

# **STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B**

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

**For reporting on  
FFY 2020**

**Wisconsin**



**PART B DUE February 1, 2022**

**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) 2020 APR targets, results, slippage from the previous APR, and verification of correction of all previous findings of all noncompliance found in FFY 2019 are compiled in the report that follows.

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

In aggregate, the results indicators (1, 2, 3, 4a, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14) offer a snapshot of how students with IEPs are performing throughout their educational lives. During this reporting period, the DPI is reporting that Wisconsin met target and/or did not experience slippage for all indicators except 4a (results indicator that measures the rates of suspension/expulsion (percentage of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 cumulative days in a school year for children with IEPs)). For that indicator, the DPI is reporting slippage.

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

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

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

#### Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Data collection and reporting continue to be affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. During this reporting period, Wisconsin LEAs returned to in-person instruction, as compared to virtual instruction provided March 18-June 30, 2020 (see Wisconsin Department of Health Secretary-designee Andrea Palm's Order for Statewide School Closure).

2019 AB 1038 was introduced on April 13, 2020, in response to the COVID-19 pandemic and resulting public health emergency. Governor Evers signed AB 1038 into law on April 15, 2020, as 2019 Act 185 (Act 185). In addition to activities reported during FFY 2019 APR (information from school districts regarding the impacts of the school closures), Act 185 requires the DPI to post guidance to schools on best practices related to transitioning from virtual instruction to in-person instruction, on its Internet site. The DPI created the Education Forward webpage to house guidance documents for Wisconsin district and school leaders to use as they planned for a safe, efficient, and equitable return to school for the 2020-21 school year amid the COVID-19 pandemic. The information from that guide has since been reorganized. Additional information pertaining to the COVID-19 pandemic and K-12 schools can be found on the DPI's COVID-19 Information web page.

While the return to school amid the COVID-19 pandemic was – for many districts - safe, efficient, and equitable, it was not without challenges that affected data collecting and reporting.

First, the Wisconsin Statewide Student Assessment System (WSAS) exams given to students during the 2020-21 school year saw a decline in participation. Assessments were administered to students in spring 2021 following standard in-person test taking procedures amid the COVID-19 pandemic.

The WSAS consists of the Forward Exam given in grades three through eight and 10, the ACT Aspire given in grades nine and 10, the ACT with writing in grade 11, and Dynamic Learning Maps given across all tested grades to students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. Results from the WSAS are a foundational component of the state-legislated school and district report cards that are issued in November.

Overall, statewide participation rates among the approximately 580,000 enrolled public and Choice school students on the Forward, DLM, Aspire, and ACT decreased from previous years to 84 percent in English language arts and 85 percent in mathematics. The decline is likely due to pandemic-related factors such as a change in learning environment, parent/guardian opt-out from the assessments, and changes in enrollment from previous years. Consistent with national trends, proficiency rates in ELA (32 percent) and mathematics (31 percent) decreased statewide among enrolled public and Choice school students. Proficiency rates are calculated as a percent of enrolled students, not tested students. Students who were not tested count against overall proficiency scores.

While the DPI worked with districts to provide additional flexibility to safely administer assessments, students did not participate in the assessments in some instances due to local health conditions and concerns, or to parent choices to keep students home. In some districts, lower than usual participation rates may mean that students who took the test are not representative of the overall student population. It is strongly recommended to use caution when

interpreting results. Making comparisons across years or districts when test participation rates are lower than 95 percent should be avoided, as varying factors resulted in an overall decline in participation rates across the state.

Second, the Indicator 14 Post School Outcome survey demonstrated the growing impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on post school activities for students with disabilities. Results of the survey, finalized in Fall 2021, gathered information on postsecondary activities of 5,071 former students with disabilities. Of those respondents, 22% had completed at least one term of postsecondary education and training. This was a decrease from the 2020 survey where 26% of respondents had completed postsecondary education. A common reason for not pursuing further education recorded by interviewers was the COVID-19 pandemic. Many former students shared concerns regarding remote learning and access to reliable internet service as reasons for not pursuing further education.

Third, and related to procedural compliance under IDEA, including the compliance indicators, is that the COVID-19 pandemic affected schools' and districts' ability to conduct initial evaluations and the provision of special education services under IDEA. The DPI provided compliance information, including guidance and resources, targeted toward district administrators and special education administrators. Updated information was shared in weekly and special news alerts; the DPI developed and maintained a "COVID-19 Special Education Question and Answer Document." Archived news alerts, the Q & A document, and other resources are curated on a dedicated "COVID-19 – Special Education Updates and Resources webpage (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/covid-19-sped-updates-and-resources>).

#### **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

The DPI ensures all districts have adopted policies, procedures, and practices that comply with IDEA and state special education law. The DPI developed Model Local Educational Agency Special Education Policies and Procedures, as well as Sample Individualized Education Program (IEP) Forms and Guide, to help districts meet their obligation to comply with all special education requirements. All districts are required to either submit an assurance to the department that they have adopted the DPI model policies and procedures and model forms or submit local versions to the DPI for review and approval.

In addition, districts identified with racial disproportionality conduct a review of their policies, procedures, and practices to determine and address any inappropriate identification associated with Indicators 4B, 9, and 10.

##### 2) Data collection and fiscal monitoring

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

##### 3) Targeted training and technical assistance

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

##### 4) Effective, responsive dispute resolution process

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

##### 4a) IDEA Complaints

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

##### 4b) Due Process

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

##### 4c) Mediation

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

##### 5) Procedural Compliance Self-Assessment

The DPI uses a Procedural Compliance Self-Assessment (PCSA) to identify and correct noncompliance. Items in the PCSA are aligned with and support Wisconsin's results driven accountability system, with its focus on improving literacy outcomes for students with disabilities. Annually, the DPI gathers monitoring data from approximately one-fifth of the districts in the state through the PCSA. Each cohort of districts is representative of the state considering such variables as geography, disability categories, age, race, and gender. The DPI includes every district in the PCSA at least once during the five-year cycle and each district with an average daily membership greater than 50,000 every year. To assure valid and reliable data, the PCSA

checklist includes standards and directions for reviewing the procedural requirements and the DPI requires all district staff conducting the assessment to complete a training and certification e-course. Information about the PCSA is posted on the DPI website at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/educators/rdapcsa>.

#### 6) Early Childhood Transition System

The DPI and the Wisconsin Department of Health Services (DHS), the Part C lead agency, worked collaboratively to develop an electronic referral and reporting system to ensure children participating in county Birth to 3 programs (Part C) experience a smooth and effective transition to early childhood programs (Part B). County Birth to 3 program data is daily uploaded into the Indicator 12 web-based application for districts; the application then notifies districts of the referral from county Birth to 3 programs. Finally, districts submit data for Indicator 12 through the application. In addition to ensuring a smooth and effective transition, this data collection system promotes accurate reporting of data. Districts report child-specific data on a real-time basis. This allows for timely identification and correction of noncompliance.

#### 7) Postsecondary Transition Plan Application

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

#### **Technical Assistance System:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Wisconsin Rtl 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](http://www.wifacets.org))

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

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

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

#### **Professional Development System:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **Broad Stakeholder Input:**

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

The DPI used both universal and targeted approaches to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

#### **1. Universal strategy: Open invitation to input sessions**

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

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

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

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

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

#### **3. Targeted strategy: State Advisory Panel input sessions**

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

#### **4. Targeted strategy: Customized invitations to stakeholders**

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

#### **5. Targeted strategy: Customized surveys of families**

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

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

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

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

YES

#### **Number of Parent Members:**

3,719

#### **Parent Members Engagement:**

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

In a variety of different ways, the DPI engaged parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 2. Web-based input

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

## 3. Customized surveys

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

## 4. Indicator 8 parent survey research contract

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

### **Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:**

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

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

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

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

#### 2. Universal activity: Plain language website

The SPP/APR stakeholder engagement website is <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>. The website is organized in family-friendly, plain language. The website translates the results indicators into four key questions, as listed in the section, above. For each of the key questions and related indicators,

the website includes a section to learn more about the data and recommended targets and rationale, a section to learn about related improvement activities, and then a link to Google forms to collect input related to the indicators.

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

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

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

### 3. Targeted activity: Customized surveys

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

### 4. Targeted activity: Indicator 8 parent survey research contract

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

### Soliciting Public Input:

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

The DPI used synchronous input sessions and asynchronous (web-based) mechanisms to solicit public input in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

On December 3, 2021, the DPI used most of the State Advisory Panel's regular meeting to gather input on targets, analyze data, develop improvement strategies, and determine evaluation metrics related to one key question: How are Wisconsin learners with IEPs performing in key areas? and is related to Indicators 3, 7, and 17. The December 3, 2021, input session included data analysis and recommended targets and rationale; discussion of the

improvement activities offered through the Wisconsin RtI Center (<https://www.wisconsinrticenter.org/>), the the Early Childhood Special Education project (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/early-childhood>), the Research to Practice Inclusive Communities project (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/educators/discretionary-grants/rpic-project>), and the Transformation Zone, all projects funded through IDEA discretionary dollars; and then time for SAP members and other stakeholders to complete Google forms related to Indicator 3a, Indicator 3b, Indicator 7, and Indicator 17.

## 2. Web-based input

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

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

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

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

## **Making Results Available to the Public:**

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

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

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

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

#### 2. Website

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

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

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

Are Wisconsin learners with IEPs learning in the same spaces as their peers? is the key question related to Indicators 5 and 6. The website describes this key question as, "Wisconsin schools have a responsibility to teach learners with IEPs in the "least restrictive environment." This means they should spend as much time as possible with peers who do not receive special education. How well are schools doing that? Where do YOU want Wisconsin schools to be in six years? The statewide data we use to answer these questions are called "educational environment" data and is submitted annually by districts." The website includes a section to learn more about the data and recommended targets and rationale; a section to learn about improvement activities offered through the Research to Practice Inclusive Communities Project (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/educators/discretionary-grants/rpic-project>) and the Early Childhood Special Education project (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/early-childhood>), both of which are funded through IDEA discretionary dollars; and then a link to Google forms to collect input related to Indicators 5 and 6.

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

How are Wisconsin learners with IEPs performing in key areas? is the key question related to Indicators 3, 7, and 17. The website describes this key question as, "One way of measuring the success of special education and related services that are provided to Wisconsin learners served by



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

### 3. IDEA Part B SPP/APR FFY 2020

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

### 4. State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2020-2025: Stakeholder engagement final report

The DPI is currently drafting a final report that details stakeholder engagement in the State’s targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State’s Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). This report will be a stand-alone document that will be posted to the DPI website no later than May 27, 2022.

## Reporting to the Public

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 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 2019 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State’s SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.**

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

## Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## Intro - OSEP Response

## Intro - Required Actions

# Indicator 1: Graduation

## Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

### Data Source

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

### Measurement

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

### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

## 1 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data<sup>1</sup>

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	85.32%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%
Data	67.51%	68.54%	68.24%	68.59%	69.8% <sup>2</sup>

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	85.32%	85.50%	85.80%	86.20%	86.70%	87.40%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The DPI used both universal and targeted approaches to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

#### 1. Universal strategy: Open invitation to input sessions

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

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

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

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

<sup>1</sup> Prior to the FFY 2020 submission, the State used a different data source to report data under this indicator.

<sup>2</sup> Percentage blurred due to privacy protection

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

**3. Targeted strategy: State Advisory Panel input sessions**

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

**4. Targeted strategy: Customized invitations to stakeholders**

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

**5. Targeted strategy: Customized surveys of families**

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

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

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

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	5,814
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	125
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	32
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	843

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
5,814	6,814	69.8% <sup>3</sup>	85.32%	85.32%	N/A	N/A

**Graduation Conditions**

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

The requirements for obtaining a regular diploma in Wisconsin for FFY 2019 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.

<sup>3</sup> Percentage blurred due to privacy protection

This statutory requirement went into effect beginning in the 2016-2017 school year.

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

A graduate is defined as a student who has met the requirements established by a school board for a prescribed course of study. Wisconsin State Statute §118.33(1)(a) defines the requirements for receipt of a high school diploma as: except as provided in §118.33(1)(d)(see below), a school board may not grant a high school diploma to any pupil unless the pupil has earned:

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

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

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

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

YES

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

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

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

The DPI reset baseline targets for this indicator due to changes in measurement instituted by OSEP for FFY 2020-2025.

### **1 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

### **1 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

### **1 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 2: Drop Out

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

#### Data Source

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 FS009.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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 exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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.*

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 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target.

With the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, States may use either option 1 or 2. States using Option 2 must provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

OPTION 1:

**Use 618 exiting data** for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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

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:

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

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023,** States must report data using Option 1 (i.e., the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA). Option 2 will not be available beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

## 2 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data<sup>4</sup>

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	12.37%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	1.70%	1.60%	1.50%	1.40%	1.40%
Data	2.24%	2.14%	2.45%	2.42%	2.40%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	12.37%	12.20%	11.90%	11.50%	11.00%	10.30%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The DPI used both universal and targeted approaches to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

<sup>4</sup> Prior to the FFY 2020 submission, the State used a different data source to report data under this indicator.

1. Universal strategy: Open invitation to input sessions

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

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

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

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

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

3. Targeted strategy: State Advisory Panel input sessions

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

4. Targeted strategy: Customized invitations to stakeholders

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

5. Targeted strategy: Customized surveys of families

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

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

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

**Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator**

Option 1

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	5,814
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	125
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	32
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	843

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
843	6,814	2.40%	12.37%	12.37%	N/A	N/A

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

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

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

NO

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

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

The DPI reset baseline targets for this indicator due to changes in measurement instituted by OSEP for FFY 2020-2025.

**2 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**2 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**2 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

### 3A - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

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

#### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%



## Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The DPI used both universal and targeted approaches to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

### 1. Universal strategy: Open invitation to input sessions

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

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

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

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

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

### 3. Targeted strategy: State Advisory Panel input sessions

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

### 4. Targeted strategy: Customized invitations to stakeholders

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

### 5. Targeted strategy: Customized surveys of families

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

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

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

## FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

### Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

### Date:

03/30/2022

### Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	9,174	8,905	8,536
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	2,252	1,218	671

c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	5,007	5,365	4,965
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	399	437	485

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

03/30/2022

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	9,176	8,904	8,536
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	2,244	1,217	672
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	4,998	5,342	4,981
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	396	437	481

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

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	7,658	9,174		95.00%	83.48%	Did not meet target	N/A
B	Grade 8	7,020	8,905		95.00%	78.83%	Did not meet target	N/A
C	Grade HS	6,121	8,536		95.00%	71.71%	Did not meet target	N/A

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	7,638	9,176		95.00%	83.24%	Did not meet target	N/A
B	Grade 8	6,996	8,904		95.00%	78.57%	Did not meet target	N/A
C	Grade HS	6,134	8,536		95.00%	71.86%	Did not meet target	N/A

**Regulatory Information**

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

## Public Reporting Information

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

[https://dpi.wi.gov/wisedash/download-files/type?field\\_wisedash\\_upload\\_type\\_value=Forward](https://dpi.wi.gov/wisedash/download-files/type?field_wisedash_upload_type_value=Forward)

[https://dpi.wi.gov/wisedash/download-files/type?field\\_wisedash\\_upload\\_type\\_value=ACT11](https://dpi.wi.gov/wisedash/download-files/type?field_wisedash_upload_type_value=ACT11)

<https://sped.dpi.wi.gov/spedprofile>

Web link demonstrating that the State reported publicly on the participation of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, “<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/about/state-performance-plan/indicators/3-assessment>”

Web links demonstrating that the State reported publicly on the participation of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children:

DPI reports all data for students with and without IEPs simultaneously through its public dashboards (<https://wisedash.dpi.wi.gov/>) and data files (<https://dpi.wi.gov/wisedash/download-files>). Further, the district profile dashboard provides district level data for each IDEA Part B indicator, into WISEdash Public’s Special Education tab. Assessment accommodations data are also provided at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/about/state-performance-plan/indicators/3-assessment>.

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

No changes to DPI’s data collection or methodology has occurred since FFY 2015, when Wisconsin adopted the Forward statewide assessment. Reporting under 3a for grades 4, 8, and 11 is identical to reporting under the previous measure of assessment participation (formerly 3b).

## **3A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

## **3A - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## **3A - Required Actions**

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

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

### 3B - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

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

#### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	16.46%	16.60%	16.80%	17.00%	17.20%	17.40%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	8.13%	8.50%	8.90%	9.30%	9.70%	10.10%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	7.70%	8.10%	8.50%	8.90%	9.30%	9.70%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	18.57%	18.60%	18.60%	18.70%	18.80%	18.90%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	5.78%	6.23%	6.73%	7.23%	7.73%	8.23%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	4.53%	5.00%	5.50%	6.00%	6.50%	7.00%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The DPI used both universal and targeted approaches to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

##### 1. Universal strategy: Open invitation to input sessions

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

The DPI distributes a weekly news update related to special education and pupil services; this update serves as the official notification to directors of special education and is distributed to more than 1,000 unique contacts. In advance of each of the input sessions, the DPI included an open invitation to

participate in the input sessions. These news updates are archived online at <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/news>. In addition, an open invitation to attend the input sessions was sent out on the CollabSupport listserv, announced at various conferences and stakeholder meetings, and posted online (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>) in May 2021 and remained online until after the final input session.

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

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

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

**3. Targeted strategy: State Advisory Panel input sessions**

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

**4. Targeted strategy: Customized invitations to stakeholders**

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

**5. Targeted strategy: Customized surveys of families**

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

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

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

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	7,259	6,583	5,636
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	745	215	100
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	450	320	334

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Grade 4</b>	<b>Grade 8</b>	<b>Grade HS</b>
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	7,242	6,559	5,653
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	821	169	74
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	524	210	182

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Group Name</b>	<b>Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards</b>	<b>Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2020 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2020 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
<b>A</b>	Grade 4	1,195	7,259		16.46%	16.46%	N/A	N/A
<b>B</b>	Grade 8	535	6,583		8.13%	8.13%	N/A	N/A
<b>C</b>	Grade HS	434	5,636		7.70%	7.70%	N/A	N/A

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Group Name</b>	<b>Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards</b>	<b>Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2020 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2020 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
<b>A</b>	Grade 4	1,345	7,242		18.57%	18.57%	N/A	N/A
<b>B</b>	Grade 8	379	6,559		5.78%	5.78%	N/A	N/A
<b>C</b>	Grade HS	256	5,653		4.53%	4.53%	N/A	N/A

### **Regulatory Information**

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

### **Public Reporting Information**

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

[https://dpi.wi.gov/wisedash/download-files/type?field\\_wisedash\\_upload\\_type\\_value=Forward](https://dpi.wi.gov/wisedash/download-files/type?field_wisedash_upload_type_value=Forward)  
[https://dpi.wi.gov/wisedash/download-files/type?field\\_wisedash\\_upload\\_type\\_value=ACT11](https://dpi.wi.gov/wisedash/download-files/type?field_wisedash_upload_type_value=ACT11)  
<https://sped.dpi.wi.gov/spedprofile>

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

The DPI reset baseline targets for this indicator due to changes in measurement instituted by OSEP for FFY 2020-2025.

### **3B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

### **3B - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

### **3B - Required Actions**

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

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

### 3C - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

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

#### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	12.78%	12.98%	13.18%	13.38%	13.58%	13.78%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	18.76%	18.76%	18.76%	18.76%	18.76%	18.77%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	28.25%	28.25%	28.25%	28.25%	28.25%	28.26%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	34.09%	34.09%	34.09%	34.09%	34.09%	34.10%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	5.26%	5.56%	5.86%	6.16%	6.46%	6.76%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	28.07%	28.07%	28.07%	28.07%	28.07%	28.08%



## Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The DPI used both universal and targeted approaches to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

### 1. Universal strategy: Open invitation to input sessions

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

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

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

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

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

### 3. Targeted strategy: State Advisory Panel input sessions

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

### 4. Targeted strategy: Customized invitations to stakeholders

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

### 5. Targeted strategy: Customized surveys of families

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

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

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

## FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

### Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

### Date:

03/03/2022

## Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	399	437	485
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate	51	82	137

standards scored at or above proficient			
-----------------------------------------	--	--	--

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	396	437	481
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	135	23	135

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	51	399		12.78%	12.78%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	82	437		18.76%	18.76%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	137	485		28.25%	28.25%	N/A	N/A

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	135	396		34.09%	34.09%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	23	437		5.26%	5.26%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	135	481		28.07%	28.07%	N/A	N/A

**Regulatory Information**

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

**Public Reporting Information**

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

[https://dpi.wi.gov/wisedash/download-files?type?field\\_wisedash\\_upload\\_type\\_value=Forward](https://dpi.wi.gov/wisedash/download-files?type?field_wisedash_upload_type_value=Forward)

[https://dpi.wi.gov/wisedash/download-files?type?field\\_wisedash\\_upload\\_type\\_value=ACT11](https://dpi.wi.gov/wisedash/download-files?type?field_wisedash_upload_type_value=ACT11)

<https://sped.dpi.wi.gov/spedprofile>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The DPI reset baseline targets for this indicator due to changes in measurement instituted by OSEP for FFY 2020-2025.

### **3C - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

### **3C - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

### **3C - Required Actions**

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

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

#### Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

### 3D - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

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

#### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	24.40	24.29	24.10	23.91	23.72	23.53
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	27.90	27.58	27.19	26.80	26.41	26.02
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	30.16	29.81	29.42	29.03	28.64	28.25
Math	A <=	Grade 4	23.69	23.67	23.67	23.57	23.47	23.38
Math	B <=	Grade 8	24.82	24.44	23.94	23.45	22.96	22.47
Math	C <=	Grade HS	24.67	24.27	23.78	23.29	22.80	22.31

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The DPI used both universal and targeted approaches to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

1. Universal strategy: Open invitation to input sessions

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

March 12, 2021; June 25, 2021; September 24, 2021; and December 3, 2021.

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

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

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

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

**3. Targeted strategy: State Advisory Panel input sessions**

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

**4. Targeted strategy: Customized invitations to stakeholders**

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

**5. Targeted strategy: Customized surveys of families**

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

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

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

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	49,359	53,384	56,128
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	7,259	6,583	5,636
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	19,276	18,724	20,472
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	892	508	776

e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	745	215	100
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	450	320	334

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	49,317	53,369	56,160
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	7,242	6,559	5,653
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	19,830	15,950	15,942
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,011	382	454
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	821	169	74
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	524	210	182

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	16.46%	40.86%		24.40	24.40	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	8.13%	36.03%		27.90	27.90	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	7.70%	37.86%		30.16	30.16	N/A	N/A

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	18.57%	42.26%		23.69	23.69	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	5.78%	30.60%		24.82	24.82	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	4.53%	29.20%		24.67	24.67	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**3D - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3D - OSEP Response**

The State established baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts the baseline.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**3D - Required Actions**

## Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 4A - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	4.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%
Data	2.45%	2.45%	4.50%	33.33%	3.59%



**Targets**

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	3.99%

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The DPI used both universal and targeted approaches to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State’s targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State’s Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

**1. Universal strategy: Open invitation to input sessions**

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

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

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

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

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

**3. Targeted strategy: State Advisory Panel input sessions**

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

**4. Targeted strategy: Customized invitations to stakeholders**

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

**5. Targeted strategy: Customized surveys of families**

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

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

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

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

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

NO

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs in the State	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage

19	444	3.59%	4.00%	NVR	Did not meet target	Slippage
----	-----	-------	-------	-----	---------------------	----------

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

Using the State's definition of a significant discrepancy (a rate greater than 2 standard deviations from the mean), one can expect in a log-normal distribution just under 5% of observations meeting the definitional criteria so long as (a.) the mean is close to zero and (b.) no observations are being omitted due to small cell size. Due to decreases in disciplinary removals in excess of 10 days since the DPI set its baseline in 2005, the statewide mean has decreased, which has the statistical effect of increasing the number of LEAs who meet the state's definition closer to 5%. Thus, the slippage observed for indicator 4a is actually the result of the DPI's success in decreasing out-of-school suspensions statewide. Additionally, a total of 8 small LEAs were identified as significantly discrepant despite having only 1 student in the numerator of the calculation.

**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**

The 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 2020 reporting (using data from the 2019-20 school year), the average statewide risk was 0.1497% and the standard deviation was 0.4489%. Thus, districts with a rate of suspension or expulsion greater than 1.0475% were identified with a significant discrepancy.

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

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 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 2020 with significant discrepancy (using 2019-20 data), a review was conducted of the district's policies, procedures, and practices that impact suspension and expulsion rates, including the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards as required by 34 CFR § 300.170(b). The districts have either adopted the DPI's model policies and procedures or have submitted policies and procedures that have been reviewed and approved by the DPI. Likewise, with IEP forms, the districts have either adopted the department's model IEP forms or use forms approved by the DPI. In addition, the DPI reviews IDEA State complaint decisions, due process decisions, and pupil nondiscrimination appeals and, when necessary, conduct additional record reviews and interviews using standard protocols. Based on the DPI's review, it was determined that the policies, procedures, and practices were in compliance for all districts identified under Indicator 4A.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**4A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**4A - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP cannot determine whether the data are valid and reliable. The State reported that 444 districts met the minimum n size requirement, and 19 districts did not meet the minimum n size requirement and were excluded from the calculation. The number of districts excluded from the calculation because they do not meet the minimum "n" size, plus the number of districts that met the State-established minimum "n" size, do not equal the total number of districts the State reported in either the FFY 2019 or FFY 2020 Introduction. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

**4A - Required Actions**

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

## Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

## 4B - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.23%	0.00%	0.00%

**Targets**

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

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

NO

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs in the State	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
49	0	445	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology**

The 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 2020 reporting (using data from the 2019-20 school year), the average statewide risk was 0.1497% and the standard deviation was 0.4489%. Thus, districts with a rate of suspension or expulsion greater than 1.0475% were identified with significant discrepancy for FFY 2020 reporting.

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

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 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 2020 with significant discrepancy (using 2019-20 data), the DPI conducted a review of the districts' policies, procedures, and practices that impact suspension and expulsion rates, including the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). The districts have either adopted the DPI's model policies and procedures or have submitted policies and procedures that have been reviewed and approved by the DPI. Likewise, with IEP forms, the districts have either adopted the DPI's model IEP forms or use forms approved by the DPI. In addition, identified districts conduct a Disproportionality Procedural Compliance Self-Assessment where districts review a sample of student records, disaggregated by race, and assess related compliance items as identified by OSEP, which is verified by the department. The DPI also reviewed IDEA State complaint decisions, due process decisions, and pupil nondiscrimination appeals, and conducted additional record reviews and interviews using standard protocols. Based on the review as described above, there were zero districts with policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and did not comply with a procedural safeguard provision under 34 CFR § 300.530.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**4B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**4B - OSEP Response**

**4B- Required Actions**

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

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served:

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

## 5 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2020	Target >=	65.20%	66.80%	68.40%	70.00%	70.00%
A	73.85%	Data	66.22%	67.39%	68.94%	70.14%	71.61%
B	2020	Target <=	9.10%	8.70%	8.30%	7.90%	7.90%
B	7.46%	Data	9.16%	8.84%	8.48%	8.47%	8.15%
C	2020	Target <=	1.10%	1.05%	1.00%	0.95%	0.95%
C	1.25%	Data	1.50%	1.43%	1.44%	1.30%	1.31%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	73.85%	74.33%	75.43%	76.38%	77.28%	78.18%
Target B <=	7.46%	7.46%	7.27%	7.05%	6.84%	6.64%
Target C <=	1.25%	1.23%	1.21%	1.19%	1.18%	1.17%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The DPI used both universal and targeted approaches to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

#### 1. Universal strategy: Open invitation to input sessions

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

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

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

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

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

**3. Targeted strategy: State Advisory Panel input sessions**

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

**4. Targeted strategy: Customized invitations to stakeholders**

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

**5. Targeted strategy: Customized surveys of families**

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

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

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

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	112,196
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	82,853
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	8,369
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	930
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	172
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	303

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

NO

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

<b>Education Environments</b>	<b>Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served</b>	<b>Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2020 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2020 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	82,853	112,196	71.61%	73.85%	73.85%	N/A	N/A
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	8,369	112,196	8.15%	7.46%	7.46%	N/A	N/A
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,405	112,196	1.31%	1.25%	1.25%	N/A	N/A

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

The DPI reset baseline targets for this indicator due to changes in measurement instituted by OSEP for FFY 2020-2025.

The DPI reported five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6.

**5 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**5 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 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:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a:

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 6 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

### Historical Data – 6A, 6B

Part	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	Target >=	34.50%	35.50%	36.50%	37.50%	37.50%
A	Data	35.91%	32.43%	34.66%	35.35%	37.21%
B	Target <=	20.25%	19.25%	18.25%	17.25%	17.25%
B	Data	16.75%	19.36%	17.82%	16.25%	15.49%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The DPI used both universal and targeted approaches to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

##### 1. Universal strategy: Open invitation to input sessions

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

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

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

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

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

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

**3. Targeted strategy: State Advisory Panel input sessions**

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

**4. Targeted strategy: Customized invitations to stakeholders**

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

**5. Targeted strategy: Customized surveys of families**

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

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

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

**Targets**

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

Inclusive Targets

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

Target Range not used

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

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

**Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B**

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	35.23%	35.23%	35.53%	36.43%	37.38%	38.38%
Target B <=	17.73%	17.73%	17.73%	17.73%	17.73%	17.72%

**Inclusive Targets – 6C**

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%

**Prepopulated Data**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

**Date:**

07/07/2021

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	2,334	4,860	958	8,152
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	446	1,970	456	2,872
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	826	544	63	1,433
b2. Number of children attending separate school	3	7	2	12
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	219	127	15	361

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

NO

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5**

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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	2,872	8,152	37.21%	35.23%	35.23%	N/A	N/A
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	1,445	8,152	15.49%	17.73%	17.73%	N/A	N/A
C. Home	361	8,152		5.00%	4.43%	N/A	N/A

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

The DPI reset baseline targets for this indicator due to changes in measurement instituted by OSEP for FFY 2020-2025.

The DPI reported five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

**6 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**6 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for B6A and B6B, and established a baseline for Indicator B6C, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that baseline.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 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

#### Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A1	2020	Target >=	78.90%	79.10%	79.30%	79.50%	79.50%
A1	67.16%	Data	80.68%	73.98%	69.35%	69.50%	67.35%
A2	2020	Target >=	73.50%	74.00%	74.50%	75.00%	75.00%

A2	58.58%	Data	65.10%	61.34%	61.97%	61.52%	60.56%
B1	2020	Target >=	80.20%	80.55%	80.90%	81.25%	81.25%
B1	69.21%	Data	83.87%	77.55%	74.23%	72.97%	71.00%
B2	2020	Target >=	61.40%	61.60%	61.80%	62.00%	62.00%
B2	46.71%	Data	54.00%	51.08%	51.93%	51.69%	50.17%
C1	2020	Target >=	79.30%	79.70%	80.10%	80.50%	80.50%
C1	68.77%	Data	83.07%	77.56%	74.83%	73.06%	70.56%
C2	2020	Target >=	81.90%	82.10%	82.30%	82.50%	82.50%
C2	65.86%	Data	74.77%	72.27%	71.84%	71.11%	68.53%

## Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	67.16%	67.17%	67.18%	67.19%	67.20%	67.21%
Target A2 >=	58.58%	58.59%	58.60%	58.61%	58.62%	58.63%
Target B1 >=	69.21%	69.22%	69.23%	69.24%	69.25%	69.26%
Target B2 >=	46.71%	46.72%	46.73%	46.74%	46.75%	46.76%
Target C1 >=	68.77%	68.78%	68.79%	68.80%	68.81%	68.82%
Target C2 >=	65.86%	65.87%	65.88%	65.89%	65.90%	65.91%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The DPI used both universal and targeted approaches to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

#### 1. Universal strategy: Open invitation to input sessions

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

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

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

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

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

#### 3. Targeted strategy: State Advisory Panel input sessions

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

#### 4. Targeted strategy: Customized invitations to stakeholders

The DPI invited targeted stakeholders for input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The State Director sent personalized invitations to representatives of Wisconsin organizations with an interest in special education (state association of special education directors, parent

center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, SEA employees, representatives from grants funded by discretionary IDEA funds, etc.) to participate in the input sessions (described, above) or to submit input via the website.

5. Targeted strategy: Customized surveys of families

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

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

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

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed**

11,208

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	118	1.05%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	2,522	22.50%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,003	17.87%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,396	30.30%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,170	28.28%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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>	5,399	8,039	67.35%	67.16%	67.16%	N/A	N/A
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>	6,566	11,209	60.56%	58.58%	58.58%	N/A	N/A

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	92	0.82%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	3,033	27.06%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,848	25.41%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	4,178	37.27%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,058	9.44%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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:</i> $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	7,026	10,151	71.00%	69.21%	69.21%	N/A	N/A
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:</i> $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	5,236	11,209	50.17%	46.71%	46.71%	N/A	N/A

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	93	0.83%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	2,208	19.70%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,526	13.61%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,542	31.60%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,840	34.26%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	5,068	7,369	70.56%	68.77%	68.77%	N/A	N/A
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. <i>Calculation:</i> $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	7,382	11,209	68.53%	65.86%	65.86%	N/A	N/A

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

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

During FFY2020, the DPI continued to use the individual child web-based application for the purpose of reporting Indicator 7 child outcomes that was introduced during the 2016-17 school year. This application uses the Child Outcomes Decision Tree developed by the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center to guide the child outcomes team through the child outcomes process for both the entry and exit rating. When using the application, the child outcomes team identifies the sources of information obtained and responds to a series of questions using the Child Outcomes Decision Tree. In using the application, the child outcomes team is required to document evidence supporting the responses provided. Based on the responses provided by the child outcomes team, the child's entry or exit rating for each outcome area is determined by the application relative to the 7-point scale used in the child outcomes summary (COS) process. This 7-point scale compares the child's level of current functioning to that of same-age typically developing peers. The ratings using the 7-point scale are then converted for the purpose of reporting the child outcomes progress categories and summary statements.

During FFY2020, the state began transitioning its criteria for reporting exit child outcomes from reporting when a child turned age 6 to reporting when a child exits preschool to align with Indicator 6. To make this transition, it meant for FFY2020, exit outcomes data continued to be collected for children enrolled in kindergarten as they turned age 6 and as well as at year end for children exiting preschool. This did result in more children being assessed in FFY2020 than prior years.

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

The DPI's continued rollout of the Child Outcomes Decision Tree and individual child web-based application has yielded more accurate and consistent data reporting for indicator 7, but it has also revealed the state's historic performance across these measures to be artificially inflated. As utilization of this data reporting method has increased, and users become more accustomed to the process, Wisconsin has seen the recent declines across indicator 7 measures stabilize. Now that the collection and reporting process has matured, it is necessary to set new baselines using FFY2020 data, allowing us to measure progress and set targets in line with the improved data quality that the process provides.

**7 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**7 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 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 and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

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

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

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

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023**, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

## 8 - Indicator Data

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

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The DPI used both universal and targeted approaches to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

#### 1. Universal strategy: Open invitation to input sessions

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

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

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

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

the results indicators and Indicator 17. To see the web pages, please visit <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/spp-target-setting>.

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

**3. Targeted strategy: State Advisory Panel input sessions**

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

**4. Targeted strategy: Customized invitations to stakeholders**

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

**5. Targeted strategy: Customized surveys of families**

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

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

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	88.52%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	86.00%	86.50%	88.75%	89.00%	89.00%
Data	83.75%	88.52%	88.94%	89.41%	89.72%

**Targets**

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	89.40%	89.50%	89.60%	89.70%	89.80%	89.90%

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
2,959	3,299	89.72%	89.40%	89.69%	Met target	No Slippage

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

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

The DPI uses the following methodology for calculating Indicator 8 results: the mean rate of agreement is calculated for each completed survey with

more than 50% of questions completed, and the percent agreement of those surveys is summed across all respondent data, then divided by the total number of surveys. Due to EMAPS requiring the numerator be an integer, this number is rounded to the nearest whole number.

**The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.**

20,861

**Percentage of respondent parents**

15.81%

**Response Rate**

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	7.31%	15.81%

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

The DPI has instituted a minimum response rate of 10% among their students with IEP population (SwIEPs) or six SwIEPs, whichever is greater, for each LEA in the survey cycle, and has integrated this completion rate into the timely and accurate data calculations used as part of LEA Determinations. While the DPI continues to offer some flexibility in light of the COVID-19 pandemic, we continue to meet with those LEAs who fail to meet their minimum response rates, and engage in improvement planning to meet the target in subsequent years.

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

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

To address this limitation, the DPI intends to institute stratified sampling to the survey analysis and reporting. This plan was originally scheduled to be implemented in FFY2019, but disruptions to survey completion and in-person family engagement events, particularly in Wisconsin's largest LEAs, has necessarily delayed those plans until a larger pool of respondents participate in our larger and more racially diverse LEAs. This will ensure both representativeness of a broader cross-section of the population as well as provide a more accurate picture of statewide data.

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

For FFY 2020, the clustered sample of LEAs and schools was representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, but the responses were not representative in the following ways. By race/ethnicity, Black and Hispanic/Latinx responses were underrepresented by 8.88% and 6.82%, respectively, while white students were overrepresented by 17.11%. These large discrepancies are attributable to a much higher response rate in predominantly White, rural LEAs and Wisconsin's largest LEA failing to meet its minimum response rate. Responses by disability reporting category were also slightly off among responses for students with speech and language disabilities (3.8% above the statewide rate) and students with Autism (3.68% above the statewide rate). The DPI believes this discrepancy is a combined result of self selection bias of parents who opt into the survey, combined with the low participation rate within Wisconsin's largest LEA.

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

NO

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

The DPI will continue to explore both methodological and outreach options to further improve representativeness in subsequent years, including shifting to stratified weighting for future SPP/APR reporting. So long as the DPI can achieve its target response rate of 10% across all participating LEAs and schools, stratified weighting is the most accurate and reliable method at Wisconsin's disposal to address persisting issues of unrepresentativeness across multiple demographic areas.

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

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.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously approved sampling plan changed?	NO

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

The clustered sample of districts within each cycle are representative of the following statewide characteristics: geographic regions, total enrollment of students with disabilities, racial/ethnic makeup of the students with disabilities 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. As Wisconsin's largest LEA, with a population in excess of 50,000, Milwaukee Public Schools participates annually, with its schools divided into the cycle cohorts in the same manner as LEAs. Within each LEA or school in the reporting cycle, all parents/guardians of students with IEPs at the time the survey opens are invited to participate.

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

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

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

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

### 8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2020 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

#### Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

### 8 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State submitted its sampling plan for this indicator with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR. OSEP will follow up with the State under separate cover regarding the submission.

### 8 - Required Actions

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

## Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

#### Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 9 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

#### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

#### FFY 2020 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.

19

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
23	0	427	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

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

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, the DPI requires districts to meet the above criteria for three consecutive years.

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

### 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**9 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

**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 2020, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

### Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 10 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

### Targets



FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

**FFY 2020 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.**

72

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
57	0	374	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

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

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

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, the DPI requires districts to meet the above criteria for three consecutive years.

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

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**10 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**10 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

**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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 11 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	88.41%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.72%	98.93%	91.28%	97.76%	98.86%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

### FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
5,303	5,163	98.86%	100%	97.36%	Did not meet target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage**

Data collection and reporting continue to be affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. During this reporting period, Wisconsin LEAs returned to in-person instruction, as compared to virtual instruction provided March 18-June 30, 2020 (see Wisconsin Department of Health Secretary-designee Andrea Palm’s Order for Statewide School Closure).

2019 AB 1038 was introduced on April 13, 2020, in response to the COVID-19 pandemic and resulting public health emergency. Governor Evers signed AB 1038 into law on April 15, 2020, as 2019 Act 185 (Act 185). In addition to activities reported during FFY 2019 APR (information from school districts regarding the impacts of the school closures), Act 185 requires the DPI to post guidance to schools on best practices related to transitioning from virtual instruction to in-person instruction, on its Internet site. The DPI created the Education Forward webpage to house guidance documents for Wisconsin district and school leaders to use as they planned for a safe, efficient, and equitable return to school for the 2020-21 school year amid the COVID-19 pandemic. The information from that guide has since been reorganized. Additional information pertaining to the COVID-19 pandemic and K-12 schools can be found on the DPI’s COVID-19 Information web page.

While the return to school amid the COVID-19 pandemic was – for many districts - safe, efficient, and equitable, it was not without challenges that affected data collecting and reporting. The COVID-19 pandemic affected schools’ and districts’ ability to conduct initial evaluations and the provision of special education services under IDEA. The DPI provided compliance information, including guidance and resources, targeted toward district administrators and special education administrators. Updated information was shared in weekly and special news alerts; the DPI developed and maintained a “COVID-19 Special Education Question and Answer Document.” Archived news alerts, the Q & A document, and other resources are curated on a dedicated “COVID-19 – Special Education Updates and Resources webpage (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/covid-19-sped-updates-and-resources>).

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

140

**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 250. Reasons for the delay include local educational agency (LEA) timeline errors, scheduling errors, staff unavailable, parent unavailable, evaluation data from either another agency or the parent was not available, additional testing needed, and students not available due to medical concerns.

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used:**

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

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

State monitoring

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

The DPI used the Indicator 11: Timely Initial Evaluations web-based application to collect student-level data from districts from the selected cohort. Wisconsin’s districts are divided into 5 groups (cohorts), and roughly one-fifth of the districts in the state report the data through the Indicator 11 application each year, with Milwaukee Public Schools, with average daily membership of over 50,000, reporting on an annual basis. The sample of districts within each cycle year are representative of the following statewide characteristics: geographic regions, total enrollment of students with disabilities, racial/ethnic makeup of the students with disabilities subgroup, and distribution of primary disabilities. For relevant demographics, a 95% confidence interval about the median was used to construct the five-year cohort cycle. See Introduction to the SPP/APR for more information. For FFY 2020, 90 districts reported on the percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 calendar days. Of the 89, 31 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 2020 was 97.36%

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
44	44	0	0

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

Consistent with OSEP memo 09-02, the DPI verified each district with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through monitoring; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district. To verify current compliance, the DPI staff examined a separate sample of current student records. Districts provided the DPI with a list of students whose initial evaluations were completed during a specified time period. For each student on the list, districts were directed to indicate the date parental consent was received and the date the

evaluation was completed. From this list, the DPI selected records for a specific number of students with the most recently completed initial evaluations. The exact number of records to be submitted for review was determined by the DPI and was dependent upon the size of the district and the number of initial evaluations completed by the district. The DPI reviewed the records to determine whether the evaluations were completed within 60 days of receiving parental consent. If all reviewed evaluations were completed within the required timeline, the DPI determined the district is currently in compliance. If one or more of the evaluations were not completed within 60 days, the DPI reviewed the regulatory requirement with the district, and for students who had been found eligible for special education and related services, directed correction of the error(s) within 20 days. Correction involved submission of evidence that the district had considered compensatory services by holding an IEP team meeting, or, with the agreement of the parent: (1) developed a written document to amend or modify the student's IEP to reflect compensatory services, or (2) discussed with the student's parent and documented an agreement that no compensatory services were necessary. The district submitted the corrected record(s) for review by the DPI. In addition, when one or more evaluations were not completed within 60 days, the district then submitted a new separate sample of the next new initial evaluation records generated within a given timeframe after making the previous corrections. These records were then reviewed by the DPI to verify that the evaluations had been completed within 60 days. In the event that one or more of the records did not meet the regulatory requirement, the process continued until the district corrected each individual case of noncompliance, and the district was found in current compliance. Following these two-pronged verification procedures, which are consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, the DPI determined all districts found in noncompliance during FFY 2019 have corrected each individual case of noncompliance and are currently in compliance with 34 CFR 300.301(c) and the exceptions at 34 CFR 300.301(d) and 34 CFR 300.309(c).

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

To verify each instance of individual student noncompliance was corrected, the DPI reviewed a randomly drawn sample of initial evaluation records of students whose evaluations were not completed within 60 days. The size of the sample of records reviewed was dependent upon the size of the district and the number of noncompliant files. For most districts, the sample included all records. Each record was reviewed to verify the evaluation was completed, although late. In instances when students were found eligible for special education services, each record was reviewed to ensure compensatory services had been considered. All records demonstrated the evaluation(s) had been completed and compensatory services had been considered. The DPI determined, based on this review of records, each individual instance of noncompliance found in FFY 2019 was corrected.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2018	2	2	0

**FFY 2018**

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

Consistent with OSEP memo 09-02, the DPI verified each district with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through monitoring; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district. To verify current compliance, the DPI examined a separate sample of current student records. Districts provided the DPI with a list of students whose initial evaluations were completed during a specified time period. For each student on the list, districts were directed to indicate the date parental consent was received and the date the evaluation was completed. From this list, the DPI selected records for a specific number of students with the most recently completed initial evaluations. The exact number of records to be submitted for review was determined by the DPI and was dependent upon the size of the district and the number of initial evaluations completed by the district. The DPI reviewed the records to determine whether the evaluations were completed within 60 days of receiving parental consent. If all reviewed evaluations were completed within the required timeline, the DPI determined the district is currently in compliance. If one or more of the evaluations were not completed within 60 days, the DPI reviewed the regulatory requirement with the district, and for students who had been found eligible for special education and related services, directed correction of the error(s) within 20 days. Correction involved submission of evidence that the district had considered compensatory services by holding an IEP team meeting, or, with the agreement of the parent: (1) developed a written document to amend or modify the student's IEP to reflect compensatory services, or (2) discussed with the student's parent and documented an agreement that no compensatory services were necessary. The district submitted the corrected record(s) for review by the DPI. In addition, when one or more evaluations were not completed within 60 days, the district then submitted a new separate sample of the next new initial evaluation records generated within a given timeframe after making the previous corrections. These records were then reviewed by the DPI to verify that the evaluations had been completed within 60 days. In the event that one or more of the records did not meet the regulatory requirement, the process continued until the district corrected each individual case of noncompliance, and the district was found in current compliance. Following these two-pronged verification procedures, which are consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, the DPI determined all districts found in noncompliance during FFY 2018 have corrected each individual case of noncompliance and are currently in compliance with 34 CFR 300.301(c) and the exceptions at 34 CFR 300.301(d) and 34 CFR 300.309(c).

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

To verify each instance of individual student noncompliance was corrected, the DPI reviewed a randomly drawn sample of initial evaluation records of students whose evaluations were not completed within 60 days. The size of the sample of records reviewed was dependent upon the size of the district and the number of noncompliant files. For most districts, the sample included all records. Each record was reviewed to verify the evaluation was completed, although late. In instances when students were found eligible for special education services, each record was reviewed to ensure compensatory services had been considered. All records demonstrated the evaluation(s) had been completed and compensatory services had been considered. The DPI determined, based on this review of records, each individual instance of noncompliance found in FFY 2018 was corrected.

**11 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that the remaining two uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2018: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of

noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

#### **Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

### **11 - OSEP Response**

#### **11 - Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

## 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

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

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

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

#### Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 12 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	65.60%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.11%	98.71%	98.53%	98.60%	99.67%

#### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

#### FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	3,298
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	488

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,255
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.	464
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	70
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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.	2,255	2,276	99.67%	100%	99.08%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

21

**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 21 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 3 days to 435 days. Reasons for the delays include staff not available, scheduling difficulties, errors by the LEA, and failure to send placement notice timely.

**Attach PDF table (optional)**

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
6	6	0	0

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

Consistent with OSEP memo 09-02, the DPI verified each district with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a quarterly review of current year district records; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance by ensuring that eligibility was determined, and if eligible, an IEP was developed. To verify current compliance, the DPI examined all current referrals for each district with noncompliance. The DPI reviewed the records to determine whether the evaluations were completed by the student's third birthday, and if eligible, an IEP was developed and implemented by the student's third birthday. If all reviewed evaluations and IEPs were completed and implemented by the student's third birthday within the quarterly review, the DPI determined that the district is currently in compliance. Following this verification procedure, which is consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, the DPI determined all districts found in noncompliance during FFY 20109 have corrected each individual case of noncompliance and are currently in compliance with 34 CFR 300.124.

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

To verify each instance of individual student noncompliance was corrected, the DPI reviewed submitted data for each student record to determine that the evaluation was completed, and if eligible, that an IEP was developed and implemented for the child (although late). The DPI reviewed all records with noncompliance to ensure correction Consistent with OSEP memo 09-02, DPI verified each district with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through a review of district referrals, evaluations, and IEPs; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance by ensuring that eligibility was determined, and if eligible, an IEP was developed.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**



Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**12 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

**12 - OSEP Response**

**12 - Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

## Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

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

#### Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 13 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	71.21%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.83%	99.93%	99.86%	99.94%	99.89%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

### FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
26,840	26,853	99.89%	100%	99.95%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

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

If no, please explain

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
14	13	1	0

#### FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Verification is consistent with the two-pronged approach established by OSEP memo 09-02. To verify current compliance, the DPI examined a separate sample of current student IEP records created after training and technical assistance of staff occurred. LEAs provided the DPI with a list of students with IEPs age 16 years old or older. From this list, the DPI selected a sample of IEPs of students with IEP meeting dates during the relevant time period and directed LEAs to submit the IEPs to DPI for review. The exact number of IEPs to be submitted for review was dependent upon the size of the district and the number of IEPs developed and revised by the district. The DPI reviewed the IEPs to determine whether the Indicator 13 transition regulatory requirements had been met. If all reviewed IEPs met the transition regulatory requirements, the DPI determined the district currently in compliance. If one or more of the IEPs did not meet one or more of the transition regulatory requirements, The DPI reviewed the regulatory requirement(s) with the district and directed correction of the error(s) within 20 days. The district submitted the corrected IEP(s) for review. The DPI reviewed the IEP(s) to verify the district has corrected each individual case of noncompliance. The district then submitted a new, separate sample of the next new IEPs generated within a given timeframe after making the previous corrections. These records were then reviewed by the DPI to verify that the transition regulatory requirements were currently in compliance. In the event that one or more of the IEPs did not meet one or more of the transition regulatory requirements, the process continued until the district corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, and the district was found in current compliance.

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

To verify each instance of individual student noncompliance was corrected, the DPI reviewed each student record to determine that the evaluation was completed, and if eligible, that an IEP was developed and implemented for the child (although late). The 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, the DPI verified each district with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through a review of district referrals, evaluations, and IEPs; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance by ensuring that eligibility was determined, and if eligible, an IEP was developed and compensatory services were considered.

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

### 13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

#### **Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

### **13 - OSEP Response**

#### **13 - Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

## Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

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

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

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

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

#### 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 2021 on students who left school during 2019-2020, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2019-2020 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

#### I. Definitions

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

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

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

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

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

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

#### II. Data Reporting

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

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

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

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

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

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

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

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

### III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

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

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

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

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

Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race/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.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due Feb. 1, 2023**, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of respondents are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

## 14 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2019	Target >=	30.80%	31.30%	31.80%	32.30%	32.30%
A	20.88%	Data	31.44%	28.40%	27.79%	24.44%	20.88%
B	2019	Target >=	63.50%	65.50%	67.50%	69.50%	69.50%
B	66.22%	Data	68.39%	71.12%	68.24%	63.48%	66.22%
C	2019	Target >=	77.00%	79.00%	81.00%	83.00%	83.00%
C	76.81%	Data	81.05%	83.15%	81.95%	76.56%	76.81%

### FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	20.90%	21.20%	21.60%	22.20%	23.00%	23.90%
Target B >=	66.40%	66.70%	67.20%	67.90%	68.80%	69.80%
Target C >=	76.90%	77.20%	77.70%	78.40%	79.30%	80.30%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The DPI used both universal and targeted approaches to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State’s targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State’s Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

#### 1. Universal strategy: Open invitation to input sessions

The DPI scheduled five synchronous input sessions to solicit input on the State’s targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State’s Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP): June 19, 2020;

March 12, 2021; June 25, 2021; September 24, 2021; and December 3, 2021.

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

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

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

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

**3. Targeted strategy: State Advisory Panel input sessions**

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

**4. Targeted strategy: Customized invitations to stakeholders**

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

**5. Targeted strategy: Customized surveys of families**

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

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

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

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	1,975
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	1,443
Response Rate	73.06%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	320
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	720
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)	48
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	85

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	320	1,443	20.88%	20.90%	22.18%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	1,040	1,443	66.22%	66.40%	72.07%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	1,173	1,443	76.81%	76.90%	81.29%	Met target	No Slippage

**Please select the reporting option your State is using:**

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

**Response Rate**

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	65.70%	73.06%

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

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

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

The DPI's response rate for indicator 14 is extremely high, with 73% of special education exiters responding to the phone survey. One problem observed despite this high participation rate, however, is the continued discrepancy between respondents and statewide demographics by disability reporting category. This may be attributable to the varying degrees of contact and transition planning which occurs across this population. Students with specific learning disabilities continue to be less likely to complete the survey, as well as having a higher dropout rate in the state.

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

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

To help ensure survey results are indeed representative, the DPI requires that each district meet a minimum response rate of 20% of its total number of exiters from the previous year. For the FFY 2020 survey of 2019-20 exiters, the representativeness of the survey fails to meet the +/- 3% threshold recommended by the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) in the following ways: Respondents with specific learning disabilities are underrepresented by 7%, and students with intellectual disabilities and autism are overrepresented by 5.5% and 3.7% respectively. All racial/ethnic reporting categories were representative to within 2.5% of their statewide demographics.

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



NO

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

The DPI's continually high survey completion rate, combined with self-selection bias of respondents, continues to result in unpredictable demographic sampling of exiters. The DPI continues its in-depth review of its sampling and survey methodology, including the utilization of existing post-secondary and administrative data which may help address the persisting non-response bias among some demographic groups.

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

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

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously approved sampling plan changed?	NO

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

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

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

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

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

Due to an unprecedentedly high survey completion rate for indicator 14 thanks to the State's Transition Incentive Grant, the DPI is resetting its baseline for indicators 14a, 14b, and 14c to FFY 2019. Increased participation has created a much more accurate picture of post-secondary outcomes statewide, but in doing so it has demonstrated that our past success--particularly in post-secondary enrollment in higher ed--was the result of non-response bias. While the DPI believes post-secondary enrollment has trended down in Wisconsin in recent years as it has nationally, the steady decline in Wisconsin's post-secondary enrollment is greater than that observed by its technical colleges and universities. This suggests that post-secondary enrollment has always been lower than what was observed prior to the Transition Incentive Grant's improvement of response rates.

## 14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2020 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

## 14 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2021 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

## 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 and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

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

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

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

### 15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	10
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	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

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The DPI used both universal and targeted approaches to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

1. Universal strategy: Open invitation to input sessions

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

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

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

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

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

3. Targeted strategy: State Advisory Panel input sessions

The DPI conducted five input sessions with the State Advisory Panel to gather input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent

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

**4. Targeted strategy: Customized invitations to stakeholders**

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

**5. Targeted strategy: Customized surveys of families**

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

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

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2012	41.18%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	42.00%	42.00%	42.00%	42.00%	42.00%
Data	44.44%	16.67%	20.00%	37.50%	75.00%

**Targets**

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	42.00%	42.00%	42.00%	42.00%	42.00%	42.00%

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
3	10	75.00%	42.00%	30.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

In Wisconsin, there are low numbers of resolution sessions, which causes variability and volatility in the data.

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

**15 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**15 - OSEP Response**

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

## 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)(i)) divided by 2.1 times 100.

#### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

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

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

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

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

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

## 16 - Indicator Data

### Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1 Mediations held	73
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	3
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	67

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

NO

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The DPI used both universal and targeted approaches to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

#### 1. Universal strategy: Open invitation to input sessions

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

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

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

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

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

3. Targeted strategy: State Advisory Panel input sessions

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

4. Targeted strategy: Customized invitations to stakeholders

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

5. Targeted strategy: Customized surveys of families

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

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

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2012	75.51%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	76.00%	76.00%	76.00%	76.00%	76.00%
Data	86.36%	93.98%	93.62%	92.22%	97.33%

**Targets**

FFY	2020 (low)	2020 (high)	2021 (low)	2021 (high)	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=	80.00%	90.00%	80.00%	90.00%	80.00%	90.00%	80.00%	90.00%	80.00%	90.00%	80.00%	90.00%

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target (low)	FFY 2020 Target (high)	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
3	67	73	97.33%	80.00%	90.00%	95.89%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**16 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**16 - OSEP Response**

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

## 16 - Required Actions

## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

**Targets:** In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

**Updated Data:** In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2, 2022, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

#### Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

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

##### **Phase I: Analysis:**

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

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

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

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

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

#### Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

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

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

##### **Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation**

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

###### A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

###### B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2021). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022).

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



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

### C. Stakeholder Engagement

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

#### Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

## 17 - Indicator Data

### Section A: Data Analysis

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

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

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

YES

#### Provide a description of the system analysis activities conducted to support changing the SiMR.

The previous SiMR was a points-based proficiency measure based on an average of the three most recent years of state assessment data for learners in grades 3-8 with IEPs in the area of literacy. With stakeholder input, the WDPI rolled over the target from FFY 2018 (31.67%) to FFY 2019 for the last year of the current cycle. Wisconsin did not administer statewide assessments in 2019-20 due to COVID-19. Therefore, WDPI is unable to calculate the actual point-based measure for FFY 2019. Thus, the FFY 2019 data percentage is unavailable. The WDPI met our SiMR targets for the first three years of the cycle, and did not meet targets for the most recent two years for which data is available. While the slippage is indicative of overall trends statewide, it brought to light the focus our agency placed on infrastructure development to the exclusion of articulating specific evidence-based improvement strategies (EBIS) we could measure and continuously improve for the benefit of learners with IEPs. Thus the WDPI began a process to narrow the target strategies to those most likely to improve learner outcomes based on research and stakeholder input for the current cycle while continuing to improve infrastructure for the effective implementation of those strategies.

#### Please list the data source(s) used to support the change of the SiMR.

- Progress toward targets set for the SiMR
- Statewide assessment performance for all learners in Wisconsin as well as for learners with IEP and learners of color in the area of literacy
- Continuous improvement data on the strategies intended to inform meeting the targets in the SiMR
- Adult training exit surveys

#### Provide a description of how the State analyzed data to reach the decision to change the SiMR.

Data on progress toward targets set for the SiMR revealed consecutive years of slippage for the two most recent years for which data is available. While statewide assessment data on the performance for all learners in Wisconsin declined during those two years, there was no relative improvement for learners with IEPs in grades 3-8 compared to their peers without IEPs. Formative data supports the efforts of the state to continuously improve one of the strategies intended to inform meeting the targets in the SiMR, however all the strategies are too broad to assess whether improvements made were resulting in positive outcomes specifically for learners with IEPs in grades 3-8 as a result of the effective use of the strategies. Surveys completed by adults participating in the use of the strategies consistently indicate a need for increased focus on support for translating professional learning about the strategies to improved practice through coaching. Input from other stakeholder groups including but not limited to the State Superintendent's Council on Special Education (SE Council), the Wisconsin Family Assistance Center for Education, Training & Support, Inc. (FACETS), and the Wisconsin Statewide Parent Educator Initiative (WSPEI) supported a change to the SiMR to bring greater specificity of strategies and activities leveraged to improve literacy outcomes for learners with IEPs across a narrower band of grade levels. Stakeholders also supported moving from a statewide focus to targeting strategies and activities to select districts and then scaling statewide as impact is demonstrated. Finally, while covid-19 has contributed to the most recent decline in proficiency for learners with IEPs in Wisconsin, the decline began the year prior to covid, suggesting that other factors are also informing the lack of outcomes being sought.

#### Please describe the role of stakeholders in the decision to change the SiMR.

The previous SiMR, the progress toward targets related to that SiMR, and descriptions of the strategies articulated to meet those targets were compiled and shared with stakeholder groups including but not limited to those indicated above. Through virtual meetings, stakeholders were provided the current SiMR, theory of action, strategies, and outcomes and were invited to share their perspective on the specific practices they believe have the greatest likelihood of impacting literacy proficiency for learners with IEPs and the grade levels the state should target for improvement to provide the greatest likelihood of long term educational success for those learners. The majority of feedback from specific stakeholder groups as well as from individuals statewide accessing the survey via the WDPI website supported targeting early literacy and a narrower grade band as the most likely means of achieving the intended impact. Stakeholders also recognize the significant discrepancy in state test performance between students of color and white students and the disproportionate placement of learners of color in special education, and supported including improved performance on the state assessment for learners of color with and without IEPs in our strategies and infrastructure improvements.

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

YES

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

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

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

YES

#### Please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action.

The theory of action for the previous cycle hypothesized that if the WDPI provided a common statewide framework and supports for improvement planning through professional development, coaching, and connecting compliance and monitoring activities to improved literacy outcomes, then regions, districts, schools and teachers would build capacity to improve literacy outcomes for learners with IEPs. Based on data gathered from a variety of sources as indicated above, the updated theory of action narrows the scope considerably and focuses on two specific strategies implemented in a cohort of school districts within our Statewide System of Supports (SSOS) with intended impact for learners with IEPs and learners of color in grades 3-5 versus grades 3-8 in the previous iteration.

**Please provide a link to the current theory of action.**

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

Implementation Zone - Early Reading

[https://docs.google.com/document/d/1K1ZjA8k0K4FXNAqVi2XDG60SzkOW\\_i8LTSTiXpowa6g/edit#heading=h.tsy58tmv1o5m](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1K1ZjA8k0K4FXNAqVi2XDG60SzkOW_i8LTSTiXpowa6g/edit#heading=h.tsy58tmv1o5m)

Implementation Zone - Inclusive Communities

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1D2MFhN8lGuUZOsNUaFL47EQZQGMdJPhPuBKEzilkrE/edit>

**Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)**

NO

**If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes.**

The strategies for the previous SSIP were too numerous and broad to be successfully implemented statewide. The WDPI is leveraging the shift to a new five-year improvement cycle to adjust the scope and specificity of strategies and activities in support of learners with IEPs and learners of color in grades three through five. Specifically, the WDPI will work with 17 school districts to install an Implementation Zone (IZ), in which intensive support will be provided for the development of systems and structures, especially training/coaching and data use for improvement, to support teachers' use of clearly defined practices related to inclusive communities and early reading. Within the Implementation Zone - Inclusive Communities (IZ-IC), activities include: supports for professional collaboration across learner needs, cultivating inclusive mindsets, establishing effective learning climates, cultures and relationships, effective instructional planning and facilitation, and enhancing authentic learner engagement. Within the Implementation Zone - Early Reading (IZ-ER) activities include the development and use of a practice profile to define and operationalize components of early reading strategies. More specifically, the early reading strategies for learners in four year old kindergarten through grade two will focus on gradual release of responsibility in explicit and systematic phonological awareness and phonics instruction, along with building background knowledge through carefully selected and delivered read-alouds. These practices will be implemented by educators in the selected districts within an intentional implementation infrastructure, where highly functioning implementation teams from the school to the district, region and state have capacity to use data that informs effective implementation of the inclusive learning communities and early reading practices in the way they are intended to be used so we improve outcomes for learners with IEPs and learners of color.

**Progress toward the SiMR**

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

**Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)**

YES

**Historical Data**

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2020	8.70%
B	2020	13.00%

**Targets**

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	8.70%	8.70%	8.70%	10.40%	11.30%	12.20%
Target B >=	13.00%	13.00%	13.00%	15.60%	16.90%	18.20%

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

Part	Number of learners with IEPs scoring Proficient or above	Number of learners with IEPs taking the Forward Exam	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	13	134	8.70%	8.70%	9.70%	N/A	N/A
B	39	355	13.00%	13.00%	10.99%	N/A	N/A

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.**

The data come from the English Language Arts score of the Wisconsin state assessment, the Forward Exam, for learners with IEPs in Grades 3-5.

**Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.**

The data are collected through our standard statewide reporting mechanism into the Wisconsin Information System for Education Data Dashboard (WISEDash) at WDPI. The data will be analyzed using the R statistical analysis application.

**Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)**

NO

**Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

YES

**If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.**

Data collection and reporting continue to be affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. During this reporting period, Wisconsin LEAs returned to in-person instruction, as compared to virtual instruction provided March 18-June 30, 2020. While the return to school amid the COVID-19 pandemic was for many districts safe, efficient, and equitable, it was not without challenges that affected data collecting and reporting.

First, the Wisconsin Statewide learner Assessment System (WSAS) exams given to learners during the 2020-21 school year saw a decline in participation. Assessments were administered to learners in 2021 following standard in-person test taking procedures amid the COVID-19 pandemic.

The WSAS consists of the Forward Exam given in grades three through eight and 10, the American College Testing (ACT) Aspire given in grades nine and 10, the ACT with writing in grade 11, and Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) given across all tested grades to learners with the most significant cognitive disabilities. Results from the WSAS are a foundational component of the state-legislated school and district report cards issued in November annually.

Overall, statewide participation rates among the approximately 580,000 enrolled public and Choice school learners on the Forward, DLM, Aspire, and ACT decreased from previous years to 84 percent in English language arts (ELA) and 85 percent in mathematics. The decline is likely due to pandemic-related factors such as a change in learning environment, parent/guardian opt-out from the assessments, and changes in enrollment from previous years. Consistent with national trends, proficiency rates in ELA (32 percent) and mathematics (31 percent) decreased statewide among enrolled public and Choice school learners. Proficiency rates are calculated as a percent of enrolled learners, not tested learners. Learners who were not tested count against overall proficiency scores.

While the WDPI worked with districts to provide additional flexibility to safely administer assessments, learners did not participate in the assessments in some instances due to local health conditions and concerns, or to parent choices to keep learners home. In some districts, lower than usual participation rates may mean that learners who took the test are not representative of the overall student population. It is strongly recommended to use caution when interpreting results. Making comparisons across years or districts when test participation rates are lower than 95 percent should be avoided, as varying factors resulted in an overall decline in participation rates across the state.

**Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**

**Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.**

WDPI SSIP Evaluation Plan

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1CzndzE2tEty6ALgBBUxPJW4o7rkhRVf6AefFPN7F6XA/edit>

**Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, provide a description of the changes and updates to the evaluation plan.**

For the previous SSIP cycle, WDPI created a detailed evaluation plan to monitor and measure outputs of the improvement strategies composing the foundation of the SSIP. This evaluation plan used three levels of assessment aligned with the theory of action. These three levels also corresponded to short-term, intermediate, and long-term outcomes.

The three levels of that SSIP evaluation model were based on two assumptions. The first was that in order for desired changes in an outcome to occur, an intervention expected to influence that outcome must first be delivered sufficiently among enough of its target audience that intended changes in adult practices resulting from the intervention could reasonably be expected to occur. The second assumption was that these intended changes in adult practices (that are expected to translate into improved learner outcomes) must occur as expected.

Thus, the three SSIP evaluation model levels assessed (1) whether the improvement strategy was delivered to the target audience, (2) whether expected changes in adult practices occurred following the delivery or implementation of the improvement strategy, and (3) whether the SiMR improved following the implementation of the improvement strategies and resulting changes in adult practices, as expected.

For the current SSIP cycle, we have a comprehensive evaluation plan for which the central question is: For schools participating in the Implementation Zone during K4-Grade 2, do learners with IEPs and learners of color have higher proficiency in literacy at grades 3-5 than similar learners not involved in these projects? There are additional components to the evaluation plan, but this discussion focuses on the desired learner outcome, which will be reported to OSEP.

The evaluation uses a posttest-only nonequivalent groups design, which is a subtype of quasi-experimental design. With this method, participants in one group are exposed to a treatment (strategy), a nonequivalent group is not exposed to the treatment, and then the two groups are compared. Because the learners are within districts and schools that were not randomly assigned to the treatment or control group, the groups are nonequivalent.

Learners involved in the treatment will be compared to learners not involved in the treatment using selection criteria based on characteristics of the

schools that they attend, including school size, learner race/ethnicity, percent of learners with IEPs, percent of learners receiving free or reduced lunch, and other factors predicted to be related to the literacy outcomes. Learners will be matched at the school level using propensity score matching.

**If yes, describe a rationale or justification for the changes to the SSIP evaluation plan.**

The shift in the WDPI theory of action and SiMR were significant enough to render the current evaluation plan irrelevant. Thus changes to the evaluation plan were developed to support the revised theory of action and strategies selected to inform the desired outcomes.

**Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:**

WDPI initiated a shift in our SSOS to be more explicit regarding our commitment to equity, more efficient and accountable with our resources, and more effective in our support. The proposed shift builds on research related to equity-focused improvement and implementation, reflects long-standing feedback from families, communities, and schools, and pulls together the work of the agency Title I and Special Education Teams to support schools and districts federally identified for improvement under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). During the 2020-21 school year, the WDPI began formal installation of the reimagined SSOS infrastructure co-created and resourced by the Special Education and Title I teams within WDPI. Within the SSOS, linked teams build capacity to use practice-to-policy feedback loops in Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cycles designed to provide organizational leaders and policy makers with information about implementation barriers and successes so that a more aligned system can be developed. Feedback from the practice level (Practice Informed Policy) engages and informs organizational leaders so they can ensure that policy, procedures, resources, etc. enable innovative practices to occur in classrooms, schools, and districts (Policy Enabled Practice) as intended.

Within this system are three levels of support provided to districts and schools based on the severity and number of identifications under ESSA and IDEA. This linked team system ensures aligned decision-making through data analysis and clearly defined communication protocols. The SSOS provides the internal structure necessary to ensure success in joint monitoring, move the supports at each level through the stages of implementation and ensure that services delivered to schools and districts are effective in positively impacting all learners while accelerating positive impact for learners with IEPs and learners of color. The levels are described as follows:

Level 3: Intensive Intervention - Direct Technical Assistance

This level of support is for districts and schools with persistent performance issues. Currently, approximately seventy schools and 10 districts have been identified for level 3 supports. These districts receive customized investments and direct support from WDPI.

Level 2: Targeted Assistance: Professional Learning Networks and Targeted Supports

This level supports districts and schools to improve identified performance gaps among learner groups based on their identifications. In teams, they develop and implement plans to close their gaps within cohort-based continuous improvement communities so that teams can learn from each other. Approximately ten schools and eighty districts have been identified for level 2 supports. The Implementation Zone strategies described in this report are among those specifically intended for districts within this level of the system.

Level 1: Universal Support: Professional Learning Resources

This level articulates the resources, tools, and voluntary technical assistance available to all interested districts and schools to improve learner performance and narrow gaps in performance among learner groups. These include WDPI's: Educator Effectiveness System, Instructional Materials & Professional Learning initiative, WISExplore and Framework for Equitable Multi-Level Systems of Supports.

**Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.**

To address the gap between what education research demonstrates works and the effective implementation of what works in classrooms, achievement of the WDPI SiMR hinges on the effectiveness of the SSOS, the linked team system that ensures aligned decision-making through data analysis and clearly defined communication protocols. The SSOS provides the internal structure necessary to ensure success in moving the supports at each level through the stages of implementation and ensuring that the IZ strategies delivered in classrooms are effective in positively impacting all learners while accelerating impact for learners with IEPs and learners of color.

Outcomes achieved with regard to the installation of the SSOS for the FFY2020 reporting period include:

Governance - Support for the installation of the SSOS from the Assistant State Superintendents for the divisions in which the Special Education and Title I teams are housed was sought and achieved.

Data - Exploration and initial installation of a decision support data system (DSDS) team was accomplished during this reporting period. Once fully installed, this team will be tasked with: defining types and sources of programmatic, fidelity and outcome data to support the IZ strategies, developing routines for expected use of data, defining questions asked/answered at each level of the system, extrapolating school and district level considerations to regional/state level, and developing an accessible data warehouse and usable data reports for all teams within the system.

Finance - A commitment from the Special Education and Title I team leadership for funding the installation and effective functioning of the SSOS was achieved for the duration of this five year cycle.

Accountability/Monitoring - The newly installed DSDS will support and oversee accountability and monitoring of all teams within the system.

**Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

The linked team structure within the SSOS is expected to be fully installed by July, 2022. Once installation is complete, next steps will include: developing onboarding for new team members, refining team terms of reference and charters, aligning team meetings at all levels of the system to the established meeting protocol, refining bi-directional communication priorities and processes across teams, and collecting, analyzing, displaying and disseminating data pertaining the the Implementation Zone strategies to inform rapid cycle decision making and continuous improvement throughout the five year cycle.

**List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:**

Implementation Zone - Inclusive Communities (IZ-IC)

Implementation Zone -Early Reading (IZ-ER)

**Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.**

The Implementation Zone - Inclusive Communities (IZ-IC) combines multiple evidence-based practices within one carefully designed innovation implemented within a framework leading to significant district-wide transformational change.

The components of the Inclusive Learning Communities Practice Profile (ILC-PP) include:

1. Professional Collaboration Among Learner Supports (Inclusive Learner-Centered Practices Vision, Co-Planning and Co-Serving and Conflict Resolution): When the implementation team shares an inclusive learner-centered vision, it allows for equitable and inclusive learning environments, which promote learning and achievement.
2. Inclusive Mindsets (Employing Equitable Practices, Activating Learner Agency and Voice, Capitalizing on Behaviors and Mistakes and Creating a Community of Learners): In an inclusive, learner-centered environment, educators believe that all learners can and will succeed and provide opportunities to find the expert learner in every child. By focusing on self-awareness and community-building, the team is able to highlight individual strengths of the learner and the community so each member is essential to the success of the whole.
3. Learning Climate, Culture, and Relationships (Designing Physical Space and Classroom Structure, Promoting Social and Emotional Well-Being of All Learners and Facilitating Inclusive, Asset-Building Language): When an environment is intentionally designed and facilitated to support a learner's social and emotional health and promotes positive language and authentic relationships, a sense of trust, safety, and belonging are developed. A strong culture and a climate of collaboration create high expectations for all learners.
4. Planning and Facilitation (Planning Learning Experiences for All Learners, Co-Creating Individual Learning Plans and Targeted, Individualized Assessment and Feedback): When educators facilitate inclusive learner-centered environments, learner efficacy, engagement, and self-regulation increase, contributing to mastery of content standards. Collaborative planning between educators and learners to develop Individualized Learner Plans (ILP) promotes self-directed learning, ownership, and agency for meeting learning targets.
5. Authentic Learner Engagement (Establishing Positive Educator-Learner Relationships, Supporting Learner Leadership Opportunities, Developing Learner Success Criteria and Promoting and Supporting Self-Awareness of Learner Disposition): When educators consistently ensure authentic learner engagement, learner development and outcomes improve.

A foundational belief of this project is that learners belong in their learning communities, in an environment with their peers, and educators are responsible to develop both accessible curriculum and environments for each learner within that inclusive setting. Following the guidance of NIRN, the ILC-PP was developed to make the innovation teachable, learnable, doable, and measurable.

In the IZ-IC, educators are supported to design and deliver learning proactively so that it is accessible for individual learners the first time it is presented. Rather than waiting for learners to fail, the multi-level system of support is fluid, flexible, and provided in the same environment that includes all learners. Learners with IEPs receive most, if not all, specially designed instruction within the general education environment.

The Implementation Zone - Early Reading (IZ-ER) will also develop critical infrastructure, to support staff at each level of the education system to focus on effective implementation of early reading instruction evidence-based practices. In order to improve literacy outcomes for learners with IEPs and learners of color in grades 3-5, early reading instruction must be effective.

Like the IZ-IC, the IZ-ER leverages guidance from NIRN through the stages of implementation, with initial efforts focused on the development of an Early Reading Practice Profile (ER-PP) that clearly defines and operationalizes components of early reading instruction. Specifically, early reading instruction in grades 4K-2 will use gradual release of responsibility to deliver explicit and systematic phonological awareness and phonics instruction, along with building background knowledge through carefully selected and delivered read-alouds. While these foci do not account for all aspects of early literacy instruction, they serve as the initial research-supported areas of emphasis within the IZ-ER.

Making a commitment to implement the IC and ER as practices within the IZ strategy includes an intentional plan for training, coaching and data use to support staff as they use the teachable, learnable and replicable practices. The IZ utilizes a multi-year plan to ensure all stakeholders have an opportunity to understand and commit to transforming mindsets, adult practices, and systems.

**Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.**

WDPI will leverage the IZ strategy to increase proficiency rates in English Language Arts (ELA) for all learners, while accelerating growth for learners with IEPs and learners of color in grades 3-5 to meet grade level expectations, and proactively reducing the frequency of literacy related special education referrals. The IZ strategy encompasses a focus on two key evidence-based practices: 1) Inclusive Communities (IC) and 2) Early Reading (ER).

Within the IZ, the WDPI will work with 17 districts, providing intensive support to them for the development of systems and structures, especially training/coaching and data use for improvement, in order for practitioners to use clearly defined practices related to inclusive communities and early reading. Within the IZ, these systems and structures are intended to effectively and efficiently identify and nurture facilitators, as well as diagnose and resolve barriers at each level of the system based on data, ultimately so we can sustain and then reliably scale those practices to other sites. In other words, the IZ will allow the WDPI to test and improve what it takes to ensure that the implementation of inclusive communities and early reading practices can be sustained and scaled statewide.

Whether the focus is on inclusive communities or early reading, efforts in the IZ will be to ensure that an enabling context is established. The IZ approach ensures highly functioning implementation teams from school to district to region to state have capacity to use data that informs effective implementation so that teachers are supported with training and coaching to use the effective practices of inclusive communities and early reading in the way they are intended. In doing so, outcomes improve for learners with IEPs and learners of color.

What makes this investment unique is that it emphasizes a very intentional focus on the implementation infrastructure or SSOS, the systems and structures needed to learn what it takes to implement practices as intended for maximum benefit. The most promising practice can be identified and articulated, one that is all but guaranteed to improve student outcomes. However, without the implementation infrastructure (meaning teams using data to support training and coaching) to change adult practice, the practice will not be effective and outcomes will not change.

Critical to any effort to coordinate the implementation of the new practice, program, or policy, is the need to intervene actively, at multiple levels of the system to help increase the likelihood that such meta-contingencies as funding, licensing, referral mechanisms, policies, regulations, and reporting requirements are aligned to support the new way of work.

The IZ-IC vision states that each and every learner will thrive in welcoming and inclusive learning communities. In the IZ-IC, districts are supported to strategically implement and sustain inclusive learning communities by receiving funding, quality resources, and supports for training and coaching in order to achieve the following outcomes:

- 1) Districts will implement collaborative linked teaming structures, supported by coaching, to ensure a consistent approach for data-informed collaborative decision making that will lead to improved outcomes for each and every learner.
- 2) Districts will ensure that educational environments are accessible, inclusive, and equitable for each and every learner, by implementing sustainable teacher teams leading to improved outcomes for every learner and accelerated improvement for learners with IEPs and learners of color.
- 3) Key learner outcomes including inclusion, agency, voice, participation, attendance, engagement, discipline, graduation rates, and achievement improve for learners with IEPs and learners of color.

The vision for early reading is that learners will secure the early literacy skills needed to become proficient readers and lifelong learners. Like the IZ-IC, districts engaged with the IZ-ER will be supported to strategically implement and sustain an evidence-based practice, in this case, the practices related to the two aspects of early literacy described above, by receiving funding, quality resources, training, and coaching support in order to achieve the following outcomes:

- 1) Districts will increase their capacity to engage in collaborative teaming structures, supported by coaching, to ensure a consistent approach for data-informed decision-making.
- 2) Districts will demonstrate high levels of fidelity to practice profiles based on the development of robust systems of training, coaching, and data use to support practitioners' effective use of early reading strategies
- 3) Proficiency rates in ELA as measured by the state Forward exam will increase for all learners and accelerate for learners with IEPs and learners of color

### **Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.**

The IZ-IC Theory of Action states: if districts are trained on how to develop and then implement consistent processes ensuring that all educational environments are accessible, inclusive, and equitable and are supported through collaborative decision-making teams, coaching and shared leadership, then districts will experience improved outcomes for every learner and accelerated improvement for learners with IEPs and learners of color.

Data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation are described in the tools below:

Wisconsin PLC Fidelity Rubric: The Wisconsin PLC Fidelity Rubric is adapted from the work of DuFour et. el. It includes components that capture the essential elements of a school level team that has created an enabling context for the innovation of inclusive learning communities. The measures include: Shared Mission, Vision, Values and Goals, Collaborative Culture, Effective Communication, Responding to Conflict, and Consistent Use of PLC processes. This fidelity measure will be completed annually by each School Level Implementation Team (SLT) to assess changes in adult practices.

Integrated Comprehensive Systems (ICS Equity Audit): The ICS Equity Audit identifies integrated/inclusive practices as measured by proportional representation as the anchoring philosophy of the equity audit. Data from the audit supports SLTs to set and prioritize goals and develop an implementation plan to reach the goals that include a review of the goals and plan. This annual data provides both programmatic and outcomes data related to shifts in adult practices impacting learner outcomes.

Vibrant School Scale (VSS): The VSS is a 21-item scale (with subscales for Enlivened Minds, Emboldened Voice, and Playful Learning) as an outcome measure of the sense of belonging, agency, and voice perceived by key stakeholders (staff, learners, and families). This tool will be implemented annually and will measure key learner outcomes as well as provide qualitative data related to shifts in adult mindsets and behaviors.

Best Practices for Inclusive Education Assessment (BPIE): The BPIE is a school self-assessment process designed to identify priority needs, develop goals, plan improvement strategies, and organize resources to support the implementation of inclusive practices for learners with IEPs. The BPIE includes indicators of inclusive practices that are categorized within the following three domains: Leadership and Decision Making, Instruction and Learner Achievement, and Communication and Collaboration. This tool will be completed annually by both DLT and SLTs measuring the fidelity of system-wide implementation for inclusive practices.

Early Childhood Inclusive Practice Profile (ICP): The ICP is a structured observation tool designed to assess the quality of daily inclusive practices that support the developmental needs of learners with IEPs in early childhood settings. It provides a measure of program/classroom quality and a framework for program planning and professional development. Each of the 12 items included in the ICP are aligned with research on effective and inclusive teaching. It is designed to be used in inclusive classrooms for children ages 2-5.

The IZ-ER Theory of Action states: if WDPI develops a systemic and systematic approach to delivering high-quality, standards-based reading foundational skills instruction within a transformation zone, then an implementation infrastructure will support training, coaching, and implementation of early literacy instruction that emphasizes building background knowledge and explicit and systematic phonemic awareness and phonics instruction in districts using implementation science to install and measure impact. Thus educators will have needed support and skills so reading outcomes increase for all learners, and accelerate for learners with IEPs and learners of color.

Based on the current stage of implementation, WDPI is in the process of developing the Early Reading Practice Profile (ER-PP). As a component of that practice profile, a measure will be identified or developed in order to assess fidelity.

### **Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.**

Because both IZ-IC and IZ-ER heavily emphasize the SSOS implementation infrastructure development, the primary programmatic and outcome data will be used across both areas of practice focus. These tools and data sources are described below.

#### **TRAINING/COACHING DATA**

- Aggregated training efficacy (i.e., principles of adult learning), impact, effectiveness data.
- Coaching System Development Worksheet Fidelity Checklist: This tool is used to initiate early discussions about the importance of coaching and the facilitative supports that administrators need to consider in order to ensure a systemic commitment to coaching. The tool specifies the coaching elements that will promote quality service delivery and support for the client, and serves as the basis for further professional development.
- Coach Reflection Data: The questions in this survey align directly to the coaching competencies. Coaches complete this feedback form after each

unique coaching session. Patterns and trends in the feedback will be used to inform professional development and support needs of coaches and clients across the district. Identifiers will be removed and data will be reported in aggregate.

- Client Feedback Data: Coaching clients complete this feedback form after each unique coaching session. Patterns and trends in the feedback will be used to inform professional development and support needs of coaches and clients across the district. Identifiers will be removed and data will be reported in aggregate.

- Coach Observation Data: An observer uses this tool to provide perception data. The observation session will focus on the competencies and components that are directly aligned to the individual coach's goal.

#### CAPACITY DATA

- WDPI, Region, District, and School level capacity data: These capacity assessments are action assessments designed to help leaders and staff at each level of the system better align resources with intended outcomes, and to develop action plans to support the use of effective innovations.

#### OUTCOME DATA

- Learner benchmark data, local assessment data, reading inventories, formative assessments (to be determined with participating districts)

- Learner summative data (Forward Exam)

### **Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

#### IZ-IC Stage of Implementation/Next Steps:

Participants in the IZ-IC are implementing inclusive learning communities using a five-year plan. Currently, participants are in year three of implementation. During the first two years leadership teams were created to prepare the district and school. Implementation teams in the IZ-IC will continue to use established improvement processes and protocols such as linked professional learning community (PLC) frameworks, bidirectional communication protocols, and internal coaching supports to name systemic barriers that perpetuate exclusionary practices. Using established PDSA cycles informed by a diverse stakeholder group and supported by coaching, teams will generate opportunities for growth and increased fidelity of implementation, design action/equity plans and develop or revise a plan for monitoring. Participants attend a focused training series supported by coaching. They also organize collaborative linked decision-making teams (district leadership team - DLT, school leadership team - SLT, and teacher teams) that use data to identify facilitators and barriers to address inequities and actively incorporate learning outcomes throughout the district across multiple years. System leaders and educators complete an annual equity audit using district and school level data to identify systemic inequities. DLTs review and revise organizational structures in support of an increasingly proactive system the following year. With training and coaching, staff increase their knowledge of the important benefits of strong shared leadership and positive culture by including diverse family and community voices in all decision making processes (outcome #2).

During this next reporting period (FFY 2021), the following activities will be prioritized:

- DLTs align all district curriculum and instructional practices and provide professional development so SLTs are better able to seamlessly create teacher teams to function cohesively;
- DLTs will align district office staff to support ICS Equity work;
- All staff and learners will be realigned to support proportional representation, ensuring learners with IEPs, English Language Learners, and advanced or gifted learners in the school are proportionally reflected in every classroom, course, activity, setting, or experience;
- DLTs will lead the transition of all district wide programs and services for learners to attend the schools they would attend if not identified adhering to the principles of proportional representation;
- DLTs will support the SLTs in their work to realign all staff and learners for future teacher teams;
- SLTs will proportionally represent learners across settings and align staff expertise to serve learners in the formation of teacher teams;
- The entire system begins the multi-year process of eliminating segregation based on educational need. It is expected to take two to four years to create a fully integrated and comprehensive system for equity where key outcomes for learners with IEPs and learners of color improve (outcome #3).

#### IZ-ER Stage of Implementation/Next Steps:

The IZ-ER is in year one of its five-year project plan. During this reporting period, emphasis will be on installation activities at the WDPI level, and exploration activities with districts. As part of prior exploration activities, WDPI has established the need to improve ELA outcomes for learners with IEPs and learners of color in grades 3-5, as well as determined the fit and feasibility of the IZ-ER through data analysis and stakeholder engagement. Additionally, financial and personnel resources have been allocated to support the IZ-ER over the five-year project.

During the next reporting period, the following activities will be prioritized:

WDPI will complete development of the ER-PP through a stakeholder engagement process. To clearly define and operationalize core components of early literacy skills initially emphasized in the IZ-ER, WDPI will convene a diverse group of stakeholder practitioners to:

- Articulate the practice philosophy based on a comprehensive literature review;
- Identify the core components and indicators of effective teacher practice related to gradual release of responsibility to deliver explicit phonological awareness and phonics instruction along with building background knowledge through carefully selected and delivered read-alouds; and
- Examine options for fidelity tool adoption or development.

The anticipated outcomes (supports long-term outcome #2) of engaging in this activity include :

- ER-PP v1.0 will support the mutual selection process with districts and initial development of training/coaching content (early summer 2022);
- Fidelity tool will be adopted or resources appropriated to facilitate development (fall 2022); and
- Engagement with potential partners will occur to identify opportunities for serving as a developer of training content or purveyor of training sessions (summer 2022).

WDPI will install the IZ-ER Implementation Team. Two implementation specialists (one WDPI consultant and one statewide coordinator) have been identified to lead the IZ-ER; four additional full-time statewide specialists will be selected to 1) support implementation capacity and infrastructure development for nine districts selected to participate in the IZ-ER and 2) develop training and coaching service delivery models and data systems to support use of the ER-PP. Selection of the statewide specialists will require contract/deliverables development and selection criteria and protocols to facilitate the hiring process. The implementation specialists situated at both WDPI and at the regional level will function as the IZ-ER Implementation Team and meet regularly to engage in installation activities, build collective capacity, and plan for implementation with districts and practitioners.

During the reporting period, the anticipated outcomes (supports long-term outcomes #1 and #2) of engaging in this activity include:

- IZ-ER Implementation Team Membership will be established through a selection process and contract execution (spring 2022);
- IZ-ER Implementation Team Charter will be developed to support effective meeting routines and structures, and establish communication and data use protocols (summer 2022); and
- IZ-ER Implementation Team will: 1) Build and measure capacity to use implementation components, practice profiles, and processes related to data, communication, and decision-making; and 2) Co-create protocols for a district mutual selection process and district implementation plans that include training and coaching service delivery models, and processes related to data, communication, and decision-making (fall 2022).

As WDPI carries out the installation activities described above, exploration activities will commence with districts, focusing on District Selection and Implementation Team Development. WDPI will support nine districts who agree to participate in the IZ-ER with intensive coaching, funds, and resources for establishing the implementation infrastructure needed to promote teachers' use of the ER-PP.

During the reporting period, the anticipated outcomes (supports long-term outcomes #1 and #2) of district exploration activities include:

- District Implementation Teams and Membership will be established through mutual selection and a partnership agreement process (winter 2022-23);
- District Implementation Team Charters will be developed to support effective meeting routines and structures, and establish communication and data use protocols (January-March 2023); and
- District Implementation Teams will build and measure capacity to use implementation components, practice profiles, processes related to data, communication, and decision-making (spring 2023).

## **Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

### **Description of Stakeholder Input**

The DPI used both universal and targeted approaches to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

#### **1. Universal strategy: Open invitation to input sessions**

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

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

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

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

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

#### **3. Targeted strategy: State Advisory Panel input sessions**

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

#### **4. Targeted strategy: Customized invitations to stakeholders**

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

#### **5. Targeted strategy: Customized surveys of families**

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

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

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



themes related to the results indicators and Indicator 17. The researcher harvested these themes for the data and submitted a written report summarizing their research findings.

Input specific to the SSIP included stakeholder groups including but not limited to the State Superintendent's Council on Special Education (SE Council), the Wisconsin Family Assistance Center for Education, Training & Support, Inc. (FACETS), and the Wisconsin Statewide Parent Educator Initiative (WSPEI). Combined, these groups included: people with disabilities, people of color, parents of learners with IEPs and learners of color, special and general educators, education advocates, special education directors, representatives from other state agencies, and statewide education support organizations. Through three virtual meetings across several months, these stakeholders were provided information regarding the current SiMR, theory of action, strategies, and outcomes and were invited to share their perspective on the specific practices they believe have the greatest likelihood of impacting literacy proficiency for learners with IEPs and learners of color and the grade levels the state should target for improvement to provide the greatest likelihood of long term educational success for those learners. The majority of feedback from these stakeholders supported targeting early literacy and a narrower grade band as the most likely means of achieving improved performance on ELA portion of the statewide assessment. Stakeholders also recognize the significant discrepancy in state test performance between students of color and white students and the disproportionate placement of learners of color in special education and supported including improved performance on the state assessment for learners of color with and without IEPs in our strategies and infrastructure improvements. Stakeholders also supported moving from a statewide focus to targeting strategies and activities to select districts and then scaling statewide as impact is demonstrated.

**Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.**

Once these specific stakeholder groups informed the content area and scope of our future efforts, additional virtual meetings were held during which the SSOS infrastructure and IZ practices were described for further input along with information to support setting targets for the revised SiMR. A virtual information session was held with the SE Council and recorded. The recording was then posted to our website and targeted promotion of its viewing sent to numerous listservs within the agency. Having viewed the recording, stakeholders were invited to complete a survey to capture their perspective on whether the infrastructure and improvement strategies aligned to improved literacy outcomes for learners with IEPs and learners of color in grades 3-5, and if not, suggestions for other approaches to achieve these outcomes. Survey results supported the installation of the SSOS and implementation of the IZ strategies as presented.

**Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)**

NO

**Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.**

**Additional Implementation Activities**

**List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.**

**Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.**

**Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.**

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

**17 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**17 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**17 - Required Actions**

## **Certification**

### **Instructions**

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

#### **Certify**

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

#### **Select the certifier's role:**

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

#### **Name:**

Julia Hartwig

#### **Title:**

Director of Special Education

#### **Email:**

julia.hartwig@dpi.wi.gov

#### **Phone:**

16082663887

#### **Submitted on:**

04/28/22 12:01:40 PM

## ED Attachments



wi-resultsmatrix-2022b.pdf



WI-B-Dispute-Resolution-2020-21.pdf



WI-2022DataRubricPartB.xlsx