil; families of color were specifically targeted to participate in the survey.

6. Targeted strategy: Contract to review data collected via Indicator 8 parent surveys

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI contracted with an independent researcher to review Indicator 8 survey data for themes related to the results indicators and Indicator 17. The researcher harvested these themes for the data and submitted a written report summarizing their research findings.

Prepopulated Data

| Source | Date | Description | Data |
|---|------------|--|-------|
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 6,233 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) | |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | 93 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 25 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 1,035 |

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

| Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out | Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) | FFY 2020 Data | FFY 2021 Target | FFY 2021 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------|
| 1,035 | 7,386 | 12.37% | 12.20% | 14.01% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The increase in dropout IEP exiters in the 2020-21 school year is also observed among students without disabilities (using FS032 EDfacts data) and is believed to be the result of apprehension among students and their families regarding in-person instruction during the COVID-19 pandemic, as well as dissatisfaction with virtual learning options for learners who require specialized instruction. The increased likelihood of underlying health concerns among students with IEPs made these LEA-level decisions particularly salient among that population and their families. DPI continues to identify and work with LEAs to prevent dropouts through its Joint Federal Notifications (JFN) and Transition Improvement Grant (TIG), as well as Wisconsin's Dropout Early Warning System (DEWS).

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

In 118.153, Wis. Stats., dropout is defined as a child who ceased to attend school, does not attend a public, private, or tribal school, technical college, or home-based private educational program on a full-time basis, has not graduated from high school, and does not have an acceptable excuse under s.118.15 (1) (b) to (d) or (3).

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3A. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

| Subject | Group | Group Name | Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------|-------|------------|---------------|---------------|
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2015 | 96.85% |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2015 | 95.55% |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2015 | 86.64% |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2015 | 96.76% |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2015 | 95.67% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2015 | 92.16% |

Targets

| Subject | Group | Group Name | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|---------|-------|------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

CURRENT REPORTING PERIOD:

The DPI used the Wisconsin Council on Special Education (the Council, <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council>) to solicit ongoing stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR, any subsequent revisions that the state has made to those targets, development and implementation of Indicator 17, and improvement activities. The Council met four times during this reporting period: September 24, 2021; December 3, 2021; March 11, 2021; and June 17, 2022. The twenty-five members of Council includes the representation required in the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004.

SOLICITING BROAD STAKEHOLDER INPUT ON THE STATE'S TARGETS IN THE SPP/APR:

The DPI used both universal and targeted approaches to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). During the year-long process, the DPI reviewed input provided by 3,719 stakeholders. During this year-long process, the DPI structured the data, discussion, and target-setting around four key questions: (1) How well is Wisconsin preparing students with IEPs for life after high school? (2) Are Wisconsin learners with IEPs learning in the same spaces as their peers? (3) How engaged are Wisconsin families in the learning of their children with IEPs? and (4) How are Wisconsin learners with IEPs performing in key areas?

1. Universal strategy: Open invitation to input sessions

The DPI scheduled five synchronous input sessions to solicit input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP): June 19, 2020; March 12, 2021; June 25, 2021; September 24, 2021; and December 3, 2021.

The DPI distributes a weekly news update related to special education and pupil services; this update serves as the official notification to directors of special education and is distributed to more than 1,000 unique contacts. In advance of each of the input sessions, the DPI included an open invitation to participate in the input sessions. These news updates are archived online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/news>. In addition, an open invitation to attend the input sessions was sent out on the CollabSupport listserve, announced at various conferences and stakeholder meetings, and posted online (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>) in May 2021 and remained online until after the final input session.

2. Universal strategy: Open invitation to submit asynchronous, web-based input

The DPI developed a series of webpages to solicit input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The web pages provided data analysis, recommended targets and rationale, and information on improvement strategies and evaluation. The web pages included this information via video or slide deck format. The web pages linked to Google forms for each of the results indicators and Indicator 17. The Google forms collected recommendations for target-setting and improvement activities and allowed stakeholders to provide additional and relevant feedback related to each of the results indicators and Indicator 17. To see the web pages, please visit <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>.

The DPI distributes a weekly news update related to special education and pupil services; this update serves as the official notification to directors of special education and is distributed to more than 1,000 unique contacts. Beginning in May 2021, the DPI included regularly an open invitation to submit input asynchronously through the web. These news updates are archived online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/news>. In addition, an invitation to participate was sent out on the CollabSupport listserve, announced at various conferences and stakeholder meetings, and posted online.

3. Targeted strategy: State Advisory Panel input sessions

The DPI conducted five input sessions with the State Advisory Panel to gather input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The dates of these sessions were June 19, 2020; March 12, 2021; June 25, 2021; September 24, 2021; and December 3, 2021. The agendas and minutes for these sessions are available online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council/agendas-and-minutes>. For details related to these input sessions, see, below, section on parent and family engagement.

4. Targeted strategy: Customized invitations to stakeholders

The DPI invited targeted stakeholders for input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The State Director sent personalized invitations to representatives of Wisconsin organizations with an interest in special education (state association of special education directors, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, SEA employees, representatives from grants funded by discretionary IDEA funds, etc.) to participate in the input sessions (described, above) or to submit input via the website.

5. Targeted strategy: Customized surveys of families

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI developed customized surveys and partnered with Green Bay Area Public Schools and Milwaukee Public Schools to collect data during parent-teacher conferences in the spring of 2021. The surveys were paper-and-pencil; families of color were specifically targeted to participate in the survey.

6. Targeted strategy: Contract to review data collected via Indicator 8 parent surveys

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI contracted with an independent researcher to review Indicator 8 survey data for themes related to the results indicators and Indicator 17. The researcher harvested these themes for the data and submitted a written report summarizing their research findings.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

04/05/2023

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

| Group | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | Grade HS |
|---|---------|---------|----------|
| a. Children with IEPs* | 9,221 | 8,682 | 8,230 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 1,775 | 905 | 603 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 6,537 | 6,430 | 5,244 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 410 | 514 | 527 |

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

04/05/2023

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

| Group | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | Grade HS |
|---|---------|---------|----------|
| a. Children with IEPs* | 9,224 | 8,686 | 8,230 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 1,776 | 908 | 603 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 6,534 | 6,423 | 5,278 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 409 | 513 | 525 |

*The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

| Group | Group Name | Number of Children with IEPs Participating | Number of Children with IEPs | FFY 2020 Data | FFY 2021 Target | FFY 2021 Data | Status | Slippage |
|-------|------------|--|------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| A | Grade 4 | 8,722 | 9,221 | 83.48% | 95.00% | 94.59% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| B | Grade 8 | 7,849 | 8,682 | 78.83% | 95.00% | 90.41% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| C | Grade HS | 6,374 | 8,230 | 71.71% | 95.00% | 77.45% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

| Group | Group Name | Number of Children with IEPs Participating | Number of Children with IEPs | FFY 2020 Data | FFY 2021 Target | FFY 2021 Data | Status | Slippage |
|-------|------------|--|------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| A | Grade 4 | 8,719 | 9,224 | 83.24% | 95.00% | 94.53% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| B | Grade 8 | 7,844 | 8,686 | 78.57% | 95.00% | 90.31% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| C | Grade HS | 6,406 | 8,230 | 71.86% | 95.00% | 77.84% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

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

https://dpi.wi.gov/wisedash/download-files/type?field_wisedash_upload_type_value=Forward

https://dpi.wi.gov/wisedash/download-files/type?field_wisedash_upload_type_value=ACT11

<https://wisedash.dpi.wi.gov/Dashboard/dashboard/22275>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

3A - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

| Subject | Group | Group Name | Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------|-------|------------|---------------|---------------|
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 16.46% |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 8.13% |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 7.70% |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 18.57% |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 5.78% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 4.53% |

Targets

| Subject | Group | Group Name | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|---------|-------|------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 16.60% | 16.80% | 17.00% | 17.20% | 17.40% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 8.50% | 8.90% | 9.30% | 9.70% | 10.10% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 8.10% | 8.50% | 8.90% | 9.30% | 9.70% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 18.60% | 18.60% | 18.70% | 18.80% | 18.90% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 6.23% | 6.73% | 7.23% | 7.73% | 8.23% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 5.00% | 5.50% | 6.00% | 6.50% | 7.00% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

CURRENT REPORTING PERIOD:

The DPI used the Wisconsin Council on Special Education (the Council, <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council>) to solicit ongoing stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR, any subsequent revisions that the state has made to those targets, development and implementation of Indicator 17, and improvement activities. The Council met four times during this reporting period: September 24, 2021; December 3, 2021; March 11, 2021; and June 17, 2022. The twenty-five members of Council includes the representation required in the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004.

SOLICITING BROAD STAKEHOLDER INPUT ON THE STATE'S TARGETS IN THE SPP/APR:

The DPI used both universal and targeted approaches to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). During the year-long process, the DPI reviewed input provided by 3,719 stakeholders. During this year-long process, the DPI structured the data,

discussion, and target-setting around four key questions: (1) How well is Wisconsin preparing students with IEPs for life after high school? (2) Are Wisconsin learners with IEPs learning in the same spaces as their peers? (3) How engaged are Wisconsin families in the learning of their children with IEPs? and (4) How are Wisconsin learners with IEPs performing in key areas?

1. Universal strategy: Open invitation to input sessions

The DPI scheduled five synchronous input sessions to solicit input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP): June 19, 2020; March 12, 2021; June 25, 2021; September 24, 2021; and December 3, 2021.

The DPI distributes a weekly news update related to special education and pupil services; this update serves as the official notification to directors of special education and is distributed to more than 1,000 unique contacts. In advance of each of the input sessions, the DPI included an open invitation to participate in the input sessions. These news updates are archived online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/news>. In addition, an open invitation to attend the input sessions was sent out on the CollabSupport listserve, announced at various conferences and stakeholder meetings, and posted online (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>) in May 2021 and remained online until after the final input session.

2. Universal strategy: Open invitation to submit asynchronous, web-based input

The DPI developed a series of webpages to solicit input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The web pages provided data analysis, recommended targets and rationale, and information on improvement strategies and evaluation. The web pages included this information via video or slide deck format. The web pages linked to Google forms for each of the results indicators and Indicator 17. The Google forms collected recommendations for target-setting and improvement activities and allowed stakeholders to provide additional and relevant feedback related to each of the results indicators and Indicator 17. To see the web pages, please visit <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>.

The DPI distributes a weekly news update related to special education and pupil services; this update serves as the official notification to directors of special education and is distributed to more than 1,000 unique contacts. Beginning in May 2021, the DPI included regularly an open invitation to submit input asynchronously through the web. These news updates are archived online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/news>. In addition, an invitation to participate was sent out on the CollabSupport listserve, announced at various conferences and stakeholder meetings, and posted online.

3. Targeted strategy: State Advisory Panel input sessions

The DPI conducted five input sessions with the State Advisory Panel to gather input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The dates of these sessions were June 19, 2020; March 12, 2021; June 25, 2021; September 24, 2021; and December 3, 2021. The agendas and minutes for these sessions are available online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council/agendas-and-minutes>. For details related to these input sessions, see, below, section on parent and family engagement.

4. Targeted strategy: Customized invitations to stakeholders

The DPI invited targeted stakeholders for input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The State Director sent personalized invitations to representatives of Wisconsin organizations with an interest in special education (state association of special education directors, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, SEA employees, representatives from grants funded by discretionary IDEA funds, etc.) to participate in the input sessions (described, above) or to submit input via the website.

5. Targeted strategy: Customized surveys of families

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI developed customized surveys and partnered with Green Bay Area Public Schools and Milwaukee Public Schools to collect data during parent-teacher conferences in the spring of 2021. The surveys were paper-and-pencil; families of color were specifically targeted to participate in the survey.

6. Targeted strategy: Contract to review data collected via Indicator 8 parent surveys

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI contracted with an independent researcher to review Indicator 8 survey data for themes related to the results indicators and Indicator 17. The researcher harvested these themes for the data and submitted a written report summarizing their research findings.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/05/2023

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

| Group | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | Grade HS |
|--|---------|---------|----------|
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment | 8,312 | 7,335 | 5,847 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 779 | 200 | 79 |

| | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 676 | 330 | 346 |
|---|-----|-----|-----|

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/05/2023

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

| Group | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | Grade HS |
|--|---------|---------|----------|
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment | 8,310 | 7,331 | 5,881 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 889 | 176 | 67 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 786 | 293 | 231 |

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

| Group | Group Name | Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards | Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment | FFY 2020 Data | FFY 2021 Target | FFY 2021 Data | Status | Slippage |
|-------|------------|--|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| A | Grade 4 | 1,455 | 8,312 | 16.46% | 16.60% | 17.50% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B | Grade 8 | 530 | 7,335 | 8.13% | 8.50% | 7.23% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| C | Grade HS | 425 | 5,847 | 7.70% | 8.10% | 7.27% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

The continued participation rate below 95% among students with IEPs in statewide assessments during the 2021-22 school year poses a significant caveat to the data, as an insufficient percentage of the population took the assessment to have confidence in the data's representativeness. However, the DPI recognizes that the families most likely to opt out of participation for non-medical reasons are higher among students who are less likely to demonstrate proficiency, suggesting that the actual numbers of proficient students in reading and math are even lower than what the reported data suggests. As many data analysts and education experts forecasted, the disruption in education caused by COVID-19 hit students with IEPs particularly hard, and will require years to rebound. The DPI continues to work with LEAs in developing and implementing successful strategies for improving students' demonstrated proficiency in reading and math through its improvement monitoring based on LEA Determinations and related oversight activities, as well as Indicator 17 improvement strategies, discretionary grants, and agency-wide initiatives to improve reading and math proficiency.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

The continued participation rate below 95% among students with IEPs in statewide assessments during the 2021-22 school year poses a significant caveat to the data, as an insufficient percentage of the population took the assessment to have confidence in the data's representativeness. However, the DPI recognizes that the families most likely to opt out of participation for non-medical reasons are higher among students who are less likely to demonstrate proficiency, suggesting that the actual numbers of proficient students in reading and math are even lower than what the reported data suggests. As many data analysts and education experts forecasted, the disruption in education caused by COVID-19 hit students with IEPs particularly hard, and will require years to rebound. The DPI continues to work with LEAs in developing and implementing successful strategies for improving students' demonstrated proficiency in reading and math through its improvement monitoring based on LEA Determinations and related oversight activities, as well as Indicator 17 improvement strategies, discretionary grants, and agency-wide initiatives to improve reading and math proficiency.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

| Group | Group Name | Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards | Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment | FFY 2020 Data | FFY 2021 Target | FFY 2021 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--------------|-------------------|---|---|----------------------|------------------------|----------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| A | Grade 4 | 1,675 | 8,310 | 18.57% | 18.60% | 20.16% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B | Grade 8 | 469 | 7,331 | 5.78% | 6.23% | 6.40% | Met target | No Slippage |
| C | Grade HS | 298 | 5,881 | 4.53% | 5.00% | 5.07% | Met target | No Slippage |

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

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

https://dpi.wi.gov/wisedash/download-files/type?field_wisedash_upload_type_value=Forward

https://dpi.wi.gov/wisedash/download-files/type?field_wisedash_upload_type_value=ACT11

<https://wisedash.dpi.wi.gov/Dashboard/dashboard/22275>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

| Subject | Group | Group Name | Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------|-------|------------|---------------|---------------|
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 12.78% |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 18.76% |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 28.25% |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 34.09% |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 5.26% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 28.07% |

Targets

| Subject | Group | Group Name | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|---------|-------|------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 12.98% | 13.18% | 13.38% | 13.58% | 13.78% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 18.76% | 18.76% | 18.76% | 18.76% | 18.77% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 28.25% | 28.25% | 28.25% | 28.25% | 28.26% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 34.09% | 34.09% | 34.09% | 34.09% | 34.10% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 5.56% | 5.86% | 6.16% | 6.46% | 6.76% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 28.07% | 28.07% | 28.07% | 28.07% | 28.08% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

CURRENT REPORTING PERIOD:

The DPI used the Wisconsin Council on Special Education (the Council, <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council>) to solicit ongoing stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR, any subsequent revisions that the state has made to those targets, development and implementation of Indicator 17, and improvement activities. The Council met four times during this reporting period: September 24, 2021; December 3, 2021; March 11, 2021; and June 17, 2022. The twenty-five members of Council includes the representation required in the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004.

SOLICITING BROAD STAKEHOLDER INPUT ON THE STATE'S TARGETS IN THE SPP/APR:

The DPI used both universal and targeted approaches to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). During the year-long process, the DPI reviewed input provided by 3,719 stakeholders. During this year-long process, the DPI structured the data, discussion, and target-setting around four key questions: (1) How well is Wisconsin preparing students with IEPs for life after high school? (2) Are Wisconsin learners with IEPs learning in the same spaces as their peers? (3) How engaged are Wisconsin families in the learning of their children with IEPs? and (4) How are Wisconsin learners with IEPs performing in key areas?

1. Universal strategy: Open invitation to input sessions

The DPI scheduled five synchronous input sessions to solicit input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP): June 19, 2020; March 12, 2021; June 25, 2021; September 24, 2021; and December 3, 2021.

The DPI distributes a weekly news update related to special education and pupil services; this update serves as the official notification to directors of special education and is distributed to more than 1,000 unique contacts. In advance of each of the input sessions, the DPI included an open invitation to participate in the input sessions. These news updates are archived online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/news>. In addition, an open invitation to attend the input sessions was sent out on the CollabSupport listserve, announced at various conferences and stakeholder meetings, and posted online (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>) in May 2021 and remained online until after the final input session.

2. Universal strategy: Open invitation to submit asynchronous, web-based input

The DPI developed a series of webpages to solicit input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The web pages provided data analysis, recommended targets and rationale, and information on improvement strategies and evaluation. The web pages included this information via video or slide deck format. The web pages linked to Google forms for each of the results indicators and Indicator 17. The Google forms collected recommendations for target-setting and improvement activities and allowed stakeholders to provide additional and relevant feedback related to each of the results indicators and Indicator 17. To see the web pages, please visit <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>.

The DPI distributes a weekly news update related to special education and pupil services; this update serves as the official notification to directors of special education and is distributed to more than 1,000 unique contacts. Beginning in May 2021, the DPI included regularly an open invitation to submit input asynchronously through the web. These news updates are archived online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/news>. In addition, an invitation to participate was sent out on the CollabSupport listserve, announced at various conferences and stakeholder meetings, and posted online.

3. Targeted strategy: State Advisory Panel input sessions

The DPI conducted five input sessions with the State Advisory Panel to gather input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The dates of these sessions were June 19, 2020; March 12, 2021; June 25, 2021; September 24, 2021; and December 3, 2021. The agendas and minutes for these sessions are available online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council/agendas-and-minutes>. For details related to these input sessions, see, below, section on parent and family engagement.

4. Targeted strategy: Customized invitations to stakeholders

The DPI invited targeted stakeholders for input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The State Director sent personalized invitations to representatives of Wisconsin organizations with an interest in special education (state association of special education directors, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, SEA employees, representatives from grants funded by discretionary IDEA funds, etc.) to participate in the input sessions (described, above) or to submit input via the website.

5. Targeted strategy: Customized surveys of families

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI developed customized surveys and partnered with Green Bay Area Public Schools and Milwaukee Public Schools to collect data during parent-teacher conferences in the spring of 2021. The surveys were paper-and-pencil; families of color were specifically targeted to participate in the survey.

6. Targeted strategy: Contract to review data collected via Indicator 8 parent surveys

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI contracted with an independent researcher to review Indicator 8 survey data for themes related to the results indicators and Indicator 17. The researcher harvested these themes for the data and submitted a written report summarizing their research findings.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/05/2023

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

| Group | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | Grade HS |
|--|---------|---------|----------|
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment | 410 | 514 | 527 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | 45 | 70 | 129 |

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/05/2023

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

| Group | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | Grade HS |
|--|---------|---------|----------|
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment | 409 | 513 | 525 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | 100 | 28 | 119 |

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

| Group | Group Name | Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards | Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment | FFY 2020 Data | FFY 2021 Target | FFY 2021 Data | Status | Slippage |
|-------|------------|--|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------|
| A | Grade 4 | 45 | 410 | 12.78% | 12.98% | 10.98% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| B | Grade 8 | 70 | 514 | 18.76% | 18.76% | 13.62% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| C | Grade HS | 129 | 527 | 28.25% | 28.25% | 24.48% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

The continued participation rate below 95% among students with IEPs in statewide assessments during the 2021-22 school year poses a significant caveat to the data, as an insufficient percentage of the population took the assessment to have confidence in the data's representativeness. However, the DPI recognizes that the families most likely to opt out of participation for non-medical reasons are higher among students who are less likely to demonstrate proficiency, suggesting that the actual numbers of proficient students in reading and math are even lower than what the reported data suggests. As many data analysts and education experts forecasted, the disruption in education caused by COVID-19 hit students with IEPs particularly hard, and will require years to rebound. The DPI continues to work with LEAs in developing and implementing successful strategies for improving students' demonstrated proficiency in reading and math through its improvement monitoring based on LEA Determinations and related oversight activities, as well as Indicator 17 improvement strategies, discretionary grants, and agency-wide initiatives to improve reading and math proficiency.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

The continued participation rate below 95% among students with IEPs in statewide assessments during the 2021-22 school year poses a significant caveat to the data, as an insufficient percentage of the population took the assessment to have confidence in the data's representativeness. However, the DPI recognizes that the families most likely to opt out of participation for non-medical reasons are higher among students who are less likely to demonstrate proficiency, suggesting that the actual numbers of proficient students in reading and math are even lower than what the reported data suggests. As many data analysts and education experts forecasted, the disruption in education caused by COVID-19 hit students with IEPs particularly hard, and will require years to rebound. The DPI continues to work with LEAs in developing and implementing successful strategies for improving students' demonstrated proficiency in reading and math through its improvement monitoring based on LEA Determinations and related oversight activities, as well as Indicator 17 improvement strategies, discretionary grants, and agency-wide initiatives to improve reading and math proficiency.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

The continued participation rate below 95% among students with IEPs in statewide assessments during the 2021-22 school year poses a significant caveat to the data, as an insufficient percentage of the population took the assessment to have confidence in the data's representativeness. However, the DPI recognizes that the families most likely to opt out of participation for non-medical reasons are higher among students who are less likely to

demonstrate proficiency, suggesting that the actual numbers of proficient students in reading and math are even lower than what the reported data suggests. As many data analysts and education experts forecasted, the disruption in education caused by COVID-19 hit students with IEPs particularly hard, and will require years to rebound. The DPI continues to work with LEAs in developing and implementing successful strategies for improving students' demonstrated proficiency in reading and math through its improvement monitoring based on LEA Determinations and related oversight activities, as well as Indicator 17 improvement strategies, discretionary grants, and agency-wide initiatives to improve reading and math proficiency.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

| Group | Group Name | Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards | Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment | FFY 2020 Data | FFY 2021 Target | FFY 2021 Data | Status | Slippage |
|-------|------------|--|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| A | Grade 4 | 100 | 409 | 34.09% | 34.09% | 24.45% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| B | Grade 8 | 28 | 513 | 5.26% | 5.56% | 5.46% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| C | Grade HS | 119 | 525 | 28.07% | 28.07% | 22.67% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

The continued participation rate below 95% among students with IEPs in statewide assessments during the 2021-22 school year poses a significant caveat to the data, as an insufficient percentage of the population took the assessment to have confidence in the data's representativeness. However, the DPI recognizes that the families most likely to opt out of participation for non-medical reasons are higher among students who are less likely to demonstrate proficiency, suggesting that the actual numbers of proficient students in reading and math are even lower than what the reported data suggests. As many data analysts and education experts forecasted, the disruption in education caused by COVID-19 hit students with IEPs particularly hard, and will require years to rebound. The DPI continues to work with LEAs in developing and implementing successful strategies for improving students' demonstrated proficiency in reading and math through its improvement monitoring based on LEA Determinations and related oversight activities, as well as Indicator 17 improvement strategies, discretionary grants, and agency-wide initiatives to improve reading and math proficiency.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

The continued participation rate below 95% among students with IEPs in statewide assessments during the 2021-22 school year poses a significant caveat to the data, as an insufficient percentage of the population took the assessment to have confidence in the data's representativeness. However, the DPI recognizes that the families most likely to opt out of participation for non-medical reasons are higher among students who are less likely to demonstrate proficiency, suggesting that the actual numbers of proficient students in reading and math are even lower than what the reported data suggests. As many data analysts and education experts forecasted, the disruption in education caused by COVID-19 hit students with IEPs particularly hard, and will require years to rebound. The DPI continues to work with LEAs in developing and implementing successful strategies for improving students' demonstrated proficiency in reading and math through its improvement monitoring based on LEA Determinations and related oversight activities, as well as Indicator 17 improvement strategies, discretionary grants, and agency-wide initiatives to improve reading and math proficiency.

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

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

https://dpi.wi.gov/wisedash/download-files/type?field_wisedash_upload_type_value=Forward
https://dpi.wi.gov/wisedash/download-files/type?field_wisedash_upload_type_value=ACT11
<https://wisedash.dpi.wi.gov/Dashboard/dashboard/22275>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

| Subject | Group | Group Name | Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------|-------|------------|---------------|---------------|
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 24.40 |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 27.90 |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 30.16 |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 23.69 |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 24.82 |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 24.67 |

Targets

| Subject | Group | Group Name | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|---------|-------|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Reading | A <= | Grade 4 | 24.29 | 24.10 | 23.91 | 23.72 | 23.53 |
| Reading | B <= | Grade 8 | 27.58 | 27.19 | 26.80 | 26.41 | 26.02 |
| Reading | C <= | Grade HS | 29.81 | 29.42 | 29.03 | 28.64 | 28.25 |
| Math | A <= | Grade 4 | 23.67 | 23.67 | 23.57 | 23.47 | 23.38 |
| Math | B <= | Grade 8 | 24.44 | 23.94 | 23.45 | 22.96 | 22.47 |
| Math | C <= | Grade HS | 24.27 | 23.78 | 23.29 | 22.80 | 22.31 |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

CURRENT REPORTING PERIOD:

The DPI used the Wisconsin Council on Special Education (the Council, <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council>) to solicit ongoing stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR, any subsequent revisions that the state has made to those targets, development and implementation of Indicator 17, and improvement activities. The Council met four times during this reporting period: September 24, 2021; December 3, 2021; March 11, 2021; and June 17, 2022. The twenty-five members of Council includes the representation required in the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004.

SOLICITING BROAD STAKEHOLDER INPUT ON THE STATE'S TARGETS IN THE SPP/APR:

The DPI used both universal and targeted approaches to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). During the year-long process, the DPI reviewed input provided by 3,719 stakeholders. During this year-long process, the DPI structured the data, discussion, and target-setting around four key questions: (1) How well is Wisconsin preparing students with IEPs for life after high school? (2) Are Wisconsin learners with IEPs learning in the same spaces as their peers? (3) How engaged are Wisconsin families in the learning of their children with IEPs? and (4) How are Wisconsin learners with IEPs performing in key areas?

1. Universal strategy: Open invitation to input sessions

The DPI scheduled five synchronous input sessions to solicit input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP): June 19, 2020; March 12, 2021; June 25, 2021; September 24, 2021; and December 3, 2021.

The DPI distributes a weekly news update related to special education and pupil services; this update serves as the official notification to directors of special education and is distributed to more than 1,000 unique contacts. In advance of each of the input sessions, the DPI included an open invitation to participate in the input sessions. These news updates are archived online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/news>. In addition, an open invitation to attend the input sessions was sent out on the CollabSupport listserv, announced at various conferences and stakeholder meetings, and posted online (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>) in May 2021 and remained online until after the final input session.

2. Universal strategy: Open invitation to submit asynchronous, web-based input

The DPI developed a series of webpages to solicit input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The web pages provided data analysis, recommended targets and rationale, and information on improvement strategies and evaluation. The web pages included this information via video or slide deck format. The web pages linked to Google forms for each of the results indicators and Indicator 17. The Google forms collected recommendations for target-setting and improvement activities and allowed stakeholders to provide additional and relevant feedback related to each of the results indicators and Indicator 17. To see the web pages, please visit <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>.

The DPI distributes a weekly news update related to special education and pupil services; this update serves as the official notification to directors of special education and is distributed to more than 1,000 unique contacts. Beginning in May 2021, the DPI included regularly an open invitation to submit input asynchronously through the web. These news updates are archived online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/news>. In addition, an invitation to participate was sent out on the CollabSupport listserv, announced at various conferences and stakeholder meetings, and posted online.

3. Targeted strategy: State Advisory Panel input sessions

The DPI conducted five input sessions with the State Advisory Panel to gather input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The dates of these sessions were June 19, 2020; March 12, 2021; June 25, 2021; September 24, 2021; and December 3, 2021. The agendas and minutes for these sessions are available online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council/agendas-and-minutes>. For details related to these input sessions, see, below, section on parent and family engagement.

4. Targeted strategy: Customized invitations to stakeholders

The DPI invited targeted stakeholders for input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The State Director sent personalized invitations to representatives of Wisconsin organizations with an interest in special education (state association of special education directors, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, SEA employees, representatives from grants funded by discretionary IDEA funds, etc.) to participate in the input sessions (described, above) or to submit input via the website.

5. Targeted strategy: Customized surveys of families

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI developed customized surveys and partnered with Green Bay Area Public Schools and Milwaukee Public Schools to collect data during parent-teacher conferences in the spring of 2021. The surveys were paper-and-pencil; families of color were specifically targeted to participate in the survey.

6. Targeted strategy: Contract to review data collected via Indicator 8 parent surveys

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI contracted with an independent researcher to review Indicator 8 survey data for themes related to the results indicators and Indicator 17. The researcher harvested these themes for the data and submitted a written report summarizing their research findings.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/05/2023

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

| Group | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | Grade HS |
|--|---------|---------|----------|
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 54,735 | 58,762 | 57,554 |

| | | | |
|--|--------|--------|--------|
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 8,312 | 7,335 | 5,847 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 21,127 | 18,777 | 21,298 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 2,109 | 971 | 913 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 779 | 200 | 79 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 676 | 330 | 346 |

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/05/2023

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

| Group | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | Grade HS |
|--|---------|---------|----------|
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 54,896 | 58,836 | 57,636 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 8,310 | 7,331 | 5,881 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 22,212 | 17,233 | 16,486 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 2,470 | 911 | 656 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 889 | 176 | 67 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 786 | 293 | 231 |

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

| Group | Group Name | Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards | Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards | FFY 2020 Data | FFY 2021 Target | FFY 2021 Data | Status | Slippage |
|-------|------------|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| A | Grade 4 | 17.50% | 42.45% | 24.40 | 24.29 | 24.95 | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| B | Grade 8 | 7.23% | 33.61% | 27.90 | 27.58 | 26.38 | Met target | No Slippage |
| C | Grade HS | 7.27% | 38.59% | 30.16 | 29.81 | 31.32 | Did not meet target | Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

The continued participation rate below 95% among students with IEPs in statewide assessments during the 2021-22 school year poses a significant caveat to the data, as an insufficient percentage of the population took the assessment to have confidence in the data's representativeness. However, the DPI recognizes that the families most likely to opt out of participation for non-medical reasons are higher among students who are less likely to demonstrate proficiency, suggesting that the actual numbers of proficient students in reading and math are even lower than what the reported data suggests. As many data analysts and education experts forecasted, the disruption in education caused by COVID-19 hit students with IEPs particularly hard, and will require years to rebound. The DPI continues to work with LEAs in developing and implementing successful strategies for improving

students' demonstrated proficiency in reading and math through its improvement monitoring based on LEA Determinations and related oversight activities, as well as Indicator 17 improvement strategies, discretionary grants, and agency-wide initiatives to improve reading and math proficiency.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

| Group | Group Name | Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards | Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards | FFY 2020 Data | FFY 2021 Target | FFY 2021 Data | Status | Slippage |
|-------|------------|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| A | Grade 4 | 20.16% | 44.96% | 23.69 | 23.67 | 24.80 | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| B | Grade 8 | 6.40% | 30.84% | 24.82 | 24.44 | 24.44 | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| C | Grade HS | 5.07% | 29.74% | 24.67 | 24.27 | 24.67 | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

The continued participation rate below 95% among students with IEPs in statewide assessments during the 2021-22 school year poses a significant caveat to the data, as an insufficient percentage of the population took the assessment to have confidence in the data's representativeness. However, the DPI recognizes that the families most likely to opt out of participation for non-medical reasons are higher among students who are less likely to demonstrate proficiency, suggesting that the actual numbers of proficient students in reading and math are even lower than what the reported data suggests. As many data analysts and education experts forecasted, the disruption in education caused by COVID-19 hit students with IEPs particularly hard, and will require years to rebound. The DPI continues to work with LEAs in developing and implementing successful strategies for improving students' demonstrated proficiency in reading and math through its improvement monitoring based on LEA Determinations and related oversight activities, as well as Indicator 17 improvement strategies, discretionary grants, and agency-wide initiatives to improve reading and math proficiency.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, 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))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n and/or cell size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, 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.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2021 | 0.75% |

| FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
|-----------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|
| Target <= | 2.50% | 2.50% | 2.50% | 2.50% | 4.00% |
| Data | 2.45% | 4.50% | 33.33% | 3.59% | NVR |

Targets

| FFY | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Target <= | 1.00% | 1.00% | 1.00% | 1.00% | 0.74% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

CURRENT REPORTING PERIOD:

The DPI used the Wisconsin Council on Special Education (the Council, <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council>) to solicit ongoing stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR, any subsequent revisions that the state has made to those targets, development and implementation of Indicator 17, and improvement activities. The Council met four times during this reporting period: September 24, 2021; December 3, 2021; March 11, 2021; and June 17, 2022. The twenty-five members of Council includes the representation required in the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004.

SOLICITING BROAD STAKEHOLDER INPUT ON THE STATE'S TARGETS IN THE SPP/APR:

The DPI used both universal and targeted approaches to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). During the year-long process, the DPI reviewed input provided by 3,719 stakeholders. During this year-long process, the DPI structured the data, discussion, and target-setting around four key questions: (1) How well is Wisconsin preparing students with IEPs for life after high school? (2) Are Wisconsin learners with IEPs learning in the same spaces as their peers? (3) How engaged are Wisconsin families in the learning of their children with IEPs? and (4) How are Wisconsin learners with IEPs performing in key areas?

1. Universal strategy: Open invitation to input sessions

The DPI scheduled five synchronous input sessions to solicit input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP): June 19, 2020; March 12, 2021; June 25, 2021; September 24, 2021; and December 3, 2021.

The DPI distributes a weekly news update related to special education and pupil services; this update serves as the official notification to directors of special education and is distributed to more than 1,000 unique contacts. In advance of each of the input sessions, the DPI included an open invitation to participate in the input sessions. These news updates are archived online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/news>. In addition, an open invitation to attend the input sessions was sent out on the CollabSupport listserv, announced at various conferences and stakeholder meetings, and posted online (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>) in May 2021 and remained online until after the final input session.

2. Universal strategy: Open invitation to submit asynchronous, web-based input

The DPI developed a series of webpages to solicit input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The web pages provided data analysis, recommended targets and rationale, and information on improvement strategies and evaluation. The web pages included this information via video or slide deck format. The web pages linked to Google forms for each of the results indicators and Indicator 17. The Google forms collected recommendations for target-setting and improvement activities and allowed stakeholders to provide additional and relevant feedback related to each of the results indicators and Indicator 17. To see the web pages, please visit <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>.

The DPI distributes a weekly news update related to special education and pupil services; this update serves as the official notification to directors of special education and is distributed to more than 1,000 unique contacts. Beginning in May 2021, the DPI included regularly an open invitation to submit input asynchronously through the web. These news updates are archived online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/news>. In addition, an invitation to participate was sent out on the CollabSupport listserv, announced at various conferences and stakeholder meetings, and posted online.

3. Targeted strategy: State Advisory Panel input sessions

The DPI conducted five input sessions with the State Advisory Panel to gather input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The dates of these sessions were June 19, 2020; March 12, 2021; June 25, 2021; September 24, 2021; and December 3, 2021. The agendas and minutes for these sessions are available online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council/agendas-and-minutes>. For details related to these input sessions, see, below, section on parent and family engagement.

4. Targeted strategy: Customized invitations to stakeholders

The DPI invited targeted stakeholders for input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The State Director sent personalized invitations to representatives of Wisconsin organizations with an interest in special education (state association of special education directors, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, SEA employees, representatives from grants funded by discretionary IDEA funds, etc.) to participate in the input sessions (described, above) or to submit input via the website.

5. Targeted strategy: Customized surveys of families

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI developed customized surveys and partnered with Green Bay Area Public Schools and Milwaukee Public Schools to collect data during parent-teacher conferences in the spring of 2021. The surveys were paper-and-pencil; families of color were specifically targeted to participate in the survey.

6. Targeted strategy: Contract to review data collected via Indicator 8 parent surveys

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI contracted with an independent researcher to review Indicator 8 survey data for themes related to the results indicators and Indicator 17. The researcher harvested these themes for the data and submitted a written report summarizing their research findings.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

44

| Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy | Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size | FFY 2020 Data | FFY 2021 Target | FFY 2021 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| 3 | 402 | NVR | 1.00% | 0.75% | N/A | N/A |

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

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

As of FFY 2021, the DPI shifted to a definition of significant discrepancy as a risk rate of 2 or greater for two consecutive years, with a minimum denominator of 30 (representing students with IEPs as of the State's October 1 Child Count) each year. No minimum numerator has been set. The intent of this change is to shift away from the previous methodology which relied upon standard deviations from the mean to establish cutoffs, which resulted in approximately 4% of LEAs always being identified as having a significant discrepancy each year. The new methodology resolves this issue while ensuring the vast majority of Wisconsin LEAs remain eligible for identification in this area.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Because this indicator uses multiple years of data and is lagged, only LEAs active in the 2020-21 school year are counted towards the total number of LEAs, aligning with the reported number of LEAs in the introduction of Wisconsin's FFY2020 SPP/APR.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 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 2021 with significant discrepancy (using 2020-21 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 the DPI's model policies and procedures or have submitted policies and procedures that have been reviewed and approved by the DPI. Likewise, with IEP forms, the districts have either adopted the department's model IEP forms or use forms approved by the DPI. In addition, the DPI reviews IDEA State complaint decisions, due process decisions, and pupil nondiscrimination appeals and, when necessary, conducts additional record reviews and interviews using standard protocols. Based on the DPI'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)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

| 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 |

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2020. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2021 in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

This is the result of a typo; there were 445 active and accountable LEAs in Wisconsin in FFY 2019 (the source year for this lagged indicator), not 444, resulting in a rate of 4.27%. This would have been a baseline year, as DPI removed its minimum cell size for its calculation.

Wisconsin continues to encourage OSEP to integrate an option for SEAs to import this data as either a CSV or from the previous year's SPP/APR reporting, so as to reduce the errors which inevitably occur when manually entering data, particularly across so many fields as are involved in SPP/APR reporting.

4A - OSEP Response

OSEP cannot determine whether the data are valid and reliable. The State reported that 420 districts met the minimum n size requirement, and 25 districts did not meet the minimum n size requirement and were excluded from the calculation. The number of districts excluded from the calculation because they do not meet the minimum "n" size, plus the number of districts that met the State-established minimum "n" size, do not equal the total number of districts the State reported in the FFY 2020 Introduction. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

The State reports "As of FFY 2021 (using 2020-21 data), the DPI shifted to a definition of significant discrepancy as a risk rate of 2 or greater for two consecutive years, with a minimum denominator of 30 each year. No minimum numerator has been set. The intent of this change is to shift away from the previous methodology which relied upon standard deviations from the mean to establish cutoffs, which resulted in approximately 4% of LEAs always being identified as having a significant discrepancy each year. The new methodology resolves this issue while ensuring the vast majority of Wisconsin LEAs remain eligible for identification." However, OSEP notes the State did not reset its baseline for FFY 2021 or revise its targets for FFYs 2021 – 2025, as required.

As noted in the FFY 2021 Part B SPP/APR General Instructions, the State's methodology for examining data for this indicator must be reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities among LEAs in the State or compared to the rates for nondisabled children within those LEAs. The State reported it has established a minimum n and/or cell size. Specifically, the State reported using an n size of 30. However, OSEP notes that the State did not provide a description of what this value represents, which is information that would enable OSEP to determine whether the State's methodology is reasonably designed to identify significant discrepancies in its LEAs.

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, 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))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2020-2021 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices 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.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, 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.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2021 | 0.00% |

| FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.23% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Targets

| FFY | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

57

| Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity | Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements | Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size | FFY 2020 Data | FFY 2021 Target | FFY 2021 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|--|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| 4 | 0 | 389 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | N/A | N/A |

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

As of FFY 2021, the DPI shifted to a definition of significant discrepancy as a risk rate of 2 or greater for two consecutive years, with a minimum denominator of 30 (representing students with IEPs in one or more race reporting categories as of the State's October 1 Child Count) each year. No minimum numerator has been set. The intent of this change is to shift away from the previous methodology which relied upon standard deviations from the mean to establish cutoffs, which resulted in approximately 4% of LEAs always being identified as having a significant discrepancy each year. The new methodology resolves this issue while ensuring the vast majority of Wisconsin LEAs remain eligible for identification in this area.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Because this indicator uses multiple years of data and is lagged, only LEAs active in the 2020-21 school year are counted towards the total number of LEAs, aligning with the reported number of LEAs in the introduction of Wisconsin's FFY2020 SPP/APR.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 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 2021 with significant discrepancy (using 2020-21 data), the DPI 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 the DPI's model policies and procedures or have submitted policies and procedures that have been reviewed and approved by the DPI. Likewise, with IEP forms, the districts have either adopted the DPI's model IEP forms or use forms approved by the DPI. 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. The DPI also reviewed IDEA State complaint decisions, due process decisions, and pupil nondiscrimination appeals, and conducted additional record reviews and interviews using standard protocols. Based on the review as described above, there were zero districts with policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and did not comply with a procedural safeguard provision under 34 CFR § 300.530.

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

| 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 |

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

OSEP cannot determine whether the data are valid and reliable. The State reported that 407 districts met the minimum n size requirement, and 38 districts did not meet the minimum n size requirement and were excluded from the calculation. The number of districts excluded from the calculation because they do not meet the minimum "n" size, plus the number of districts that met the State- established minimum "n" size, do not equal the total number of districts the State reported in the FFY 2021 Introduction. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target. Additionally, OSEP cannot determine whether the data are valid and reliable because the State reported its definition of significant discrepancy and methodology for determining significant discrepancies as, "As of FFY 2021 (using 2020-21 data), the DPI shifted to a definition of significant discrepancy as a risk rate of 2 or greater for two consecutive years, with a minimum denominator of 30 each year." It is unclear whether the State's methodology considers significant discrepancy by race and ethnicity, as required by the Measurement Table. Additionally, OSEP notes the State did not reset its baseline for FFY 2021 or revise its targets for FFYs 2021 – 2025, as required. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

Additionally, as noted in the FFY 2021 Part B SPP/APR General Instructions, the State's methodology for examining data for this indicator must be reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities among LEAs in the State or compared to the rates for nondisabled children within those LEAs. The State reported it has established a minimum n and/or cell size. Specifically, the State reported using an n size of 30. However, OSEP notes that the State did not provide a description of what this value represents, which is information that would enable OSEP to determine whether the State's methodology is reasonably designed to identify significant discrepancies in its LEAs.

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 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))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6. Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

| Part | Baseline | FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
|------|----------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A | 2020 | Target >= | 66.80% | 68.40% | 70.00% | 70.00% | 73.85% |
| A | 73.85% | Data | 67.39% | 68.94% | 70.14% | 71.61% | 73.85% |
| B | 2020 | Target <= | 8.70% | 8.30% | 7.90% | 7.90% | 7.46% |
| B | 7.46% | Data | 8.84% | 8.48% | 8.47% | 8.15% | 7.46% |
| C | 2020 | Target <= | 1.05% | 1.00% | 0.95% | 0.95% | 1.25% |
| C | 1.25% | Data | 1.43% | 1.44% | 1.30% | 1.31% | 1.25% |

Targets

| FFY | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|-------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target A >= | 74.33% | 75.43% | 76.38% | 77.28% | 78.18% |
| Target B <= | 7.46% | 7.27% | 7.05% | 6.84% | 6.64% |
| Target C <= | 1.23% | 1.21% | 1.19% | 1.18% | 1.17% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

CURRENT REPORTING PERIOD:

The DPI used the Wisconsin Council on Special Education (the Council, <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council>) to solicit ongoing stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR, any subsequent revisions that the state has made to those targets, development and implementation of Indicator 17, and improvement activities. The Council met four times during this reporting period: September 24, 2021; December 3, 2021; March 11, 2021; and June 17, 2022. The twenty-five members of Council includes the representation required in the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004.

SOLICITING BROAD STAKEHOLDER INPUT ON THE STATE'S TARGETS IN THE SPP/APR:

The DPI used both universal and targeted approaches to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). During the year-long process, the DPI reviewed input provided by 3,719 stakeholders. During this year-long process, the DPI structured the data, discussion, and target-setting around four key questions: (1) How well is Wisconsin preparing students with IEPs for life after high school? (2) Are Wisconsin learners with IEPs learning in the same spaces as their peers? (3) How engaged are Wisconsin families in the learning of their children with IEPs? and (4) How are Wisconsin learners with IEPs performing in key areas?

1. Universal strategy: Open invitation to input sessions

The DPI scheduled five synchronous input sessions to solicit input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP): June 19, 2020; March 12, 2021; June 25, 2021; September 24, 2021; and December 3, 2021.

The DPI distributes a weekly news update related to special education and pupil services; this update serves as the official notification to directors of special education and is distributed to more than 1,000 unique contacts. In advance of each of the input sessions, the DPI included an open invitation to participate in the input sessions. These news updates are archived online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/news>. In addition, an open invitation to attend the input sessions was sent out on the CollabSupport listserve, announced at various conferences and stakeholder meetings, and posted online (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>) in May 2021 and remained online until after the final input session.

2. Universal strategy: Open invitation to submit asynchronous, web-based input

The DPI developed a series of webpages to solicit input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The web pages provided data analysis, recommended targets and rationale, and information on improvement strategies and evaluation. The web pages included this information via video or slide deck format. The web pages linked to Google forms for each of the results indicators and Indicator 17. The Google forms collected recommendations for target-setting and improvement activities and allowed stakeholders to provide additional and relevant feedback related to each of the results indicators and Indicator 17. To see the web pages, please visit <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>.

The DPI distributes a weekly news update related to special education and pupil services; this update serves as the official notification to directors of special education and is distributed to more than 1,000 unique contacts. Beginning in May 2021, the DPI included regularly an open invitation to submit input asynchronously through the web. These news updates are archived online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/news>. In addition, an invitation to participate was sent out on the CollabSupport listserve, announced at various conferences and stakeholder meetings, and posted online.

3. Targeted strategy: State Advisory Panel input sessions

The DPI conducted five input sessions with the State Advisory Panel to gather input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The dates of these sessions were June 19, 2020; March 12, 2021; June 25, 2021; September 24, 2021; and December 3, 2021. The agendas and minutes for these sessions are available online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council/agendas-and-minutes>. For details related to these input sessions, see, below, section on parent and family engagement.

4. Targeted strategy: Customized invitations to stakeholders

The DPI invited targeted stakeholders for input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The State Director sent personalized invitations to representatives of Wisconsin organizations with an interest in special education (state association of special education directors, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, SEA employees, representatives from grants funded by discretionary IDEA funds, etc.) to participate in the input sessions (described, above) or to submit input via the website.

5. Targeted strategy: Customized surveys of families

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI developed customized surveys and partnered with Green Bay Area Public Schools and Milwaukee Public Schools to collect data during parent-teacher conferences in the spring of 2021. The surveys were paper-and-pencil; families of color were specifically targeted to participate in the survey.

6. Targeted strategy: Contract to review data collected via Indicator 8 parent surveys

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI contracted with an independent researcher to review Indicator 8 survey data for themes related to the results indicators and Indicator 17. The researcher harvested these themes for the data and submitted a written report summarizing their research findings.

Prepopulated Data

| Source | Date | Description | Data |
|---|------------|--|---------|
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 | 114,395 |
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 86,372 |
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 7,900 |
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools | 887 |

| Source | Date | Description | Data |
|---|------------|--|------|
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities | 182 |
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements | 219 |

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

| Education Environments | Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served | Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 | FFY 2020 Data | FFY 2021 Target | FFY 2021 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|--|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 86,372 | 114,395 | 73.85% | 74.33% | 75.50% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 7,900 | 114,395 | 7.46% | 7.46% | 6.91% | Met target | No Slippage |
| C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3] | 1,288 | 114,395 | 1.25% | 1.23% | 1.13% | Met target | No Slippage |

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program 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.
- C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

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

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

Measurement

- A. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs})] \times 100$.
- B. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs})] \times 100$.
- C. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs})] \times 100$.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%). Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under IDEA section 618, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data – 6A, 6B

| Part | FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
|------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A | Target >= | 35.50% | 36.50% | 37.50% | 37.50% | 35.23% |
| A | Data | 32.43% | 34.66% | 35.35% | 37.21% | 35.23% |
| B | Target <= | 19.25% | 18.25% | 17.25% | 17.25% | 17.73% |
| B | Data | 19.36% | 17.82% | 16.25% | 15.49% | 17.73% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

CURRENT REPORTING PERIOD:

The DPI used the Wisconsin Council on Special Education (the Council, <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council>) to solicit ongoing stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR, any subsequent revisions that the state has made to those targets, development and implementation of Indicator 17, and improvement activities. The Council met four times during this reporting period: September 24, 2021; December 3, 2021; March 11, 2021; and June 17, 2022. The twenty-five members of Council includes the representation required in the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004.

SOLICITING BROAD STAKEHOLDER INPUT ON THE STATE'S TARGETS IN THE SPP/APR:

The DPI used both universal and targeted approaches to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). During the year-long process, the DPI reviewed input provided by 3,719 stakeholders. During this year-long process, the DPI structured the data, discussion, and target-setting around four key questions: (1) How well is Wisconsin preparing students with IEPs for life after high school? (2) Are Wisconsin learners with IEPs learning in the same spaces as their peers? (3) How engaged are Wisconsin families in the learning of their children with IEPs? and (4) How are Wisconsin learners with IEPs performing in key areas?

1. Universal strategy: Open invitation to input sessions

The DPI scheduled five synchronous input sessions to solicit input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State

has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP): June 19, 2020; March 12, 2021; June 25, 2021; September 24, 2021; and December 3, 2021.

The DPI distributes a weekly news update related to special education and pupil services; this update serves as the official notification to directors of special education and is distributed to more than 1,000 unique contacts. In advance of each of the input sessions, the DPI included an open invitation to participate in the input sessions. These news updates are archived online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/news>. In addition, an open invitation to attend the input sessions was sent out on the CollabSupport listserv, announced at various conferences and stakeholder meetings, and posted online (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>) in May 2021 and remained online until after the final input session.

2. Universal strategy: Open invitation to submit asynchronous, web-based input

The DPI developed a series of webpages to solicit input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The web pages provided data analysis, recommended targets and rationale, and information on improvement strategies and evaluation. The web pages included this information via video or slide deck format. The web pages linked to Google forms for each of the results indicators and Indicator 17. The Google forms collected recommendations for target-setting and improvement activities and allowed stakeholders to provide additional and relevant feedback related to each of the results indicators and Indicator 17. To see the web pages, please visit <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>.

The DPI distributes a weekly news update related to special education and pupil services; this update serves as the official notification to directors of special education and is distributed to more than 1,000 unique contacts. Beginning in May 2021, the DPI included regularly an open invitation to submit input asynchronously through the web. These news updates are archived online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/news>. In addition, an invitation to participate was sent out on the CollabSupport listserv, announced at various conferences and stakeholder meetings, and posted online.

3. Targeted strategy: State Advisory Panel input sessions

The DPI conducted five input sessions with the State Advisory Panel to gather input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The dates of these sessions were June 19, 2020; March 12, 2021; June 25, 2021; September 24, 2021; and December 3, 2021. The agendas and minutes for these sessions are available online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council/agendas-and-minutes>. For details related to these input sessions, see, below, section on parent and family engagement.

4. Targeted strategy: Customized invitations to stakeholders

The DPI invited targeted stakeholders for input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The State Director sent personalized invitations to representatives of Wisconsin organizations with an interest in special education (state association of special education directors, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, SEA employees, representatives from grants funded by discretionary IDEA funds, etc.) to participate in the input sessions (described, above) or to submit input via the website.

5. Targeted strategy: Customized surveys of families

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI developed customized surveys and partnered with Green Bay Area Public Schools and Milwaukee Public Schools to collect data during parent-teacher conferences in the spring of 2021. The surveys were paper-and-pencil; families of color were specifically targeted to participate in the survey.

6. Targeted strategy: Contract to review data collected via Indicator 8 parent surveys

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI contracted with an independent researcher to review Indicator 8 survey data for themes related to the results indicators and Indicator 17. The researcher harvested these themes for the data and submitted a written report summarizing their research findings.

Targets

Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.

Inclusive Targets

Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.

Target Range not used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

| Part | Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|------|---------------|---------------|
| A | 2020 | 35.23% |
| B | 2020 | 17.73% |
| C | 2020 | 4.43% |

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

| FFY | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|-----|------|------|------|------|------|
| | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target A >= | 35.23% | 35.53% | 36.43% | 37.38% | 38.38% |
| Target B <= | 17.73% | 17.73% | 17.73% | 17.73% | 17.72% |

Inclusive Targets – 6C

| | | | | | |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| FFY | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
| Target C <= | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% |

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

07/06/2022

| Description | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3 through 5 - Total |
|--|-------|-------|-------|---------------------|
| Total number of children with IEPs | 2,970 | 4,410 | 1,069 | 8,449 |
| 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 | 547 | 1,970 | 524 | 3,041 |
| b1. Number of children attending separate special education class | 1,080 | 479 | 66 | 1,625 |
| b2. Number of children attending separate school | 5 | 5 | 4 | 14 |
| b3. Number of children attending residential facility | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home | 206 | 86 | 17 | 309 |

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

| Preschool Environments | Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served | Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 | FFY 2020 Data | FFY 2021 Target | FFY 2021 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|--|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program | 3,041 | 8,449 | 35.23% | 35.23% | 35.99% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 1,639 | 8,449 | 17.73% | 17.73% | 19.40% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| C. Home | 309 | 8,449 | 4.43% | 5.00% | 3.66% | Met target | No Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B aged 3 through 5, if applicable

Qualitative evidence collected from school and district staff for the 2021-22 school year indicates an increased hesitance to introduce preschool students with IEPs into regular early childhood settings, instead electing to provide services in smaller environments such as phonological classrooms. Additionally, school and district staff report that the average level of social and emotional preparedness for traditional early childhood settings has decreased, likely as a result of fewer social and developmental opportunities during the pandemic. The DPI continues to provide technical assistance and monitor LEAs in selecting the least restrictive environment possible for each student, and includes this results indicator in its annual LEA Determinations.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

- 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.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement 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.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

| Part | Baseline | FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
|------|----------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A1 | 2020 | Target >= | 79.10% | 79.30% | 79.50% | 79.50% | 67.16% |
| A1 | 67.16% | Data | 73.98% | 69.35% | 69.50% | 67.35% | 67.16% |
| A2 | 2020 | Target >= | 74.00% | 74.50% | 75.00% | 75.00% | 58.58% |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A2 | 58.58% | Data | 61.34% | 61.97% | 61.52% | 60.56% | 58.58% |
| B1 | 2020 | Target >= | 80.55% | 80.90% | 81.25% | 81.25% | 69.21% |
| B1 | 69.21% | Data | 77.55% | 74.23% | 72.97% | 71.00% | 69.21% |
| B2 | 2020 | Target >= | 61.60% | 61.80% | 62.00% | 62.00% | 46.71% |
| B2 | 46.71% | Data | 51.08% | 51.93% | 51.69% | 50.17% | 46.71% |
| C1 | 2020 | Target >= | 79.70% | 80.10% | 80.50% | 80.50% | 68.77% |
| C1 | 68.77% | Data | 77.56% | 74.83% | 73.06% | 70.56% | 68.77% |
| C2 | 2020 | Target >= | 82.10% | 82.30% | 82.50% | 82.50% | 65.86% |
| C2 | 65.86% | Data | 72.27% | 71.84% | 71.11% | 68.53% | 65.86% |

Targets

| FFY | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target A1 >= | 67.17% | 67.18% | 67.19% | 67.20% | 67.21% |
| Target A2 >= | 58.59% | 58.60% | 58.61% | 58.62% | 58.63% |
| Target B1 >= | 69.22% | 69.23% | 69.24% | 69.25% | 69.26% |
| Target B2 >= | 46.72% | 46.73% | 46.74% | 46.75% | 46.76% |
| Target C1 >= | 68.78% | 68.79% | 68.80% | 68.81% | 68.82% |
| Target C2 >= | 65.87% | 65.88% | 65.89% | 65.90% | 65.91% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

CURRENT REPORTING PERIOD:

The DPI used the Wisconsin Council on Special Education (the Council, <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council>) to solicit ongoing stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR, any subsequent revisions that the state has made to those targets, development and implementation of Indicator 17, and improvement activities. The Council met four times during this reporting period: September 24, 2021; December 3, 2021; March 11, 2021; and June 17, 2022. The twenty-five members of Council includes the representation required in the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004.

SOLICITING BROAD STAKEHOLDER INPUT ON THE STATE'S TARGETS IN THE SPP/APR:

The DPI used both universal and targeted approaches to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). During the year-long process, the DPI reviewed input provided by 3,719 stakeholders. During this year-long process, the DPI structured the data, discussion, and target-setting around four key questions: (1) How well is Wisconsin preparing students with IEPs for life after high school? (2) Are Wisconsin learners with IEPs learning in the same spaces as their peers? (3) How engaged are Wisconsin families in the learning of their children with IEPs? and (4) How are Wisconsin learners with IEPs performing in key areas?

1. Universal strategy: Open invitation to input sessions

The DPI scheduled five synchronous input sessions to solicit input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP): June 19, 2020; March 12, 2021; June 25, 2021; September 24, 2021; and December 3, 2021.

The DPI distributes a weekly news update related to special education and pupil services; this update serves as the official notification to directors of special education and is distributed to more than 1,000 unique contacts. In advance of each of the input sessions, the DPI included an open invitation to participate in the input sessions. These news updates are archived online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/news>. In addition, an open invitation to attend the input sessions was sent out on the CollabSupport listserve, announced at various conferences and stakeholder meetings, and posted online (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>) in May 2021 and remained online until after the final input session.

2. Universal strategy: Open invitation to submit asynchronous, web-based input

The DPI developed a series of webpages to solicit input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The web pages provided data analysis, recommended targets and rationale, and information on improvement strategies and evaluation. The web pages included this information via video or slide deck format. The web pages linked to Google forms for each of the results indicators and Indicator 17. The Google forms collected recommendations for target-setting and improvement activities and allowed stakeholders to provide additional and relevant feedback related to each of the results indicators and Indicator 17. To see the web pages, please visit <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>.

The DPI distributes a weekly news update related to special education and pupil services; this update serves as the official notification to directors of special education and is distributed to more than 1,000 unique contacts. Beginning in May 2021, the DPI included regularly an open invitation to submit input asynchronously through the web. These news updates are archived online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/news>. In addition, an invitation to participate was sent out on the CollabSupport listserve, announced at various conferences and stakeholder meetings, and posted online.

3. Targeted strategy: State Advisory Panel input sessions

The DPI conducted five input sessions with the State Advisory Panel to gather input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The dates of these sessions were June 19, 2020; March 12, 2021; June 25, 2021; September 24, 2021; and December 3, 2021. The agendas and minutes for these sessions are available online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council/agendas-and-minutes>. For details related to these input sessions, see, below, section on parent and family engagement.

4. Targeted strategy: Customized invitations to stakeholders

The DPI invited targeted stakeholders for input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The State Director sent personalized invitations to representatives of Wisconsin organizations with an interest in special education (state association of special education directors, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, SEA employees, representatives from grants funded by discretionary IDEA funds, etc.) to participate in the input sessions (described, above) or to submit input via the website.

5. Targeted strategy: Customized surveys of families

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI developed customized surveys and partnered with Green Bay Area Public Schools and Milwaukee Public Schools to collect data during parent-teacher conferences in the spring of 2021. The surveys were paper-and-pencil; families of color were specifically targeted to participate in the survey.

6. Targeted strategy: Contract to review data collected via Indicator 8 parent surveys

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI contracted with an independent researcher to review Indicator 8 survey data for themes related to the results indicators and Indicator 17. The researcher harvested these themes for the data and submitted a written report summarizing their research findings.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

4,894

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

| Outcome A Progress Category | Number of children | Percentage of Children |
|---|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 58 | 1.19% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 1,169 | 23.89% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 941 | 19.23% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,395 | 28.50% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,331 | 27.20% |

| Outcome A | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2020 Data | FFY 2021 Target | FFY 2021 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i> | 2,336 | 3,563 | 67.16% | 67.17% | 65.56% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| 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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i> | 2,726 | 4,894 | 58.58% | 58.59% | 55.70% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

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

| Outcome B Progress Category | Number of Children | Percentage of Children |
|---|--------------------|------------------------|
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 39 | 0.80% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 1,318 | 26.93% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 1,261 | 25.77% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,776 | 36.29% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 500 | 10.22% |

| Outcome B | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2020 Data | FFY 2021 Target | FFY 2021 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|-----------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i> | 3,037 | 4,394 | 69.21% | 69.22% | 69.12% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| 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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i> | 2,276 | 4,894 | 46.71% | 46.72% | 46.51% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

| Outcome C Progress Category | Number of Children | Percentage of Children |
|---|--------------------|------------------------|
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 40 | 0.82% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 987 | 20.17% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 712 | 14.55% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,602 | 32.73% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,553 | 31.73% |

| Outcome C | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2020 Data | FFY 2021 Target | FFY 2021 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|-----------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i> | 2,314 | 3,341 | 68.77% | 68.78% | 69.26% | Met target | No Slippage |
| C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 | 3,155 | 4,894 | 65.86% | 65.87% | 64.47% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

| Outcome C | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2020 Data | FFY 2021 Target | FFY 2021 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|-----------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$ | | | | | | | |

| Part | Reasons for slippage, if applicable |
|------|---|
| A1 | In all three domains of development in which Wisconsin notes slippage, there are two contributing factors. First, the youngest learners continue to bear the brunt of the lasting effects of COVID-19 as early childhood teachers report significant decreases related to literacy, language, and social and emotional skills. Second, the early childhood teacher and sub shortages make it difficult to offer professional learning related to accelerated skill instruction and formative and summative assessments for early learners. The DPI funds two IDEA discretionary grant projects targeted to improve outcomes for early learners: an Early Literacy Technical Assistance grant, which focuses explicitly on literacy, and an Early Learning Technical Assistance grant, which focuses on improving results for learners with IEPs ages 3-5. |
| A2 | In all three domains of development in which Wisconsin notes slippage, there are two contributing factors. First, the youngest learners continue to bear the brunt of the lasting effects of COVID-19 as early childhood teachers report significant decreases related to literacy, language, and social and emotional skills. Second, the early childhood teacher and sub shortages make it difficult to offer professional learning related to accelerated skill instruction and formative and summative assessments for early learners. The DPI funds two IDEA discretionary grant projects targeted to improve outcomes for early learners: an Early Literacy Technical Assistance grant, which focuses explicitly on literacy, and an Early Learning Technical Assistance grant, which focuses on improving results for learners with IEPs ages 3-5. |
| C2 | In all three domains of development in which Wisconsin notes slippage, there are two contributing factors. First, the youngest learners continue to bear the brunt of the lasting effects of COVID-19 as early childhood teachers report significant decreases related to literacy, language, and social and emotional skills. Second, the early childhood teacher and sub shortages make it difficult to offer professional learning related to accelerated skill instruction and formative and summative assessments for early learners. The DPI funds two IDEA discretionary grant projects targeted to improve outcomes for early learners: an Early Literacy Technical Assistance grant, which focuses explicitly on literacy, and an Early Learning Technical Assistance grant, which focuses on improving results for learners with IEPs ages 3-5. |

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/no)

YES

| Sampling Question | Yes / No |
|--------------------|----------|
| Was sampling used? | NO |

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)

YES

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

During FFY2021, the DPI 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 summary (COS) 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.

During FFY2021, the state continued criteria for reporting exit child outcomes from reporting when a child turned age 6 to reporting when a child exits preschool to align with Indicator 6, which was introduced and supported during FFY2020.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The Indicator 7 Preschool Outcome data demonstrated the growing and long-term impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the youngest learners with disabilities. In this reporting period, 4,894 students exited early childhood programs as compared to 11,210 during FFY2020 and 7,739 in FFY2019. While this shift also reflects the changes in reporting for five year old learners, the largest attribution to this drop in numbers is the school closures during COVID-19 and then learning that relied on remote and/or hybrid learning, which was not developmentally appropriate for the youngest learners and many parents withdrew consent for special education and related services when in-person learning was not available.

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must consider race/ethnicity. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process. States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

8 - Indicator Data

| Question | Yes / No |
|---|----------|
| Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? | NO |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

CURRENT REPORTING PERIOD:

The DPI used the Wisconsin Council on Special Education (the Council, <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council>) to solicit ongoing stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR, any subsequent revisions that the state has made to those targets, development and implementation of Indicator 17, and improvement activities. The Council met four times during this reporting period: September 24, 2021; December 3, 2021; March 11, 2021; and June 17, 2022. The twenty-five members of Council includes the representation required in the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004.

SOLICITING BROAD STAKEHOLDER INPUT ON THE STATE'S TARGETS IN THE SPP/APR:

The DPI used both universal and targeted approaches to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). During the year-long process, the DPI reviewed input provided by 3,719 stakeholders. During this year-long process, the DPI structured the data, discussion, and target-setting around four key questions: (1) How well is Wisconsin preparing students with IEPs for life after high school? (2) Are Wisconsin learners with IEPs learning in the same spaces as their peers? (3) How engaged are Wisconsin families in the learning of their children with IEPs? and (4) How are Wisconsin learners with IEPs performing in key areas?

1. Universal strategy: Open invitation to input sessions

The DPI scheduled five synchronous input sessions to solicit input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP): June 19, 2020; March 12, 2021; June 25, 2021; September 24, 2021; and December 3, 2021.

The DPI distributes a weekly news update related to special education and pupil services; this update serves as the official notification to directors of special education and is distributed to more than 1,000 unique contacts. In advance of each of the input sessions, the DPI included an open invitation to participate in the input sessions. These news updates are archived online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/news>. In addition, an open invitation to attend the input sessions was sent out on the CollabSupport listserv, announced at various conferences and stakeholder meetings, and posted online (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>) in May 2021 and remained online until after the final input session.

2. Universal strategy: Open invitation to submit asynchronous, web-based input

The DPI developed a series of webpages to solicit input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The web pages provided data analysis, recommended targets and rationale, and information on improvement strategies and evaluation. The web pages included this information via video or slide deck format. The web pages linked to Google forms for each of the results indicators and Indicator 17. The Google forms collected recommendations for target-setting and improvement activities and allowed stakeholders to provide additional and relevant feedback related to each of the results indicators and Indicator 17. To see the web pages, please visit <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>.

The DPI distributes a weekly news update related to special education and pupil services; this update serves as the official notification to directors of special education and is distributed to more than 1,000 unique contacts. Beginning in May 2021, the DPI included regularly an open invitation to submit input asynchronously through the web. These news updates are archived online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/news>. In addition, an invitation to participate was sent out on the CollabSupport listserve, announced at various conferences and stakeholder meetings, and posted online.

3. Targeted strategy: State Advisory Panel input sessions

The DPI conducted five input sessions with the State Advisory Panel to gather input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The dates of these sessions were June 19, 2020; March 12, 2021; June 25, 2021; September 24, 2021; and December 3, 2021. The agendas and minutes for these sessions are available online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council/agendas-and-minutes>. For details related to these input sessions, see, below, section on parent and family engagement.

4. Targeted strategy: Customized invitations to stakeholders

The DPI invited targeted stakeholders for input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The State Director sent personalized invitations to representatives of Wisconsin organizations with an interest in special education (state association of special education directors, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, SEA employees, representatives from grants funded by discretionary IDEA funds, etc.) to participate in the input sessions (described, above) or to submit input via the website.

5. Targeted strategy: Customized surveys of families

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI developed customized surveys and partnered with Green Bay Area Public Schools and Milwaukee Public Schools to collect data during parent-teacher conferences in the spring of 2021. The surveys were paper-and-pencil; families of color were specifically targeted to participate in the survey.

6. Targeted strategy: Contract to review data collected via Indicator 8 parent surveys

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI contracted with an independent researcher to review Indicator 8 survey data for themes related to the results indicators and Indicator 17. The researcher harvested these themes for the data and submitted a written report summarizing their research findings.

Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2021 | 86.30% |

| FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target >= | 86.50% | 88.75% | 89.00% | 89.00% | 89.40% |
| Data | 88.52% | 88.94% | 89.41% | 89.72% | 89.69% |

Targets

| FFY | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target >= | 86.30% | 86.40% | 86.50% | 86.60% | 86.70% |

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data | FFY 2021 Target | FFY 2021 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| 4,011 | 4,648 | 89.69% | 86.30% | 86.30% | N/A | N/A |

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 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.

The DPI uses the following methodology for calculating Indicator 8 results:

1. The mean rate of agreement is calculated for each completed survey with more than 50% of questions completed.
2. Each included response is assigned a weight using iterative proportional fitting (IPF, also known as survey raking) to bring the survey data inline with statewide demographics along race/ethnicity, disability reporting category, and region.
3. The percent agreement of each response is multiplied by its assigned IPF weight, summed across all respondent data, then divided by the total number of surveys.
4. Due to EMAPS requiring the numerator be an integer, the numerator of the statewide calculation (percent agreement) is rounded to the nearest whole number.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

27,519

Percentage of respondent parents

16.89%

Response Rate

| FFY | 2020 | 2021 |
|---------------|--------|--------|
| Response Rate | 15.81% | 16.89% |

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

As of FFY2020, the DPI instituted a minimum response rate of 10% among each LEA's students with IEP population or six students with IEPs, whichever is greater, for all LEAs in the survey cycle, and has integrated this completion rate into the timely and accurate data calculations used as part of LEA Determinations. As of FFY2021, all LEAs met their minimum response rate (including Milwaukee Public Schools, resulting in a more representative sample prior to IPF weighting). The DPI continues to meet with those LEAs who fail to achieve the minimum response rate and engages with them in improvement planning to meet the target in subsequent years.

The DPI invests annually discretionary grant funds in the Wisconsin Statewide Parent Educator Initiative (<https://wspei.org>). Staff, particularly in Milwaukee, will continue to be responsible for targeted outreach and support to districts with high concentrations of groups that are underrepresented. Every year, staff develop a strategic plan and include targeted strategies to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

The DPI continues to see disproportionate participation in the Family Engagement Survey across the state, which skews the unweighted results toward rural white respondents. Additionally, Wisconsin's largest LEA participates annually, (divided across the reporting cycle so that one fifth of their schools participate each year), which further reduces the number of students of color within the reporting cycle in a given reporting period. This makes a demographically representative sample from the clustered sampling of LEAs alone an unviable option.

To address this limitation, the DPI implemented post-collection stratified sampling in FFY 2021, using a method known as iterative proportional fitting (IPF). This methodology identifies the discrepancy between the statewide population and survey respondents, then assigns weights to each response to bring the results inline with the National Post-School Outcomes Center guidance of +/-3% along race/ethnicity, disability reporting category, and region.

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. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

Due to the incorporation of IPF into our indicator 8 methodology, Wisconsin is pleased to share that its results for this indicator are representative across race/ethnicity, disability reporting category, and region for the first time in over five years. See the indicator 8 methodology paper for details.

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)

YES

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Wisconsin continues to use a benchmark of 3% (inline with National Post-School Outcomes Center guidance for indicator 14) 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, disability reporting categories, and regions.

| Sampling Question | Yes / No |
|--------------------|----------|
| Was sampling used? | YES |

| Sampling Question | Yes / No |
|---|----------|
| If yes, has your previously approved sampling plan changed? | YES |
| If yes, provide sampling plan. | |

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

As of FFY2021, Wisconsin implemented a two-stage sampling methodology: a pre-collection clustered sampling of LEAs in the five-year reporting cycle; a post-collection stratified weighting of responses using iterative proportional fitting (IPF).

The clustered 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, and distribution of primary disabilities. For relevant demographics, a 95% confidence interval about the median was used to construct the five-year cohort cycle. As Wisconsin's largest LEA, with a population in excess of 50,000, Milwaukee Public Schools participates annually, with its schools divided into the cycle cohorts in the same manner as LEAs. Within each LEA or school in the reporting cycle, all parents/guardians of students with IEPs at the time the survey opens are invited to participate.

Each LEA in cycle distributes the survey using their existing family engagement networks and infrastructure, but the methods include in-person, online invitation via text or email, and mail-in surveys sent directly to DPI. To ensure confidentiality of responses and promote honest feedback, phone surveys are not permitted.

To address growing disparities in participation across LEAs, the DPI instituted a minimum response rate of 10% or six students with IEPs, whichever is greater, per LEA.

Once the survey responses are submitted, the DPI performs post-collection stratified weighting of responses to address any remaining unrepresentativeness that arose across race/ethnicity, disability reporting category, and region. This methodology uses IPF, to assign weights to each response with the following constraints:

1. No response can count more than 5 times the average. This effectively caps the variance introduced through weighting.
2. The minimum threshold for representativeness is set to +/-2%. This is purposefully well within the +/-3% recommended by the National Post-School Outcomes Center for indicator 14.
3. Weights are assigned through an iterative process, addressing the demographic categories with the greatest disparity from the statewide population first. If all demographic categories do not fall within the +/-2% threshold, the process repeats the weighting calculations, using the weighting results of the previous round of analysis as the starting point. Thus, through multiple iterations, the assigned weights continue to be adjusted until all specified demographic categories fall within the specified threshold.

| Survey Question | Yes / No |
|--|----------|
| Was a survey used? | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised survey? | NO |
| If yes, provide a copy of the survey. | |

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2021 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

See the responses to "Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse..." and "Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics..." for this information.

8 - OSEP Response

The State revised its FFY 2025 targets, however OSEP cannot accept the targets because the end target does not reflect improvement over the baseline data.

In its description of strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, the State did not specifically address strategies to increase the response rate for those groups that are underrepresented, as required by the Measurement Table.

The State did not analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias or identify steps taken to reduce any identified bias to promote response from parents of children receiving special education services in the State, as required by the Measurement Table.

OSEP notes a discrepancy between the following statements: 1) Due to the incorporation of IPF into our indicator 8 methodology, Wisconsin is pleased to share that its results for this indicator are representative across race/ethnicity, disability reporting category, and region for the first time in over five years, to within +/-2% of the statewide population; 2) 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 disability reporting categories. OSEP is unclear what metric was used to determine if the data were representative.

The State submitted its sampling plan for this indicator with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR. OSEP will follow up with the State under separate cover regarding the submission.

8 - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "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).

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, 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 as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2020 | 0.00% |

| FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Targets

| FFY | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, 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 excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

20

| Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services | Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/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 and/or cell size | FFY 2020 Data | FFY 2021 Target | FFY 2021 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| 22 | 0 | 429 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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).

Calculation of Disproportionate Representation:

1) A Risk Ratio or Alternate Risk Ratio of 2.0 or Greater: In calculating the risk ratio for over-representation, the DPI uses the Westat technical assistance guidance for calculating disproportionality based on the Risk Ratio, which is the risk for the racial/ethnic group within any disability category divided by the risk for the comparison group in special education. When the local comparison group does not meet the state's minimum cell and n sizes, the DPI 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) 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 30 students in the given racial or ethnic group. A district can be identified when one racial or ethnic group has a total enrollment of 30 students, even if the other racial or ethnic groups in the district have a total enrollment of less than 30 students.

3) Consecutive Years: Acknowledging changing demographics, potential anomalies in data collection, and other factors, the 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 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 the DPI 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 the DPI's model policies and procedures or have submitted policies and procedures that have been reviewed and approved by the DPI. The districts also have either adopted the DPI's model IEP forms or use forms approved by the DPI. 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 DPI also reviews IDEA state complaint decisions, due process decisions, and pupil nondiscrimination appeals. Finally, identified districts conduct a Disproportionality Procedural Compliance Self-Assessment. Districts review a sample of student records, disaggregated by race, and assess compliance items identified by OSEP as related to disproportionality, which is verified by the DPI. Through the review described above, the DPI determined that there were zero districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Because this indicator uses multiple years of data, only LEAs active in the 2021-22 school year are counted towards the total number of LEAs, aligning with the reported number of LEAs in the introduction of Wisconsin's FFY2021 SPP/APR. The data used for this indicator includes the 2019-20, 2020-21, and 2021-22 school years.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

| 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 |

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

OSEP cannot determine whether the data are valid and reliable. The State reported that 423 districts met the minimum n size requirement, and 23 districts did not meet the minimum n size requirement and were excluded from the calculation. The number of districts excluded from the calculation because they do not meet the minimum "n" size, plus the number of districts that met the State-established minimum "n" size, do not equal the total number of districts the State reported in the FFY 2021 Introduction. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "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).

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2020 | 0.00% |

| FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Targets

| FFY | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, 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 excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

77

| Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories | Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification | Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size | FFY 2020 Data | FFY 2021 Target | FFY 2021 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| 41 | 0 | 372 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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).

Calculation of Disproportionate Representation:

- 1) A Risk Ratio or Alternate Risk Ratio of 2.0 or Greater: In calculating the risk ratio for over-representation, the DPI uses the Westat technical assistance guidance for calculating disproportionality based on the Risk Ratio, which is the risk for the racial/ethnic group within the disability category divided by the risk for the comparison group in special education. When the local comparison group does not meet the state’s minimum cell and n sizes, the DPI 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) 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 30 students in the given racial or ethnic group. A district can be identified when one racial or ethnic group has a total enrollment of 30 students, even if the other racial or ethnic groups in the district have a total enrollment of less than 30 students.
- 3) Consecutive Years: Acknowledging changing demographics, potential anomalies in data collection, and other factors, the 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 DPI 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 the DPI’s model policies and procedures or have submitted policies and procedures that have been reviewed and approved by the DPI. The districts also have either adopted the DPI’s model IEP forms or use forms approved by the DPI. 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 DPI also reviews IDEA state complaint decisions, due process decisions, and pupil nondiscrimination appeals. Finally, identified districts conduct a Disproportionality Procedural Compliance Self-Assessment. Districts review a sample of student records, disaggregated by race, and assess compliance items identified by OSEP as related to disproportionality, which is verified by the DPI. Through the review described above, the DPI determined that there were zero districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Because this indicator uses multiple years of data, only LEAs active in the 2021-22 school year are counted towards the total number of LEAs, aligning with the reported number of LEAs in the introduction of Wisconsin’s FFY2021 SPP/APR. The data used for this indicator includes the 2019-20, 2020-21, and 2021-22 school years.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

| 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 |

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

Measurement

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
 - b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
- 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.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2005 | 88.41% |

| FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 98.93% | 91.28% | 97.76% | 98.86% | 97.36% |

Targets

| FFY | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data | FFY 2021 Target | FFY 2021 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| 6,121 | 5,987 | 97.36% | 100% | 97.81% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)

134

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 137. Reasons for the delay include staff unavailable, parent unavailable, evaluation data unavailable, and staff errors.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

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

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

State monitoring

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

The DPI used the Indicator 11: Timely Initial Evaluations web-based 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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

| Findings of Noncompliance Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year | Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 33 | 33 | 0 | 0 |

FFY 2020 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, the DPI verified each district with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020: (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, the DPI staff examined a separate sample of current student records. Districts provided the DPI 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, the DPI selected records for a specific number of students with the most recently completed initial evaluations. The exact number of records to be submitted for review was determined by the DPI and was dependent upon the size of the district and the number of initial evaluations completed by the district. The DPI 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, the DPI determined the district is currently in compliance. If one or more of the evaluations were not completed within 60 days, the DPI 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 the DPI. 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 the DPI to verify that the evaluations had been completed within 60 days. In the event that one or more of the records did not meet the regulatory requirement, the process continued until the district corrected each individual case of noncompliance, and the district was found in current compliance. Following these two-pronged verification procedures, which are consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, the DPI determined all districts found in noncompliance during FFY 2020 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, the DPI 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. The DPI determined, based on this review of records, each individual instance of noncompliance found in FFY 2020 was corrected.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|---|---|--|---|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 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 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

N/A

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- # 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.

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.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2005 | 65.60% |

| FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 98.71% | 98.53% | 98.60% | 99.67% | 99.08% |

Targets

| FFY | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

| | |
|---|-------|
| a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination. | 3,672 |
| b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday. | 593 |

| | |
|---|-------|
| c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. | 2,517 |
| d. Number 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. | 484 |
| e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays. | 45 |
| f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option. | 0 |

| Measure | Numerator (c) | Denominator (a-b-d-e-f) | FFY 2020 Data | FFY 2021 Target | FFY 2021 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|---------------|-------------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| 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. | 2,517 | 2,550 | 99.08% | 100% | 98.71% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

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

33

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 33 children found eligible for Part B whose IEPs were implemented after their third birthday. The range of days for late implementation of the IEP was from 1 day to 139 days. Reasons for the delays include staff not available, scheduling difficulties, and errors by the LEA.

Attach PDF table (optional)

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

The Preschool Transition Application is used by districts to electronically access referrals from the Part C program as well complete Indicator 12 reporting. In developing this application, the DPI and the Wisconsin Department of Health Services (WDHS), the Part C lead agency, worked collaboratively to develop a system for sharing referrals from Part C with the DPI. Referrals received from Part C are loaded by the DPI into the Preschool Transition Application three times daily at which time staff identified by the district receive an email notifying them of receipt of a referral. Using the Preschool Transition Application, districts are required to complete the Indicator 12 reporting for each referral received which promotes data accuracy and allows for monitoring of progress on Indicator 12 by the district and the DPI.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

| Findings of Noncompliance Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year | Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 13 | 13 | 0 | 0 |

FFY 2020 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, the DPI verified each district with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020: (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, the DPI examined all current referrals for each district with noncompliance. The DPI 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 within the quarterly review, the DPI determined that the district is currently in compliance. Following this verification procedure, which is consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, the DPI determined all districts found in noncompliance during FFY 2020 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, the DPI reviewed submitted data for 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). The DPI reviewed all records with noncompliance to ensure correction. Consistent with OSEP memo 09-02, DPI verified each district with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019: (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.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 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 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

N/A

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

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 that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, 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))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

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 that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2009 | 71.21% |

| FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 99.93% | 99.86% | 99.94% | 99.89% | 99.95% |

Targets

| FFY | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data | FFY 2021 Target | FFY 2021 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| 26,157 | 26,184 | 99.95% | 100% | 99.90% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

The DPI utilizes an online Postsecondary Transition Plan (PTP) application. The PTP application enables the DPI 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.

| Question | Yes / No |
|--|----------|
| Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16? | YES |
| If yes, 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? | NO |

If no, please explain

The State did not choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator because it is not required to do so. FFY2020-FFY2025 Measurement Table for Part B Indicators states, "If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator."

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

| Findings of Noncompliance Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year | Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 27 | 27 | 0 | 0 |

FFY 2020 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, the DPI examined a separate sample of current student IEP records created after training and technical assistance of staff occurred. LEAs provided the DPI with a list of students with IEPs age 16 years old or older. From this list, the DPI selected a sample of IEPs of students with IEP meeting dates during the relevant time period and directed LEAs to submit the IEPs to DPI 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. The DPI reviewed the IEPs to determine whether the Indicator 13 transition regulatory requirements had been met. If all reviewed IEPs met the transition regulatory requirements, the DPI determined the district currently in compliance. If one or more of the IEPs did not meet one or more of the transition regulatory requirements, The DPI 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. The DPI 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 the DPI 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 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 2020 has been corrected.

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. WDPI determined, based on this review of IEPs, each LEA with identified noncompliance FFY 2020 was in current compliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 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 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

N/A

13 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that the State did not provide an explanation for not including youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator.

In its description of correction of noncompliance, the State referenced the incorrect requirements of this indicator, "To verify each instance of individual student noncompliance was corrected, the DPI 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)". Therefore, the State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, as required in the Measurement Table.

13 - Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2022 on students who left school during 2020-2021, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2020-2021 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

Enrolled in higher education as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment”:

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: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). 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.

Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

Some other employment as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

II. Data Reporting

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. 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);
4. 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).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also

happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, 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. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process. If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

| Measure | Baseline | FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
|---------|----------|--------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A | 2019 | Target >= | 31.30% | 31.80% | 32.30% | 32.30% | 20.90% |
| A | 20.88% | Data | 28.40% | 27.79% | 24.44% | 20.88% | 22.18% |
| B | 2019 | Target >= | 65.50% | 67.50% | 69.50% | 69.50% | 66.40% |
| B | 66.22% | Data | 71.12% | 68.24% | 63.48% | 66.22% | 72.07% |
| C | 2019 | Target >= | 79.00% | 81.00% | 83.00% | 83.00% | 76.90% |
| C | 76.81% | Data | 83.15% | 81.95% | 76.56% | 76.81% | 81.29% |

FFY 2020 Targets

| FFY | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|-------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target A >= | 21.20% | 21.60% | 22.20% | 23.00% | 23.90% |
| Target B >= | 66.70% | 67.20% | 67.90% | 68.80% | 69.80% |
| Target C >= | 77.20% | 77.70% | 78.40% | 79.30% | 80.30% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

CURRENT REPORTING PERIOD:

The DPI used the Wisconsin Council on Special Education (the Council, <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council>) to solicit ongoing stakeholder input on the State’s targets in the SPP/APR, any subsequent revisions that the state has made to those targets, development and implementation of Indicator 17, and improvement activities. The Council met four times during this reporting period: September 24, 2021; December 3, 2021; March 11, 2021; and June 17, 2022. The twenty-five members of Council includes the representation required in the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004.

SOLICITING BROAD STAKEHOLDER INPUT ON THE STATE’S TARGETS IN THE SPP/APR:

The DPI used both universal and targeted approaches to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State’s targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State’s Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). During the year-long process, the DPI reviewed input provided by 3,719 stakeholders. During this year-long process, the DPI structured the data,

discussion, and target-setting around four key questions: (1) How well is Wisconsin preparing students with IEPs for life after high school? (2) Are Wisconsin learners with IEPs learning in the same spaces as their peers? (3) How engaged are Wisconsin families in the learning of their children with IEPs? and (4) How are Wisconsin learners with IEPs performing in key areas?

1. Universal strategy: Open invitation to input sessions

The DPI scheduled five synchronous input sessions to solicit input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP): June 19, 2020; March 12, 2021; June 25, 2021; September 24, 2021; and December 3, 2021.

The DPI distributes a weekly news update related to special education and pupil services; this update serves as the official notification to directors of special education and is distributed to more than 1,000 unique contacts. In advance of each of the input sessions, the DPI included an open invitation to participate in the input sessions. These news updates are archived online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/news>. In addition, an open invitation to attend the input sessions was sent out on the CollabSupport listserve, announced at various conferences and stakeholder meetings, and posted online (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>) in May 2021 and remained online until after the final input session.

2. Universal strategy: Open invitation to submit asynchronous, web-based input

The DPI developed a series of webpages to solicit input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The web pages provided data analysis, recommended targets and rationale, and information on improvement strategies and evaluation. The web pages included this information via video or slide deck format. The web pages linked to Google forms for each of the results indicators and Indicator 17. The Google forms collected recommendations for target-setting and improvement activities and allowed stakeholders to provide additional and relevant feedback related to each of the results indicators and Indicator 17. To see the web pages, please visit <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>.

The DPI distributes a weekly news update related to special education and pupil services; this update serves as the official notification to directors of special education and is distributed to more than 1,000 unique contacts. Beginning in May 2021, the DPI included regularly an open invitation to submit input asynchronously through the web. These news updates are archived online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/news>. In addition, an invitation to participate was sent out on the CollabSupport listserve, announced at various conferences and stakeholder meetings, and posted online.

3. Targeted strategy: State Advisory Panel input sessions

The DPI conducted five input sessions with the State Advisory Panel to gather input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The dates of these sessions were June 19, 2020; March 12, 2021; June 25, 2021; September 24, 2021; and December 3, 2021. The agendas and minutes for these sessions are available online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council/agendas-and-minutes>. For details related to these input sessions, see, below, section on parent and family engagement.

4. Targeted strategy: Customized invitations to stakeholders

The DPI invited targeted stakeholders for input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The State Director sent personalized invitations to representatives of Wisconsin organizations with an interest in special education (state association of special education directors, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, SEA employees, representatives from grants funded by discretionary IDEA funds, etc.) to participate in the input sessions (described, above) or to submit input via the website.

5. Targeted strategy: Customized surveys of families

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI developed customized surveys and partnered with Green Bay Area Public Schools and Milwaukee Public Schools to collect data during parent-teacher conferences in the spring of 2021. The surveys were paper-and-pencil; families of color were specifically targeted to participate in the survey.

6. Targeted strategy: Contract to review data collected via Indicator 8 parent surveys

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI contracted with an independent researcher to review Indicator 8 survey data for themes related to the results indicators and Indicator 17. The researcher harvested these themes for the data and submitted a written report summarizing their research findings.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

| | |
|--|--------|
| Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census | 1,482 |
| Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school | 1,110 |
| Response Rate | 74.90% |
| 1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school | 255 |
| 2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school | 579 |
| 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) | 49 |
| 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). | 74 |

| Measure | Number of respondent youth | Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school | FFY 2020 Data | FFY 2021 Target | FFY 2021 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|----------------------------|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| A. Enrolled in higher education (1) | 255 | 1,110 | 22.18% | 21.20% | 22.97% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2) | 834 | 1,110 | 72.07% | 66.70% | 75.14% | Met target | No Slippage |
| 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) | 957 | 1,110 | 81.29% | 77.20% | 86.22% | Met target | No Slippage |

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.

Response Rate

| FFY | 2020 | 2021 |
|---------------|--------|--------|
| Response Rate | 73.06% | 74.90% |

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

Wisconsin continues to enjoy a high survey completion rate due to its Transition Incentive Grant, which allows LEAs to apply for and receive Special Education Transition Incentive Grant funds based on the number of former special education students from the district who responded to the Wisconsin Indicator 14 Post School Outcomes Survey.

The DPI invests annually discretionary grant funds in the Transition Improvement Grant (<https://witig.org>). Staff, particularly in Milwaukee, will continue to be responsible for targeted outreach and support to districts with high concentrations of groups that are underrepresented. Every year, staff develop a strategic plan and include targeted strategies to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

The DPI's response rate for indicator 14 is extremely high, with 75% of special education exiters responding to the phone survey. One problem observed despite this high participation rate, however, is the lower response rate in areas of the state with higher population density. This is suspected to be due to a decrease in family engagement and communication during the COVID-19 pandemic.

The DPI and its grant staff continue to work with all LEAs in the state to improve their transition improvement strategies, as well as their outreach and communicative capacity with recent exiters. Additionally, incorporating administrative and post-secondary enrollment data may help to address this nonresponse bias, which is a long term project DPI continues to explore.

Include the State's analyses 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. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

The DPI consistently examines representativeness along race and disability reporting categories for its surveys, as well as ad hoc analyses along a variety of other indicators including exit type and geographic area. The response data for indicator 14 is representative among students with IEPs across disability reporting category but is unrepresentative among black students due to the aforementioned lower response rate in Wisconsin's urban school

districts. The response rate for black students is still high for surveys--58%--but that is significantly lower than the overall response rate of 75%. Thus, while the response rate among black students may be lower and unrepresentative using the +/-3% threshold, it is still sufficient to provide statistically reliable data.

The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

The DPI is exploring the possibility of collecting student contact information earlier so as to ensure the student can be contacted if they exit earlier than expected. The DPI is also exploring the possibility of incorporating administrative data from external partners (Department of Workforce Development and higher education institutions) to supplement the survey with existing data, thereby increasing data accuracy and completeness.

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

The DPI uses a benchmark of +/- 3% (in-line with National Post-School Outcomes Center guidance for indicator 14) to assess the extent to which survey data reflects the demographics of the state; namely, that parents who responded to the survey have students of diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds and primary disabilities.

| Sampling Question | Yes / No |
|---|----------|
| Was sampling used? | YES |
| If 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 Indicator 14 Survey is conducted as a within-district census so all exiters from participating districts have an opportunity to complete the survey. Wisconsin's districts are divided into 5 groups (cohorts), and roughly one-fifth of districts in the state are required to participate in the survey each year. One exception is that Milwaukee Public Schools, with average daily enrollment over 50,000, participates in the survey on an annual basis.

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

| Survey Question | Yes / No |
|--|----------|
| Was a survey used? | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised survey? | NO |

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2021 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, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

See the responses to "Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse..." and "Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics..." for this information.

14 - OSEP Response

The State did not describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented, as required by the Measurement Table.

The State submitted its sampling plan for this indicator with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR. OSEP will follow up with the State under separate cover regarding the submission.

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

| Source | Date | Description | Data |
|---|------------|--|------|
| SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/02/2022 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 5 |
| SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/02/2022 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 2 |

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

CURRENT REPORTING PERIOD:

The DPI used the Wisconsin Council on Special Education (the Council, <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council>) to solicit ongoing stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR, any subsequent revisions that the state has made to those targets, development and implementation of Indicator 17, and improvement activities. The Council met four times during this reporting period: September 24, 2021; December 3, 2021; March 11, 2021; and June 17, 2022. The twenty-five members of Council includes the representation required in the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004.

SOLICITING BROAD STAKEHOLDER INPUT ON THE STATE'S TARGETS IN THE SPP/APR:

The DPI used both universal and targeted approaches to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). During the year-long process, the DPI reviewed input provided by 3,719 stakeholders. During this year-long process, the DPI structured the data, discussion, and target-setting around four key questions: (1) How well is Wisconsin preparing students with IEPs for life after high school? (2) Are Wisconsin learners with IEPs learning in the same spaces as their peers? (3) How engaged are Wisconsin families in the learning of their children with IEPs? and (4) How are Wisconsin learners with IEPs performing in key areas?

1. Universal strategy: Open invitation to input sessions

The DPI scheduled five synchronous input sessions to solicit input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP): June 19, 2020; March 12, 2021; June 25, 2021; September 24, 2021; and December 3, 2021.

The DPI distributes a weekly news update related to special education and pupil services; this update serves as the official notification to directors of special education and is distributed to more than 1,000 unique contacts. In advance of each of the input sessions, the DPI included an open invitation to participate in the input sessions. These news updates are archived online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/news>. In addition, an open invitation to attend the input sessions was sent out on the CollabSupport listserv, announced at various conferences and stakeholder meetings, and posted online (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>) in May 2021 and remained online until after the final input session.

2. Universal strategy: Open invitation to submit asynchronous, web-based input

The DPI developed a series of webpages to solicit input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The web pages provided data analysis, recommended targets and rationale, and information on improvement strategies and evaluation. The web pages included this information via

video or slide deck format. The web pages linked to Google forms for each of the results indicators and Indicator 17. The Google forms collected recommendations for target-setting and improvement activities and allowed stakeholders to provide additional and relevant feedback related to each of the results indicators and Indicator 17. To see the web pages, please visit <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>.

The DPI distributes a weekly news update related to special education and pupil services; this update serves as the official notification to directors of special education and is distributed to more than 1,000 unique contacts. Beginning in May 2021, the DPI included regularly an open invitation to submit input asynchronously through the web. These news updates are archived online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/news>. In addition, an invitation to participate was sent out on the CollabSupport listserve, announced at various conferences and stakeholder meetings, and posted online.

3. Targeted strategy: State Advisory Panel input sessions

The DPI conducted five input sessions with the State Advisory Panel to gather input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The dates of these sessions were June 19, 2020; March 12, 2021; June 25, 2021; September 24, 2021; and December 3, 2021. The agendas and minutes for these sessions are available online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council/agendas-and-minutes>. For details related to these input sessions, see, below, section on parent and family engagement.

4. Targeted strategy: Customized invitations to stakeholders

The DPI invited targeted stakeholders for input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The State Director sent personalized invitations to representatives of Wisconsin organizations with an interest in special education (state association of special education directors, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, SEA employees, representatives from grants funded by discretionary IDEA funds, etc.) to participate in the input sessions (described, above) or to submit input via the website.

5. Targeted strategy: Customized surveys of families

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI developed customized surveys and partnered with Green Bay Area Public Schools and Milwaukee Public Schools to collect data during parent-teacher conferences in the spring of 2021. The surveys were paper-and-pencil; families of color were specifically targeted to participate in the survey.

6. Targeted strategy: Contract to review data collected via Indicator 8 parent surveys

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI contracted with an independent researcher to review Indicator 8 survey data for themes related to the results indicators and Indicator 17. The researcher harvested these themes for the data and submitted a written report summarizing their research findings.

Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2012 | 41.18% |

| FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target >= | 42.00% | 42.00% | 42.00% | 42.00% | 42.00% |
| Data | 16.67% | 20.00% | 37.50% | 75.00% | 30.00% |

Targets

| FFY | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target >= | 42.00% | 42.00% | 42.00% | 42.00% | 42.00% |

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

| 3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 3.1 Number of resolutions sessions | FFY 2020 Data | FFY 2021 Target | FFY 2021 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| 2 | 5 | 30.00% | 42.00% | 40.00% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2021. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

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)))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(ii)) divided by 2.1 times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

| Source | Date | Description | Data |
|---|------------|---|------|
| SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/02/2022 | 2.1 Mediations held | 94 |
| SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/02/2022 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 2 |
| SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/02/2022 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 80 |

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

CURRENT REPORTING PERIOD:

The DPI used the Wisconsin Council on Special Education (the Council, <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council>) to solicit ongoing stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR, any subsequent revisions that the state has made to those targets, development and implementation of Indicator 17, and improvement activities. The Council met four times during this reporting period: September 24, 2021; December 3, 2021; March 11, 2021; and June 17, 2022. The twenty-five members of Council includes the representation required in the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004.

SOLICITING BROAD STAKEHOLDER INPUT ON THE STATE'S TARGETS IN THE SPP/APR:

The DPI used both universal and targeted approaches to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). During the year-long process, the DPI reviewed input provided by 3,719 stakeholders. During this year-long process, the DPI structured the data, discussion, and target-setting around four key questions: (1) How well is Wisconsin preparing students with IEPs for life after high school? (2) Are Wisconsin learners with IEPs learning in the same spaces as their peers? (3) How engaged are Wisconsin families in the learning of their children with IEPs? and (4) How are Wisconsin learners with IEPs performing in key areas?

1. Universal strategy: Open invitation to input sessions

The DPI scheduled five synchronous input sessions to solicit input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP): June 19, 2020; March 12, 2021; June 25, 2021; September 24, 2021; and December 3, 2021.

The DPI distributes a weekly news update related to special education and pupil services; this update serves as the official notification to directors of special education and is distributed to more than 1,000 unique contacts. In advance of each of the input sessions, the DPI included an open invitation to participate in the input sessions. These news updates are archived online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/news>. In addition, an open invitation to attend the input sessions was sent out on the CollabSupport listserve, announced at various conferences and stakeholder meetings, and posted online (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>) in May 2021 and remained online until after the final input session.

2. Universal strategy: Open invitation to submit asynchronous, web-based input

The DPI developed a series of webpages to solicit input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to

those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The web pages provided data analysis, recommended targets and rationale, and information on improvement strategies and evaluation. The web pages included this information via video or slide deck format. The web pages linked to Google forms for each of the results indicators and Indicator 17. The Google forms collected recommendations for target-setting and improvement activities and allowed stakeholders to provide additional and relevant feedback related to each of the results indicators and Indicator 17. To see the web pages, please visit <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>.

The DPI distributes a weekly news update related to special education and pupil services; this update serves as the official notification to directors of special education and is distributed to more than 1,000 unique contacts. Beginning in May 2021, the DPI included regularly an open invitation to submit input asynchronously through the web. These news updates are archived online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/news>. In addition, an invitation to participate was sent out on the CollabSupport listserve, announced at various conferences and stakeholder meetings, and posted online.

3. Targeted strategy: State Advisory Panel input sessions

The DPI conducted five input sessions with the State Advisory Panel to gather input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The dates of these sessions were June 19, 2020; March 12, 2021; June 25, 2021; September 24, 2021; and December 3, 2021. The agendas and minutes for these sessions are available online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council/agendas-and-minutes>. For details related to these input sessions, see, below, section on parent and family engagement.

4. Targeted strategy: Customized invitations to stakeholders

The DPI invited targeted stakeholders for input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The State Director sent personalized invitations to representatives of Wisconsin organizations with an interest in special education (state association of special education directors, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, SEA employees, representatives from grants funded by discretionary IDEA funds, etc.) to participate in the input sessions (described, above) or to submit input via the website.

5. Targeted strategy: Customized surveys of families

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI developed customized surveys and partnered with Green Bay Area Public Schools and Milwaukee Public Schools to collect data during parent-teacher conferences in the spring of 2021. The surveys were paper-and-pencil; families of color were specifically targeted to participate in the survey.

6. Targeted strategy: Contract to review data collected via Indicator 8 parent surveys

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI contracted with an independent researcher to review Indicator 8 survey data for themes related to the results indicators and Indicator 17. The researcher harvested these themes for the data and submitted a written report summarizing their research findings.

Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2012 | 75.51% |

| FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------------|
| Target >= | 76.00% | 76.00% | 76.00% | 76.00% | 80.00%-90.00% |
| Data | 93.98% | 93.62% | 92.22% | 97.33% | 95.89% |

Targets

| FFY | 2021 (low) | 2021 (high) | 2022 (low) | 2022 (high) | 2023 (low) | 2023 (high) | 2024 (low) | 2024 (high) | 2025 (low) | 2025 (high) |
|-----------|------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| Target >= | 80.00% | 90.00% | 80.00% | 90.00% | 80.00% | 90.00% | 80.00% | 90.00% | 80.00% | 90.00% |

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

| 2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints | 2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints | 2.1 Number of mediations held | FFY 2020 Data | FFY 2021 Target (low) | FFY 2021 Target (high) | FFY 2021 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|--|-------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------|------------------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| 2 | 80 | 94 | 95.89% | 80.00% | 90.00% | 87.23% | Met target | No Slippage |

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Targets: In its FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2021 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2021 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2022). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023 for the FFY 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023 for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023)) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) State-Identified Measurable Result (SiMR) focuses on early literacy, operationally defined as the percentage of learners with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) participating in the Implementation Zone (IZ) with a score of "Proficient" or higher on the English Language Arts section of the state Forward exam, Wisconsin's required statewide assessment. We will calculate scores for learners in Grade 3 and an average of scores across Grades 3-5.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

YES

Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

The population of interest is limited to the cohort of learners with IEPs attending school districts participating in the Implementation Zone in four-year-old Kindergarten through Grade 2. These learners will then be assessed in Grades 3-5.

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

The theory of action for this improvement cycle is: If the WDPI provides intensive services to a select group of school districts for the installation of an effective implementation infrastructure to support the use of clearly defined evidence-based practices related to early reading and inclusive communities, then educators will have needed support and skills to increase reading outcomes for all learners and accelerate outcomes for learners with IEPs and learners of color within a framework that can be scaled statewide. Logic models supporting the strategies to achieve the theory of action can be found at the following links:

Implementation Zone - Early Reading
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1vd4H2wWPBtS8QilmPmOZGZzG66si2-_FkL2R04hxTVs/edit#

Implementation Zone - Inclusive Learning Communities
https://docs.google.com/document/d/15wyhom7SgPjesjQL6m1_5RYxBX1AJSUUXhE7bCVJYNg/edit#

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

YES

Historical Data

| Part | Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|------|---------------|---------------|
| A | 2020 | 8.70% |
| B | 2020 | 13.00% |

Targets

| FFY | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|-------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target A >= | 8.70% | 8.70% | 10.40% | 11.30% | 12.20% |
| Target B >= | 13.00% | 13.00% | 15.60% | 16.90% | 18.20% |

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

| Part | Number of learners with IEPs scoring Proficient or above | Number of learners with IEPs taking the WI Forward Exam | FFY 2020 Data | FFY 2021 Target | FFY 2021 Data | Status | Slippage |
|------|--|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| A | 19 | 147 | 9.70% | 8.70% | 12.93% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B | 30 | 216 | 10.99% | 13.00% | 13.89% | Met target | No Slippage |

Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.

The data come from the English Language Arts (ELA) score of the Wisconsin state assessment, the Forward Exam, for learners with IEPs in Grades 3-5.

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

The data are collected through our standard statewide reporting mechanism into the Wisconsin Information System for Education Data Dashboard (WISEdash) at WDPI. The data are analyzed using the R statistical analysis application.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)

YES

Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.

DPI collects additional data on fidelity of implementation and changes in adult behavior related to the evidence-based practices described in Section B.

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)

YES

If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.

The COVID-19 pandemic continues to impact data collection. However, during this reporting period, Wisconsin Local Educational Agencies (LEA) returned to relative normalcy. While the return to school amid the COVID-19 pandemic was safe, efficient, and equitable for many districts, it was not without challenges that affected data collecting and reporting. The Wisconsin Statewide Assessment System (WSAS) exams given to learners during the 2021-22 school year saw an increase in participation. Assessments were administered to learners in 2022 following standard in-person test taking procedures. Among students in grades 3 through 5, participation in ELA assessments rebounded from 82.9% to 94.6%, approaching but not yet meeting the pre-pandemic rate of 96.2%. DPI anticipates it will take several more years to return to pre-pandemic levels due to the default bias (i.e., the tendency for individuals to continue to adopt behavior in-line with a past decision even after the rationale for that decision no longer applies). DPI continues its outreach efforts as part of its Joint Federal Notification work to increase test participation among all students.

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1CzndzE2tEty6ALgBBUxPJW4o7rkhRVf6AefFPN7F6XA/edit>

Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:

In 2019-20 the WDPI initiated a shift in our Statewide System of Supports (SSOS) to be more explicit regarding our commitment to equity, more efficient and accountable with our resources, and more effective in our support. The proposed shift built on research related to equity-focused improvement and implementation, reflected long-standing feedback from families, communities, and schools, and pulled together the work of the agency Title I and Special Education Teams to support schools and districts federally identified for improvement under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). During the 2020-21 school year, the WDPI began formal installation of the reimagined SSOS infrastructure co-created and resourced by the Special Education and Title I Teams. Within this system, linked teams build capacity to use practice-to-policy feedback loops in Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cycles designed to provide organizational leaders and policy makers with information about implementation barriers and successes so that a more aligned system can be developed. Feedback from the practice level (Practice Informed Policy) engages and informs organizational leaders so they can ensure that policy, procedures, and resources, enable innovative practices to occur in classrooms, schools, and districts (Policy Enabled Practice) as intended. Within this system three levels of support provided to LEAs were articulated based on the severity and number of identifications under ESSA and IDEA. During this reporting period (January 2022-January 2023) the SSOS levels of support were further refined to reflect universal technical assistance available to all LEAs, implementation and Improvement supports available to LEAs with federal identifications, and the Implementation Zone in which clearly defined practices related to Inclusive Learning Communities (IZ-ILC) and Early Reading (IZ-ER) are supported by the WDPI through a linked team system ensuring aligned decision-making through data analysis and clearly defined communication protocols. The SSOS provides the internal structure necessary to ensure success in joint monitoring, move the supports at each level through the stages of implementation and ensure that supports delivered to and within schools and districts are effective in positively impacting all learners while accelerating positive impact for learners with IEPs and learners of color. A graphic representation of the SSOS can be found at the following link:

https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/11CeRKZFBHztN6jNs7-m-itMtIQBEPI4TMxHO-LUVYw/edit#slide=id.g1b74668bb9b_0_0

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.

The intended outcomes for this reporting period were not achieved due to a period of vacancies, changes in staffing, reconfiguration of leadership structure, requiring additional capacity building and intentional cross-division vision building within WDPI, resulting in a delay in the hiring of project staff and installment of the IZ-early reading project. Funding also needed to be restructured which required some reconfiguration of positions. These alternate outcomes were achieved regarding the installation of the implementation zone-early reading and overall SSOS for the current reporting period:

Onboarding New Staff– Additional information to support the understanding of the implementation zone-early reading and overall SSOS was developed and delivered to new staff members within the WDPI agency leadership. Approval to move forward with the design of the Technical Assistance (TA) and Implementation and Improvement (I&I) components of the system is expected. Achievement of our SiMR depends on the infrastructure the SSOS will provide for effective implementation and scale-up of our evidence-based practices.

Data – Due to a change in funding, an alternate approach to installing a decision support data system was developed. One of the positions to be hired to support the installation of the IZ-ER evidenced based practice will be revised to support installation of both practices within selected LEAs as well as the development of the data structures needed to: define types and sources of programmatic, fidelity and outcome data to support the IZ strategies, develop routines for expected use of data, define questions asked/answered at each level of the system, extrapolate school and district level considerations to regional/state level, and develop an accessible data warehouse and usable data reports for all teams within the system. This will ensure that progress toward the SiMR is monitored and adjusted as needed to achieve the targets.

Accountability/Monitoring - A workgroup within the Special Education Team was created to support the development of the data structures described above while more permanent structures are developed and installed. Power BI was identified as the platform through which practice and fidelity data will be summarized and made available to teams within the system to engage in rapid cycles of continuous improvement and monitor progress toward intended outcomes. The workgroup is currently co-creating the elements necessary for generating usable data reports for this purpose. Establishing a decision support data system will ensure effective functioning of the SSOS and achievement of the SiMR targets.

Professional Development - During this submission period common protocols for meeting agendas, data analysis and use, and communication within and among teams were finalized and are being tested for usability by current teams within the system. These common ways of work are critical to sustaining our improvement efforts, achieving our SiMR targets, and then systematically scaling up the practices statewide.

Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

Next steps for the installation of the SSOS include:

Convening design teams for the Technical Assistance (TA) and Implementation and Improvement (I&I) components of the system. The outcome of this step is an implementation plan for these two components.

Based on the design identifying a service delivery model and provider for the I&I component of the system.

Creating Power BI data reports that support rapid cycles of continuous improvement with the Implementation Zone component of the SSOS. The outcome of this step is data driven decision making for practice improvements based on these reports.

Formalizing a Decision Support Data System based on available resources to develop the data structures as described in the prompt pertaining to achieved outcomes above. The outcome of this step is data driven decision making for infrastructure (systems) improvements.

Finalizing a formal intensive partnership between the WDPI and State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidenced-Based Practices (SISEP) in support of our Implementation Zone installation and implementation. The outcome of this step is access to the supports and resources afforded through an intensive partnership with SISEP.

Revising the common protocols for meeting agendas, data analysis and use, and communication based on usability testing and scaling use to all teams within the SSOS. The outcome of this step is improved efficiency and communication through the use of the common protocols.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

Implementation Zone (IZ) - Inclusive Learning Communities (ILC)

Implementation Zone (IZ) - Early Reading (ER)

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

The Implementation Zone - Inclusive Learning Communities (IZ-ILC) combines multiple evidence-based practices within one carefully designed innovation implemented within a powerful framework leading to significant district-wide transformational change.

The evidence-based practices embedded within the Inclusive Learning Communities Practice Profile (ILC-PP) include: 1) Professional Collaboration Among Learner Supports; 2) Inclusive Mindsets; 3) Learning Climate, Culture, and Relationships; 4) Planning and Facilitation; and 5) Authentic Learner Engagement. For a more detailed description of the elements within the ILC-PP, see the February 2022 SSIP submission.

A foundational belief of this project is that learners belong in their learning communities, in an environment with their peers, and that educators are responsible for developing both accessible curriculum and environments for each and every learner within that inclusive setting. Following the guidance of the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN), the ILC-Practice Profile was developed to make the innovation teachable, learnable, doable, and measurable (Fixsen, Blase, Metz, & Van Dyke, 2013).

In the IZ-ILC, educators are supported to design and deliver learning proactively so that it is accessible for individual learners the first time it is presented. Rather than waiting for learners to fail, the equitable multi-level system of supports is fluid, flexible, and provided in the same environment that includes all learners. Learners with IEPs will receive most, if not all, specially designed instruction within the general education environment.

The Implementation Zone - Early Reading (IZ-ER) develops critical infrastructure to support staff at each level of the education system to focus on

effective implementation of specific early reading instruction evidence-based practices.

Like the IZ-ILC, the IZ-ER leverages guidance from NIRN through the stages of implementation, with initial efforts focused on developing an Early Reading Practice Profile (ER-PP) that clearly defines and operationalizes two evidence-based practices of early reading instruction in grades 4K-2: 1) explicit and systematic phonological awareness and phonics instruction and 2) building background knowledge through text collections (Farrall, 2012; McKenna & Stall, 2009; Scarborough, 2001). While these practices by themselves do not account for all aspects of early literacy instruction, they serve as research-supported areas of emphasis within the IZ-ER (Student Achievement Partners, 2021).

Making a commitment to implement the ILC and ER practices within the IZ includes an intentional plan for training, coaching, and data use to support staff. The IZ uses a multi-year plan to ensure interested parties understand and commit to transforming mindsets, adult practices, and systems.

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes.

The WDPI is leveraging the IZ-ILC and IZ-ER strategies to increase proficiency rates in English Language Arts (ELA) for all learners, while accelerating growth for learners with IEPs and learners of color in grades 3-5 to meet grade level standards, and proactively reduce the overall frequency of special education referrals.

Mutually selected LEAs will partner with WDPI through the IZ to develop systems and structures, especially training/coaching and data use for improvement, to support teachers' use of clearly defined practices related to inclusive communities and early reading, respectively. These systems and structures are intended to effectively and efficiently identify and nurture facilitators, as well as diagnose and resolve barriers at each level of the system based on data, so we can sustain and then reliably scale those practices to other sites. In other words, the IZ will allow us to test and improve what it takes to ensure that the implementation of inclusive communities and early reading practices can be equitably sustained and scaled elsewhere.

The IZ-ILC vision states that each learner will thrive in welcoming and inclusive learning communities. In the IZ-ILC, LEAs are supported to strategically implement and sustain inclusive learning communities by receiving funding, quality resources, and supports for training and coaching. The IZ-ILC will impact the SiMR by achieving the following outcomes:

Districts will implement collaborative linked teaming structures, supported by coaching, to ensure a consistent approach for data-informed collaborative decision making that will lead to improved outcomes for each learner.
Districts will ensure that educational environments are accessible, inclusive, and equitable for every learner by implementing sustainable teacher teams. This will lead to improved outcomes for every learner and accelerated improvement for learners with IEPs and learners of color.
Key learner outcomes including inclusion, agency, voice, participation, attendance, engagement, discipline, graduation rates, and achievement improve for learners with IEPs and learners of color.

The vision for IZ-ER is that learners will secure the early literacy skills needed to become proficient and lifelong learners. Like the IZ-ILC, LEAs that engage with the IZ-ER will be supported to strategically implement and sustain evidence-based practices related to the two aspects of early literacy described above by receiving funding, quality resources, training, and coaching support. The IZ-ER will impact the SiMR by achieving the following outcomes:

Supported by coaching, districts will increase their capacity to engage in collaborative teaming structures to ensure a consistent approach for data-informed decision-making.
Districts will demonstrate high levels of fidelity to practice profiles based on the development of robust systems of training, coaching, and data use to support teachers' effective use of early reading strategies.
Proficiency rates in ELA as measured by the state summative assessment will increase for all learners with an accelerated increase for learners with IEPs and learners of color.
For additional context, see the February 2022 submission for Indicator 17.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

The IZ-ILC Theory of Action states: If districts are trained on how to develop and then implement consistent processes ensuring that all educational environments are accessible, inclusive, and equitable and are supported through collaborative decision-making teams, coaching and shared leadership, then districts will experience improved outcomes for every learner and accelerated improvement for learners with IEPs and learners of color.

Data collected to assess change in adult practices, monitor fidelity of implementation, and assess practice change are described in the tools below:
Wisconsin Professional Learning Community (WI PLC) Fidelity Rubric - captures the essential elements of a school level team that has created an enabling context for the ILC practices
Integrated Comprehensive Systems (ICS) Equity Audit - supports school level teams to set and prioritize goals and develop an implementation plan
Vibrant Schools Scale (VSS) - measures key student outcomes as well as providing qualitative data related to shifts in adult mindsets and behaviors
Best Practices for Inclusive Education Fidelity Assessment (BPIE) - identifies priority needs and supports the development of goals and plan improvement strategies, as well as the organization of resources to support the implementation of ILC for students with IEPs
Early Childhood Inclusive Classroom Profile (ICP) - assesses the quality of daily inclusive practices that support the developmental needs of children with disabilities in early childhood settings
For a detailed description of the data collected for the IZ-ILC project, see the February 2022 submission for Indicator 17.

The IZ-ER Theory of Action states: If WDPI develops a systemic and systematic approach to delivering high-quality, standards-based reading foundational skills instruction within an implementation zone, this implementation infrastructure will support training, coaching, and implementation of early literacy instruction emphasizing building background knowledge and explicit and systematic phonemic awareness and phonics instruction in districts using implementation science to install and measure impact. Educators will then have the needed support and skills to improve reading outcomes for all learners and accelerate outcomes for learners with IEPs and learners of color.

Based on the current stage of implementation, WDPI has mapped out the general types of data to be collected (see below), including fidelity, capacity, and programmatic, but has yet to establish the specific data sources pending further implementation planning and identification of a fidelity measure in 2023.

Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

The primary programmatic and outcome data will be used across both areas of practice focus. These tools and data sources are described below:

Training and Coaching Data:

Aggregated training efficacy (i.e., principles of adult learning), impact, effectiveness data

Coaching System Development Worksheet Fidelity Checklist - used to initiate discussions about the importance of coaching and the facilitative supports that administrators need to consider to ensure a systemic commitment to coaching. This is a proactive approach to purposeful and supportive coaching. It specifies the coaching elements that will promote quality service delivery and support for the client, and serve as the basis for further professional development. Participating LEAs track coaching system development annually with this tool.

Coach Reflection Data - Coaches complete this feedback form after each coaching session. Patterns and trends in the feedback are used to inform professional development and support needs of coaches and clients across the LEA.

Client Feedback Data - Clients complete this feedback form after each coaching session. Patterns and trends in the feedback are used to inform professional development and support needs of coaches and clients across the district.

Coach Observation Data - Coaches are observed twice annually with attention to their personally identified competencies aligned to an annual professional growth goal. The data collected informs professional growth needs in individual coaches as well as coaches across the system.

Coach Time Log Data: This tool was added as a required data collection tool during this reporting period and provides individual coaches information to support their workload in systems and monitor how they show up as a coach through each coaching competency. It also provides holistic data from a system of coaching, revealing trends and patterns about how coaches are showing up through the lens of the competencies based on coaching activities. This data informs how to support coaches through Professional Development (PD), coaching, policies, and structures. For a detailed description of the coaching data collected, see the February 2022 submission for Indicator 17.

Capacity Data:

IZ-ILC - Participating districts completed the District Capacity Assessment. This tool is designed to help district leaders and staff better align resources with intended outcomes, and to inform action plans to support the use of inclusive learning communities. Analysis of capacity indicates an increase of total capacity over time. Three of the four participating districts are approaching 80% capacity (79.6%, 59.3% and 55.6%) with overall positive increases in each administration across the life of the project. The fourth district recently reported a dip in total capacity in the most recent administration. These districts experienced heavy leadership and staff turnover as well as a change in external coaching support. The continued intervention of TZ-ILC will promote further capacity among participating districts. The data warrants continued capacity building through training and coaching.

IZ-ER - Capacity data was not collected during this reporting period.

Outcome Data:

Student benchmark data, local assessment data, reading inventories, formative assessments (to be determined with participating LEAs)
Student summative data (Forward Exam)

Based on the current stages of implementation, outcome data was not collected/used for either IZ-ILC or IZ-ER during this reporting period.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

IZ-ILC is in year four of the project and participants are working through installation and initial implementation activities by developing systems and structures to support implementation. Using PDSA cycles informed by a diverse group of interested parties and supported by coaching, teams will generate and strengthen opportunities for growth and increased fidelity of implementation, and design action plans using equity non-negotiables. Districts will strengthen routines and protocols to sustain the linked decision-making teaming structures. Teams will use data to identify facilitators and barriers to address inequities and actively incorporate learning outcomes across the district. They will also establish collaborative teacher teams that proactively support the proportional representation of students grounded in the understanding and affirmed by federal law that special education, multilingual support, gifted services, reading support, etc., are all services and not locations where learners are placed. (ICS Equity, 2021).

Due to the current education culture and climate, districts experienced barriers to advancing educational equity in this reporting period. There were nine participating districts at the beginning of this reporting period and by the end of this reporting period, the cohort decreased to four participating districts. Throughout this reporting period, teams worked to understand how to discuss equity and operationalize equity change that interrupts oppressive structural and instructional practices, even in politically charged communities. Teams will continue adjusting their systems to more proactive frameworks that center equity despite political, financial, staffing, and time challenges.

The practices continue a multi-year process of promoting and ensuring that all students belong in their learning communities, in an environment with their peers, and educators are responsible to develop both accessible curriculum and environments for every student within that inclusive setting. The actual number of years to create a fully integrated and comprehensive system for equity where the outcomes articulated for learners with IEPs and learners of color is achieved is expected to take between one to three additional years. Due to barriers described above, the following stage-based activities will be prioritized during this next reporting period.

To support implementation of ILCs, districts will implement collaborative linked teaming structures, supported by coaching, to ensure a consistent approach for data-informed collaborative decision-making and continue to align professional development, policies and procedures, funding allocation and initiatives in the following ways:

District Leadership Teams (DLT) will align district curriculum and instructional practices and provide professional development so that Building Leadership Teams (BLT) seamlessly create collaborative and aligned teacher teams.

DLTs will align district office staff to support inclusive learning communities leading to "de-siloing" the work related to funding streams

Staff and learners will realign to support proportional representation, where the demographics of learners labeled for special education, English Language learners, and advanced or gifted learners in the school are proportionally reflected in every classroom, course, activity, setting, or experience.

To support ILC implementation, districts will change instructional environments and teacher practices to align with the ILC practice profile competencies. DLTs will lead the transition of district programs and services for learners to attend the schools they would attend if not identified adhering to the principles of proportional representation

DLTs will support BLTs in their work to realign all staff and learners for future teacher teams

BLTs will proportionally represent learners across settings and align staff expertise to serve learners through teacher teams.

Finally, using lessons learned and data informed decisions from the PDSA process, the WDPI will work to scale up and sustain the project by adding a

new district cohort through the following activities:
Develop mutual selection criteria to identify Cohort 2 district partners
Inform the implementation plan using the PDSA process
Inform training and coaching service delivery plans using the PDSA process
Act on identified gaps in data by co-creating a classroom level fidelity assessment tool

The IZ-ER project will transition from exploration to installation activities during the next reporting period. Based on implementation science, leadership engagement and buy-in are critical to sustaining effective implementation. Given that WDPI has experienced both anticipated and unanticipated key leadership transitions, time was invested in building understanding and buy-in among new leadership to maintain both commitment and integrity to the IZ-ER project. While this time investment has solidified the project, the timeline has adjusted to accommodate a longer exploration period for proposed activities and the number of districts participating has been reduced from nine to six. As a result, many project activities and outcomes will remain the same for the next reporting period, with the following stage-based activities prioritized:

Complete the ER-PP, including finalizing the literature review, philosophical front matter, and the review/vetting process
Examine options for fidelity tool adoption or development
Develop an implementation plan
Develop mutual selection criteria to identify district partners
Hire and onboard project staff
Develop training materials and a delivery plan
Develop a coaching delivery plan

During the next reporting period, the following outcomes will be achieved:

A finalized ER-PP v1.0 to support the mutual selection process with districts and initial development of training/coaching content
A completed fidelity tool
Engagement with partners and content experts to identify opportunities for serving as a developer of training content and/or purveyor of training sessions
Established IZ-ER Implementation Team membership through hiring/selection process to ensure needed expertise and perspectives
A completed IZ-ER Implementation Team Charter to support effective meeting routines and structures, and establish communication and data use protocols
Assessment of the capacity of the Implementation team to use implementation components, practice profiles
Established criteria for district mutual selection process
Completed district implementation plans that include initial training/coaching delivery models, and processes related to data, communication, and decision-making.

As WDPI carries out the installation activities described above, exploration activities will start with districts focusing on District Selection and Implementation Team Development. WDPI will support districts who agree to participate in the IZ-ER with coaching, funds, and other resources to establish the implementation infrastructure needed to promote teachers' use of the ER-PP.

During the next reporting period, the anticipated outcomes of district exploration activities include:

Established District Implementation Teams (DITs) and membership through mutual selection and partnership agreement process to ensure needed expertise and perspectives
Developed DIT Charters to support effective meeting routines and structures, and establish communication and data use protocols
Use of capacity data by DITs to use implementation components, practice profiles, processes related to data, communication, and decision-making.

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes.

The timeline for installation of the SSOS infrastructure and the IZ-ER evidenced based practices will be adjusted by one additional year due to a period of vacancies and changes in staffing requiring additional capacity building with the WDPI. Funding also needed to be restructured so that IDEA would provide the sole source of funding, which resulted in reconfiguration of positions.

The number of LEAs participating in the State Systemic Improvement Plan for this cycle has decreased from seventeen to ten for three reasons. First, for the Special Education Team to assume full funding responsibility for the Implementation Zone a reduction in personnel and subsequent LEA participation from nine districts to six was necessary. Second, the Inclusive Learning Communities strategy includes supporting LEAs in understanding educational inequities across ability, race, ethnicity, social class, gender, sexual/gender identity and their intersections. Due to divergent political viewpoints pertaining to race and racism in schools encountered by several of the school boards serving LEAs participating in the IZ-ILC project, three districts have opted to discontinue participation in the project. Finally, one LEA discontinued participation in the IZ-ILC project due to changes in district leadership.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

CURRENT REPORTING PERIOD:

The DPI used the Wisconsin Council on Special Education (the Council, <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council>) to solicit ongoing stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR, any subsequent revisions that the state has made to those targets, development and implementation of Indicator 17, and improvement activities. The Council met four times during this reporting period: September 24, 2021; December 3, 2021; March 11, 2021; and June 17, 2022. The twenty-five members of Council includes the representation required in the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004.

SOLICITING BROAD STAKEHOLDER INPUT ON THE STATE'S TARGETS IN THE SPP/APR:

The DPI used both universal and targeted approaches to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). During the year-long process, the DPI reviewed input provided by 3,719 stakeholders. During this year-long process, the DPI structured the data, discussion, and target-setting around four key questions: (1) How well is Wisconsin preparing students with IEPs for life after high school? (2) Are Wisconsin learners with IEPs learning in the same spaces as their peers? (3) How engaged are Wisconsin families in the learning of their children with IEPs? and (4) How are Wisconsin learners with IEPs performing in key areas?

1. Universal strategy: Open invitation to input sessions

The DPI scheduled five synchronous input sessions to solicit input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP): June 19, 2020; March 12, 2021; June 25, 2021; September 24, 2021; and December 3, 2021.

The DPI distributes a weekly news update related to special education and pupil services; this update serves as the official notification to directors of special education and is distributed to more than 1,000 unique contacts. In advance of each of the input sessions, the DPI included an open invitation to participate in the input sessions. These news updates are archived online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/news>. In addition, an open invitation to attend the input sessions was sent out on the CollabSupport listserve, announced at various conferences and stakeholder meetings, and posted online (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>) in May 2021 and remained online until after the final input session.

2. Universal strategy: Open invitation to submit asynchronous, web-based input

The DPI developed a series of webpages to solicit input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The web pages provided data analysis, recommended targets and rationale, and information on improvement strategies and evaluation. The web pages included this information via video or slide deck format. The web pages linked to Google forms for each of the results indicators and Indicator 17. The Google forms collected recommendations for target-setting and improvement activities and allowed stakeholders to provide additional and relevant feedback related to each of the results indicators and Indicator 17. To see the web pages, please visit <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>.

The DPI distributes a weekly news update related to special education and pupil services; this update serves as the official notification to directors of special education and is distributed to more than 1,000 unique contacts. Beginning in May 2021, the DPI included regularly an open invitation to submit input asynchronously through the web. These news updates are archived online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/news>. In addition, an invitation to participate was sent out on the CollabSupport listserve, announced at various conferences and stakeholder meetings, and posted online.

3. Targeted strategy: State Advisory Panel input sessions

The DPI conducted five input sessions with the State Advisory Panel to gather input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The dates of these sessions were June 19, 2020; March 12, 2021; June 25, 2021; September 24, 2021; and December 3, 2021. The agendas and minutes for these sessions are available online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/council/agendas-and-minutes>. For details related to these input sessions, see, below, section on parent and family engagement.

4. Targeted strategy: Customized invitations to stakeholders

The DPI invited targeted stakeholders for input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The State Director sent personalized invitations to representatives of Wisconsin organizations with an interest in special education (state association of special education directors, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, SEA employees, representatives from grants funded by discretionary IDEA funds, etc.) to participate in the input sessions (described, above) or to submit input via the website.

5. Targeted strategy: Customized surveys of families

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI developed customized surveys and partnered with Green Bay Area Public Schools and Milwaukee Public Schools to collect data during parent-teacher conferences in the spring of 2021. The surveys were paper-and-pencil; families of color were specifically targeted to participate in the survey.

6. Targeted strategy: Contract to review data collected via Indicator 8 parent surveys

The DPI collaborated with the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI, online at <https://wspei.org/>) to gather input from families on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). WSPEI contracted with an independent researcher to review Indicator 8 survey data for themes related to the results indicators and Indicator 17. The researcher harvested these themes for the data and submitted a written report summarizing their research findings.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

During the Spring 2022 semester, the Wisconsin Evaluation Collaborative (WEC) engaged with four of the eight participating IZ-ILC districts in a case study as part of the longitudinal evaluation of the WDPI's SSOS for federally identified schools and districts. The IZ-ILC is one of the supports offered within the SSOS. The case study's purpose was to engage interested parties in discussions related to continuous improvement efforts within the project. Through this process, five common findings were identified across the four districts: 1) readiness for grant activities, 2) assessment streamlining and improvement process integration, 3) support from community, school board, and staff not on a leadership team, 4) engaging the community, and 5) further collaboration within and outside of the district. Although districts experienced challenges, participants reported that the IZ-ILC grant is helping them "make good strides", engage in the "right work" and is providing them with a "framework to be more successful".

The primary engagement of interested parties that occurred in IZ-ER improvement efforts involved convening a group of practitioners from February through June 2022 to co-develop a set of practice profiles focusing on explicit and systematic phonics instruction and building background knowledge through text collections. Based on well-established connections with the field through a WDPI Literacy Consultant, a critical partner in this work, and selection criteria to ensure practitioner expertise and diversity, individuals were identified to participate in the Early Reading Practice Profile (ER-PP) Development Team. A \$1500 per person stipend was provided to honor the work of these full-time practitioners joining the team and supporting the ER-PP development.

The ER-PP Development Team consisted of eight practitioners from the field representing literacy instructional expertise in general education, special education, higher education, regional education service agencies, early childhood, and libraries. The team met with the WDPI project team for eight 2-hour whole group capacity-building sessions. These sessions were developed and delivered by WDPI and SISEP implementation specialists, a WDPI Literacy Consultant, and an external subject-matter expert. The purpose of these sessions was to ensure collective understanding of the role practice profiles play in supporting teacher practice, as well as the critical components of explicit phonics instruction and building background knowledge through text collections. Once that capacity was built, the team met five more times in smaller writing groups to develop components and descriptors for each of the two practice profiles before returning to the whole group for final smoothing and review.

Given the significant emphasis placed on practitioners as interested parties, SISEP approached the ER-PP team to contribute to a podcast focused on

the WDPI practice profile development process. Half of the ER-PP Development Team joined the WDPI Project Team to engage in a conversation with SISEP to highlight the experience and share our perspectives on the process. This podcast will be made widely available through SISEP's networks to those interested in a process to develop practice profiles that prioritizes practitioners' involvement in co-development.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

With regard to the IZ-ILC project five themes surfaced during the case study interviews as concerns described above, as implementation activities shifted from internal capacity building to external facing action planning with equity as the center, it became clear that readiness of families and community members (including school board members) was underdeveloped. Despite efforts to partner with families in decision making from the beginning, there was a gap in family/community understanding of the project. Adding in the current political climate, many misunderstood the goals of the project. During this reporting period, three participating districts received such pushback from school boards and community members that they withdrew from the project. An additional district withdrew due to readiness barriers in leadership. Information from the Spring, 2022 case study prompted reflection and discussion within the coaching cohort group that supports each participating district. Discussion prompts included: 1) how can the findings inform coaching next steps and 2) what recommendations or suggestions do coaches have for districts, or the WDPI based on findings and their work with and within districts?

In response to the findings and expressed concerns, the following actions were taken:

WDPI engaged in individual planning sessions with districts who struggled with readiness and timeline requirements due to COVID challenges. Pacing and requirement timelines were individualized to meet each district where they were to promote and sustain success while attending to fidelity. Additional "office hours" were offered for districts who requested added support from the training experts. These were attended by both internal and external coaches.

In an effort to streamline assessment and data use integration, WDPI convened a Decision Support Data System (DSDS) team charged with collecting, organizing, categorizing, analyzing and reporting on programmatic, fidelity and outcome data related to the project. At the time of this report, the team is positioned to engage in this work which will provide data in user-friendly dashboards allowing interested parties at any level of the system to use data to inform decisions.

To address concerns shared by interested parties regarding support from the community, questions considered include: 1) how can the WDPI provide guidance on communicating with and strategies for challenging conversations with community members, school board members, and staff who are not supportive of the work and 2) what guidance can the WDPI share with districts about including school board members in initial trainings and having conversations with communities about the work earlier in the project timeline? WDPI invited consultants from the Wisconsin Statewide Parent Educator Initiative (WSPEI) to provide ongoing training and coaching support to the regional and district coaching cohort during the 2022-2023 school year. During this reporting period, WSPEI engaged in two monthly training and coaching sessions (September and October 2022) with the coaching cohort. Learning topics for the year include ensuring families are represented and have a voice on district and school committees, learners and families as equal partners in the IEP process, and leadership roles in decision-making groups at the school and in community settings are equitably representative of all learners and families. During these sessions, coaches engaged in collaborative discussions related to embedding family partnerships into system policies and procedures to ensure an environment where every family's culture is welcomed, honored, and integrated into the learning community. Throughout the current school year, coaches are working to take this learning back to district leadership teams to facilitate further conversations and action planning. Finally, the participating districts will gather feedback directly from interested parties within their communities (students, staff and families) through the Vibrant School Scale designed to capture the highest aspirations of educators, students, and families for the kinds of schools they would dream of for themselves or a child they love. Data from this survey will help inform action planning and decision making related to climate, culture, and partnerships.

During engagement with interested parties during the ER-PP development, feedback overall yielded positive responses regarding meeting objectives, team dynamics (i.e., norms, use of time), and structures for success (i.e., access to resources, communication). Participants also voiced concerns regarding the intensity of the work and amount of time it required to fully participate. They saw the value of the ER-PP and were committed to supporting its development but noted in the final session that if this process were carried out in the future, ensuring the relevant parties are more aware of and effectively manage the time commitment was recommended. Additionally, as the two practices focused on a limited scope of early literacy instruction, they asserted the need to ensure that the final ER-PP effectively messages the need to consider the role of these practices in relationship to other critical components of early literacy practices. Finally, throughout the sessions, participants demonstrated concern for the future use of the practice profile, expressing their significant regard for the development of high-quality training and coaching supports to ensure the practices they had so thoughtfully defined and operationalized would be used to fidelity in districts. The concerns outlined above were addressed in the following ways:

Knowing that the ER-PP development process would be a significant time commitment from the beginning, the WDPI offered a \$1500 per-person stipend. As the project got underway, based on anecdotal feedback and meeting evaluation data regarding challenges to managing the time commitment for this work, the WDPI was mindful of consistently incorporating elements of high quality professional learning into capacity-building and component/descriptor writing sessions. Real-time adjustments to chunking and pacing content, flexibility for small group assignments, and opportunities for processing were employed to mitigate some of the time pressures associated with the ER-PP development process.

Given that the ER-PP Development Team participants expressed concerns that the ER-PP would misconstrue a narrow focus on literacy instruction based on the two specific practices it contained, the WDPI is drafting foundational information to include a philosophical position about comprehensive early literacy instruction aligned to best practices and WDPI's ELA standards and priorities. Training and coaching will also be developed to ensure that the two ER-PP practices are understood within the broader context of early literacy as a whole.

Reflecting the ER-PP Development Team's convictions regarding the use of the ER-PP to support fidelity of teacher practice, the WDPI is prioritizing training and coaching service delivery as a key driver of implementation efforts. Participants in the ER-PP Development Team will be invited to provide feedback on the training and coaching materials to increase the likelihood of effective use of the ER-PP. Further, mutual selection criteria and the exploration process with districts will address readiness so partner districts are appropriately identified to participate in the IZ-ER and use the ER-PP as intended.

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

DPI identified an error in the data submission for FFY2020 in this indicator, which resulted in a number of students outside the specified subset to be included in the data. The revised data would place DPI's baseline at 8.82% (6/68) for both 17a and 17b. It is the same for both 17a and 17b due to the data being baseline, and there being no students within the subgroup yet enrolling in grades 4 and 5. The described methodology has not changed, and the coding which produced the error has been corrected. Because this corrected data is lower than the data originally submitted and the improvement seen over FFY2020 and FFY2021 is greater than anticipated, DPI is keeping its targets as-is.

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

17 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

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

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name:

Patricia Williams

Title:

Director of Special Education

Email:

patricia.williams@dpi.wi.gov

Phone:

16082669849

Submitted on:

04/26/23 10:15:53 AM