

**State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report:
Part B**

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

**For reporting on
FFY18**

Wisconsin



PART B DUE February 3, 2020

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

Introduction

Instructions

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

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

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

The Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2018 APR targets, results, slippage from the previous APR, and verification of correction of all previous findings of all noncompliance found in FFY 2017 are compiled in the report that follows. Procedurally compliant individualized education programs (IEPs) form the basis for practices that drive improved results for students with IEPs, and DPI demonstrated substantial compliance in all compliance indicators. Additionally, DPI continues to support district implementation of the "College and Career Ready IEP Framework," which allows districts to continuously monitor procedural compliance while at the same time improving key areas in developing and implementing IEPs that are correlated with improvement in academic and functional performance. DPI staff, as well as staff funded through discretionary grants, provide ongoing technical assistance and training, grant activities, and the development of additional resources.

In aggregate, the results indicators (1, 2, 3, 4a, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14) offer a snapshot of how students with IEPs are performing throughout their educational lives. DPI believes that the balanced monitoring approach under Results Driven Accountability (RDA) is the right approach to identifying areas of focus and investment to ensure learners supported by IEPs can graduate college and career ready. Specific areas of focus include how to accelerate academic growth for students with IEPs, particularly in middle and high school. More detail and information will be included in Indicator 17, to be submitted in early April. Indicator 17 will discuss Wisconsin's continuing effort to improve the Statewide Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The SIMR is a points-based reading proficiency measure for students with disabilities in grades 3-8 based on three consecutive years of data from annual statewide assessments on reading (English Language Arts).

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

446

General Supervision System

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

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

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

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

2) Data collection and fiscal monitoring

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

3) Targeted training and technical assistance

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

4) Effective, responsive dispute resolution process

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

a) IDEA Complaints

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

b) Due Process

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

c) Mediation

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

5) Procedural Compliance Self-Assessment

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

6) Early Childhood Transition System

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

7) Postsecondary Transition Plan Application

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

Technical Assistance System

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

DPI has a number of mechanisms in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidence based technical assistance and support to districts. As indicated above, within Wisconsin's general supervision system, DPI develops information bulletins, training documents and modules, as well as provides statewide and regional training designed to improve results for children with disabilities and to ensure understanding of and compliance with the requirements of IDEA and state special education law. In addition, each week DPI sends an email to all districts that includes updates on new guidance materials, grants and other supports, as well as technical assistance opportunities. Identified districts receive targeted training and technical assistance to improve results for children with disabilities, correct noncompliance or fiscal mismanagement, and address inappropriate identification resulting in racial disproportionality.

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

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

The Wisconsin Regional Special Education Network (RSN) (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/educators/initiatives/regional-special-education-network>)

Wisconsin Statewide Parent Educator Initiative (<http://wspei.org/>)

Disproportionality Technical Assistance Network (<http://www.thenetworkwi.com/>)

Early Childhood Program Support and Leadership (<http://dpi.wi.gov/sped/early-childhood>)

Wisconsin RtI Center (<http://www.wisconsinrticenter.org/>)

Wisconsin Special Education Mediation System (<http://www.wsems.us/>)

Transition Improvement Grant (<http://www.witig.org/>)

Independent Charter School Special Education Capacity Building Initiative (<http://dpi.wi.gov/sped/educators/discretionary-grants/summaries>)

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

WI Family Assistance Center for Education, Training and Support (WI FACETS) Milwaukee Public Schools Initiative (www.wifacets.org)

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

Research to Practice Inclusive Communities Project (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/research-practice-inclusive-communities-rpic-project>)

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

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

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

The Wisconsin Regional Special Education Network (RSN) (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/educators/initiatives/regional-special-education-network>)

Wisconsin Rtl Center (<http://www.wisconsinrtlcenter.org/>)

Wisconsin Statewide Parent Educator Initiative (<http://wspei.org/>)

Transition Improvement Grant (<http://www.witig.org/>)

Disproportionality Technical Assistance Network (<http://www.thenetworkwi.com/>)

Early Childhood Program Support and Leadership (<http://dpi.wi.gov/sped/early-childhood>)

Independent Charter School Special Education Capacity Building Initiative (<http://dpi.wi.gov/sped/educators/discretionary-grants/summaries>)

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

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

Stakeholder Involvement

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

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

On January 24, 2020, DPI staff met with Council to analyze data, set targets for FFY 2019, review the SPP and give updates.

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

YES

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY17 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 2017 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 2017 APR in 2019, is available.

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

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2018 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year 4; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2019); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities are impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

Intro - OSEP Response

The State provided a FFY 2019 target for Indicator B-17/State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and OSEP accepts that target.

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Measurement

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2011	67.10%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%
Data	68.70%	68.99%	67.51%	68.54%	68.24%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	85.00%	85.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

On January 24, 2020, DPI staff met with Council to analyze data, set targets for FFY 2019, review the SPP and give updates.

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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	5,093
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	7,425

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	10/02/2019	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	68.59%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
5,093	7,425	68.24%	85.00%	68.59%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:

4-year ACGR

If extended, provide the number of years

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

The requirements for obtaining a regular diploma in Wisconsin for FFY 2018 reporting are the same for students with disabilities and students without disabilities with one exception. Under Wisconsin State Statute §118.33(1m), students without IEPs must take and pass the high school civics test before they may be awarded a high school diploma. Students with IEPs must take the high school civics test (unless the IEP team determines that it is not appropriate to administer the test), but students with IEPs are not required to pass the high school civics test in order to receive a high school diploma.

This statutory requirement went into effect beginning in the 2016-2017 school year. Otherwise, the requirements below apply to students both with and without IEPs.

A graduate is defined as a student who has met the requirements established by a school board for a prescribed course of study.

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

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

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

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

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)

YES

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

The requirements for obtaining a regular diploma in Wisconsin for FFY 2018 reporting are the same for students with disabilities and students without disabilities with one exception. Under Wisconsin State Statute §118.33(1m), students without IEPs must take and pass the high school civics test before they may be awarded a high school diploma. Students with IEPs must take the high school civics test (unless the IEP team determines that it is not appropriate to administer the test), but students with IEPs are not required to pass the high school civics test in order to receive a high school diploma.

This statutory requirement went into effect beginning in the 2016-2017 school year. Otherwise, the requirements below apply to students both with and without IEPs.

A graduate is defined as a student who has met the requirements established by a school board for a prescribed course of study.

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

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

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

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

1 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

OSEP notes that the State indicated that the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are the same as for all students. However, the State also indicated that the requirements for obtaining a regular diploma in Wisconsin for FFY 2018 reporting are the same for students with disabilities and students without disabilities with one exception. Under Wisconsin State Statute §118.33(1m), students without IEPs must take and pass the high school civics test before they may be awarded a high school diploma; however, students with IEPs are not required to pass the high school civics test in order to receive a high school diploma. As a result, OSEP cannot determine if the conditions that were reported are different.

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification C009.

OPTION 2:

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

Measurement

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2:

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

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

OPTION 2:

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

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	2.13%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	1.90%	1.80%	1.70%	1.60%	1.50%
Data	1.75%	2.29%	2.24%	2.14%	2.45%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	1.40%	1.40%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

On January 24, 2020, DPI staff met with Council to analyze data, set targets for FFY 2019, review the SPP and give updates.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 2

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	5,698
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	50
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	107
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	1,257
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	28

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

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

NO

If yes, provide justification for the changes below.

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)

YES

Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)

YES

If use a different calculation methodology is yes, provide an explanation of the different calculation methodology

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs Grades 7-12 who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of Students with IEPs in Grades 7-12	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
1,229	50,882	2.45%	1.40%	2.42%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

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

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

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

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

NO

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Consistent with the methodology used in FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, and in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data, DPI uses the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving in a single year. The calculation is the percentage of youth with IEPs previously enrolled in grades 7 - 12 who exit special education as a result of dropping out, divided by the total number of youths with IEPs in grades 7 - 12 who are expected to complete the school term. DPI is reporting 2017-2018 data for FFY 2018.

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

2 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Grade 3	X										
B	Grade 4		X									
C	Grade 5			X								
D	Grade 6				X							
E	Grade 7					X						
F	Grade 8						X					
G	Grade 11									X		
H												
I												
J												
K												
L												

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Grade 3	2015	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	Grade 3	97.37%	Actual	99.20%	96.30%	97.37%	97.78%	97.51%
B	Grade 4	2015	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
B	Grade 4	96.85%	Actual	99.35%	96.09%	96.85%	97.33%	97.36%
C	Grade 5	2015	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

C	Grade 5	97.14%	Actual	99.49%	96.96%	97.14%	97.67%	97.12%
D	Grade 6	2015	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
D	Grade 6	97.21%	Actual	99.14%	96.50%	97.21%	97.10%	96.45%
E	Grade 7	2015	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
E	Grade 7	96.62%	Actual	99.20%	95.47%	96.62%	97.08%	96.42%
F	Grade 8	2015	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
F	Grade 8	95.55%	Actual	98.92%	94.70%	95.55%	96.03%	95.55%
G	Grade 11	2015	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
G	Grade 11	86.64%	Actual	97.85%	84.09%	86.64%	91.37%	87.32%
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Grade 3	2015	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	Grade 3	97.30%	Actual	99.23%	96.11%	97.30%	97.82%	97.53%
B	Grade 4	2015	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
B	Grade 4	96.76%	Actual	99.32%	95.74%	96.76%	97.53%	97.36%
C	Grade 5	2015	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
C	Grade 5	97.10%	Actual	99.44%	96.57%	97.10%	97.70%	97.18%
D	Grade 6	2015	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
D	Grade 6	97.07%	Actual	99.11%	95.62%	97.07%	97.21%	96.40%
E	Grade 7	2015	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
E	Grade 7	96.46%	Actual	99.17%	94.73%	96.46%	97.17%	96.38%
F	Grade 8	2015	Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
F	Grade 8	95.67%	Actual	98.97%	93.94%	95.67%	95.97%	95.44%
G	Grade 11	2015	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
G	Grade 11	92.16%	Actual	97.57%	86.10%	92.16%	91.52%	87.57%
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					

L			Target >=				
L			Actual				

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Grade 3	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade 5	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	D >=	Grade 6	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	E >=	Grade 7	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	F >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	G >=	Grade 11	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	H >=			
Reading	I >=			
Reading	J >=			
Reading	K >=			
Reading	L >=			
Math	A >=	Grade 3	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade 5	95.00%	95.00%
Math	D >=	Grade 6	95.00%	95.00%
Math	E >=	Grade 7	95.00%	95.00%
Math	F >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%
Math	G >=	Grade 11	95.00%	95.00%
Math	H >=			
Math	I >=			
Math	J >=			
Math	K >=			
Math	L >=			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

On January 24, 2020, DPI staff met with Council to analyze data, set targets for FFY 2019, review the SPP and give updates.

These targets align with the requirements under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). They were initially agreed upon and formally approved by Council at the December 2017 meeting of the State Superintendent’s Council on Special Education.

FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

YES

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

04/08/2020

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	9,222	9,414	9,067	9,106	8,821	8,632			8,101		
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	2,170	1,776	1,388	1,220	1,147	1,044			815		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	6,357	6,775	6,870	6,965	6,706	6,551			5,574		
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	417	542	546	605	588	608			686		

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

04/08/2020

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	9,227	9,416	9,071	9,108	8,824	8,636			8,101		
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	2,172	1,778	1,387	1,218	1,150	1,040			816		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	6,359	6,776	6,873	6,966	6,703	6,546			5,589		
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	417	542	546	605	588	610			688		

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 3	9,222	8,944	97.51%	95.00%	96.99%	Met Target	No Slippage
B	Grade 4	9,414	9,093	97.36%	95.00%	96.59%	Met Target	No Slippage
C	Grade 5	9,067	8,804	97.12%	95.00%	97.10%	Met Target	No Slippage
D	Grade 6	9,106	8,790	96.45%	95.00%	96.53%	Met Target	No Slippage
E	Grade 7	8,821	8,441	96.42%	95.00%	95.69%	Met Target	No Slippage
F	Grade 8	8,632	8,203	95.55%	95.00%	95.03%	Met Target	No Slippage
G	Grade 11	8,101	7,075	87.32%	95.00%	87.33%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Grade 3	XXX
B	Grade 4	XXX
C	Grade 5	XXX
D	Grade 6	XXX
E	Grade 7	XXX
F	Grade 8	XXX
G	Grade 11	XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 3	9,227	8,948	97.53%	95.00%	96.98%	Met Target	No Slippage
B	Grade 4	9,416	9,096	97.36%	95.00%	96.60%	Met Target	No Slippage
C	Grade 5	9,071	8,806	97.18%	95.00%	97.08%	Met Target	No Slippage
D	Grade 6	9,108	8,789	96.40%	95.00%	96.50%	Met Target	No Slippage
E	Grade 7	8,824	8,441	96.38%	95.00%	95.66%	Met Target	No Slippage
F	Grade 8	8,636	8,196	95.44%	95.00%	94.91%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
G	Grade 11	8,101	7,093	87.57%	95.00%	87.56%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Grade 3	XXX
B	Grade 4	XXX
C	Grade 5	XXX

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
D	Grade 6	XXX
E	Grade 7	XXX
F	Grade 8	XXX
G	Grade 11	XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

Public reports of assessment results are posted on the DPI website:

1. WISEdash Public Dashboard (Wisconsin Information System for Education Data Dashboard) at <http://wisedash.dpi.wi.gov/Dashboard/portalHome.jsp>;
2. WISEdash Data Files by Topic at <https://dpi.wi.gov/wisedash/download-files>.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

3B - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3C - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Grade 3	X										
B	Grade 4		X									
C	Grade 5			X								
D	Grade 6				X							
E	Grade 7					X						
F	Grade 8						X					
G	Grade 11									X		
H												
I												
J												
K												
L												

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Grade 3	2015	Target >=	31.80%	37.80%	43.80%	19.01%	19.01%
A	Grade 3	19.01%	Actual	17.98%	27.88%	19.01%	18.71%	16.24%
B	Grade 4	2015	Target >=	31.80%	37.80%	43.80%	18.00%	18.00%
B	Grade 4	18.00%	Actual	16.74%	25.28%	18.00%	18.97%	17.99%
C	Grade 5	2015	Target >=	31.80%	37.80%	43.80%	14.80%	17.40%

C	Grade 5	14.77%	Actual	14.62%	22.89%	14.77%	15.30%	14.72%
D	Grade 6	2015	Target >=	31.80%	37.80%	43.80%	13.60%	17.40%
D	Grade 6	12.42%	Actual	13.18%	16.54%	12.42%	12.30%	10.91%
E	Grade 7	2015	Target >=	31.80%	37.80%	43.80%	13.60%	17.40%
E	Grade 7	12.51%	Actual	13.89%	16.88%	12.51%	12.00%	11.99%
F	Grade 8	2015	Target >=	31.80%	37.80%	43.80%	13.60%	17.40%
F	Grade 8	11.06%	Actual	12.22%	18.97%	11.06%	10.46%	9.01%
G	Grade 11	2015	Target >=	31.80%	37.80%	43.80%	13.60%	17.40%
G	Grade 11	11.83%	Actual	13.79%	14.00%	11.83%	10.23%	9.95%
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Grade 3	2015	Target >=	43.00%	50.40%	57.80%	24.20%	24.20%
A	Grade 3	24.12%	Actual	30.46%	29.14%	24.12%	23.90%	24.34%
B	Grade 4	2015	Target >=	43.00%	50.40%	57.80%	20.70%	20.70%
B	Grade 4	20.66%	Actual	28.76%	24.49%	20.66%	19.37%	19.52%
C	Grade 5	2015	Target >=	43.00%	50.40%	57.80%	17.40%	17.40%
C	Grade 5	17.37%	Actual	25.18%	16.62%	17.37%	16.30%	17.05%
D	Grade 6	2015	Target >=	43.00%	50.40%	57.80%	13.60%	17.30%
D	Grade 6	13.05%	Actual	20.35%	14.24%	13.05%	12.70%	11.89%
E	Grade 7	2015	Target >=	43.00%	50.40%	57.80%	13.60%	17.30%
E	Grade 7	9.86%	Actual	18.82%	13.25%	9.86%	9.65%	9.00%
F	Grade 8	2015	Target >=	43.00%	50.40%	57.80%	13.60%	17.30%
F	Grade 8	7.27%	Actual	16.52%	10.66%	7.27%	6.59%	7.12%
G	Grade 11	2015	Target >=	43.00%	50.40%	57.80%	13.60%	17.30%
G	Grade 11	6.12%	Actual	13.33%	7.67%	6.12%	6.82%	6.56%

H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Grade 3	21.20%	21.20%
Reading	B >=	Grade 4	21.20%	21.20%
Reading	C >=	Grade 5	21.20%	21.20%
Reading	D >=	Grade 6	21.20%	21.20%
Reading	E >=	Grade 7	21.20%	21.20%
Reading	F >=	Grade 8	21.20%	21.20%
Reading	G >=	Grade 11	21.20%	21.20%
Reading	H >=			
Reading	I >=			
Reading	J >=			
Reading	K >=			
Reading	L >=			
Math	A >=	Grade 3	24.20%	24.20%
Math	B >=	Grade 4	21.00%	21.00%
Math	C >=	Grade 5	21.00%	21.00%
Math	D >=	Grade 6	21.00%	21.00%
Math	E >=	Grade 7	21.00%	21.00%
Math	F >=	Grade 8	21.00%	21.00%
Math	G >=	Grade 11	21.00%	21.00%
Math	H >=			
Math	I >=			
Math	J >=			
Math	K >=			
Math	L >=			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

On January 24, 2020, DPI staff met with Council to analyze data, set targets for FFY 2019, review the SPP and give updates.

FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

YES

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/08/2020

Reading Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	8,944	9,093	8,804	8,790	8,441	8,203			7,075		
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	813	796	506	425	373	231			97		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	459	636	481	413	456	318			395		
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	45	64	103	92	156	153			194		

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/08/2020

Math Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	8,948	9,096	8,806	8,789	8,441	8,196			7,093		
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,122	883	613	444	330	210			58		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	895	753	835	538	384	332			261		
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	53	110	67	42	32	30			51		

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 3	8,944	1,317	16.24%	21.20%	14.72%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B	Grade 4	9,093	1,496	17.99%	21.20%	16.45%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C	Grade 5	8,804	1,090	14.72%	21.20%	12.38%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
D	Grade 6	8,790	930	10.91%	21.20%	10.58%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
E	Grade 7	8,441	985	11.99%	21.20%	11.67%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
F	Grade 8	8,203	702	9.01%	21.20%	8.56%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
G	Grade 11	7,075	686	9.95%	21.20%	9.70%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Grade 3	<p>Following a statewide decline in ELA Proficiency rates of 3.5% from 2016-17 to 2018-19, DPI performed an in-depth analysis to identify the factors which contributed to this decrease. DPI concluded that, although part of the decline could be explained by a combination of standard error (0.2% with 90% confidence intervals) and changing demographics (0.2% annually based on a Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition analysis), the remaining decline in proficiency is the result of unobserved variables in the analysis. These may be variations in the assessment characteristics itself, or real changes to performance among student subgroups. Identifying the causes and possible solutions to this decline continues to be a priority among DPI staff.</p> <p>DPI will continue to focus on student performance on the statewide reading assessment, as it is Wisconsin's area of focus under the State System Improvement Plan (SSIP). Many of the improvement strategies in our SSIP involve in-depth systems change, which can take multiple years to yield student-level outcomes. The SSIP includes capacity and implementation data that shows an increase in adult practices that are highly correlated with increased student-level results. DPI's focus on coaching, coordinating continuous improvement with Title 1 and educator effectiveness, and college and career ready IEPs and related monitoring will continue to be a focus of systems-change work going forward. Evaluating the effectiveness of the strategies is in accordance with the SSIP evaluation plan. (See Indicator 17 for more information).</p>
B	Grade 4	<p>Following a statewide decline in ELA Proficiency rates of 3.5% from 2016-17 to 2018-19, DPI performed an in-depth analysis to identify the factors which contributed to this decrease. DPI concluded that, although part of the decline could be explained by a combination of standard error (0.2% with 90% confidence intervals) and changing demographics (0.2% annually based on a Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition analysis), the remaining decline in proficiency is the result of unobserved variables in the analysis. These may be variations in the assessment characteristics itself, or real changes to performance among student subgroups. Identifying the causes and possible solutions to this decline continues to be a priority among DPI staff.</p> <p>DPI will continue to focus on student performance on the statewide reading assessment, as it is Wisconsin's area of focus under the State System Improvement Plan (SSIP). Many of the improvement strategies in our SSIP involve in-depth systems change, which can take multiple years to yield student-level outcomes. The SSIP includes capacity and implementation data that shows an increase in adult practices that are highly correlated with increased student-level results. DPI's focus on coaching, coordinating continuous improvement with Title 1 and educator effectiveness, and college and career ready IEPs and related monitoring will continue to be a focus of systems-change work going forward. Evaluating the effectiveness of the strategies is in accordance with the SSIP evaluation plan. (See Indicator 17 for more information).</p>

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
C	Grade 5	<p>Following a statewide decline in ELA Proficiency rates of 3.5% from 2016-17 to 2018-19, DPI performed an in-depth analysis to identify the factors which contributed to this decrease. DPI concluded that, although part of the decline could be explained by a combination of standard error (0.2% with 90% confidence intervals) and changing demographics (0.2% annually based on a Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition analysis), the remaining decline in proficiency is the result of unobserved variables in the analysis. These may be variations in the assessment characteristics itself, or real changes to performance among student subgroups. Identifying the causes and possible solutions to this decline continues to be a priority among DPI staff.</p> <p>DPI will continue to focus on student performance on the statewide reading assessment, as it is Wisconsin's area of focus under the State System Improvement Plan (SSIP). Many of the improvement strategies in our SSIP involve in-depth systems change, which can take multiple years to yield student-level outcomes. The SSIP includes capacity and implementation data that shows an increase in adult practices that are highly correlated with increased student-level results. DPI's focus on coaching, coordinating continuous improvement with Title 1 and educator effectiveness, and college and career ready IEPs and related monitoring will continue to be a focus of systems-change work going forward. Evaluating the effectiveness of the strategies is in accordance with the SSIP evaluation plan. (See Indicator 17 for more information).</p>
D	Grade 6	XXX
E	Grade 7	XXX
F	Grade 8	
G	Grade 11	
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 3	8,948	2,070	24.34%	24.20%	23.13%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B	Grade 4	9,096	1,746	19.52%	21.00%	19.20%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C	Grade 5	8,806	1,515	17.05%	21.00%	17.20%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
D	Grade 6	8,789	1,024	11.89%	21.00%	11.65%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
E	Grade 7	8,441	746	9.00%	21.00%	8.84%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
F	Grade 8	8,196	572	7.12%	21.00%	6.98%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
G	Grade 11	7,093	370	6.56%	21.00%	5.22%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Grade 3	Grade-level slippage from FFY 2017 to FFY 2018 may be the result of several factors, including the cohort nature of assessment data (ie. slippage does not reflect cohort level changes). Based on an analysis of assessment outcomes, changing state demographics--namely rises in economically disadvantaged, Hispanic, and ELL populations--can explain approximately a 0.2% of the observed slippage. DPI has made closing achievement gaps a priority focus. As part of this effort, the Special Education team continues to increase our cross-team coordination with Title 1 services, collaborating and unifying messaging, professional development, and resources. DPI has also added two items to our procedural compliance monitoring system around ensuring that accommodations on assessments are properly considered, documented in the IEP, and implemented.
B	Grade 4	XXX
C	Grade 5	XXX
D	Grade 6	XXX
E	Grade 7	
F	Grade 8	
G	Grade 11	Grade-level slippage from FFY 2017 to FFY 2018 may be the result of several factors, including the cohort nature of assessment data (ie. slippage does not reflect cohort level changes). Based on an analysis of assessment outcomes, changing state demographics--namely rises in economically disadvantaged, Hispanic, and ELL populations--can explain approximately a 0.2% of the observed slippage. DPI has made closing achievement gaps a priority focus. As part of this effort, the Special Education team continues to increase our cross-team coordination with Title 1 services, collaborating and unifying messaging, professional development, and resources. DPI has also added two items to our procedural compliance monitoring system around ensuring that accommodations on assessments are properly considered, documented in the IEP, and implemented.
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

Public reports of assessment results are posted on the DPI website:

1. WISEdash Public Dashboard (Wisconsin Information System for Education Data Dashboard) at <http://wisedash.dpi.wi.gov/Dashboard/portalHome.jsp>;
2. WISEdash Data Files by Topic at <https://dpi.wi.gov/wisedash/download-files>.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

3C - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of 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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

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

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	4.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%
Data	1.57%	2.24%	2.45%	2.45%	4.50%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	2.50%	2.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

On January 24, 2020, DPI staff met with Council to analyze data, set targets for FFY 2019, review the SPP and give updates.

On January 24, 2020, Council also reviewed criteria for determining significant discrepancy in suspensions/expulsions and advised DPI to eliminate minimum numerator and denominator sizes. DPI will report using this new criteria beginning FFY 2019.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

396

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
16	48	4.50%	2.50%	33.33%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Following guidance provided by OSEP during the October 2019 TA call (<https://youtu.be/2NPluCzSozc?t=956>), the above calculation reflects the clarification that OSEP's language does not differentiate between 'cell size' (referring to the numerator) and 'n size' (referring to the denominator), as many states, including Wisconsin, do.

DPI does not have a minimum requirement for the denominator, but the minimum numerator to qualify for significant discrepancy is 2.

The significant change in percentage of districts meeting the State's minimum n-size between FFY 2017 and FFY 2018 reflects DPI's change in understanding of the n-size referring to either the numerator or denominator. Prior to this year, DPI understood n-size to refer to denominator only, and the clarification came after discipline discrepancy findings were made and released to districts.

When one calculates the FFY 2018 data using the same methodology used for FFY 2017 data, the results would be 16/444 significantly discrepant LEAs, or 3.6%. When one calculates the FFY 2018 data using the methodology approved by council for FFY 2019, the results would be 20/444 significantly discrepant LEAs, or 4.5%. Neither result meets the definitional criteria for slippage.

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

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

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

DPI defines significant discrepancy as a district rate of suspension or expulsion for students with IEPs of greater than ten days that is two standard deviations above the average statewide rate (statewide risk). For FFY 2018 reporting (using data from the 2017-18 school year), the average statewide risk was 0.2312% and the standard deviation was 0.6264%. Thus, districts with a rate of suspension or expulsion greater than 1.484% were identified with significant discrepancy for FFY 2018 reporting.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using FFY17- FFY18 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

For districts identified in FFY 2018 with significant discrepancy (using 2017-18 data), a review was conducted of the district's policies, procedures, and practices that impact suspension and expulsion rates, including the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards as required by 34 CFR § 300.170(b). The districts have either adopted DPI's model policies and procedures or have submitted policies and procedures that have been reviewed and approved by DPI staff. Likewise, with IEP forms, the districts have either adopted the department's model IEP forms or use forms approved by DPI. In addition, DPI staff review a sample of records, conduct interviews using standard protocols, and review IDEA state complaint decisions and due process decisions. Based on DPI's review, it was determined that the policies, procedures, and practices were in compliance for all districts identified under Indicator 4A.

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

The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

XXX

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

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

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

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

4A - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- 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))

Data Source

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

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of 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) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons

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

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

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below:

Historical Data

Baseline	2009	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.23%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

403

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies procedure, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
27	0	41	0.23%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if not applicable

XXX

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

DPI defines significant discrepancy as districts with a rate of suspension or expulsion of greater than 10 days for students with IEPs within each racial/ethnic subgroup that is two standard deviations above the average statewide rate. For FFY 2018 reporting (using 2017-2018 data) the mean statewide risk was 0.231% and the standard deviation was 0.626%. Thus, districts with a rate of suspension or expulsion greater than 1.484% within one or more race/ethnicity reporting categories were identified with a significant discrepancy.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using 2017-2018 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

For districts identified in FFY 2018 with significant discrepancy (using 2017-2018 data), DPI conducted a review of the districts' policies, procedures, and practices that impact suspension and expulsion rates, including the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). The districts have either adopted DPI's model policies and procedures or have submitted policies and procedures that have been reviewed and approved by DPI staff. Likewise, with IEP forms, the districts have either adopted the department's model IEP forms or use forms approved by DPI. In addition, identified districts conduct a Disproportionality Procedural Compliance Self-Assessment where districts review a sample of student records, disaggregated by race, and assess related compliance items as identified by OSEP, which is verified by the department. DPI also reviewed IDEA State complaint decisions, due process decisions, and pupil nondiscrimination appeals, and conducted additional record reviews and interviews using standard protocols. Based on the review as described above, there were zero districts with policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and did not comply with a procedural safeguard provision under 34 CFR § 300.530.

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

If YES, select one of the following:

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

The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

XXX

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

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

Consistent with OSEP memo 09-02, DPI verified the single district with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance. To verify compliance, DPI staff provided extensive training on the regulatory requirement in noncompliance and identified the reason for the noncompliance as a lack of automaticity in the special education information system to trigger an IEP team meeting to discuss services after the tenth cumulative day of disciplinary change in placement. The district worked with their software vendor to automate the scheduling of an IEP team to ensure the regulatory requirements are met, and DPI reviewed records and interviewed staff to ensure that this change in practice corrected the noncompliance.

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

Consistent with OSEP memo 09-02, DPI verified the single district with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance. DPI reviewed a random sample of student records of students who were in the district's sample and whose records were not compliance with the respective Indicator 4b regulatory requirements. The size of the sample of records reviewed was dependent upon the size of the district, the number of noncompliant files, and whether the students were still within the jurisdiction of the district. Each record was reviewed to verify it was compliant with the disciplinary regulatory requirements. All of the selected records met the regulatory requirements; therefore, DPI determined that each individual case of noncompliance had been corrected. DPI determined, based on this review of records, each individual case of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 has been corrected.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Education environments (children 6-21): 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))

Data Source

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

Measurement

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

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

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

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

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2005	Target >=	62.00%	63.60%	65.20%	66.80%	68.40%
A	50.83%	Data	63.54%	65.10%	66.22%	67.39%	68.94%
B	2005	Target <=	9.90%	9.50%	9.10%	8.70%	8.30%
B	12.09%	Data	9.75%	9.56%	9.16%	8.84%	8.48%
C	2005	Target <=	1.20%	1.15%	1.10%	1.05%	1.00%
C	1.43%	Data	1.40%	1.43%	1.50%	1.43%	1.44%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	70.00%	70.00%
Target B <=	7.90%	7.90%
Target C <=	0.95%	0.95%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

On January 24, 2020, DPI staff met with Council to analyze data, set targets for FFY 2019, review the SPP and give updates.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	106,938

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	75,003
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	9,056
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	958
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	175
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	253

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

NO

Provide an explanation below

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	75,003	106,938	68.94%	70.00%	70.14%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	9,056	106,938	8.48%	7.90%	8.47%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,386	106,938	1.44%	0.95%	1.30%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]							

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

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

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	XXX
B	XXX
C	XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

5 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Preschool environments: 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))

Data Source

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

Measurement

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

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

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

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

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2011	Target >=	32.50%	33.50%	34.50%	35.50%	36.50%
A	30.98%	Data	34.33%	35.16%	35.91%	32.43%	34.66%
B	2011	Target <=	22.25%	21.25%	20.25%	19.25%	18.25%
B	25.89%	Data	20.34%	18.53%	16.75%	19.36%	17.82%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	37.50%	37.50%
Target B <=	17.25%	17.25%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

On January 24, 2020, DPI staff met with Council to analyze data, set targets for FFY 2019, review the SPP and give updates.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	16,403

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	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	5,798
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	2,631
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b2. Number of children attending separate school	34
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	5,798	16,403	34.66%	37.50%	35.35%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	2,665	16,403	17.82%	17.25%	16.25%	Met Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

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

Provide reasons for slippage for A

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	XXX
B	XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

6 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

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

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

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

Instructions

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

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

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

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

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

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

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2012	Target >=	78.50%	78.70%	78.90%	79.10%	79.30%
A1	78.20%	Data	79.25%	79.13%	80.68%	73.98%	69.35%
A2	2012	Target >=	72.50%	73.00%	73.50%	74.00%	74.50%
A2	72.50%	Data	68.75%	64.55%	65.10%	61.34%	61.97%
B1	2012	Target >=	79.50%	79.85%	80.20%	80.55%	80.90%
B1	79.50%	Data	82.58%	82.08%	83.87%	77.55%	74.23%
B2	2012	Target >=	61.00%	61.20%	61.40%	61.60%	61.80%
B2	60.80%	Data	58.03%	53.20%	54.00%	51.08%	51.93%
C1	2012	Target >=	78.50%	78.90%	79.30%	79.70%	80.10%
C1	78.20%	Data	80.71%	81.34%	83.07%	77.56%	74.83%
C2	2012	Target >=	81.50%	81.70%	81.90%	82.10%	82.30%
C2	81.30%	Data	78.87%	75.41%	74.77%	72.27%	71.84%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1 >=	79.50%	79.50%
Target A2 >=	75.00%	75.00%
Target B1 >=	81.25%	81.25%
Target B2 >=	62.00%	62.00%
Target C1 >=	80.50%	80.50%
Target C2 >=	82.50%	82.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

On January 24, 2020, DPI staff met with Council to analyze data, set targets for FFY 2019, review the SPP and give updates.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

7,180

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

	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	73	1.02%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,504	20.95%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,186	16.52%

	Number of children	Percentage of Children
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,408	33.54%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,009	27.98%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	3,594	5,171	69.35%	79.50%	69.50%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	4,417	7,180	61.97%	75.00%	61.52%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	55	0.77%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,712	23.84%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,702	23.70%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,068	42.73%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	643	8.96%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	4,770	6,537	74.23%	81.25%	72.97%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	3,711	7,180	51.93%	62.00%	51.69%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	47	0.65%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,194	16.63%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	833	11.60%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,532	35.26%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,574	35.85%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	3,365	4,606	74.83%	80.50%	73.06%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
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.	5,106	7,180	71.84%	82.50%	71.11%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	XXX
A2	XXX
B1	<p>DPI introduced during the 2016-17 school year a web-based application for the reporting of child outcomes. This application guides the child outcomes team through the rating process by use of the Child Outcomes Decision Tree. This guided approach has led to more accurate rating reporting, which has resulted in slippage.</p> <p>Additionally, statewide training has been provided throughout the state specific to the three early childhood indicators. For Indicator 7, this training focused on the use of an age-anchoring assessment tool to accurately rate a child, as well as the need for ongoing assessment to inform instruction.</p> <p>DPI, through discretionary grants, provides both targeted and statewide technical assistance to improve early childhood outcomes. DPI funds twelve regional early childhood program support teachers, a position working directly with the largest school district, and a statewide early childhood coordinator.</p> <p>These regional discretionary grant staff members provide professional development statewide, as well as targeted to specific districts, and are directly involved in supporting DPI's work related to College and Career Ready IEPs. The professional development provided by the regional discretionary grant focuses on the development and implementation of quality IEPs at the early childhood level.</p> <p>DPI has also launched a statewide initiative focusing on preschool inclusion. Focus districts have been identified through the use of data. The regional discretionary grant staff are directly working with these focus districts to increase opportunities for young children to receive special education and related services in inclusive settings. It is expected that expanded access to high quality preschool inclusion will lead to more positive outcomes for young children.</p>
B2	XXX
C1	<p>DPI introduced during the 2016-17 school year a web-based application for the reporting of child outcomes. This application guides the child outcomes team through the rating process by use of the Child Outcomes Decision Tree. This guided approach has led to more accurate rating reporting, which has resulted in slippage.</p> <p>Additionally, statewide training has been provided throughout the state specific to the three early childhood indicators. For Indicator 7, this training focused on the use of an age-anchoring assessment tool to accurately rate a child, as well as the need for ongoing assessment to inform instruction.</p> <p>DPI, through discretionary grants, provides both targeted and statewide technical assistance to improve early childhood outcomes. DPI funds twelve regional early childhood program support teachers, a position working directly with the largest school district, and a statewide early childhood coordinator.</p>

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	<p>These regional discretionary grant staff members provide professional development statewide, as well as targeted to specific districts, and are directly involved in supporting DPI's work related to College and Career Ready IEPs. The professional development provided by the regional discretionary grant focuses on the development and implementation of quality IEPs at the early childhood level.</p> <p>DPI has also launched a statewide initiative focusing on preschool inclusion. Focus districts have been identified through the use of data. The regional discretionary grant staff are directly working with these focus districts to increase opportunities for young children to receive special education and related services in inclusive settings. It is expected that expanded access to high quality preschool inclusion will lead to more positive outcomes for young children.</p>
C2	XXX

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)

YES

Please explain why the State did not include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If the plan has changed, please provide sampling plan	

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

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

YES

If no, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers."

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

During FFY18, DPI continued to use the individual child web-based application for the purpose of reporting Indicator 7 child outcomes that was introduced during the 2016-17 school year. This application uses the Child Outcomes Decision Tree developed by the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center to guide the child outcomes team through the child outcomes process for both the entry and exit rating. When using the application, the child outcomes team identifies the sources of information obtained and responds to a series of questions using the Child Outcomes Decision Tree. In using the application, the child outcomes team is required to document evidence supporting the responses provided. Based on the responses provided by the child outcomes team, the child's entry or exit rating for each outcome area is determined by the application relative to the 7-point scale used in the child outcomes process. This 7-point scale compares the child's level of current functioning to that of same-age typically developing peers. The ratings using the 7-point scale are then converted for the purpose of reporting the child outcomes progress categories and summary statements.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

7 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

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

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

8 - Indicator Data

	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO
If yes, will you be providing the data for preschool children separately?	XXX

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

On January 24, 2020, DPI staff met with Council to analyze data, set targets for FFY 2019, review the SPP and give updates.

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	88.52%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	85.00%	85.50%	86.00%	86.50%	88.75%
Data	86.09%	84.66%	83.75%	88.52%	88.94%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	89.00%	89.00%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
1,824	2,040	88.94%	89.00%	89.41%	Met Target	No Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

21,401

Percentage of respondent parents

9.53%

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

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

DPI uses the following methodology for calculating Indicator 8 results: the mean rate of agreement is calculated for each completed survey, which is then summed across all respondent data and then divided by the total number of survey's submitted. Due to the interface's requirement that the numerator be an integer, this was rounded to the nearest whole number (from 1823.551). All included surveys are weighted equally, and all partially completed surveys are counted so long as more than 50% of the survey questions were answered.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Preschool	XXX	Target >=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
Preschool	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
School age	XXX	Target >=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
School age	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	XXX	XXX
Target B >=	XXX	XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Preschool Children Reported Separately

	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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
Preschool	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
School age	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

The number of School-Age parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

XXX

Percentage of respondent School-Age parents

XXX

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	NO
If yes, provide sampling plan.	XXX

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

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

To help ensure that results of the survey are valid and reliable, DPI requires that districts meet a minimum response rate that is calculated for each district based on the number of students with IEPs in the district. Because of an expanded population from which to solicit responses, many districts exceeded their minimum response rates requirements. The FFY 2018 response rate of 9.59% yields a margin of error of 0.92% (95% CI), which is in line with the conventional measure of rigor for survey research.

	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	XXX
The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.	NO

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

DPI performed an analysis of Indicator 8 demographic representation in the Spring of 2019, and concluded that major revisions to the sampling and methodology needed to take place to make survey responses representative of statewide demographics. Toward that end, DPI is implementing the following changes (will report beginning in FFY 2019):

First, the minimum response rate for districts in the reporting cycle will increase to 10%. While statewide responses are already at approximately 10%, the responses are disproportionately coming from smaller, majority white districts, which skews the demographic representativeness of the results. This change is expected to double black and Hispanic response rates, but the overall representativeness would still be below achieving the 3% threshold recommended by the National Post-School Outcomes Center guidance.

Second, to address the remaining under-representation of black and Hispanic respondents, DPI will implement post-collection stratified sampling on the surveys (prioritizing race first, followed by disability reporting category). Based on data from past years, the post-stratified sampling likely can achieve a demographically representative sample while also preserving approximately 91% of responses in the statewide calculation. Recognizing the valuable contribution of time and thought each respondent provided, however, 100% of these responses will remain in district level calculations; DPI continues to recognize the importance of facilitating dialogue between districts and families through the survey.

The result of both the above steps is expected to create a much larger and more demographically representative sample for subsequent reporting years.

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

Districts report the race/ethnicity and primary disability status of their students on the annual October 1st count of children with disabilities. This data is used to determine the race/ethnicity and primary disability of students whose family members completed an Indicator 8 survey. A benchmark of 3% (in line with National Post-School Outcomes Center guidance for indicator 14) is used to assess the extent to which survey data reflect the demographics of the state; namely, that parents who responded to the survey have students of diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds and primary disabilities. The attached table "FFY_2018_Ind8_Demographics.csv" compares the disability and racial/ethnic makeup of students with completed surveys with statewide demographics.

For FFY 2018, the sample fails to meet the 3% threshold in several areas. Among race reporting categories, black students are underrepresented by 8.9% and Hispanic students are underrepresented by 5.1%. White students are over-represented by 18.2%. The sample is representative along all disability reporting categories.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

8 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

The State did not provide verification that the attachment it included in its FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission is in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), as required by Section 508 and noted in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR User Guides and technical webinar.

8 - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

24

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
19	0	422	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

Definition of Disproportionate Representation:

A Risk Ratio or Alternate Risk Ratio of 2.0 or Greater: In calculating the risk ratio for over-representation, DPI uses the Westat technical assistance guidance for calculating disproportionality based on the Risk Ratio, which is the risk for the racial/ethnic group within the disability category divided by the risk for the comparison group to be in special education. When the local comparison group does not meet the state's minimum cell and n sizes, DPI uses the Alternate Risk Ratio for its calculation, as is recommended by the Westat technical assistance guidance. This calculation is the local risk for the racial/ethnic group divided by the statewide risk for the comparison group.

Cell size: To be identified for over-representation, a racial or ethnic group must have at least ten students with IEPs in a given cell used for risk ratio analysis, and a total enrollment of 30 students in the given racial or ethnic group. A district can be identified when one racial or ethnic group has a total enrollment of 30 students, even if the other racial or ethnic groups in the district have a total enrollment of less than 30 students.

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

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

Once districts are identified based on data for disproportionate representation, district and DPI staff review policies, procedures, and practices used in identification to determine whether students are appropriately identified, and that all policies, procedures, and practices are race neutral and in compliance with state special education law and Part B of IDEA 2004, including the requirements of 34 CFR 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311. The districts have either adopted DPI's model policies and procedures or have submitted policies and procedures that have been reviewed and approved by DPI staff. The districts also have either adopted the DPI's model IEP forms or use forms approved by DPI. In determining eligibility for special education, the districts use state eligibility criteria. In determining whether a district's disproportionality was a result of inappropriate identification, the DPI also reviews IDEA state complaint decisions, due process decisions, and pupil nondiscrimination appeals. Finally, identified districts conduct a Disproportionality Procedural Compliance Self-Assessment. Districts review a sample of student records, disaggregated by race, and assess compliance items identified by OSEP as related to disproportionality, which is verified by DPI. Through the review described above, the DPI determined that there were zero districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

XXX

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

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

9 - OSEP Response

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

73

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
54	0	373	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

A Risk Ratio or Alternate Risk Ratio of 2.0 or Greater: In calculating the risk ratio for over-representation, DPI uses the Westat technical assistance guidance for calculating disproportionality based on the Risk Ratio, which is the risk for the racial/ethnic group within the disability category divided by the risk for the comparison group within the disability category. When the local comparison group does not meet the state's minimum cell and n sizes, DPI uses the Alternate Risk Ratio for its calculation, as is recommended by the Westat technical assistance guidance. This calculation is the local risk for the racial/ethnic group divided by the statewide risk for the comparison group.

Cell size: To be identified for over-representation, a racial or ethnic group must have at least ten students with IEPs in a given cell used for risk ratio analysis, and a total enrollment of 30 students in the given racial or ethnic group. A district can be identified when one racial or ethnic group has a total enrollment of 30 students, even if the other racial or ethnic groups in the district have a total enrollment of less than 30 students.

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

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

Once districts are identified based on data for disproportionate representation, district and DPI staff review policies, procedures, and practices used in identification to determine whether students are appropriately identified, and that all policies, procedures, and practices are race neutral and in compliance with state special education law and Part B of IDEA 2004, including the requirements of 34 CFR 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311. The districts have either adopted DPI's model policies and procedures or have submitted policies and procedures that have been reviewed and approved by DPI staff. The districts also have either adopted the DPI's model IEP forms or use forms approved by DPI. In determining eligibility for special education, the districts use state eligibility criteria. In determining whether a district's disproportionality was a result of inappropriate identification, the DPI also reviews IDEA state complaint decisions, due process decisions, and pupil nondiscrimination appeals. Finally, identified districts conduct a Disproportionality Procedural Compliance Self-Assessment. Districts review a sample of student records, disaggregated by race, and assess compliance items identified by OSEP as related to disproportionality, which is verified by DPI. Through the review described above, the DPI determined that there were zero districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

XXX

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

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

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

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	88.41%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.67%	98.64%	97.72%	98.93%	91.28%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
7,769	7,595	91.28%	100%	97.76%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage

XXX

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

174

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

The range of days beyond the timeline was 1 to 95. Reasons for the delay include: staff, parent, interpreter or evaluation data (from other agency or parent) unavailable; scheduling changes; software and human error; and unknown.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

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

What is the State’s timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).

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

State monitoring

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

DPI used the Indicator 11: Timely Initial Evaluations application to collect student-level data from districts from the selected cohort. Wisconsin’s districts are divided into 5 groups (cohorts), and roughly one-fifth of the districts in the state report the data through the Indicator 11 application each year, with Milwaukee Public Schools, with average daily membership of over 50,000, reporting on an annual basis. The sample of districts within each cycle year are representative of the following statewide characteristics: geographic regions, total enrollment of students with disabilities, racial/ethnic makeup of the students with disabilities subgroup, and distribution of primary disabilities. For relevant demographics, a 95% confidence interval about the median was used to construct the five-year cohort cycle. See Introduction to the SPP/APR for more information. For FFY 2018, 86 districts reported on the percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 calendar days. Of the 86, 40 had one or more initial evaluations beyond the 60 day timeline with no applicable exception (noncompliant). The percent of children with parental consent to evaluate who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days during FFY 2018 was 97.76%.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
707	707	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Consistent with OSEP memo 09-02, DPI verified each district with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through monitoring; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district.

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

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

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

Following these two-pronged verification procedures, which are consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, DPI determined all districts found in noncompliance during FFY 2017 have corrected each individual case of noncompliance and are currently in compliance with 34 CFR 300.301(c) and the exceptions at 34 CFR 300.301(d) and 34 CFR 300.309(c).

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

To verify each instance of individual student noncompliance was corrected, DPI staff reviewed a randomly drawn sample of initial evaluation records of students whose evaluations were not completed within 60 days. The size of the sample of records reviewed was dependent upon the size of the district and the number of noncompliant files. For most districts, the sample included all records. Each record was reviewed to verify the evaluation was completed, although late. In instances when students were found eligible for special education services, each record was reviewed to ensure compensatory services had been considered. All records demonstrated the evaluation(s) had been completed and compensatory services had been considered. DPI determined, based on this review of records, each individual instance of noncompliance found in FFY 2017 was corrected.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	65.60%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.81%	98.85%	99.11%	98.71%	98.53%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	3,779
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	521
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,748

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.	419
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	52
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,748	2,787	98.53%	100%	98.60%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

39

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

Children not accounted for above include 35 children found eligible for Part B whose IEPs were implemented after their third birthdays, 3 children found not eligible for Part B whose eligibility was determined after their third birthdays, and 1 child for whom eligibility for Part B has not yet been determined. Of the 35 children found eligible for Part B whose IEPs were implemented after their third birthdays, the range of days for late implementation of the IEP was from 1 day to 184 days. Reasons for the delays include staff not available, difficulties coordinating meetings, referrals to Part B received less than 90 days prior to the child's third birthday, and scheduling errors.

Attach PDF table (optional)

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
39	39	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Consistent with OSEP memo 09-02, DPI verified each district with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a quarterly review of current year district records; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance by ensuring that eligibility was determined, and if eligible, an IEP was developed. To verify current compliance, DPI staff examined all current referrals for each district with noncompliance. DPI staff reviewed the records to determine whether the evaluations were completed by the student's third birthday, and if eligible, an IEP was developed and implemented by the student's third birthday. If all reviewed evaluations and IEPs were completed and implemented by the student's third birthday within the quarterly review, DPI determined that the district is currently in compliance. Following this verification procedure, which is consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, the DPI determined all districts found in noncompliance during FFY 2017 have corrected each individual case of noncompliance and are currently in compliance with 34 CFR 300.124.

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

To verify each instance of individual student noncompliance was corrected, DPI staff reviewed submitted data for each student record to determine that the evaluation was completed, and if eligible, that an IEP was developed and implemented for the child (although late). DPI reviewed all records with noncompliance to ensure correction. Consistent with OSEP memo 09-02, DPI verified each district with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected

through a review of district referrals, evaluations, and IEPs; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance by ensuring that eligibility was determined, and if eligible, an IEP was developed.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Secondary transition: 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))

Data Source

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

Measurement

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

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

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2009	71.21%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.92%	99.65%	99.83%	99.93%	99.86%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
26,779	26,796	99.86%	100%	99.94%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

	Yes / No
Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	YES
If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age?	NO
If yes, at what age are youth included in the data for this indicator	

If no, please explain

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
38	38	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

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

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

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

To verify each instance of individual student noncompliance was corrected, DPI staff reviewed each student record to determine that the evaluation was completed, and if eligible, that an IEP was developed and implemented for the child (although late). DPI reviewed all records with noncompliance to ensure correction. In instances when the IEP was implemented after the child's birthday, each record was reviewed to ensure compensatory services had been considered. Consistent with OSEP memo 09-02, DPI verified each district with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through a review of district referrals, evaluations, and IEPs; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance by ensuring that eligibility was determined, and if eligible, an IEP was developed and compensatory services were considered.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX

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

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected
Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX
Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected
Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX
Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.

Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

Collect data by September 2019 on students who left school during 2017-2018, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2017-2018 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

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

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment” in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, due February 2020:

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

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

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

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

II. Data Reporting

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

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

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

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

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

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

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2012	Target >=	29.80%	30.30%	30.80%	31.30%	31.80%
A	29.80%	Data	27.51%	27.15%	31.44%	28.40%	27.79%
B	2012	Target >=	59.50%	61.50%	63.50%	65.50%	67.50%
B	59.40%	Data	64.94%	64.51%	68.39%	71.12%	68.24%
C	2012	Target >=	73.00%	75.00%	77.00%	79.00%	81.00%
C	72.90%	Data	77.56%	77.81%	81.05%	83.15%	81.95%

FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	32.30%	32.30%
Target B >=	69.50%	69.50%
Target C >=	83.00%	83.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

On January 24, 2020, DPI staff met with Council to analyze data, set targets for FFY 2019, review the SPP and give updates.

FFY 2018 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	1,506
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	368
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	588
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)	65
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).	132

	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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	368	1,506	27.79%	32.30%	24.44%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	956	1,506	68.24%	69.50%	63.48%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	1,153	1,506	81.95%	83.00%	76.56%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	<p>The cyclical nature of DPI's post-secondary outcomes survey make year to year comparisons difficult, as regional variations in employment opportunities and post-secondary educational institutions can result in inconsistent outcomes. While DPI attempts to control for this variation by including a mix of rural and urban communities in each cycle, there is no perfect solution to eliminate this variation.</p> <p>Additionally, the population of Wisconsin dropouts continue to show a significant un-engagement rate following exit from high school. Almost 50% of the dropouts interviewed during the 2019 survey window did not meet reporting requirements for categories A, B, or C. DPI and our grant partners continue to perform outreach and assistance to schools with low graduation / high dropout rates for intensive targeted work to improve high school completion, and by extension improve post-secondary outcomes correlated with high school completion.</p>
B	<p>The cyclical nature of DPI's post-secondary outcomes survey make year to year comparisons difficult, as regional variations in employment opportunities and post-secondary educational institutions can result in inconsistent outcomes. While DPI attempts to control for this variation by including a mix of rural and urban communities in each cycle, there is no perfect solution to eliminate this variation.</p> <p>Additionally, the population of Wisconsin dropouts continue to show a significant un-engagement rate following exit from high school. Almost 50% of the dropouts interviewed during the 2019 survey window did not meet reporting requirements for categories A, B, or C. DPI and our grant partners continue to perform outreach and assistance to schools with low graduation / high dropout rates for intensive targeted work to improve high school completion, and by extension improve post-secondary outcomes correlated with high school completion.</p>
C	<p>The cyclical nature of DPI's post-secondary outcomes survey make year to year comparisons difficult, as regional variations in employment opportunities and post-secondary educational institutions can result in inconsistent outcomes. While DPI attempts to control for this variation by including a mix of rural and urban communities in each cycle, there is no perfect solution to eliminate this variation.</p> <p>Additionally, the population of Wisconsin dropouts continue to show a significant un-engagement rate following exit from high school. Almost 50% of the dropouts interviewed during the 2019 survey window did not meet reporting requirements for categories A, B, or C. DPI and our grant partners continue to perform outreach and assistance to schools with low graduation / high dropout rates for intensive targeted work to improve high school completion, and by extension improve post-secondary outcomes correlated with high school completion.</p>

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

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

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	NO
If yes, provide sampling plan.	XXX

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

The Wisconsin Indicator 14 Survey is conducted as a within-district census so all exiters from participating districts have an opportunity to complete the survey. Wisconsin's districts are divided into 5 groups (cohorts), and roughly one-fifth of districts in the state are required to participate in the survey each year. One exception is that Milwaukee Public Schools, with average daily enrollment over 50,000, participates in the survey on an annual basis.

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

	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, attach a copy of the survey	XXX

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

For the FFY 2018 survey of 2017-18 exiters, the cohort included the required one-fifth of the districts (80), representing 21% of the 378 districts with an exiter population in Wisconsin. The representativeness of the survey meets the three percent threshold recommended by the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) for all primary disability categories. Using conventional rounding rules, the representativeness for minority and dropouts is at the recommended 3% and they are considered to be under-represented categories. Please see the attached document for this analysis.

To help ensure survey results are indeed representative, DPI requires that each district meet a minimum response rate of 20% of its total number of exiters from the previous year. For FFY 2018, DPI reports a response rate of 58.83% on the Wisconsin Indicator 14 Survey. This response rate yields a margin of error of 2.14% (95% CI), which is in line with the conventional measure of rigor for survey research.

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

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

Due to the geographic concentration of underrepresented races/ethnicities in larger districts, DPI has determined that it is not possible to achieve demographically representative responses while holding all LEAs to the same expectations of minimum response rates. Therefore, DPI will explore the use of data sharing with post-secondary and state partners to supplement survey data with existing enrollment and employment data collections to improve the representativeness of future reporting. This strategy, combined with the use of post-collection stratified sampling, should allow future reporting to more accurately reflect Wisconsin's demographics.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

14 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State reported that the response data for this indicator were representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. However, in its narrative, the State reported that the representativeness for minority and dropouts is less than the recommended 3% and are considered to be under-represented categories. Therefore, it is unclear whether or not the response data was representative. OSEP notes that the State did not describe the strategies to address this issue in the future.

The State did not provide verification that the attachment it included in its FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission is in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), as required by Section 508 and noted in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR User Guides and technical webinar.

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	8
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3

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

NO

Provide an explanation below.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

On January 24, 2020, DPI staff met with Council to analyze data, set targets for FFY 2019, review the SPP and give updates.

Historical Data

Baseline	2012	41.18%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	42.00%	42.00%	42.00%	42.00%	42.00%
Data	63.64%	50.00%	44.44%	16.67%	20.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	42.00%	42.00%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
3	8	20.00%	42.00%	37.50%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Targets

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

15 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2018. The State is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1 Mediations held	90
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	4
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	79

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

NO

Provide an explanation below

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

On January 24, 2020, DPI staff met with Council to analyze data, set targets for FFY 2019, review the SPP and give updates.

Historical Data

Baseline	2012	75.51%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	76.00%	76.00%	76.00%	76.00%	76.00%
Data	81.40%	92.54%	86.36%	93.98%	93.62%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	76.00%	76.00%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
4	79	90	93.62%	76.00%	92.22%	Met Target	No Slippage

Targets

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

16 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

16 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

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

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name:

Julia Hartwig

Title:

Director, Special Education

Email:

julia.hartwig@dpi.wi.gov

Phone:

608-266-1781

Submitted on: