

**State of Wisconsin**

**Part B Annual Performance Report**

**2005-2006**

**Submitted to the U.S. Dept. of Education,  
Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)  
February 1, 2007**



Contents

	Page
Overview of the APR Development.....	3
Indicator	
1 Graduation.....	5
2 Dropout.....	9
3 Participation and Performance on State Assessment.....	13
4 Suspension/Expulsion.....	22
5 Environment, Ages 6-21.....	25
6 Environment, Ages 3-5.....	28
7 Preschool Outcomes.....	30
8 Parent Involvement.....	32
9 Disproportionality.....	33
10 Disproportionality in Specific Disability Areas.....	34
11 Timely Evaluations.....	35
12 Early Childhood Transition (Part C to Part B).....	36
13 Postsecondary Transition Goals.....	39
14 Postsecondary Outcomes.....	40
15 General Supervision.....	41
16 Complaints.....	44
17 Due Process Hearings.....	45
18 Resolution Sessions.....	46
19 Mediation.....	47
20 Timely and Accurate Data.....	49

## Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development

In accordance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 2004, every State must have in place a State Performance Plan (SPP) that evaluates the State's efforts to implement the requirements and purposes of Part B and describes how the State will improve such implementation. The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) must report annually to the public on the performance of each local educational agency located in the State on the targets in the SPP. In addition, WDPI must report in the Annual Performance Report (APR) on the performance of the State to the Secretary of Education by February 1, 2007.

With this APR, WDPI has submitted a revised complete SPP that addresses all of the "New Indicators" (#4B, #8, #9, #10, #11, #13, and #18), and the deficiencies identified in the Office of Special Education Programs' SPP response letter issued March 23, 2006. In completing the SPP and APR, WDPI used the SPP and APR Instructions, the Part B Indicator/Measurement Table with Instructions, the SPP and APR Templates, Table 6 Assessment and Table 7 Report of Dispute Resolution, and the Optional Part B SPP/APR Review Checklist. In addition, WDPI participated in SPP technical assistance conference calls with OSEP and the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC).

### Stakeholder Involvement in Setting Targets for New Indicators

With broad stakeholder input, WDPI developed the new indicators and targets for the February 2007 submission of the SPP. Previously, Wisconsin's State Superintendent approved the creation of an ad hoc group of stakeholders, the Continuous Improvement and Focused Monitoring (CIFMS) Stakeholders (hereafter stakeholders), to advise the WDPI on such matters as the development of the State Performance Plan. The stakeholders include parents of children with disabilities, parent advocates, special education administrators, regular education administrators, special education teachers, and school board representatives. A current listing of the CIFMS Stakeholders may be found at <http://www.dpi.wi.gov/sped/cifmstake.html>. Staff from the National Center on Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) and the NCRRC facilitate the stakeholder process.

In developing data collection plans for the sampling indicators, WDPI sought the technical assistance of the NCSEAM, NCRRC, the Early Childhood Outcomes Center, and the National Post-School Outcomes Center. On February 7 and 8, 2006, WDPI provided an overview of the sampling plans for indicators #7, #8, and #14 (see indicator descriptions in APR) to the stakeholders.

On October 10, 2006, WDPI provided information regarding Indicator 8; the stakeholders then set measurable and rigorous targets. Through the stakeholder process, WDPI chose to use a version of the parent involvement survey developed by NCSEAM to collect data. WDPI worked with NCRRC to develop a sampling plan and to create an online survey available in English, Spanish, and Hmong. Also on October 10, WDPI presented information on Indicator 18, resolution sessions, to the stakeholders. The stakeholders noted that other than providing training to those involved in resolution sessions and developing stakeholder awareness of the option, WDPI has limited authority to impact the results of resolution sessions. The stakeholders, therefore, set the targets to reflect encouragement of the resolution session process.

On December 5, 2006, WDPI provided updates on indicators #9 and #10, specifically on activities conducted as part of the WDPI sponsored Second Annual Summer Institute on Disproportionality. WDPI also provided information on indicator #4B. In preparation for setting targets, WDPI participated in a regional conference call with other states and learned that many states used a risk-ratio to identify districts with significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than ten days. Since indicator #4B deals with race and ethnicity, WDPI in collaboration with stakeholders determined to analyze the indicator in conjunction with indicators #9 and #10. Targets were set by the stakeholders after applying a weighted risk-ratio and minimal cell size to identify districts with significant discrepancy. WDPI presented revised baseline data for indicator #4A after applying a minimal cell-size criterion. Stakeholders maintained their original target of reducing the number of districts by one district per year; targets were reset accordingly starting with the new baseline data. WDPI provided baseline data from the required school year (2004-05) for indicators #1 and #2. Since this data was not

available at the time stakeholders set the targets for the December 2005 submission of the SPP, the stakeholders chose to establish new targets using a two-year plateau-step, while maintaining alignment with the NCLB goal of 98% graduation rate and 0% dropout for all students by 2013-14 SY. Stakeholders also received updates on the progress and/or slippage made on the remaining indicators. Minutes of the CIFMS stakeholder meetings are posted on the website at <http://www.dpi.wi.gov/sped/cifmstake.html>.

In addition to working with stakeholders, the WDPI Special Education Team worked collaboratively with the Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS), the WDPI Office of Educational Accountability, WDPI Content and Learning and Title I Teams, and the WDPI Applications Development Team for information technology support.

### **Public Reporting of Performance**

WDPI will report to the public on the State's progress and slippage in meeting the measurable and rigorous targets found in the SPP by annually posting the APR on the department's website in February. Presentations will be given by WDPI at the Wisconsin Council of Administrators of Special Services (WCASS) and the State Superintendent's Conference on Special Education and Pupil Services Leadership Issues. In addition, WDPI will meet with the Continuous Improvement and Focused Monitoring (CIFMS) Stakeholders and the State Superintendent's Council on Special Education to review the changes to the SPP and the Annual Performance Report. Since 1998-99, WDPI has publicly posted LEA data related to many of the current performance indicators including graduation, dropout, participation and performance on statewide assessments, suspensions, expulsions, and educational environments for children ages 3-5 and 6-21 on the department's website. From 1998-99 to 2005-06, LEAs were required to submit an annual district Special Education Plan that included an analysis of these data points and a plan to address any identified needs. These plans were also posted to the department's website. Beginning with the 2006-07 school year, LEAs are required to submit an annual Local Performance Plan to the WDPI for review. The LPP is an internet application and serves as the IDEA flow-through and preschool funding mechanism that must be completed in approvable form before a district may encumber and expend federal monies. Through the LPP, districts submit their IDEA flow-through and preschool budgets and provide assurance to WDPI of compliance with state and federal special education requirements. Districts are required to analyze their performance on each of the indicators in the State Performance Plan and develop and submit improvement activities for those indicators for which a district does not meet the established targets. The LPP is reviewed by a WDPI consultant assigned to work with the individual local educational agency (LEA). WDPI will report annually to the public on the performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets associated with indicators #1-#14 in the SPP. WDPI will continue to work with NCRRC and Wisconsin stakeholders on the public report format.

It is the intention of the department to annually post the performance results for each LEA on the department's website prior to the next school year. For indicators #7, #8, and #14, WDPI will use the monitoring cycle to identify LEAs for data collection. The State gathers monitoring data from one-fifth of the LEAs in the state through an LEA self-assessment of procedural requirements related to monitoring priority areas and SPP indicators. Over the course of the SPP, WDPI will monitor approximately 440 local educational agencies, including independent charter schools, the Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services, and the Wisconsin Department of Corrections. In addition, WDPI monitors the Wisconsin Educational Services Program for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing and the Wisconsin Center for the Blind and Visually Impaired. Wisconsin's public agencies have been divided into five cohorts of approximately 88 agencies each. One cohort is monitored each year beginning with the 2006-2007 school year. Each cohort is developed to be representative of the state for such variables as disability categories, age, race, and gender. The cycle includes LEAs from rural and urban areas of the state, as well as small, medium, and large school districts. Milwaukee Public Schools, the only LEA with an average daily membership of over 50,000, is included each year. WDPI will not report to the public any information on performance that would result in the disclosure of personally identifiable information about individual children or where the available data is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information. WDPI will include the most recently available performance data on each LEA and the date the data were obtained. Furthermore, WDPI will collect and report on the performance of each LEA on each of the sampling indicators at least once during the course of the SPP. For all other indicators for which WDPI is required to report at the LEA level, WDPI will report annually on every LEA.

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

**Indicator 1:** Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.

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

**Measurement:**

Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth. Explain calculation.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	80.6% of students with disabilities will graduate with a regular diploma

**Actual Target Data for 2005-06:**

2005-06 SY	Regular Diploma	Certificate	HSED	Maximum Age	Cohort Dropouts	Regular Diploma Graduation Rate
Students with Disabilities	6380	99	115	76	1165	81.4%
Students without Disabilities	56626	236	583	102	5157	90.3%
All Students	63006	335	698	178	6322	89.3%

Data Source: From Wisconsin's Individual Student Enrollment System (ISES) as displayed on Wisconsin's Information Network for Successful Schools (WINSS) Website

WDPI has demonstrated progress and exceeded the target for the 2005-06 SY. The State improved from 80.6% for the previous reporting period to 81.4% during this reporting period the percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the state graduating with a regular diploma. This is an increase of 0.8%.

Data are collected using the Individual Student Enrollment System (ISES) in which LEAs report data at the individual student level, as opposed to aggregate data. This ensures more accurate data. (See SPP Indicator 20 for more information on efforts to ensure valid and reliable data.)

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-06:**

In February 2005, State Superintendent Elizabeth Burmaster convened a statewide High School Task Force to ensure Wisconsin high school students continue to graduate with the knowledge and skills they need to succeed in postsecondary education, the high-skills workplace, and as citizens of the global economy. Recommendations from the Task Force emphasize the need for rigorous, authentic learning using multiple instructional and assessment strategies; high schools that establish a personal connection for each student; learning plans that help individual students accomplish their goals; and solid business and community partnerships. To continue this work at the local level, WDPI sponsored a High School Summit in November 2006 focusing on high school redesign and showcasing promising practices in Wisconsin.

**WDPI implemented the improvement activities as described in the SPP including the following:**

The WDPI Graduation Gap Workgroup conducted focused monitoring activities as described in the SPP. All noncompliance identified during focused monitoring was corrected as soon as possible but no later than one year from identification. WDPI provided technical assistance and ongoing progress monitoring to ensure correction of noncompliance and progress on improvement activities.

Districts submitted to WDPI their local Special Education Plans for the 2005-06 SY.

Categorical Program Support Meetings were conducted statewide.

Improvement activities in the Wisconsin School for the Visually Impaired and the Wisconsin School for the Deaf were completed.

The following discretionary projects were implemented as described in the SPP:

- Regional Service Network
- Paraprofessional Training Initiative
- Behavior Grant
- Wisconsin Statewide Transition Initiative
- Wisconsin Assistive Technology Initiative
- Responsive Education for All Children Initiative (see below)
- Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative
- Focused Performance Reviews (see below)
- Autism Project
- Traumatic Brain Injury: Wisconsin's Response Initiative

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2005-06****Revisions to Baseline and Targets with Justification**

WDPI revised the baseline data for this indicator with the required 2004-05 data. When the SPP was submitted in December 2005, WDPI did not have 2004-05 SY baseline data available. Wisconsin was implementing a new Individual Student Enrollment System (ISES) data collection process to collect graduation and dropout data. In order to ensure accurate reporting of data, WDPI extended the due date for LEAs to submit their data causing the data to not be available for inclusion in the December 2005 submission of the SPP. The State has now revised SPP Indicator 1 to include the baseline data from FFY 2004 (July 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005) and progress data from FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005, through June 30, 2006) in the APR.

WDPI revised the targets and goal for this indicator, based on Stakeholder input. WDPI did not have 2004-05 SY baseline data available when the original targets for Indicator 1 were established. After completing the 2004-05 data collection, WDPI met with Stakeholders to share the required baseline data and review targets and goals related to graduation rates. The Stakeholders chose to set new

and rigorous targets using the 2004-05 baseline data, while maintaining alignment with the NCLB goal of a 98% graduation rate for all students by the 2013-14 school year.

The goal for the 2010-11 SY as reflected in the SPP is lower due to several factors. The goal is calculated from a lower baseline or starting point. The decrease in the 2004-05 graduation rate may be attributed in part to a change in the data collection from an aggregate count of students to an individual student record system, as well as a change in the formula for calculating graduation rate. The formula now includes in the denominator students who reached maximum age, received a certificate of attendance, or received a high school equivalency diploma (HSED). The 2010-11 goal is also impacted by the 2-year plateau-step option Stakeholders used to set the new targets. Stakeholders previously set targets at equal steps. After further analysis and discussion, the Stakeholders recognized that students who are credit deficient often need more than one year to make up the necessary credits for graduation, and that a plateau-step approach would also provide WDPI and LEAs with the opportunity to identify needed resources and implement strategies to impact student outcomes. The Stakeholders maintained high expectations for students with disabilities with the goal of a 98% graduation rate for all students by the 2013-14 school year.

#### Revisions to Improvement Activities

The requirement for LEAs to submit to WDPI a local Special Education Plan was repealed by state statute. Changes in the state's special education statute were determined through a stakeholder consensus process. Beginning with the 2006-07 school year, LEAs are required to submit a Local Performance Plan (see SPP for description).

Two WDPI initiatives, the Reading Excellence and Demonstration of Success Initiative (READS) and the Early Ongoing Collaboration and Assistance Initiative (EOCA), were combined into a new initiative, the Responsive Education for All Children (REACH) initiative. This initiative is a collaborative effort between the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction Special Education and Title I Teams. The purpose of this statewide initiative is to help Wisconsin schools establish and sustain the capacity to make systemic improvement needed to reduce barriers to learning and enable all students to experience success, including students with disabilities (see SPP for description).

The Special Education Data Retreat, a data analysis component, was revised and integrated into Wisconsin's Focused Monitoring (FM) process as a beginning point for districts selected for focused monitoring. The Special Education Data Retreat was renamed the Focus Performance Review (see SPP for description).

Each year beginning in 2006-2007, the state will gather monitoring data from one-fifth of the LEAs in the state through an LEA self-assessment of procedural requirements related to monitoring priority areas and SPP indicators. LEAs conduct the self-assessment using a sample of student individualized education program (IEP) records. Each year the cohort of districts are representative of the state considering such variables as disability categories, age, race, and gender. Milwaukee Public Schools, the only LEA with average daily membership of over 50,000, is included in the sample each year. WDPI will include every LEA in the state at least once during the course of the SPP. The self-assessment of procedural requirements includes data on each of the SPP indicators including the number of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet post-secondary goals. LEAs will report the self-assessment results to WDPI, along with planned corrective actions. LEAs will be required to correct noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year from identification. Annually, WDPI will review all LEA self assessments and conduct verification activities on a portion of the LEA self assessments. Based on its review, WDPI will provide technical assistance to LEAs, which may result in revisions to their planned corrective actions. LEAs will report the status of their corrective actions to ensure correction within one year of identification of the noncompliance. WDPI will verify that all noncompliance has been corrected within one year. LEAs failing to correct noncompliance within one year of identification will be required to report the reasons

and the specific steps that will be implemented to correct the noncompliance. These LEAs will be assigned to a more intensive level of oversight.

Other additions to improvement activities are found in the SPP Indicator 1 under descriptions of the Graduation Gap Workgroup, the Wisconsin Special Education Paraprofessional Training Grant, and the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI).

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

**Indicator 2:** Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.

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

**Measurement:**

Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth. Explain calculation.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	No more than 2.09% of students with disabilities will drop out

**Actual Target Data for 2005-06:**

2005-2006 SY Grades 7-12	Dropouts	Expected to Complete School Term	Dropout Rate
Students with Disabilities	1257	57644	2.13%
Students without Disabilities	5706	360937	1.56%
All Students	6963	418581	1.64%

Data Source: From Wisconsin's Individual Student Enrollment System (ISES) as displayed on Wisconsin's Information Network for Successful Schools (WINSS) Website

During the previous reporting period, the State had a dropout rate of 2.09% of youth with IEPs; during this reporting period the percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of school was 2.13 percent. This is an increase of .04 %.

Data are collected using the Individual Student Enrollment System (ISES) in which LEAs report data at the individual student level, as opposed to aggregate data. This ensures more accurate data. (See SPP Indicator 20 for more information on efforts to ensure valid and reliable data.)

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-06:**

Dropout data for all students in Wisconsin is collected through the Individual Student Enrollment System (ISES), which provides student level data. The dropout rate for both students with disabilities and non-disabled students is calculated as the number of students in grades 7 through 12 who drop out of school during the given year, divided by the number of students expected to complete the school term in those grades. This is the second year LEAs have reported dropout data using ISES. As with any new data collection system, data becomes more valid and reliable with each successive year. This may be reflected in the .04 increase in the percentage of students with disabilities reported as dropping out of school.

Many factors contribute to student dropout rates over time; it is difficult to determine a causal connection between any single factor and a student's decision to quit school. As part of the focused monitoring conducted by the WDPI Graduation Gap Workgroup, possible factors that may contribute to increased dropout rates are examined and addressed. These factors include student academic and social engagement, academic achievement, multiple options for student learning, student retention, and student mobility. Additionally, WDPI examines district policies, procedures, and practices as they relate to students with disabilities including suspension/expulsion, attendance, and graduation.

In February 2005, State Superintendent Elizabeth Burmaster convened a statewide High School Task Force to ensure Wisconsin high school students continue to graduate with the knowledge and skills they need to succeed in postsecondary education, the high-skills workplace, and as citizens of the global economy. Recommendations from the Task Force emphasize the need for rigorous, authentic learning using multiple instructional and assessment strategies; high schools that establish a personal connection for each student; learning plans that help individual students accomplish their goals; and solid business and community partnerships. To continue this work at the local level, WDPI sponsored a High School Summit in November 2006 focusing on high school redesign and showcasing promising practices in Wisconsin.

WDPI implemented the improvement activities as described in the SPP including the following:

The WDPI Graduation Gap Workgroup conducted focused monitoring activities as described in the SPP. All noncompliance identified was corrected as soon as possible but no later than one year from identification. WDPI provided technical assistance and ongoing progress monitoring to ensure correction of noncompliance and progress on improvement activities.

Districts submitted to WDPI their local Special Education Plans for the 2005-06 SY.

Categorical Program Support Meetings were conducted statewide.

Improvement activities in the Wisconsin School for the Visually Impaired and the Wisconsin School for the Deaf were completed.

The following discretionary projects were implemented as described in the SPP:

- Regional Service Network
- Paraprofessional Training Initiative
- Behavior Grant
- Wisconsin Statewide Transition Initiative
- Wisconsin Assistive Technology Initiative
- Responsive Education for All Children Initiative (see below)
- Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative
- Focused Performance Reviews (see below)
- Autism Project
- Traumatic Brain Injury: Wisconsin's Response Initiative

### **Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2005-06**

#### Revisions to Baseline and Targets with Justification

WDPI revised the baseline data for this indicator with the required 2004-05 data. When the SPP was submitted in December 2005, WDPI did not have 2004-05 SY baseline data available. Wisconsin was implementing a new Individual Student Enrollment System (ISES) data collection process to collect graduation and dropout data. In order to ensure accurate reporting of data, WDPI extended the due date for LEAs to submit their data causing the data to not be available for inclusion in the December 2005 submission of the SPP. The State has now revised the SPP to include the baseline

data from FFY 2004 for Indicator 2 and progress data from FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005, through June 30, 2006) in the APR.

WDPI revised the targets and goal for this indicator based on Stakeholder input. WDPI did not have 2004-05 SY baseline data available when the original targets for Indicator 2 were established. After completing the 2004-05 data collection, WDPI met with Stakeholders to share the required baseline data and review targets and goals related to dropout rates. The Stakeholders chose to set new and rigorous targets using the 2004-05 baseline data, while maintaining alignment with the NCLB goal of 0% dropout rate for all students by the 2013-14 school year.

The goal for the 2010-11 SY dropout rate as reflected in the SPP is higher due to several factors. The goal is calculated from a higher baseline or starting point. The increase in the 2004-05 dropout rate may be attributed in part to a change in the data collection from an aggregate count of students to an individual student record system, as well as a change in the formula for calculating dropout rate. The formula for calculating dropout rate changed to include students who dropped out in grades 7 through 12 to align with NCLB requirements; previously only students who dropped out in grades 9-12 were included. The denominator also changed from point-in-time enrollment to all students expected to complete the school term. This change necessitated the setting of new targets by the Stakeholders. The 2010-11 goal is also impacted by the 2-year plateau-step option Stakeholders used to set the new targets. Stakeholders previously set targets at equal steps. After further analysis and discussion, the Stakeholders determined that a 2-year plateau-step approach would provide WDPI and LEAs with the opportunity to identify needed resources and implement strategies to impact student outcomes. The Stakeholders maintained high expectations for students with disabilities with the goal of a 0% dropout rate for all students by the 2013-14 school year.

#### Revisions to Improvement Activities

The requirement for LEAs to submit to WDPI a local Special Education Plan was repealed by state statute. Changes in the state's special education statute were determined through a stakeholder consensus process. Beginning with the 2006-07 school year, LEAs are required to submit a Local Performance Plan (see SPP for description).

Two WDPI initiatives, the Reading Excellence and Demonstration of Success Initiative (READS) and the Early Ongoing Collaboration and Assistance Initiative (EOCA), were combined into a new initiative, the Responsive Education for All Children (REACH) initiative. This initiative is a collaborative effort between the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction Special Education and Title I Teams. The purpose of this statewide initiative is to help Wisconsin schools establish and sustain the capacity to make systemic improvement needed to reduce barriers to learning and enable all students to experience success, including students with disabilities (see SPP for description).

The Special Education Data Retreat, a data analysis component, was revised and integrated into Wisconsin's Focused Monitoring (FM) process as a beginning point for districts selected for focused monitoring. The Special Education Data Retreat was renamed the Focus Performance Review (see SPP for description).

Each year beginning in 2006-2007, the state will gather monitoring data from one-fifth of the LEAs in the state through an LEA self-assessment of procedural requirements related to monitoring priority areas and SPP indicators. LEAs conduct the self-assessment using a sample of student individualized education program (IEP) records. Each year the cohort of districts are representative of the state considering such variables as disability categories, age, race, and gender. Milwaukee Public Schools, the only LEA with average daily membership of over 50,000, is included in the sample each year. WDPI will include every LEA in the state at least once during the course of the SPP. The self-assessment of procedural requirements includes data on each of the SPP indicators including the number of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet post-secondary goals. LEAs will report the self-assessment results to WDPI, along with planned corrective

actions. LEAs will be required to correct noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year from identification. Annually, WDPI will review all LEA self-assessments and conduct verification activities on a portion of the LEA self-assessments. Based on its review, WDPI will provide technical assistance to LEAs, which may result in revisions to their planned corrective actions. LEAs will report the status of their corrective actions to ensure correction within one year of identification of the noncompliance. WDPI will verify that all noncompliance has been corrected within one year. LEAs failing to correct noncompliance within one year of identification will be required to report the reasons and the specific steps that will be implemented to correct the noncompliance. These LEAs will be assigned to a more intensive level of oversight.

Other additions to improvement activities are found in the SPP under descriptions of the Graduation Gap Workgroup, the Wisconsin Special Education Paraprofessional Training Grant, and the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI).

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

**Indicator 3:** Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.

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

**Measurement:**

A. Percent = # of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup (children with IEPs) divided by the total # of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size in the State times 100.

B. Participation rate =

- a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades;
- b. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = b divided by a times 100);
- c. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (percent = c divided by a times 100);
- d. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = d divided by a times 100); and
- e. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards (percent = e divided by a times 100).

Account for any children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e above

Overall Percent = b + c + d + e divided by a.

C. Proficiency rate =

- a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades;
- b. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = b divided by a times 100);
- c. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations (percent = c divided by a times 100);
- d. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = d divided by a times 100); and
- e. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured against alternate achievement standards (percent = e divided by a times 100).

Overall Percent = [(b + c + d + e) divided by (a)].

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	<p>Percent of districts meeting AYP in reading: 75%</p> <p>Percent of districts meeting AYP in math: 75%</p> <p>Participation rate for children in reading: 95%</p> <p>Participation rate for children in math: 95%</p> <p>Proficiency for children in reading: 67.5%</p> <p>Proficiency for children in math: 47.5%</p>

**Actual Target Data for 2005-06:**

A. Percent of Districts Making Adequate Yearly Progress

Percent = # of districts, by subject, that met 2005-2006 AYP requirements for students with disabilities, divided by total number of districts that met minimum students with disabilities cell size (50 FAY tested) times 100:

Reading:	$(27/28) * 100 = 96.4\%$
Math:	$(27/28) * 100 = 96.4\%$

B. Participation Rate

**Grade 4: Reading (2005)**

Overall participation rate, Grade 4 reading:

- a. # of children with IEPs: 8352
- b. # w/IEP, regular assessment, no accommodations: 2919
- c. # w/IEP, regular assessment, accommodations: 4310
- d. # w/IEP, alternate assessment at grade level: 56
- e. # w/IEP, alternate assessment/alt. standards (WAA-SWD): 994

$(b + c + d + e)/a$

$(2919 + 4310 + 56 + 994)/8352 * 100 = 99.13\%$

**Grade 4: Math (2005)**

Overall participation rate, Grade 4 math:

- a. # of children with IEPs: 8352
- b. # w/IEP, regular assessment, no accommodations: 29377
- c. # w/IEP, regular assessment, accommodations: 4510
- d. # w/IEP, alternate assessment at grade level: 60
- e. # w/IEP, alternate assessment/alt. standards (WAA-SWD): 784

$(b + c + d + e)/a$

$(29377 + 4510 + 60 + 784)/8352 * 100 = 99.26\%$

**Grade 8: Reading (2005)**

Overall participation rate, Grade 8 reading:

a. # of children with IEPs:	9608
b. # w/IEP, regular assessment, no accommodations:	2820
c. # w/IEP, regular assessment, accommodations:	5749
d. # w/IEP, alternate assessment at grade level:	12
e. # w/IEP, alternate assessment/alt. standards (WAA-SWD):	904

(b + c + d + e)/a

$$(2820 + 5749 + 12 + 904)/9608 * 100 = 98.71\%$$

**Grade 8: Math (2005)**

Overall participation rate, Grade 8 math:

a. # of children with IEPs:	9608
b. # w/IEP, regular assessment, no accommodations:	2806
c. # w/IEP, regular assessment, accommodations:	5767
d. # w/IEP, alternate assessment at grade level:	27
e. # w/IEP, alternate assessment/alt. standards (WAA-SWD):	875

(b + c + d + e)/a

$$(2806 + 5767 + 27 + 875)/9608 * 100 = 98.61\%$$

**Grade 10: Reading (2005)**

Overall participation rate, Grade 10 reading:

a. # of children with IEPs:	9744
b. # w/IEP, regular assessment, no accommodations:	3990
c. # w/IEP, regular assessment, accommodations:	4619
d. # w/IEP, alternate assessment at grade level:	11
e. # w/IEP, alternate assessment/alt. standards (WAA-SWD):	767

(b + c + d + e)/a

$$(3990 + 4619 + 11 + 767)/9744 * 100 = 96.33\%$$

**Grade 10: Math (2005):**

Overall participation rate, Grade 10 math:

a. # of children with IEPs:	9744
b. # w/IEP, regular assessment, no accommodations:	3984
c. # w/IEP, regular assessment, accommodations:	4612
d. # w/IEP, alternate assessment at grade level:	27
e. # w/IEP, alternate assessment/alt. standards (WAA-SWD):	772

(b + c + d + e)/a

$$(3984 + 4612 + 27 + 772)/9744 * 100 = 96.42\%$$

C. Performance Rates

**Grade 4 Reading (2005)**

Overall performance rate, Grade 4 Reading:

a. # of children with IEPs:	8352
b. # regular assessment- proficient, no accommodations:	1937
c. # regular assessment-proficient, accommodations:	1809
d. # alternate assessment at grade level-proficient:	9
e. # alternate assessment/alt. standards -proficient:	667

$$(b + c + d + e)/a$$

$$(1937 + 1809 + 9 + 667)/8352 * 100 = \mathbf{52.94\%}$$

**Grade 4 Math (2005)**

Overall performance rate, Grade 4 Math:

a. # of children with IEPs:	8352
b. # regular assessment- proficient, no accommodations:	1706
c. # regular assessment-proficient, accommodations:	1785
d. # alternate assessment at grade level-proficient:	14
e. # alternate assessment/alt. standards -proficient:	522

$$(b + c + d + e)/a$$

$$(1706 + 1785 + 14 + 522)/8352 * 100 = \mathbf{48.21\%}$$

**Grade 8 Reading (2005)**

Overall performance rate, Grade 4 Math:

a. # of children with IEPs:	9608
b. # regular assessment- proficient, no accommodations:	1498
c. # regular assessment-proficient, accommodations:	2622
d. # alternate assessment at grade level-proficient:	3
e. # alternate assessment/alt. standards -proficient:	604

$$(b + c + d + e)/a$$

$$(1498 + 2622 + 3 + 604)/9608 * 100 = \mathbf{49.19\%}$$

**Grade 8 Math (2005)**

Overall performance rate, Grade 8 Math:

a. # of children with IEPs:	9608
b. # regular assessment- proficient, no accommodations:	1071
c. # regular assessment-proficient, accommodations:	1695
d. # alternate assessment at grade level-proficient:	10
e. # alternate assessment/alt. standards -proficient:	574

$$(b + c + d + e)/a$$

$$(1071 + 1695 + 10 + 574)/9608 * 100 = \mathbf{34.86\%}$$

**Grade 10 Reading (2005)**

Overall performance rate, Grade 10 Reading:

- a. # of children with IEPs: 9744
- b. # regular assessment- proficient, no accommodations: 1353
- c. # regular assessment-proficient, accommodations: 1261
- d. # alternate assessment at grade level-proficient: 2
- e. # alternate assessment/alt. standards -proficient: 512

$(b + c + d + e)/a$

$(1353 + 1261 + 2 + 512)/9744 * 100 = 32.10\%$

**Grade 10 Math (2005)**

Overall performance rate, Grade 4 Math:

- a. # of children with IEPs: 9744
- b. # regular assessment- proficient, no accommodations: 1159
- c. # regular assessment-proficient, accommodations: 1098
- d. # alternate assessment at grade level-proficient: 9
- e. # alternate assessment/alt. standards -proficient: 500

$(b + c + d + e)/a$

$(1159 + 1098 + 9 + 500)/9744 * 100 = 28.38\%$

Analysis of Actual Target Data

A. Percent of districts meeting State's AYP objectives:

	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2005-06</b>	
Reading	94.7%	96.4%	Increase
Math	94.7%	96.4%	Increase

*Data Source: From Wisconsin Student Assessment System (WSAS) 2004-05 SY and 2005-06 SY*

WDPI exceeded the FFY 2005 target for the percent of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives in Reading and Math. WDPI improved from 94.7% for the previous reporting period to 96.4% during this reporting period.

For this indicator, WDPI is required to report the percentage of districts that met the state's AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup. Under Wisconsin's accountability plan, AYP at the *district* level for students with disabilities (SwD) in Reading and Math is determined by whether the district (a) met the minimum cell size of 50, and if so, whether it (b) met annual measurable objectives of 67.5% in Reading and 47.5% in Math for 2005-06. In order to miss AYP at the district level for the SwD subgroup in Reading or Math, a district needs to miss AYP for that subject in all relevant grade spans (e.g., all grade spans in which the district has tested students). For most Wisconsin districts, there are three relevant grade spans (elementary, middle, and high), because they are K-12 districts and thus have students tested in all three spans. A small number of districts, however – such as union high school districts or K-8 districts - have only two or even one relevant grade span for AYP purposes, since they have tested students in fewer than three spans.

The use of grade spans for determining AYP is unique to the district level; at the school level, no grade spans are used for accountability purposes.

AYP can be met by meeting the annual measurable objectives (AMO) (e.g., by having at least 67.5% of students counted as proficient in Reading and 47.5% in Math for both 2004-05 and for 2005-06), or through the use of confidence intervals or Safe Harbor if the AMO is not met.

In Fall 2004, Wisconsin administered the Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examination (WKCE) in Reading and Math in grades 4, 8, and 10 only, and tested just under 200,000 students statewide. In Fall 2005, Reading and Math were tested in grades 3-8 and 10, resulting in approximately 450,000 students tested statewide. For AYP purposes, one result of additional testing is that more districts met SwD cell size in Fall 2005 compared to Fall 2004, particularly at the elementary and middle grade spans, since most districts tested three grades in each span in Fall 2005 compared to having only one tested grade at the elementary and middle spans in Fall 2004.

#### Fall 2004 Data:

Nineteen K-12 districts that enroll students in all three grade spans (elementary, middle, and high) met SwD cell size of 50 in all three spans. Among these 19 districts, 18 (94.7%) met AYP in all relevant grade spans for SwD for both Reading and Math. Milwaukee was the only district that did not meet AYP for SwD in all relevant grade spans; this was true of MPS in both subjects.

#### Fall 2005 Data:

Twenty-four K-12 districts that enroll students in all three grade spans (elementary, middle, and high) met SwD cell size of 50 in all three spans. Another four districts that are not K-12 (and thus do not enroll students in all three spans) met the SwD cell size in all relevant spans (e.g., those spans in which they have tested students). This makes a total of 28 districts that met SwD cell size of 50 in all relevant grade spans for Fall 2005.

Among these 28 districts, 27 (96.4%) met AYP in all relevant grade spans for SwD for both Reading and Math. Milwaukee was the only district that did not meet AYP for SwD in all relevant grade spans; this was true of MPS in both subjects.

### B. Participation Rate for Children with Disabilities

	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2005-06</b>	
4 <sup>th</sup> Gr. Reading	98.36%	99.13%	Met Target
4 <sup>th</sup> Gr. Math	98.42%	99.26%	Met Target
8 <sup>th</sup> Gr. Reading	98.13%	98.71%	Met Target
8 <sup>th</sup> Gr. Math	97.81%	98.61%	Met Target
10 <sup>th</sup> Gr. Reading	97.09%	96.33%	Met Target
10 <sup>th</sup> Gr. Math	96.85%	96.42%	Met Target

*Data Source: From Wisconsin Student Assessment System (WSAS) 2004-05 SY and 2005-06 SY*

WDPI continues to meet the target for the rate of children with disabilities participating in statewide testing.

### C. Proficiency Rate for Children with Disabilities

	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2005-06</b>	
4 <sup>th</sup> Gr. Reading	52.91%	52.94%	Increase
4 <sup>th</sup> Gr. Math	48.53%	48.21%	Met Target
8 <sup>th</sup> Gr. Reading	48.63%	49.19%	Increase
8 <sup>th</sup> Gr. Math	34.31%	34.86%	Increase
10 <sup>th</sup> Gr. Reading	35.61%	32.10%	Decrease
10 <sup>th</sup> Gr. Math	28.72%	28.38%	Decrease

*Data Source: From Wisconsin Student Assessment System (WSAS) 2004-05 SY and 2005-06 SY*

WDPI improved from the previous reporting period to this reporting period in 4<sup>th</sup> grade reading, 8<sup>th</sup> grade reading, and 8<sup>th</sup> grade math proficiency. The State met the target for 4<sup>th</sup> grade math proficiency for both school years. There was a decrease in 10<sup>th</sup> grade reading and math proficiency from the previous reporting period to this reporting period.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-06:**

Explanation of Progress or Slippage

Proficiency Rates:

There was a decrease in 10<sup>th</sup> grade reading and math proficiency from the previous reporting period to this reporting period. An assessment of secondary achievement in Wisconsin shows that while many students in Wisconsin read and perform math equations quite well as measured by state and national standards, significant achievement gaps persist among student subgroups. These achievement gaps represent one of the biggest challenges facing Wisconsin and the nation.

In February 2005, State Superintendent Elizabeth Burmaster convened a statewide High School Task Force to ensure Wisconsin high school students graduate with the knowledge and skills they need to succeed in postsecondary education, the high-skills workplace, and as citizens of the global economy. Recommendations from the Task Force emphasize the need for rigorous, authentic learning using multiple instructional and assessment strategies; high schools that establish a personal connection for each student; learning plans that help individual students accomplish their goals; and solid business and community partnerships. Wisconsin has been and must continue to be an innovator in policies, programs, and practices to bring improvements to high schools. A variety of programs, including adolescent literacy programs, work-based programs, career academies, alternative education programs, youth options, and collaborative programs to improve attendance are currently addressing high school improvement needs. The recommendations advanced in the WDPI High School Task Force Report set an agenda for effective action. To encourage LEA participation and awareness, WDPI sponsored a High School Summit in November 2006 focusing on high school redesign and showcasing promising practices in Wisconsin.

When CIFMS Stakeholders analyzed the data for this indicator in preparation for completing the APR, the Stakeholders were very concerned with the performance on the WKCE in reading and math by students with disabilities. They specifically requested an additional Stakeholder meeting to be convened in July 2007 for the purpose of identifying strategies to improve reading and math outcomes for students with disabilities.

During WDPI Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring for the Reading Achievement Gap, the FM team identified school districts often do not explicitly teach reading skills to students beyond elementary school. After participating in focused monitoring, many districts are adding specific reading instruction at the middle school level.

Improvement Activities Completed

Wisconsin's Information Network for Successful Schools (WINSS) posted public information regarding state-wide assessment.

The Schools Identified for Improvement (SIFI) program was implemented during the 2005-06 SY and completed two toolkits to assist schools districts.

The WDPI Reading Achievement Workgroup conducted focused monitoring activities as described in the SPP.

Districts submitted to WDPI their local Special Education Plans for the 2005-06 SY.

The documents developed under Improving AYP for Students with Disabilities continue to be used by professionals in the field.

The following discretionary projects were implemented as described in the SPP:

- Assessment Grant
- Behavior Grant
- Responsive Education for All Children Initiative (see below)
- Wisconsin Assistive Technology Initiative
- Making Differences Ordinary Math Grant was not funded, a new grant has been submitted.
- State Residential Schools and Outreach Staff continue to provide training to students with disabilities in the residential setting or in local school districts.

### **Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2005-06**

#### Revisions in Baseline

Baseline data for grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 has been added to the SPP. The administration of statewide testing at these grade levels first began during the 2005-06 SY.

The Wisconsin Student Assessment System (WSAS) changed in 2005 to encompass grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 10. The WSAS consists of state standardized tests called the Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examinations (WKCE) for grades 4, 8 and 10 in Science, Language Arts, and Social Studies; the Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examinations - Criterion Referenced Test (WKCT-CRT) for grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10 in Reading and Mathematics; and the standards-based WAA, which includes the WAA-LEP for students with limited English proficiency and the WAA-SwD for students with disabilities. Tests are administered in the fall of the school year. To fulfill the annual review requirements for the current year, schools and districts must meet the criteria for the required AYP objectives.

#### WDPI revised the baseline data for Indicator 3.A.

#### Percent of districts meeting the state's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup

For the 2004-05 SY, WDPI previously reported 32 districts met the minimum cell size requirement for students with disabilities (SwD) in both Reading and Math in at least one grade span (elementary, middle, and high), and that in 24 of these 32 instances where SwD cell size was met, AYP objectives for Reading and Math were also met.

WDPI has revised the baseline data for 2004-05, to reflect a more accurate picture of how AYP is calculated at the district level in Wisconsin. The revised data for 2004-05 shows instead that 19 districts met minimum cell size for SwD at all relevant grade spans (e.g., those spans in which they had tested students). It should be noted some districts do not meet cell size at all three spans because they do not have students in all three spans, but do meet cell size at all relevant spans (all spans in which they have students tested). This is true for union high school districts that are comprised of a single school – a high school, as well as for K-4 and K-8 districts. Of the 19 districts that met the minimum cell size during the 2004-05 SY, 18 (or 94.7%) met AYP requirements for the SwD subgroup in both Reading and Math. This is a more accurate count than what was reported previously because under Wisconsin's accountability plan, AYP must be missed at all relevant grade spans in order for a district to miss AYP.

When calculating the percent of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup for the 2004-05 baseline, WDPI counted any school district that missed the AMO at one grade level (4, 8, or 10) as a school district that missed AYP. In 2005-06 WDPI conducted statewide testing in grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 for the first time. WDPI has revised baseline data to reflect a change in how school districts are identified for missing AYP. When calculating the percent of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup, WDPI will now count any school district that has missed the AMO at all three grade spans (elementary, middle, and high school) as a school district that missed AYP. This revision allows the SPP criteria to be more consistent with Wisconsin's state consolidated application for NCLB criteria. Applying these criteria, WDPI revised the 2004-05 baseline for reading from 75% to 94.7% and for math from 75% to 94.7%.

Additional Improvement Activities

**Mathematics Understanding for All (MUFA) Grant**

In 2006, WDPI applied for a Special Education Research grant entitled, "Mathematics Understanding for All." The grant is intended to help in developing programs, practices, and policies that are potentially effective for improving student outcomes in mathematics specific to ninth grade. The project will assist high school students with disabilities in ninth grade who receive mathematics instruction in a special education classroom and transition to inclusive regular mathematics classrooms. Teams of ninth grade mathematics and special education teachers will receive extensive professional development in mathematics content knowledge, differentiated instruction in mathematics, designing group work in mathematics, and co-teaching strategies. National experts in the fields of mathematics and special education will offer professional development sessions.

MUFA will establish a consortium of 30 high-need schools, three Wisconsin Universities, Wisconsin Education Association Council, Learning Point Associates, and other educational organizations in Wisconsin. One hundred and fifty teachers and administrators will participate in the program, impacting students in high-need high schools. The grant is built on the contention that using the proper teaching pedagogy and challenging mathematical content, special education students can become proficient or advanced in mathematics.

**Math and Science Partnership Grants**

In 2006, State Superintendent Elizabeth Burmaster announced partnership grants that will help more than 600 teachers in 77 school districts learn new information in mathematics and science that will support increased student achievement. The ten partnerships, five new grants and five renewal grants, will share \$1.7 million in federal funding. Grant activities will impact teachers in urban, suburban, and rural parts of the state. Projects will bring together mathematics and science teachers with science, technology, engineering, and mathematics faculty from state colleges and universities to expand teachers' subject matter knowledge.

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

**Indicator 4:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and
- B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.

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

**Measurement:**

- A. Percent = # of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year divided by # of districts in the State times 100.
- B. Percent = # of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race ethnicity divided by # of districts in the State times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<b>2005</b> (2005-2006)	<b>4A. No more than 3.42% of districts will be</b> identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than ten days in a school year.

**Actual Target Data for 2005-06:**

School Year	# Districts with Significant Discrepancy	Total # of Districts	Percent of Districts with Significant Discrepancy
2005-06	18	440	4.0%

*Data Source:* The 2005-06 School Performance Report and the Individual Student Enrollment System (ISES)

WDPI increased from 3.64% for the previous reporting period to 4.0% during this reporting period the percentage of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year.

Data are collected using the School Performance Report and Individual Student Enrollment System (ISES) in which LEAs report data at the individual student level, as opposed to aggregate data. This ensures accurate data. (See SPP Indicator 20 for more information on efforts to ensure valid and reliable data.)

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-06:**

All LEAs identified during the 2004-05 SY with significant discrepancies in the rates of suspension/expulsions of children with disabilities for more than ten days in a school year provided an assurance to WDPI that they had completed a review and revised, if necessary, their policies, procedures, and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure that policies, procedures, and practices comply with Part B, as required by 34 CFR 300.146. In additions, districts submitted to WDPI an improvement plan to reduce the rates of suspension/expulsions of children with disabilities for more than ten days in a school year. Assurances and improvement plans were reviewed by WDPI staff to verify full compliance with this requirement.

An analysis of the 2005-06 SY data indicates there was an increase of two districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for more than ten days in a school year as compared to the 2004-05 SY. Of the 18 districts identified with a significant discrepancy in the 2005-06 SY, five were also identified during the previous school year. Districts identified with significant discrepancies in the rates of suspension/expulsions of children with disabilities for more than ten days in a school year are also often identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education. These districts attend a WDPI summer institute on disproportionality.

WDPI met with stakeholders to review this indicator. Stakeholders identified a need for LEAs to have more information about options to suspension and expulsion, stating that some LEAs use suspension as a frequent discipline technique. WDPI will develop technical assistance strategies to address this need.

Research shows that students with disabilities who are suspended or expelled are more likely to become disconnected from school, fall behind in their class work and achievement, and thus drop out of school and fail to graduate. Because of the correlation among suspension, expulsion, graduation, and dropout rates, the WDPI has designed its continuous improvement and focused monitoring of the graduation gap between students with disabilities and students without disabilities (see Indicator 1) to include activities that specifically address LEA suspension and expulsion rates.

The WDPI Graduation Gap Workgroup conducted focused monitoring activities including interviews that explicitly probe LEA suspension and expulsion practices and conducted a review of LEA suspension and expulsion policies and procedures

Districts submitted to WDPI their local Special Education Plans for the 2005-06 SY which included an analysis of their suspension and expulsion data and improvement strategies.

The following discretionary projects were implemented as described in the SPP (see Indicator 1):

- Regional Service Network
- Paraprofessional Training Initiative
- Behavior Grant
- Wisconsin Statewide Transition Initiative
- Wisconsin Assistive Technology Initiative
- Responsive Education for All Children Initiative
- Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative
- Focused Performance Reviews
- Autism Project
- Traumatic Brain Injury: Wisconsin's Response Initiative

In addition, Program Support Meetings, as described in the SPP, were conducted; as well as improvement activities at the Wisconsin Center for the Blind and Visually Impaired and the Wisconsin School for the Deaf.

Beginning with the 2005-06 school year, ISES became the new data source for collecting enrollment data on children with disabilities (used as the denominator for calculating this indicator) in order to foster consistency with other WDPI data collection efforts. The apparent increase in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than ten days during the 2005-06 SY may in part be due to the change in data collection system.

WDPI examined the data to determine causative factors for the increase. It was noted a significant number of districts do not reappear in second year data and a number of districts each year are small districts. For smaller districts, a difference of one or two students may result in identification of significant discrepancy. Preliminary analysis underscores the importance of examining trend data when it becomes available to ensure the State's criteria correctly identifies districts most in need of improvement. WDPI will meet with stakeholders to consider the use of trend data in identifying districts in future years.

WDPI will monitor this data to verify that the increase was due to a change in data collection systems and not a true increase in suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for more than ten days in a school year. WDPI will also monitor related requirements through the LEA procedural compliance self-assessment (see Indicator 15) and through the focused monitoring process (see Indicator 1).

### **Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2005-06**

#### Revisions to Baseline and Targets with Justification

WDPI revised the baseline data for Indicator 4A by establishing a minimal cell size after seeking stakeholder input. Stakeholders previously established 1.75 standard deviations above the mean for the purpose of setting the target. This defined significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than ten days in a school year as 2.93% or higher. Using child count data as the data source, 30 districts, or 6.6% of the districts in the state, were identified with significant discrepancy. After further analysis, WDPI aligned this indicator with Indicators 9 & 10, and established a minimal cell size of four students suspended/expelled for more than 10 days, while maintaining the previously established standard deviation and definition of significant discrepancy. This reduced the number identified with significant discrepancy during the 2004-05 SY to 16 districts, or 3.42% of the districts in the state. WDPI then revised the targets and goal for this indicator using the new baseline data and the previous goal of reducing the number of districts identified with significant discrepancy by one school district each year.

Beginning with the 2005-06 SY, WDPI adjusted the threshold for identification of significant discrepancy from 2.93% to 3.29%. This adjustment was due to the availability of a more complete data set than was available at the time the original threshold was set. Previously one school district with the highest rate of removals was not included in the data set when the stakeholders analyzed the data.

#### Revisions to Improvement Activities

Because the Special Education Plan (SEP) software was eliminated with the change in state statute, districts identified with significant discrepancies were no longer required to submit improvement activities via the SEP. Instead, these districts submitted paper copies of their improvement plan that were reviewed by WDPI staff.

Stakeholders identified an LEA need for more information about options to suspension. WDPI will develop technical assistance to address this need.

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

**Indicator 5:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:

- A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;
- B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or
- C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.

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

**Measurement:**

- A. Percent = # of children with IEPs removed from regular class less than 21% of the day divided by the total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100.
- B. Percent = # of children with IEPs removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day divided by the total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100.
- C. Percent = # of children with IEPs served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements divided by the total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<b>2005 (2005-2006)</b>	Removed from regular class less than 21% of day: <b>51%</b> Removed from regular class greater than 60% of day: <b>11.5%</b> Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements: <b>1.25%</b>

**Actual Target Data for 2005-06:**

FFY	Actual Target Data
<b>2005 (2005-2006)</b>	Removed from regular class less than 21% of day: <b>50.83%</b> Removed from regular class greater than 60% of day: <b>12.09%</b> Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements: <b>1.43%</b>

## Environment Data Ages 6-21

	Student Count	Total Students	Percent
Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day	57853	113809	50.83%
Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day	13761	113809	12.09%
Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements	1622	113809	1.43%

Data Source: Federal Student Data Report 2005

WDPI is making progress in meeting the targets set for this indicator. WDPI increased the percentage of children with IEPs removed from regular class less than 21% of the day from 49.45% for the previous reporting period to 50.83% during this reporting period. There was a decrease from 12.20% to 12.09% in the percentage of children with IEPs removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day. There was a decrease from 1.44% to 1.43% in the percentage of children with IEPs served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.

WDPI has included in the SPP accurate baseline data from FFY 2004 (July 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005) and progress data from FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005, through June 30, 2006). Data are collected via WDPI child count software in which LEAs report data at the individual student level, as opposed to aggregate data. This ensures accurate data. (See SPP Indicator 20 for more information on efforts to ensure valid and reliable data.)

During the six-year monitoring cycle WDPI conducted from 1998-99 to 2003-04, the State identified district confusion regarding the difference between amount of removal from the regular education classroom and the amount of special education a child with a disability received. WDPI provided technical assistance to districts and districts corrected all noncompliance of related requirements. Because all noncompliance regarding this confusion was corrected, WDPI is confident the 2004 child count data accurately reflect the percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 removed from the regular education classroom.

### **Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-06:**

#### Analysis of Data and Explanation of Performance

An analysis of the 2005-06 data indicates that progress is being made toward the targets. For students removed from regular class less than 21% of the day, progress toward the target of 1.38% was reported. For students removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day, progress toward the target of 0.11% was reported. For students served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements progress toward the target of 0.1% was reported.

Stakeholders recognize the decision regarding the amount of time a child with a disability is removed from the regular classroom is determined by an IEP team based upon the unique needs of the child. The Stakeholders do not intend for the targets to cause IEP teams to forego this decision-making process. The progress made toward these targets reflects the stakeholders' intent.

Description of improvement activities implemented during the 2005-06 SY

The WDPI Data Verification Workgroup conducted data verification activities as described in the SPP.

Districts submitted to WDPI their local Special Education Plans for the 2005-06 SY.

The following discretionary projects were implemented as described in the SPP:

- Focused Performance Reviews (see below)
- Wisconsin Assistive Technology Initiative
- High Cost Initiative

In addition, improvement activities as described in the SPP were implemented at the Wisconsin Center for the Blind and Visually Impaired and the Wisconsin School for the Deaf.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2005-06**

Revisions to Improvement Activities

The requirement for LEAs to submit to WDPI a local Special Education Plan was repealed by state statute. Changes in the state's special education statute were determined through a stakeholder consensus process. Beginning with the 2006-07 school year, LEAs are required to submit a Local Performance Plan (see SPP Indicator 1 for description).

The Special Education Data Retreat, a data analysis component, was revised and integrated into Wisconsin's Focused Monitoring (FM) process as a beginning point for districts selected for focused monitoring. The Special Education Data Retreat was renamed the Focus Performance Review (see SPP Indicator 5 for description).

Other additions to Indicator 5 improvement activities are found in the SPP under descriptions of the Data Verification Workgroup and the Procedural Compliance Self-Assessment.

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

**Indicator 6:** Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).

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

**Measurement:**

Percent = # of preschool children with IEPs who received special education services in settings with typically developing peers divided by the total # of preschool children with IEPs times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	35.86% of preschool children with IEPs who received all special education services in settings with typically developing peers.

**Actual Target Data for 2005-06:**

FFY	Actual Target Data
2005 (2005-2006)	35.47% of preschool children with IEPs who received all special education services in settings with typically developing peers.

**Environment Data Ages 3-5**

	Student Count	Total Students	Percent
Early childhood setting, home, part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education setting	5698	16066	35.47%

*Data Source: 2005 Federal Student Data Report*

WDPI decreased from 35.86% for the previous reporting period to 35.47% during this reporting period which is a difference of 0.39%. This decrease represents 63 students out of 16,066 total children (ages 3 through 5).

WDPI has included in the SPP accurate progress data from FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005, through June 30, 2006). Data are collected via WDPI child count software in which LEAs report data at the individual student level, as opposed to aggregate data. This ensures accurate data. (See SPP Indicator 20 for more information on efforts to ensure valid and reliable data.)

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-06:**

Slippage on this indicator may be due to a decrease in the percentage of children who receive services in general education settings and an increase in the percentage of children who receive

services in special education settings as a result of a need for receiving special education and related services in more restrictive settings as determined by an IEP team. Further analysis of the data indicates a trend of increasing services in part-time general/part-time special education environments. The percentage of children with services provided within the home has varied slightly from year to year. The category of itinerant services outside the home (3 hours or less per week) represents 22.59% (3,629 students) of children ages 3-5 with disabilities, and is a category not reflected in this indicator. This group of children is likely available for general education/activities with typically developing preschool children for the majority of the time, receiving special education only 3 hours or less per week. The percentage of children with services in separate schools decreased significantly this reporting period, from 0.58% to 0.42%.

WDPI completed the improvement activities as described in the SPP (see Indicator 6), including the following:

IDEA funded Preschool Discretionary statewide grants for training, technical assistance, and mini-grants to LEAs.

Statewide training on the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards includes information for community approaches for expanding service delivery options for children with disabilities.

Wisconsin Early Childhood Collaborating Partners (WECCP) has featured preschool options through videoconferences and regional activities throughout the state ([www.collaboratingpartners.com](http://www.collaboratingpartners.com)).

Community Collaboration Coaches, provided with braided funding from a number of state departments, foundations, and other agencies also focused on the expansion of service delivery options.

Environment code training is planned for 2006-07 with the focus on new environment codes for preschool. This training will be presented with webcast technology, making the information available at the consumers' convenience. Ongoing data verification activities to ensure accuracy of data will focus on preschool environment codes.

Stakeholders recognize the decision regarding the amount of time a child with a disability is removed from settings with typically developing peers is determined by an IEP team based upon the unique needs of the child. The Stakeholders do not intend for the targets to cause IEP teams to forego this decision making process.

WDPI will continue to monitor this indicator and provide technical assistance and training. The system of training and technical assistance for preschool LRE requirements and implementation will continue to be provided through the statewide grant projects, mini-grants to LEAs, activities of the WECCP, and Community Collaboration Coaches.

#### **Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2005-06:**

Each year beginning in 2006-2007, the state will gather monitoring data from one-fifth of the LEAs in the state through an LEA self-assessment of procedural requirements related to monitoring priority areas and SPP indicators. LEAs conduct the self-assessment using a sample of student individualized education program (IEP) records. Each year the cohort of districts are representative of the state considering such variables as disability categories, age, race, and gender. Milwaukee Public Schools, the only LEA with average daily membership of over 50,000, is included in the sample each year. WDPI will include every LEA in the state at least once during the course of the SPP. The self-assessment of procedural requirements includes data on each of the SPP indicators including requirements related to Indicator #6. LEAs will report the self-assessment results to WDPI, along with planned corrective actions. LEAs will be required to correct noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year from identification (see Indicator 15).

## Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

**Indicator 7:** Percent of preschool children 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))

**Measurement:**

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):
  - a. **Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by the (# 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 the (# 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 the (# 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 the (# 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 the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.**

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)
  - a. **Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by the (# 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 the (# 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 but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# 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 the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed times)] 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 the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.**

If a + b + c +d +e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:

- a. **Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by the (# 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 the (# 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 the (# 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 the (# 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 the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.**

If a + b + c +d +e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	N/A

**Actual Target Data for** *(Insert FFY):*

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for** *(Insert FFY):*

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for** *(Insert FFY)*  
*[If applicable]*

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

**Indicator 8:** 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))

**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.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	N/A

**Actual Target Data for** *(Insert FFY):*

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for** *(Insert FFY):*

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for** *(Insert FFY)*  
*[If applicable]*

**Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality**

**Indicator 9:** 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))

**Measurement:**

Percent = # of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification divided by # of districts in the State times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.”

Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	N/A

**Actual Target Data for** *(Insert FFY):*

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for** *(Insert FFY):*

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for** *(Insert FFY)*  
*[If applicable]*

**Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality**

**Indicator 10:** 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))

**Measurement:**

Percent = # of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification divided by # of districts in the State times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.”

Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	N/A

**Actual Target Data for** *(Insert FFY):*

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for** *(Insert FFY):*

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for** *(Insert FFY)*  
*[If applicable]*

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

**Indicator 11:** Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days (or State established timeline).

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

**Measurement:**

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # determined not eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).
- c. # determined eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).

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

Percent = b + c divided by a times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	N/A

**Actual Target Data for** *(Insert FFY):*

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for** *(Insert FFY):*

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for** *(Insert FFY)*  
*[If applicable]*

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

**Indicator 12:** 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))

**Measurement:**

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.

Account for children included in a but not included in b, c or d. 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) times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100%

**Actual Target Data for 2005-06:**

The 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 for the 2005-06 SY was 65.6%.

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination: 2,829
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays: 215
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays: 1,618
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services: 147

Calculation:  $1,618 / (2,829 - 215 - 147) = 65.6\%$

Account for children included in a but not included in b, c, or d:

90 of those referred were determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined after the third birthdays.

715 of those referred were found eligible and had an IEP developed and implemented after their third birthday.

44 of those referred reported delays in their eligibility determination for reasons other than parent refusal to provide consent.

The range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed: 1 to 365.

The reasons for the delays include:

- The referral was not made by Part C to the school district at least 90 days prior to the child's third birthday.
- The child was not available for the evaluation due to various circumstances such as being hospitalized, moving out of district, or family circumstances.
- The child moved into the district after the initial referral had been made.
- Parents did not provide timely consent for the evaluation.

*Data Source: Local Performance Plan (LPP)*

To ensure valid and reliable data for the required measurement, WDPI developed an electronic data collection system for the purpose of collecting data for this indicator. Beginning with the 2005-06 school year, all districts are required to submit this data annually for all children referred from Part C. The following data elements are collected through this electronic system:

- The number of referrals received from Part C to Part B between July, 1, 2005, and June 30, 2006.
- The number of students whose eligibility was not determined and the reasons for the determination not being made.
- The number of students found to be not eligible by their third birthday.
- The number of students found to be not eligible after their third birthday, the range of days beyond their third birthday, and the reasons for the delays.
- The number of students found to be eligible and whose IEP was developed and implemented by their third birthday.
- The number of students found to be eligible and whose IEP was developed and implemented after their third birthday, the range of days beyond their third birthday, and the reasons for the delays.

These data elements collected through this electronic data collection system allow WDPI to report the percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who were eligible for Part B and who had an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. WDPI staff reviewed the submitted data and contacted districts when reporting errors were identified. Districts resubmitted corrected data as necessary.

#### **Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-06:**

The number of children referred from Part C to Part B appears to be holding steady for the past two years. Further analysis indicates a lower percentage of referrals were found not eligible than the previous year. However, due to an incomplete data set, it is not possible to make additional comparisons between the 2004-05 baseline data and the 2005-06 progress data. For the 2004-05 baseline data, WDPI did not use the required measurement in reporting data. The State provided data regarding the percent of children referred by Part C who were found eligible by their third birthday, not, as required, the percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who were found eligible for Part B, and who had an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday. WDPI relied on data collected by the Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS). DHFS did not have firsthand knowledge as to whether or not an IEP was developed and implemented by a child's third birthday since this is WDPI's responsibility. For the 2005-06 SY, WDPI developed its own data collection system in order to include the required data and calculations in reporting performance on this indicator. WDPI collected this data from LEAs with direct access to placement data. WDPI provided written instructions and technical assistance to assist LEAs in their data reporting. LEAs were required to report data for the 2005-06 SY by December 2006.

Through the General Supervision Enhancement Grant (GSEG), WDPI will continue to work collaboratively with the Department of Health and Family Services to develop an electronic data collection system that links data between the departments.

Improvement activities as described in the SPP have been implemented during the 2005-06 SY. The major training product is "Ready, Set, Go...Transitions and Options" which provides information on the requirements and implementation strategies to promote effective early transitions.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2005-06:**

Revisions

WDPI will use the 2005-06 data to set a new baseline of 66.5% due to missing data elements not collected during the 2004-05 SY (see discussion above).

Improvement Activities

**Procedural Compliance Self-Assessment**

Each year beginning in 2006-2007, one-fifth of LEAs in the state conduct a self-assessment of procedural requirements related to monitoring priority areas and SPP indicators using a sample of student individualized education program (IEP) records. The self-assessment includes procedural requirements related to transition from Part C to B. All LEAs will conduct a self-assessment of procedural requirements during the current SPP time period. LEAs report the self-assessment results to WDPI, along with planned corrective actions. LEAs are required to correct noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year from identification. WDPI verifies correction.

**Interagency Agreements**

WDPI and WDHFS have created an advisory workgroup to guide the revision of current state interagency agreements related to Part C and Part B. This workgroup has met during 2006 to identify issues to be included in the agreement. The plan for this work includes a meeting of primary state partners on January 31, 2007, regional focus groups to identify practice issues during spring 2007, and implementation and training on the revised interagency agreement. The intent is to utilize the state agreement as a template for local early intervention and early childhood special education programs to develop local agreements. The activities associated with transition between programs including referral, transition planning conferences, and development and implementation of an IEP by the child's 3rd birthday are important aspects of the interagency agreements.

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

**Indicator 13:** Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.

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

**Measurement:**

Percent = # of youth with disabilities aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals divided by # of youth with an IEP age 16 and above times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	N/A

**Actual Target Data for** *(Insert FFY):*

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for** *(Insert FFY):*

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for** *(Insert FFY)*  
*[If applicable]*

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

**Indicator 14:** Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.

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

**Measurement:**

Percent = # of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school divided by # of youth assessed who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	N/A

**Actual Target Data for** *(Insert FFY):*

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for** *(Insert FFY):*

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for** *(Insert FFY)*  
*[If applicable]*

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

**Indicator 15:** General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

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

**Measurement:**  
 Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = b divided by a times 100.

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and enforcement actions that the State has taken.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% of LEAs correct noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year after identification.

**Actual Target Data for 2005-06:**

Wisconsin met its target for 2005-2006. 100% of Wisconsin's LEAs corrected noncompliance identified during the 2005-2006 no later than one year after identification. To ensure valid and reliable data, WDPI conducts activities (see below) to verify all noncompliance was corrected within one year of identification.

**Focused Monitoring**

During the 2005-2006 school year, focused monitoring in priority areas related to student outcomes was completed in six local educational agencies. Priority areas are eighth grade reading achievement and graduation rates. Through monitoring activities, noncompliance was identified in all six agencies. Areas of noncompliance included: secondary transition (3 LEAs), reporting progress on IEP annual goals to parents (1 LEA); student participation in the general curriculum (1 LEA); including supplementary aids and services in IEPs (3 LEAs); and failing to address children's individual special education and related services needs (1 LEA). WDPI conducted activities to verify all noncompliance in the six local educational agencies was corrected within one year of identification.

**Milwaukee Public Schools**

WDPI continued its oversight and activities in the Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS) to correct 62 issues related to continuing noncompliance identified prior to 2005-2006. These issues were identified through procedural compliance monitoring and IDEA state complaints. There are now seven remaining issues related to noncompliance. The seven issues include discipline (3 issues), school attendance (3 issues), and implementation of IEPs (1 issue).

**IDEA State Complaints**

Fifty-seven complaint decisions were issued between July 1, 2005, and June 30, 2006. Fifty of these investigations either resulted in no findings of noncompliance or corrective actions were completed within one year of the date of the decision. Consequently, of these decisions which resulted in findings of noncompliance, all corrective action was completed within one year of identification of noncompliance. Six decisions requiring corrective action were issued after February 1, 2006. Consequently, less than one year has passed since the finding of noncompliance. WDPI anticipates closure of each of these investigations within one year of identification of noncompliance. One decision was issued January 20, 2006, and remains open. All child-specific corrective action has been completed and, with one exception, all other corrective action has been completed. The district filed an action in court to challenge the department's decision, including the one corrective action directive which has yet to be completed. If the court ultimately agrees with the department's complaint decision, the department will ensure the remaining corrective measure is completed promptly. Areas of noncompliance identified through IDEA complaints included: 4 - Discipline; 2 - Evaluation; 1 - Placement; 17 - Proper IEP; 25 - Properly implemented IEP; 2 - Records; 7 - Referral; 4 - Transfer; and 3 - Other.

**Due Process Hearings**

Six due process hearing officer decisions were issued during the reporting period. No noncompliance was identified in these decisions.

**Mediation**

No noncompliance was identified through the Wisconsin Special Education Mediation System.

**Summary of Findings of Noncompliance**

ISSUE	# OF FINDINGS	IDEA COMPLAINT	FOCUSED MONITORING	MPS MONITORING
Properly implemented IEP	26	X		X
Proper IEP	21	X	X	
Referral	7	X		
Discipline	10	X		X
Transfer	4	X		
Secondary Transition	3		X	
Evaluation	2	X		
Placement	1	X		
Records	2	X		
Other	5	X	X	

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-06:****Focused Monitoring**

All noncompliance identified in 2005-2006 through focused monitoring was corrected within one year of identification. WDPI required districts to submit and implement corrective action plans to correct identified noncompliance. A WDPI consultant was assigned to each district to monitor progress and provide technical assistance. The districts identified with noncompliance related to transition requirements received technical assistance from the Wisconsin Statewide Transition Initiative (WSTI). WDPI verified noncompliance was corrected within one year of identification through an on-site review.

**Milwaukee Public Schools**

Prior to 2005-2006, WDPI required MPS to re-organize the district's administration of special education and improve its data system to provide increased accountability for its schools within a decentralized administrative model. As part of this model, the evaluation of school personnel includes data on the school's compliance with special education requirements. In this new model, nine MPS Special Education Leadership Liaisons (SELLs) report directly to the MPS Director of Special Services. Together, they are responsible to ensure compliance. Each SELL works with special services supervisors assigned to schools. WDPI requires MPS to provide ongoing training and increased supervision to its staff through its special education administrative structure. The training includes a system for reviewing work product and providing feedback on an ongoing basis during the school year. Annually, MPS performs a school-based assessment in conjunction with WDPI. The assessment data is used to plan both school-based and district-wide actions to ensure compliance. Progress has been due in large measure to the implementation of these activities.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2005-06**

**Milwaukee Public Schools**

Milwaukee Public Schools has made good progress in addressing the findings of noncompliance. During the 2005-06 SY, WDPI closed 55 of the 62 previously identified findings. WDPI will continue its oversight of MPS to obtain compliance on the remaining seven issues related to continuing noncompliance. In addition, during the 2006-2007 SY, schools in need of intensive intervention were identified and more substantial interventions are being carried out with these schools. MPS SELLs, the Director of Special Services, and other staff have developed a district-wide support plan to address the seven remaining issues. School-based actions to ensure compliance were planned and are being carried out. WDPI and MPS administration meet at least quarterly to review progress. The WDPI Urban Consultant provides weekly technical assistance within the district. In November 2006, WDPI informed MPS that if compliance is not obtained on the seven continuing issues by June 2007, WDPI will impose additional sanctions.

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

**Indicator 16:** Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

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

**Measurement:**

Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100%

**Actual Target Data for 2005-06:**

WDPI improved from 84% for the previous reporting period to 89% during this reporting period the percentage of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within a 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint (see Table 7). Additionally, performance through December 2006 continues to improve.

To assure data are valid and reliable, WDPI has a dedicated staff person (an office operations associate) whose responsibility it is to maintain the electronic complaint investigation log. The office operations associate meets with the complaint workgroup on a monthly basis to review data. Color-coded data reports are utilized to track progress. Consultants also review the reports for accuracy. The office operations associate completed Table 7 using the electronic complaint investigation log.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-06:**

The state continues to make progress towards the target of 100%. WDPI collects and maintains a log of multiple data elements related to complaint investigation information and reviews performance on a regular basis. Since progress is being made on this indicator, WDPI will continue the improvement activities noted in the State Performance Plan (specifying a date when materials are due; following the internal complaint procedures when materials have not been received timely; due date electronic reminders sent to complaint staff). Staff will continue to review performance on this indicator throughout the year and will consider initiating additional improvement activities if slippage is detected.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2005-06:**

In response to missing the FFY 2005 target of 100%, WDPI added an additional complaint investigator in January 2007 to the complaint workgroup, bringing to six the number of staff who investigate complaints. With the addition of this staff person, WDPI has a high level of confidence the 2006-07 target will be met.

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

**Indicator 17:** Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.

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

**Measurement:**

Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100%

**Actual Target Data for 2005-06:**

100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party (see Table 7).

When a hearing is requested, the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI), by contract with the Department of Administration--Division of Hearings and Appeals (DHA), appoints an impartial hearing officer to conduct the hearing. Since 1996, WDPI has contracted with DHA to complete IDEA due process hearings. DHA maintains an electronic tracking system which monitors decision due dates. The system tracks extensions of the initial 45-day time limit and the dates when the hearing is to occur and the decision is due. This information is available to each hearing officer. WDPI has maintained an electronic log of critical information related to receipt of due process hearing requests for many years. The information includes elements such as the names of the parties, filing date, initial 45-day time limit, dates of extensions and date of the decision. During the year, department staff also track hearing due dates. Department staff confer with DHA staff prior to reporting the timeliness of completed due process hearings to verify the data.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-06:**

WDPI completed improvement activities as described in the SPP.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2005-06 (if applicable):**

Not applicable.

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

**Indicator 18:** 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))

**Measurement:**

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	N/A

**Actual Target Data for** *(Insert FFY):*

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for** *(Insert FFY):*

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for** *(Insert FFY)*  
*[If applicable]*

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

**Indicator 19:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

**Measurement:**

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	At least 75% of mediations held will result in mediation agreements.

**Actual Target Data for 2005-06:**

SECTION B: Mediation requests	
(2) Mediation requests total	66
(2.1) Mediations Held	
(a) Mediations related to due process	11
(i) Mediation agreements	8
(b) Mediations not related to due process	37
(i) Mediation agreements	32
(2.2) Mediations not held (including pending)	18

During FFY 2005, a total of 48 mediations were held (11 related to due process and 37 not related to due process). Eight mediations related to due process resulted in an agreement. 32 mediations not related to due process resulted in an agreement.

**Measurement:**

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

8 + 32 divided by 48 times 100 = 83.33%.

To ensure reliability of data, the Wisconsin Special Education Mediation System (WSEMS) maintains a data base that includes tracking of the required data for Indicator 19. Personnel responsible for maintaining the data base have received training on reporting Indicator 19 data.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-06:**

WDPI exceeded its target rate of 75% for FFY 2005. To maintain the success of the mediation system, WSEMS uses a roster of mediators who are required by state law to attend a five-day training program and receive a one-day update training each year. For FFY 2005, the annual training was held on March 10, 2006. The training included information on changes in state law, mediation data for 2005-2006, and the role of attorneys in mediation based on case experiences.

An analysis of WSEMS survey data for 2005 FFY shows that participants, mediators, and attorneys believe mediation was helpful and that participants felt part of the decision-making process. Participants and attorneys reported that they would use mediation again, the mediator was neutral, and that they would use the same mediator. Participants also reported they were satisfied with the agreement. This survey data indicates WSEMS is providing an effective dispute resolution option.

Information about WSEMS is disseminated to parents and educators through trainings, conferences, and upon request. New special education directors receive information from WDPI on the system each fall. For FFY 2005, the WSEMS partners updated and expanded the mediation brochure. Outreach activities for FFY 2005 included presentations to parents on dispute resolution options in October 2005, a presentation on WSEMS to parents and educators in February 2006, and a presentation on "What Parents Need to Know about IDEA and Dispute Resolution Options" in April 2006. WSEMS partners also present at national conferences.

WSEMS is recognized as an exemplary model by the Consortium for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE). One of the WSEMS' partners serves on CADRE's Advisory Board. WDPI will continue to implement improvement activities as described in the SPP.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2005-06:** *[If applicable]*

Not applicable.

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

**Indicator 20:** State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

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

**Measurement:**

State reported data, including 618 data and annual performance reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity, placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports); and
- b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring error-free, consistent, valid and reliable data and evidence that these standards are met).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100%

**Actual Target Data for 2005-06:**

98% of State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. All 618 data reports were submitted prior to the due dates with the exception of exit data. The SPP and APR include the required baseline and progress data.

WDPI ensures the reliability and validity of the data collected using:

- Defined values for data elements
- Automated validations/edit checks to prevent data mismatches to be submitted
- Edit checks to prevent null and invalid values to be submitted
- Written technical instructions outlining application use
- Basic collected data and calculating derived data in a consistent manner for all LEAs
- Statewide technical training in the use of the specific data applications provided to LEAs and vendors
- Disability specific identification checklists
- Data dictionary with common definitions across data collections (being developed)
- Statewide training on specific data elements (for example, educational environment, eligibility criteria)
- Web posting of statewide training or ongoing user access (for example, educational environment)
- Review of submitted data by WDPI staff for anomalies and contacts to districts when anomalies are identified
- Summary reports generated after data has been submitted and LEAs provided a window of time for data corrections

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-06:**

WDPI made progress in meeting the target for this indicator. WDPI improved from 90% for the previous reporting period to 98% during this reporting period. WDPI has included both baseline data from FFY 2004 (July 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005) and progress data from FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005, through June 30, 2006) for Indicators 1 and 2 in the SPP and APR.

The necessary graduation and dropout data for the required baseline data year of 2004-05 was not available at the time of submission of the SPP. This was because WDPI was using two data collection reports, the Federal Student Data Report (child count) and Individual Student Enrollment System (ISES). The Federal Student Data Report was used to accurately and timely complete the 618 Data Table 4 – Exiting Special Education. ISES data was used to report baseline data for SPP Indicators 1 & 2 because a comparison of all students was required and the child count report only includes students with disabilities. With ISES being a new data collection system, WDPI allowed districts as much time as possible to submit the data which meant it was not available by December 1, 2005, to include in the SPP. ISES uses a unique student identification number for every student which will allow a cohort of children with and without disabilities to be tracked over time. This data will enable staff to gather reliable data on how children with disabilities perform or improve as compared to their nondisabled peers. During the 2004-05 SY, LEAs were more experienced with submitting data via ISES, so WDPI did not extend the timeline for LEAs to submit their data. In addition, staff from the WDPI Special Education Team work collaboratively with staff from the WDPI Office of Educational Accountability and the Applications Development Team to ensure the required data were available for submission with the APR.

WDPI has clarified in the SPP that the confusion LEAs exhibited during the six-year onsite compliance monitoring cycle regarding the meaning of two data concepts: 1) the amount of time a child with a disability is removed from the regular classroom and 2) the amount of special education a child receives according to his or her individualized education program (IEP) did not impact the 2004-05 data submitted under Indicator 5 in the SPP. WDPI required all districts with identified errors to submit a corrective action plan and correct all noncompliance. During the 2004-2005 school year, WDPI concluded its verification activities, having verified correction of all previously identified noncompliance including requirements related to amount of removal. WDPI will continue to monitor for understanding of these requirements through the LEA Procedural Compliance Self-Assessment and data verification activities.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2005-06:**

WDPI has reconsidered the baseline data provided for Indicator 20 of the SPP and provided more accurate information. WDPI previously misunderstood that the state had met the requirement by submitting 618 data in a timely and accurate manner. WDPI did not take into consideration that the correct baseline data was not available for the SPP. WDPI has revised the baseline data from 100% to 90% of State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

Staff from the WDPI Special Education Team continue to work collaboratively with staff from the WDPI Office of Educational Accountability and the Applications Development Team to ensure the required data (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity, placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports) are available for submission. Improvement activities to ensure data accuracy and timeliness have been added as described in the SPP.