Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

General Supervision System:

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

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

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

2) Data collection and fiscal monitoring. WDPI collects data related to SPP indicators and priority areas through the Wisconsin Student Assessment System, the Individual Student Enrollment System (ISES), Indicator 7 Child Outcomes, Indicator 8 Parent Involvement Survey, Post High School Outcomes Survey, and the LEA Local Performance Plan (LPP). Each school year, all Wisconsin LEAs, including charter schools, complete and submit an annual LPP to the WDPI for review. The LPP is an internet application and is 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. The LPP is reviewed by a WDPI consultant assigned to work with the individual LEA. Risk-based monitoring is conducted when warranted.

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

4) Effective, responsive dispute resolution process. WDPI has established effective, responsive systems for IDEA complaints, due process hearings, and mediation.

IDEA Complaints

WDPI is responsible for investigating complaints and issuing decisions within 60 calendar days of receipt of the complaint. WDPI staff review all relevant information and make an independent determination, based upon a preponderance of the evidence, about whether the district has met a requirement. WDPI's decision includes findings of fact and a conclusion for each issue. The complaint is closed when the WDPI verifies the LEA: 1.) corrected each individual case of student-specific noncompliance; and 2.) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s).

Due Process

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

Mediation

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

the mediation process.

5) Procedural Compliance Self-Assessment. WDPI uses a Procedural Compliance Self-Assessment (PCSA) to identify and correct noncompliance. Items in the PCSA are related to monitoring priority areas and SPP/APR indicators. Annually, the state gathers monitoring data from approximately one-fifth of the LEAs in the state through the PCSA. Each cohort of districts is representative of the state considering such variables as geography, disability categories, age, race, and gender. WDPI includes every LEA in the PCSA at least once during the course of the SPP and each district with an average daily membership greater than 50,000 every year. To assure valid and reliable data, the PCSA checklist includes standards and directions for reviewing the procedural requirements and WDPI provides web-based training in how to conduct the PCSA. Information about the PCSA is posted on the WDPI website at http://sped.dpi.wi.gov/sped_spp-selfassmt.

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

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

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

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

WDPI also has a system of categorical program area Program Support Teachers (PST). PSTs are special education teacher-leaders and administrators to whom technical assistance is systematically provided on a regular basis by WDPI categorical program area consultants. PSTs act as conduits between WDPI and LEA programs. Technical assistance is provided in the form of in-person meetings and conferences, online communities of practice, web-based resources, and regular listserv communications.

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

- The Wisconsin Special Education Regional Service Network (http://sped.dpi.wi.gov/sped_rsn)
- Wisconsin Statewide Parent Educator Initiative (http://wspei.org/)
- Disproportionality Technical Assistance Network (http://www.thenetworkwi.com/)
- Early Childhood Program Support and Leadership (http://ec.dpi.wi.gov/ec_ecspedhm)
- Wisconsin RtI Center (http://www.wisconsinrticenter.org/)
- Wisconsin Special Education Mediation System (http://www.wsems.us/)
- Transition Improvement Grant (http://www.witig.org/)
- 2r Charter School Special Education Capacity Building Initiative (http://sped.dpi.wi.gov/sped_grt_disc)

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

To ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities, WDPI has prioritized state IDEA discretionary funds for creating, scaling up, and sustaining systems change initiatives with a focus on improved results for students with disabilities. Through these initiatives, WDPI funds professional development providers regionally throughout the state in order to equitably address the unique needs within different areas of the state. Each initiative has mechanisms for ensuring fidelity of professional development provision, as well as evaluation processes to determine impact on service providers' practice, and, where available, impact on student-level outcomes. Each initiative has a focus on unique results for students with disabilities, while each is currently increasing its capacity to additionally address Wisconsin's State Identified Measurable Result: literacy outcomes for students with disabilities.

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

- The Wisconsin Special Education Regional Service Network (http://sped.dpi.wi.gov/sped_rsn)
- Wisconsin RtI Center (http://www.wisconsinrticenter.org/)
- Wisconsin Statewide Parent Educator Initiative (http://wspei.org/)
- Transition Improvement Grant (http://www.witig.org/)
- Disproportionality Technical Assistance Network (http://www.thenetworkwi.com/)
- Early Childhood Program Support and Leadership (http://ec.dpi.wi.gov/ec_ecspedhm)
- State Personnel Develoment Grant: A Focus On Professional Learning Communities (http://sped.dpi.wi.gov/sped_grt_spdgdisc)
- 2r Charter School Special Education Capacity Building Initiative (http://sped.dpi.wi.gov/sped_grt_disc)

Stakeholder Involvement:

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

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

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2012 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2012 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2012 APR in 2014, is available.

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

Indicator 1: Graduation

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		84.08%	84.08%	80.00%	80.00%	85.00%	87.00%	85.00%
Data	81.40%	80.39%	79.20%	79.20%	79.30%	79.75%	67.10%	68.60%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2012-13 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/15/2014	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	5,090	
SY 2012-13 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/15/2014	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	7,409	
SY 2012-13 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	9/23/2014	2012-13 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	68.70%	Calculate

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2012 Data	FFY 2013 Target	FFY 2013 Data
5,090	7,409	68.60%	85.00%	68.70%

Graduation Conditions Field

Provide the four-year graduation cohort rate. The four-year graduation rate follows a cohort, or a group of students, who begin as first-time 9th graders in a particular school year and who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less. An extended-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for an additional year or years. The cohort is "adjusted" by adding any students transferring into the cohort and by subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during the years covered by the rate.

Under 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(iv), a "regular high school diploma" means the standard high school diploma awarded to students in a State that is fully aligned with the State's academic content standards and does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance, or any alternative award. The term "regular high school diploma" also includes a "higher diploma" that is awarded to students who complete requirements above and beyond what is required for a regular diploma.

The four-year graduation cohort rate for FFY 2013 reporting is 68.70%

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

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

1. In the high school grades, at least 4 credits of English including writing composition, 3 credits of social studies including state and local government, 3 credits of mathematics, 3 credits of science and 1.5 credits of physical education.
2. In grades 7 to 12, at least 0.5 credit of health education.

The state superintendent encourages school boards to require an additional 8.5 credits selected from any combination of vocational education, foreign languages, fine arts and other courses.

A school board may identify alternative means to satisfy academic performance criteria under its high school graduation policy. Whatever approaches a school board chooses, it should be clearly stated within the local school board graduation policy and followed by individualized education program (IEP) teams or other staff involved in decisions about a student’s academic performance.

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

1. The pupil was enrolled in an alternative education program, as defined in s. 115.28(7)(e)1.
2. The school board determines that the pupil has demonstrated a level of proficiency in the subjects listed in par. (a) equivalent to that which he or she would have attained if he or she had satisfied the requirements under par. (a).

School boards may develop policies under section PI 18.04 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code to issue a diploma to a student who has successfully completed his or her IEP program.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≤		1.67%	1.67%	1.67%	2.49%	2.39%	2.29%	2.19%
Data	2.13%	2.61%	2.59%	2.59%	2.38%	2.67%	2.46%	1.96%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	1.90%	1.80%	1.70%	1.60%	1.50%	1.40%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21)	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
916	52,409	1.96%	1.90%	1.75%

☑ **Use a different calculation methodology**

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

WDPI uses the annual event dropout rate for students leaving in a single year in accordance with the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) guidance. The calculation is the percentage of youth with IEPs age 14-21 who exit special education as a result of dropping out relative to all youth with IEPs ages 14-21 who are expected to graduate in a given year. WDPI is reporting 2012-2013 data for FFY 2013.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

A. **Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.**
B. **Participation rate for children with IEPs.**
C. **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.**

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥								
Data								

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	15.00%	15.00%	15.50%	15.50%	16.00%	16.30%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

WDPI is using FFY 2013 for the revised baseline data as they represent the most current data available, and are based upon the most rigorous benchmarks to date for the students with disabilities subgroup.

Please see Attachment A for historical data and targets, and Attachment B for FFY 2013 results.

WDPI staff presented background information, new baseline and target options for Indicator 3A at the January 2015 meeting of the State Superintendent's Council on Special Education (see Introduction to the SPP/APR for more information on the Council). Following analysis and discussion, stakeholders voiced their approval via consensus vote.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Does your State have an ESEA Flexibility Waiver of determining AYP? (•) Yes ( ) No

Are you reporting AYP or AMO? ( ) AYP (•) AMO

Number of districts in the State	Number of districts that met the minimum "n" size	Number of districts that meet the minimum "n" size AND met AMO	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
449				15.00%	

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

Please see Attachment A for historical data and targets, and Attachment B for FFY 2013 results.

For FFY 2013 reporting, there were 266 districts meeting the minimum "n" size of 20 students with disabilities (SwD) for

a particular tested grade band. Of these districts, 43 met annual measurable objectives (AMOs) for reading and 40 met AMOs for math. Consequently, 16.2% of districts met AMOs for reading and 15% met AMOs for math. Slippage of 61.4% for reading and 56.7% for math are in part a result of two factors:

1.) a decrease in the minimum cell size from 40 to 20 full academic year (FAY) district students, which resulted in the doubling of the Indicator 3A denominator relative to FFY 2012 reporting; and

2.) the steep increase in proficiency expected for the students with disabilities subgroup set under Wisconsin's approved Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) flexibility waiver.

Using 2011-12 data, AMOs were set to move all schools in the state to the level of those schools currently performing at the 90th percentile within six years. That is, by 2016-17, the expectation is for all schools to have all student groups reach 50% reading proficiency and 65% mathematics proficiency or higher. Thus, under the waiver, the students with disabilities subgroup is expected to meet proficiency targets that, increase respectively by 6% and 7.4% annually for reading and math.

For further description of how AMOs were set please refer to the following webpage http://oea.dpi.wi.gov/acct/amo.

Due to the change in minimum cell size noted above, data reported in this FFY 2013 APR are considered baseline.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

A. **Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.**
B. **Participation rate for children with IEPs.**
C. **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.**

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Reading	A Grade 3	2005	Target ≥		95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data	99.15%	98.34%	98.30%	98.96%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.20%
	B Grade 4	2005	Target ≥		95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data	99.13%	98.64%	98.19%	99.04%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.50%
	C Grade 5	2005	Target ≥		95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data	99.57%	98.75%	98.81%	99.25%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.40%
	D Grade 6	2005	Target ≥		95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data	99.22%	98.98%	98.68%	99.20%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.20%
	E Grade 7	2005	Target ≥		95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data	98.99%	98.98%	98.55%	99.21%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.20%
	F Grade 8	2005	Target ≥		95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data	98.71%	98.45%	98.17%	99.01%	99.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.90%
	G Grade 10	2005	Target ≥		95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data	96.33%	96.61%	96.00%	97.40%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.80%
Math	A Grade 3	2005	Target ≥		95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data	99.14%	99.20%	99.14%	99.52%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.40%
	B Grade 4	2005	Target ≥		95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data	99.26%	99.24%	98.68%	99.42%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.60%
	C Grade 5	2005	Target ≥		95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data	99.46%	99.33%	98.97%	99.42%	99.00%	100%	99.00%	99.40%
	D Grade 6	2005	Target ≥		95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data	99.30%	98.90%	98.69%	99.44%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.30%
	E Grade 7	2005	Target ≥		95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data	98.98%	99.20%	98.57%	99.42%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.30%
	F Grade 8	2005	Target ≥		95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data	98.61%	98.55%	98.08%	99.30%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	98.90%
	G Grade 10	2005	Target ≥		95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data	96.42%	96.70%	95.96%	97.44%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.40%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018

	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Grade 3	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	B ≥ Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	C ≥ Grade 5	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	D ≥ Grade 6	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	E ≥ Grade 7	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	F ≥ Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	G ≥ Grade 10	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A ≥ Grade 3	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	B ≥ Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	C ≥ Grade 5	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	D ≥ Grade 6	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	E ≥ Grade 7	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	F ≥ Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	G ≥ Grade 10	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

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

Data Source: SY 2013-14 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) **Date:** 12/18/2014

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	8142	8526	8593	8528	8788	8817	0	8479	0	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	3190	2708	2267	2229	2284	2256		2997			

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	4126	4946	5429	5367	5571	5556		4536			
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	761	817	853	859	863	910		764			

Data Source: SY 2013-14 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C185; Data Group: 588) **Date:** 12/18/2014

Math assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	8146	8533	8597	8532	8791	8818	0	8479	0	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	3048	2504	2111	1874	1952	1900		2584			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	4276	5156	5588	5726	5908	5919		4926			
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	759	815	850	856	858	908		763			

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Grade 3	8,142	8,077	99.20%	95.00%	99.20%
B Grade 4	8,526	8,471	99.50%	95.00%	99.35%
C Grade 5	8,593	8,549	99.40%	95.00%	99.49%
D Grade 6	8,528	8,455	99.20%	95.00%	99.14%
E Grade 7	8,788	8,718	99.20%	95.00%	99.20%
F Grade 8	8,817	8,722	98.90%	95.00%	98.92%
G Grade 10	8,479	8,297	97.80%	95.00%	97.85%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Grade 3	8,146	8,083	99.40%	95.00%	99.23%
B Grade 4	8,533	8,475	99.60%	95.00%	99.32%
C Grade 5	8,597	8,549	99.40%	95.00%	99.44%
D Grade 6	8,532	8,456	99.30%	95.00%	99.11%
E Grade 7	8,791	8,718	99.30%	95.00%	99.17%
F Grade 8	8,818	8,727	98.90%	95.00%	98.97%
G Grade 10	8,479	8,273	97.40%	95.00%	97.57%

Public Reporting Information

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

Data posted on the WDPI website: WISEdash (Wisconsin Information System for Education Data Dashboard) at http://wisedash.dpi.wi.gov/

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

A. **Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.**
B. **Participation rate for children with IEPs.**
C. **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.**

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Reading	A Grade 3	2011	Target ≥		67.50%	74.00%	74.00%	74.00%	80.50%	19.80%	25.80%
			Data	50.37%	50.64%	51.47%	50.85%	51.00%	51.00%	17.00%	17.40%
	B Grade 4	2011	Target ≥		67.50%	74.00%	74.00%	74.00%	80.50%	19.80%	25.80%
			Data	52.94%	52.35%	50.20%	51.43%	51.00%	53.00%	17.00%	15.60%
	C Grade 5	2011	Target ≥		67.50%	74.00%	74.00%	74.00%	80.50%	19.80%	25.80%
			Data	49.76%	52.74%	52.60%	47.59%	46.00%	54.00%	15.00%	15.60%
	D Grade 6	2011	Target ≥		67.50%	74.00%	74.00%	74.00%	80.50%	19.80%	25.80%
			Data	47.00%	50.98%	50.95%	48.07%	51.00%	53.00%	14.00%	13.30%
	E Grade 7	2011	Target ≥		67.50%	74.00%	74.00%	74.00%	80.50%	19.80%	25.80%
			Data	47.12%	49.47%	49.53%	51.67%	53.00%	53.00%	14.00%	13.90%
	F Grade 8	2011	Target ≥		67.50%	74.00%	74.00%	74.00%	80.50%	19.80%	25.80%
			Data	49.19%	47.85%	46.97%	50.48%	48.00%	53.00%	11.00%	13.30%
	G Grade 10	2011	Target ≥		67.50%	74.00%	74.00%	74.00%	80.50%	19.80%	25.80%
			Data	32.10%	33.40%	31.82%	35.84%	38.00%	36.00%	14.00%	13.90%
Math	A Grade 3	2011	Target ≥		47.50%	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%	68.50%	28.20%	35.60%
			Data	49.65%	52.97%	53.90%	55.40%	57.00%	54.00%	32.00%	28.80%
	B Grade 4	2011	Target ≥		47.50%	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%	68.50%	28.20%	35.60%
			Data	48.21%	53.21%	51.72%	58.88%	58.00%	55.00%	30.00%	27.60%
	C Grade 5	2011	Target ≥		47.50%	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%	68.50%	28.20%	35.60%
			Data	43.00%	46.54%	46.66%	51.10%	51.00%	51.00%	26.00%	25.10%
	D Grade 6	2011	Target ≥		47.50%	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%	68.50%	28.20%	35.60%
			Data	37.35%	42.36%	41.07%	43.12%	44.00%	46.00%	20.00%	22.40%
	E Grade 7	2011	Target ≥		47.50%	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%	68.50%	28.20%	35.60%
			Data	36.27%	42.55%	40.62%	42.81%	47.00%	44.00%	18.00%	17.80%
	F Grade 8	2011	Target ≥		47.50%	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%	68.50%	28.20%	35.60%
			Data	34.86%	36.64%	36.73%	43.02%	42.00%	43.00%	16.00%	16.10%
	G Grade 10	2011	Target ≥		47.50%	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%	68.50%	28.20%	35.60%
			Data	28.38%	28.80%	25.79%	29.25%	29.00%	31.00%	14.00%	14.40%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018

	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Grade 3	31.80%	37.80%	43.80%	49.80%	55.80%	61.80%
	B ≥ Grade 4	31.80%	37.80%	43.80%	49.80%	55.80%	61.80%
	C ≥ Grade 5	31.80%	37.80%	43.80%	49.80%	55.80%	61.80%
	D ≥ Grade 6	31.80%	37.80%	43.80%	49.80%	55.80%	61.80%
	E ≥ Grade 7	31.80%	37.80%	43.80%	49.80%	55.80%	61.80%
	F ≥ Grade 8	31.80%	37.80%	43.80%	49.80%	55.80%	61.80%
	G ≥ Grade 10	31.80%	37.80%	43.80%	49.80%	55.80%	61.80%
Math	A ≥ Grade 3	43.00%	50.40%	57.80%	65.20%	72.60%	80.00%
	B ≥ Grade 4	43.00%	50.40%	57.80%	65.20%	72.60%	80.00%
	C ≥ Grade 5	43.00%	50.40%	57.80%	65.20%	72.60%	80.00%
	D ≥ Grade 6	43.00%	50.40%	57.80%	65.20%	72.60%	80.00%
	E ≥ Grade 7	43.00%	50.40%	57.80%	65.20%	72.60%	80.00%
	F ≥ Grade 8	43.00%	50.40%	57.80%	65.20%	72.60%	80.00%
	G ≥ Grade 10	43.00%	50.40%	57.80%	65.20%	72.60%	80.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Grade 3	8,077	1,452	17.40%	31.80%	17.98%
B Grade 4	8,471	1,418	15.60%	31.80%	16.74%
C Grade 5	8,549	1,250	15.60%	31.80%	14.62%

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
D Grade 6	8,455	1,114	13.30%	31.80%	13.18%
E Grade 7	8,718	1,211	13.90%	31.80%	13.89%
F Grade 8	8,722	1,066	13.30%	31.80%	12.22%
G Grade 10	8,297	1,144	13.90%	31.80%	13.79%

Explanation of Group F Slippage

While annual changes in proficiency as measured in these tables represent different student cohorts, WDPI is pleased to report no significant slippage in seven of eight grade groups. As part of the state's broader efforts under Results Driven Accountability (RDA) - a statewide focus on improved literacy outcomes for students with disabilities - WDPI will analyze factors that may be associated with this slippage and incorporate improvement strategies into Indicator 17 - the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) such that grade groups demonstrate continued improvement. WDPI is currently engaging several internal and external stakeholder groups in addition to the State Superintendent's Council on Special Education to help identify high leverage strategies for improvement that will also be included in the SSIP.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Grade 3	8,083	2,462	28.80%	43.00%	30.46%
B Grade 4	8,475	2,437	27.60%	43.00%	28.76%
C Grade 5	8,549	2,153	25.10%	43.00%	25.18%
D Grade 6	8,456	1,721	22.40%	43.00%	20.35%
E Grade 7	8,718	1,641	17.80%	43.00%	18.82%
F Grade 8	8,727	1,442	16.10%	43.00%	16.52%
G Grade 10	8,273	1,103	14.40%	43.00%	13.33%

Explanation of Group D Slippage

While annual changes in proficiency as measured in these tables represent different student cohorts, WDPI is pleased to report no significant slippage in six of eight grade groups. WDPI will analyze factors that may be associated with this slippage and implement improvement strategies through the State Personnel Development Grant, the IDEA Discretionary Grant Network, and other statewide initiatives/grants focusing on academic achievement. While achievement in mathematics showed greater grade group slippage for FFY 2013 reporting, stakeholders recommended a focus on improving statewide literacy achievement across grade-spans, primary disability categories, and geographic regions. Part of the logic behind the choice of focusing on reading over math was the widely shared belief that improved literacy will yield improved outcomes within other subject areas such as math.

Explanation of Group G Slippage

While annual changes in proficiency as measured in these tables represent different student cohorts, WDPI is pleased to report no significant slippage in six of eight grade groups. WDPI will analyze factors that may be associated with this slippage and implement improvement strategies through the State Personnel Development Grant, the IDEA Discretionary Grant Network, and other statewide initiatives/grants focusing on academic achievement. While achievement in mathematics showed greater grade group slippage for FFY 2013 reporting, stakeholders recommended a focus on improving statewide literacy achievement across grade-spans, primary disability categories, and geographic regions. Part of the logic behind the choice of focusing on reading over math was the widely shared belief that improved literacy will yield improved outcomes within other subject areas such as math.

Public Reporting Information

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

Data posted on the WDPI website: WISEdash (Wisconsin Information System for Education Data Dashboard) at http://wisedash.dpi.wi.gov/

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≤		3.19%	2.96%	2.96%	2.73%	2.51%	2.28%	2.05%
Data	4.00%	1.14%	0.68%	0.68%	0.68%	0.45%	0.90%	1.13%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

WDPI staff presented background information and target options for Indicators 4A and 7 at the July 2014 meeting of the State Superintendent's Council on Special Education (see Introduction to the SPP/APR for more information on the Council). WDPI identifies LEAs as having a significant discrepancy if the percent of students with IEPs suspended or expelled for greater than ten days is two standard deviations above the statewide average, and at least two students with IEPs were suspended or expelled for greater than ten days. Given the nature of this calculation, WDPI reccomended a static target of 2.50% of LEAs, which aligns with the criterion of two standard deviations greater than the state mean. Council unanimously approved these targets.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

(•) Number of districts in the State
( ) Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
7	445	1.13%	2.50%	1.57%

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

(•) Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State
( ) The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

WDPI defines signifcant discrepancy as LEAs with a rate of suspension or expulsion of greater than ten days for students with IEPs as two standard deviations above the statewide risk (mean). For FFY 2013 reporting the statewide risk was 0.233% and the standard deviation was 0.73%. Thus, LEAs with a rate of suspension or expulsion greater than 1.693% were identified with significant discrepancy.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

FFY 2012 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY2013 using 2012-2013 data)

Description of review

For LEAs identified in FFY 2013 with significant discrepancy (using 2012-13 data), a review was conducted of the LEAs' policies, procedures, and practices that impact suspension and expulsion rates, including the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). Based on the department's review, WDPI determined the policies, procedures, and practices were in compliance for all LEAs identified under Indicator 4A.

- The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)
- The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
2	2	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

WDPI has verified correction of noncompliance for the two LEAs identified with noncompliance. The LEAs had policies and procedures that were in compliance, and therefore, no revisions were required. However, implementation of requirements was in error. Consequently, WDPI required the LEAa to revise its practices and verified, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, within one year from the date of written notification that each LEA was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a review of updated data; and had corrected the individual cases of noncompliance. To verify the LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirement, WDPI reviewed updated data collected through on-site monitoring; WDPI selected and reviewed a reasonable sample of records to ensure 100% compliance.

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

To verify correction of each individual case of noncompliance, WDPI reviewed the student records that were in error and

ensured the noncompliance was corrected.

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data					0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

Number of districts in the State

Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
8	0	445	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

WDPI defines signifcant discrepancy as LEAs with a rate of suspension or expulsion of greater than ten days for students with IEPs within each racial/ethnic subgroup as two standard deviations above the statewide risk (mean). For FFY 2013 reporting the statewide risk was 0.233% and the standard deviation was 0.73%. Thus, LEAs with a rate of suspension or expulsion greater than 1.693% were identified with significant discrepancy.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

FFY 2012 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY2013 using 2012-2013 data)

Description of review

For the LEAs identified in FFY 2013 with significant discrepancy (using 2012-2013 data), a review was conducted of the LEAs' policies, procedures, and practices that impact suspension and expulsion rates, including the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). WDPI then conducted additional data reviews and interviews using standard protocols. Based on the department's review, WDPI determined the policies, procedures, and practices were in compliance for all LEAs identified under 4B.

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

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
4	4	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

WDPI has verified correction of noncompliance for the four LEAs identified with noncompliance. The LEAs had policies and procedures that were in compliance, and therefore, no revisions were required. However, procedural requirements were not properly implemented. Consequently, WDPI required the LEAs to revise its practices and, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, verified within one year from the date of written notification that each LEA was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement based on a review of updated data; and had corrected each individual case of noncompliance. To verify the LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, WDPI reviewed updated data collected through on-site monitoring; WDPI selected and reviewed a reasonable sample of records to ensure 100% compliance.

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

To verify correction of each individual case of noncompliance, WDPI reviewed the student records that were in error and ensured the noncompliance was corrected.

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	62.00%	63.60%	65.20%	66.80%	68.40%	70.00%
Target B ≤	9.90%	9.50%	9.10%	8.70%	8.30%	7.90%
Target C ≤	1.20%	1.15%	1.10%	1.05%	1.00%	0.95%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	106,488	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	67,658	

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	10,384	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	1,015	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	250	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	222	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	67,658	106,488	61.91%	62.00%	63.54%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	10,384	106,488	9.97%	9.90%	9.75%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,487	106,488	1.23%	1.20%	1.40%

Explanation of C Slippage

There was an increase of .17 (167 students) in the percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. 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. An analysis of the data, shows the greatest increase is in the placement of students in private separate schools. LEAs periodically cite the reason they use segregated sites is due to student mental health issues that create a safety issue at the school or require more intensive attention than the school district is able to provide.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

A. **Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and**
B. **Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.**

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2011	Target ≥								32.00%
		Data							30.98%	32.56%
B	2011	Target ≤								25.00%
		Data							25.89%	22.25%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	32.50%	33.50%	34.50%	35.50%	36.50%	37.50%
Target B ≤	22.25%	21.25%	20.25%	19.25%	18.25%	17.25%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	16,166	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	5,550	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	3,202	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec	7/3/2014	b2. Number of children attending separate school	84	

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
C089; Data group 613)				
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	2	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	5,550	16,166	32.56%	32.50%	34.33%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	3,288	16,166	22.25%	22.25%	20.34%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A1	2012	Target ≥					79.20%	79.40%	79.60%	
		Data				79.00%	78.40%	79.30%	80.50%	78.20%
A2	2012	Target ≥					69.70%	69.90%	70.10%	
		Data				69.50%	67.00%	65.70%	69.10%	72.50%
B1	2012	Target ≥					82.10%	82.30%	82.50%	
		Data				81.90%	82.10%	80.70%	82.80%	79.50%
B2	2012	Target ≥					61.90%	70.10%	70.30%	
		Data				61.70%	59.60%	54.70%	59.20%	60.80%
C1	2012	Target ≥					82.00%	82.20%	82.40%	
		Data				81.80%	83.40%	82.10%	83.50%	78.20%
C2	2012	Target ≥					80.40%	80.50%	80.60%	
		Data				80.30%	79.50%	78.60%	79.70%	81.30%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	78.50%	78.70%	78.90%	79.10%	79.30%	79.50%
Target A2 ≥	72.50%	73.00%	73.50%	74.00%	74.50%	75.00%
Target B1 ≥	79.50%	79.85%	80.20%	80.55%	80.90%	81.25%
Target B2 ≥	61.00%	61.20%	61.40%	61.60%	61.80%	62.00%
Target C1 ≥	78.50%	78.90%	79.30%	79.70%	80.10%	80.50%
Target C2 ≥	81.50%	81.70%	81.90%	82.10%	82.30%	82.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

WDPI staff presented background information and target options for Indicators 4A and 7 at the July 2014 meeting of the State Superintendent's Council on Special Education (see Introduction to the SPP/APR for more information on the Council). Following analysis and discussion stakeholders approved Indicator 7 targets by consensus.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	5,101

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	38
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	630
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	926
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,626
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,881

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	2,552	3,220	78.20%	78.50%	79.25%
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	3,507	5,101	72.50%	72.50%	68.75%

Explanation of A2 Slippage

Districts have participated in data reviews focusing on data accuracy as well as other professional development specific to Indicator 7 child outcomes ratings. As a result of these opportunies, the accuracy of both entry and exit outcome ratings has improved.

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	21
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	748
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,372
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,273
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	687

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	3,645	4,414	79.50%	79.50%	82.58%
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	2,960	5,101	60.80%	61.00%	58.03%

Explanation of B2 Slippage

Districts have participated in data reviews focusing on data accuracy as well as other professional development specific to Indicator 7 child outcomes ratings. As a result of these opportunies, the accuracy of both entry and exit outcome ratings

has improved.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	24
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	478
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	576
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,525
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,498

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	2,101	2,603	78.20%	78.50%	80.71%
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	4,023	5,101	81.30%	81.50%	78.87%

Explanation of C2 Slippage

Districts have participated in data reviews focusing on data accuracy as well as other professional development specific to Indicator 7 child outcomes ratings. As a result of these opportunies, the accuracy of both entry and exit outcome ratings has improved.

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? Yes

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2013 in the FFY 2013 APR.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

The State has reported progress data and actual target data for FFY 2013 in the FFY 2013 APR.

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2012

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		72.30%	76.10%	79.90%	70.00%	72.50%	75.00%	77.50%
Data	72.04%	73.57%	73.41%	72.77%	70.99%	78.27%	78.30%	78.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	85.00%	85.50%	86.00%	86.50%	87.00%	87.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Previously, determination of whether the state was meeting Indicator 8 targets was determined by using a version of process capability analysis. The capability analysis employed by WDPI used the observed lowest performance limit on any of the performance measures / survey questions. WDPI reported the lowest agreement item on the NCSEAM preschool and school age surveys as its Indicator 8 performance measure. From 2005 onward the lowest item of agreement was question 21 on the preschool survey and question 25 on the school age survey: "the school explains what options parents have if they disagree with a decision of the school."

At the July 2014 State Superintendent's Council on Special Education meeting (see Introduction to the SPP/APR for more information on the Council), WDPI proposed changing the calcuation to a simple average of agreement of all questions on the NCSEAM survey. Stakeholders were in strong favor of this change citing both transparency and ease of explanation of the calculation.

WDPI staff presented background information and target options for Indicators 8 and 14 at the October 2014 meeting of the Council. Following analysis and discussion, stakeholders approved the Indicator 8 targets by consensus.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
36,490	42,385	78.00%	85.00%	86.09%

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

WDPI uses the following methodology for calculating Indicator 8: # of respondents that agree with questions 1,...,22 (preschool survey) + # of respondents that agree with questions 1,...,25 (school age survey) divided by # of responses to questions 1,..,22 (preschool survey) + # of responses to questions 1,...,25 (school age survey). For FFY 2013 reporting, parents agreed on 36490 of 42385 items answered.

Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

WDPI uses the Wisconsin Family Engagement Survey (based on questions from a survey developed by the National Center on Special Education Accountability Monitoring, NCSEAM) to measure parent involvement. The survey is conducted between January and July in a district's procedural compliance self-assessment cycle year. Roughly one-fifth of the districts in the state conduct the survey each year, with Milwaukee Public Schools conducting the survey on an annual basis. The sample of districts within each cycle year are representative of the state (see Introduction to the SPP/APR for more information). For relevant demographics, a 95% confidence interval about the median was used to construct the procedural compliance self-assessment cycle.

To help ensure that results of the survey are statistical reliability, WDPI requires that districts meet a minimum response rate of 20% of the sample, or 6 respondents, whichever is higher. This year the average response rate was 36.2%, which well exceeds the threshold set by the state. This response rate yields a margin of error of 2.33% (95% CI), which is in line with the conventional measure of rigor for survey research.

WDPI uses the race/ethnicity of the students as a proxy for determining if parents who respond to the Wisconsin Family Engagement Survey are representative of the demographics of the state. Local educational agencies report race/ethnicity and disability status of students on the annual October 1st count of children with disabilities, which is used to determine the race/ethnicity of students for Indicator 8. A benchmark of 5% is used to assess the extent to which survey data reflect the demographics of the state, namely, that parents who responded to the survey have students of diverse racial/ethnic background and primary disabilities. The attached table compares the makeup of students for whom survey data was collected and the statewide demographics. For FFY 2013 reporting, Black and Hispanic students are underrepresented by greater than 5% and White students are overrepresented by greater than 5%.

While the survey is voluntary and it is not possible to guarantee representativeness within a 5% margin, a switch from sampling to census in FFY 2014 may help address these discrepancies. In the case that it does not, WDPI may consider adding representativeness criteria to its response rate requirements that LEAs must meet.

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

Was a collection tool used? Yes
Is it a new or revised collection tool? No

(•) **Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State**
( ) **No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State**

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

The Wisconsin Family Engagement Survey is conducted between January and July in a district's procedural compliance self-assessment cycle year. Roughly one-fifth of the districts in the state conduct the survey each year, with Milwaukee

Public Schools conducting the survey on an annual basis. The sample of districts within each cycle year are representative of the following statewide characteristics: geographic regions, total enrollment of students with disabilities, racial/ethnic makeup of the students with disabilities subgroup, and distribution of primary disabilities. For relevant demographics, a 95% confidence interval about the median was used to construct the procedural compliance self-assessment cycle.

To help ensure that results of the survey are statistical reliability, WDPI requires that districts meet a minimum response rate of 20% of the sample, or 6 respondents, whichever is higher. This year the average response rate was 36.2%, which well exceeds the threshold set by the state. This response rate yields a margin of error of 2.33% (95% CI), which is in line with the conventional measure of rigor for survey research.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- (●) Number of districts in the State
- ( ) Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
6	0	449	0%	0%	0%

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

Define "disproportionate representation" and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

Definition of disproportionate representation:

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

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

   For each racial group, over-representation may be considered where the risk level for the given group exceeds the

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

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

WDPI conducted a review of the district's policies, procedures, and practices related to the requirements of 34 CFR 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311. The district has either adopted WDPI's model policies and procedures or has submitted policies and procedures that have been reviewed and approved by WDPI staff. The district also has either adopted the department's model IEP forms or uses forms approved by WDPI. In determining eligibility for special education, the district uses state eligibility criteria. All policies, procedures, and practices are race neutral. Through the procedural compliance self-assessment, WDPI identified noncompliance with Part B evaluation requirements in this district. WDPI conducted additional data reviews and interviews using standard protocols.

WDPI verified within one year from the date of written notification the LEA has corrected the noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements and has corrected the individual cases of noncompliance. To verify the LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirement, WDPI reviewed updated data collected through on-site monitoring; WDPI selected and reviewed a reasonable sample of records to ensure 100% compliance.

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

To verify correction of each individual case of noncompliance, WDPI reviewed the student records that were in error and ensured the noncompliance was corrected.

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

Number of districts in the State

Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
29	0	449	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define "disproportionate representation" and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

Definition of disproportionate representation:

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

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

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

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
12	12	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

For twelve districts, WDPI identified noncompliance with Part B in the areas of child find, evaluation, and/or eligibility requirements. WDPI conducted a review of each districts' policies, procedures, and practices related to the requirements of 34 CFR 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311. All policies, procedures, and practices are race neutral. The districts have either adopted WDPI's model policies and procedures or have submitted policies and procedures that have been reviewed and approved by WDPI staff. The districts also have either adopted the department's model IEP forms or use forms approved by WDPI. In determining eligibility for special education, the districts use state eligibility criteria. However, these twelve districts were found in noncompliance through the following: (1) a substantiated IDEA complaint based on child find, evaluation, and/or eligibility requirements and/or (2) student-specific errors based on child find, evaluation, and/or eligibility requirements determined through the procedural compliance self-assessment. For these twelve districts, WDPI conducted additional data reviews and interviews using standard protocols. There were no racial patterns of noncompliance. There was no evidence that the noncompliance resulted in inappropriate identification for the student-specific errors.

WDPI verified within one year from the date of written notification the twelve LEAs have corrected the noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, and have corrected the individual cases of noncompliance. To verify the LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirement, WDPI reviewed updated data collected through on-site monitoring; WDPI selected and reviewed a reasonable sample of records to ensure 100% compliance.

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

To verify correction of each individual case of noncompliance, WDPI reviewed the student records that were in error and ensured the noncompliance was corrected.

Indicator 11: Child Find

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	88.41%	96.48%	98.20%	98.39%	98.78%	97.67%	98.91%	98.80%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
8,183	8,074	98.80%	100%	98.67%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	109

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

The range of days beyond the timeline was one (1) to sixty-six (66). Reasons for the delays include: unavailability of staff, unavailability of parents, scheduling problems, and timeline calculation errors.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

- (•) **The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.**
- ( ) **The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.**

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

- (•) **State monitoring**
- ( ) **State database that includes data for the entire reporting year**

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

to collect these data.

The State uses its *Procedural Compliance Self-Assessment to* collect data on this indicator. For FFY 2013, ninety-one agencies conducted the *Procedural Compliance Self-Assessment* and reported the percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 calendar days. The percent of children with parental consent to evaluate who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days during FFY 2012 was 98.67%. The State demonstrated substantial compliance for this indicator.

The Self-Assessment cycle is designed to create a representative sample of LEAs (see Introduction to the SPP/APR for more information).

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
109	109		0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Consistent with OSEP memo 09-02, WDPI verified each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2012: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

To verify current compliance, WDPI staff examined a separate sample of current student records. LEAs provided the WDPI with a list of students whose initial evaluations were completed during a specified time period. For each student on the list, LEAs were directed to indicate the date parental consent was received and the date the evaluation was completed. From this list WDPI selected records for a specific number of students with the most recently completed initial evaluations. The exact number of records to be submitted for review was determined by the WDPI and was dependent upon the size of the LEA and the number of initial evaluations completed by the LEA as reported on its original *Procedural Compliance Self-Assessment* report submitted during the 2012-13 school year. WDPI staff reviewed the records to determine whether the evaluations were completed within 60 days of receiving parental consent. If all reviewed evaluations were completed within the required timeline, WDPI determined the LEA is currently in compliance.

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

reviewed the record(s) to verify correction.

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

Following these two-pronged verification procedures, which are consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, the WDPI determined all LEAs found in noncompliance during FFY 2012 have corrected each individual case of noncompliance and are currently in compliance with 34 CFR 300.301(c) and the exceptions at 34 CFR 300.301(d) and 34 CFR 300.309(c).

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

To verify each instance of individual student noncompliance was corrected, WDPI staff reviewed a randomly drawn sample of initial evaluation records of students who were in the LEA's original *Procedural Compliance Self-Assessment* sample submitted during the 2012-13 school year and whose evaluations were not completed within 60 days. The size of the sample of records reviewed was dependent upon the size of the district, the number of noncompliant files, and whether the students were still within the jurisdiction of the LEA. For most districts, the sample includes all records. Each record was reviewed to verify the evaluation was completed, although late. In instances when students were found eligible for special education services each record was reviewed to ensure compensatory services had been considered. All records demonstrated the evaluation(s) had been completed and compensatory services had been considered. WDPI determined, based on this review of records, each individual instance of noncompliance has been corrected.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	65.60%	74.35%	89.00%	96.78%	98.72%	99.03%	99.23%	99.33%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	3,578
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	492
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,646
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	382
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	26

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. [c/(a-b-d-e)]x100	2,646	2,678	99.33%	100%	98.81%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e	32

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

Children not accounted for above include eight children found not eligible for special education services after their third birthday and 24 children found eligible for special education services whose IEPs were not implemented until after their third birthdays. The range of days beyond their third birthdays was 1 day to 118 days. Reasons for the delay include staff error, staff unavailability, the need for additional testing, and referrals sent by the Birth to 3 Program less than 90 days prior to the child's third birthday.

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

- ( ) **State monitoring**
- (•) **State database that includes data for the entire reporting year**

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

WDPI made no findings of noncompliance in FFY 2012. All LEAs immediately (i.e., before the State issued a finding) corrected noncompliance and provided documentation of such correction. WDPI verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements at 100% compliance based on a review of data; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

WDPI verified each individual case of noncompliance had been immediately corrected by verifying the children had eligibility determination or IEP implementation dates recorded in the electronic data collection system, known as the Program Participation System (PPS). In addition, LEAs submitted a copy of the student's IEP to WDPI to demonstrate the LEA had completed the eligibility determination or developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom the required action was not timely. WDPI reviewed each child's record to verify correction.

To verify current compliance, WDPI reviewed quarterly progress data in PPS for districts with FFY 2012 noncompliance. LEAs were required to demonstrate 100% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who were found ineligible had eligibility determinations prior to their third birthday or who were found eligible for Part B, had an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. Based on a review of updated data, WDPI has verified each LEA with noncompliance in FFY 2012 is correctly implementing the requirements at 100% compliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		26.90%	39.35%		71.21%	72.16%	79.28%	98.75%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
27,485	27,785	98.75%	100%	98.92%

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

- **State monitoring**
- **State database that includes data for the entire reporting year**

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
97	97		0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

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

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

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

To verify each individual case of noncompliance had been corrected, WDPI staff reviewed a random sample of IEPs of students who were in the LEA's sample and whose IEPs were not compliant with the respective Indicator 13 regulatory requirements. The size of the sample of IEPs reviewed was dependent upon the size of the district, the number of noncompliant files, whether students' IEPs had previously been corrected and whether the students were still within the jurisdiction of the LEA. Each IEP was reviewed to verify it was compliant with the transition regulatory requirements. If all the selected IEPs met the regulatory requirements, WDPI determined each individual case of noncompliance had been corrected. If one or more of the selected IEPs did not meet one or more of the regulatory requirements, WDPI staff reviewed the regulatory requirement(s) with the LEA, directed the LEA to correct the IEP(s) within 20 days and submit the corrected IEP(s) to WDPI for review. WDPI determined, based on this review of IEPs, each individual case of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 has been corrected.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2012	Target ≥						41.50%	42.80%	44.50%
		Data					39.44%	41.52%	34.62%	29.80%
B	2012	Target ≥						69.60%	70.00%	71.50%
		Data					66.52%	69.57%	64.52%	59.40%
C	2012	Target ≥						83.30%	82.00%	83.00%
		Data					79.89%	83.26%	78.83%	72.90%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	29.80%	30.30%	30.80%	31.30%	31.80%	32.30%
Target B ≥	59.50%	61.50%	63.50%	65.50%	67.50%	69.50%
Target C ≥	73.00%	75.00%	77.00%	79.00%	81.00%	83.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

WDPI staff presented background information and target options for Indicators 8 and 14 at the October 2014 meeting of the State Superintendent's Council on Special Education (see Introduction for more information on the Council). Following analysis and discussion, stakeholders approved Indicator 14 targets by consensus.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	887
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	244
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	332
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	24
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	88

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	244	887	29.80%	29.80%	27.51%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	576	887	59.40%	59.50%	64.94%
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	688	887	72.90%	73.00%	77.56%

Explanation of A Slippage

WDPI utilizes a sampling methodology, and ensures a statewide response rate such that point estimates fall within a margin of error of less than or equal to three percent. Thus, we would not infer a statistically significant change in enrollment in higher education from FFY 2012 to FFY 2013. WDPI futher disaggregated the data with the following findings:

- No change in participation in 2-year colleges (2013 = 7%; 2014 = 7%)
- No change in participation in 4-year colleges (2013 = 5%; 2014 = 5%)
- Slight decline in participation in 2-year degree programs at technical colleges (2013 = 20%; 2014 = 17%)
    - More males shifted from tech college (decrease 4%) to 2-year colleges (increase 3%)
    - There was a slight (2%) decline in each type of higher education program by females

The decrease in enrollment in higher education mirrors national trends for students with and without disabilities. With respect to students with disabilities the trend is reflected in the FFY 2012 APR analysis of Indicator 14 by the National Post School Outcome Center, which found an average decrease in enrollment of higher education of 1.2% across states and territories. More broadly, however, any systemic decreases in enrollment may be attributed to the economic downturn of 2008, oversupply of recent graduates, and weakness in the job market such that the predicted return on tuition investment has also declined vis-a-vis alternatives. See for example Andrew Martin,"Downturn Still Squeezes Colleges and Universities," *New York Times*, 10 January, 2013.

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

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

Participation in the Wisconsin Post School Outcomes Survey is based upon a district's procedural compliance self-assessment cycle year. Roughly one-fifth of the districts in the state conduct the survey each year, with Milwaukee Public Schools conducting the survey on an annual basis. The sample of districts within each cycle year are representative of the state (see Introduction to the SPP/APR for more information). For relevant demographics, a 95% confidence interval about the median was used to construct the procedural compliance self-assessment cycle. Additionally, for the 2013 Wisconsin Post School Outcomes Survey WDPI is pleased to report a response rate of 54%. This response rate yields a margin of error of 2.96% (95% CI), which is in line with the conventional measure of rigor for survey research.

To help ensure survey results are statistical reliability WDPI requires that districts meet a minimum response rate of 20% of the sample, or 6 respondents, whichever is higher.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2012

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		51.00%	52.00%	53.00%	54.00%	55.00%	56.00%	57.00%
Data	50.00%	67.00%	76.00%	60.00%	66.70%	55.56%	50.00%	41.18%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	42.00%	42.00%	42.00%	42.00%	42.00%	42.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2014	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	7	
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2014	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	11	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
7	11	41.18%	42.00%	63.64%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 16: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2012

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	76.00%	76.00%	76.00%	76.00%	76.00%	76.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

WDPI staff presented background information and target options for Indicators 2, 5, 6, 15, and 16 at the April 2014 meeting of the State Superintendent's Council on Special Education. Following analysis and discussion, stakeholders approved Indicator 16 targets by consensus.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	3	
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	32	
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1 Mediations held	43	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
3	32	43	75.51%	76.00%	81.40%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Baseline Data

FFY	2013
Data	29.00%

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	29.00%	30.00%	31.00%	31.00%	31.50%

Description of Measure

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) staff presented background information and target options for Indicators 3a and 17 at the January 2015 meeting of the State Superintendent's Council on Special Education (see Introduction for more information on the Council). Following analysis and discussion, stakeholders approved these targets by consensus.

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

Stakeholder Involvement

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

2013, and quarterly since then, WDPI has met with the Council on the development of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Arlene Russell of North Central Regional Resource Center helped facilitate the Council meetings.

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

- Executive Board of the Wisconsin Council of Administrators of Special Services (WCASS), which represents local directors of special education, as well as directors serving multiple districts through a Cooperative Educational Service Agency (CESA),
- WI Family Assistance Center for Education, Training and Support (FACETS), the state's Parent Training and Information Center funded by OSEP,
- Disability Rights Wisconsin, a protection and advocacy agency for people with disabilities,
- WI Board for People with Development Disabilities, established to advocate on behalf of individuals with developmental disabilities,
- The Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI), initiative for parents, educators, and others interested in parent-educator partnerships for children with disabilities,
- Early Childhood Program Support Teachers, providers of technical assistance to local early childhood special education teachers,
- Directors of Special Education (DSEs) and Regional Service Network Directors (RSNs) in CESAs 11 and 12, located in the northern rural areas of Wisconsin, and
- Department of Health Services (DHS) Birth to 3 Programs, the state's lead agency for Part C.

Internal Stakeholders

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

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

Data Analysis Process

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6 Thinking Hats:

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

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

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

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

Data Disaggregation

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

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

WDPI posed the following question:

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

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

Summary of Findings:

- Students with disabilities in all grade levels perform at low reading levels and reading proficiency decreases between grades 3 and 10.
- There is not significant variance in reading achievement by gender, district enrollment size, or geographic (CESA) region.
- In general, students with disabilities who are economically disadvantaged have lower reading achievement than students who are not economically disadvantaged; however, students without disabilities who are economically disadvantaged outperform students with disabilities who are not economically disadvantaged.

- Students with disabilities who are Black, Hispanic, and American Indian tend to have lower reading achievement than White or Asian students. However, these racial patterns also hold true for students without disabilities.
- Students with Specific Learning Disabilities have the lowest proficiency rates within the students with disabilities subgroup (4%). Students with Other Health Impairments and Emotional and Behavioral Disabilities are second and third lowest performing (10% and 13%, respectively). While these data point to variance by disability category, when compared to students without disabilities (40%), significant gaps exist notwithstanding the category of impairment.

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

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

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

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

LEA Survey- professional development, technical assistance, quality standards

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

CESA Survey- professional development, technical assistance

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

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

Professional Organization Survey- professional development, technical assistance

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

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

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

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

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

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

Wisconsin.

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

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

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

Agenda 2017 focus areas include:

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

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

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

These four categories now serve as a framework for much of the work within WDPI, and many of the outlined strategies within these materials are supported through research for their effectiveness for students with disabilities as well. This

initiative has opened a door for spotlighting additional promising practices that have led to greater reading outcomes for students with disabilities, using a similar systematic data-based decision-making and showcasing process.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Special Education RSN (http://sped.dpi.wi.gov/sped_rsn) has shifted its focus the last two years to provide direct supports to school teams identified based on low graduation rates or reading achievement for students with disabilities. Each RSN Director serves as a coach to assist school teams in action planning processes to increase identified areas for improvement. While this regional, targeted approach holds much promise to impact outcomes, there is a need for increased

coordination of the project, professional learning around identified core competencies for those serving in a coaching role, and processes for schools to identify and implement evidence-based practices with fidelity to increase reading outcomes for students with disabilities. To address these areas of need, WDPI has increased funding within this project to hire an RSN Coordinator.

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

WSPEI (http://sped.dpi.wi.gov/sped_parent) assists Wisconsin school districts and parents of children with disabilities to develop and maintain ongoing, positive communication about their children's education. WSPEI helps parents and school districts find or create the resources to build positive working relationships that lead to shared decision making and children's learning. In an effort to align supports to Wisconsin's SIMR, WSPEI now provides supports for families to meaningfully discuss reading strategies and approaches with educators, as well as provides tools for families to work with their children on literacy-specific content. WSPEI serves as a structure to support families and school-family partnerships, while implementing new evidence-based practices to impact literacy outcomes.

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

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

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

Statement

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

Description

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

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

Result

WDPI aims to improve the performance results of students with disabilities on the statewide literacy assessment, grades three through eight. This decision was made as a result of meetings with multiple stakeholder groups focused on a broad analysis of indicator data, the establishment of core values within Wisconsin's RDA system, an analysis of leverage points

within and between indicators, and an in-depth exploration of data. Reading performance data was disaggregated by multiple subgroups, geographic regions, and district sizes. For details of each of these components, please see the Data Analysis section.

Measurement

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

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

Operationalization

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SIMR is also aligned with a growth measurement currently reported on school and district report cards. Importantly, both the SIMR and the report card metric will be reportable as WDPI transitions from the Wisconsin Statewide Assessment System (WSAS) to the Badger Exam (Smarter Balanced). The choice of this SIMR creates alignment between the Special Education Team, the Office of Educational Accountability, the Title I team, and reporting requirements under Wisconsin's waiver for flexibility under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) (submitted in 2015 and pending approval).

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

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Based on the data analysis, the determination that reading achievement for students with disabilities is unacceptably low across the state, across grade levels, across race and ethnicity categories, and across disability categories, lead stakeholders

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

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

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

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

Within the collaborative stakeholder process, there was much discussion about existing initiatives. Like many states, over the last few years Wisconsin has adopted new academic standards, prepared and built the infrastructure for new state-wide assessments, implemented a new teacher and principal evaluation system (Educator Effectiveness), provided systematic supports to focus and priority schools, and supported schools through the phases of implementation of multi-level systems of support for both academics and behavior as a framework for increasing outcomes for all students. Stakeholders repeatedly emphasized that educators are experiencing initiative fatigue, and that any new requirements and supports should be well-integrated with existing effective initiatives. Stakeholders also emphasized that Wisconsin's RDA messaging and supports should focus both on special and general education staff and structures in order to make meaningful and sustained change to outcomes.

To help address the initiative fatigue issue as well as the potential root cause of disparate and frequently-changing priority

areas, the state superintendent and his cabinet have determined that monitoring and improvement supports should be aligned across the various divisions of WDPI, beginning with the Special Education and Title I teams. In order to develop, implement, and scale-up the most effective and efficient system, WDPI is in the process of applying for intensive supports through the State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-Based Practices Center (SISEP).

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

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

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

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

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

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

provision of frameworks to connect academic and functional disability-related needs to services, accommodations, goals, and supports.

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

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

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Submitted Theory of Action: Wisconsin's Theory of Action Graphic

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

As described in the Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies section, based on information from the data and infrastructure analyses, stakeholders agreed that Wisconsin's Theory of Action and improvement strategies should focus on practices that will lead to broad systems change as well as provide educators and families with concrete supports to impact reading outcomes.

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

- provide a common framework and supports for improvement planning and implementation of evidence-based practices through a cross-divisional coordinated improvement-planning process;
- develop and provide resources and professional learning on evidence-based practices to address:
  - meaningful access
  - literacy-specific needs
  - examples of promising practices; and
- implement a coaching model to support identified LEAs' district improvement plans with fidelity.

The coordinated monitoring and improvement-planning system and the development and provision of professional learning

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

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

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

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

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

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

This indicator is not applicable.