

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 80.39%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 81.4%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 84.08%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 2.61%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 2.13%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of no more than 1.672%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the February 1, 2008 APR improvement activities for this indicator and the State provided that information.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 94.44% for reading and 97.22% for math. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 96.4% for reading and progress from the FFY 2005 data of 96.4% for math.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 targets of 75% for both reading and math.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>	<p>OSEP's February 9, 2007 verification visit letter stated that WDPI did not yet have in effect a process for identifying noncompliance with IDEA requirements in sections 612(a)(16) and 614(d)(1)(A)(i)(VI) with respect to districtwide assessments. The letter further required the State to submit documentation to OSEP that WDPI corrected this area of noncompliance. The State</p>

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																																															
<p>level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 282 1419 732"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="3">Reading</td> <td colspan="3">Math</td> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>99.15%</td> <td>98.34%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>99.14%</td> <td>99.20%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>99.13%</td> <td>98.64%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>99.26%</td> <td>99.24%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>99.57%</td> <td>98.75%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>99.46%</td> <td>99.33%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>99.22%</td> <td>98.98%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>99.30%</td> <td>98.90%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>98.99%</td> <td>98.98%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>98.98%</td> <td>99.20%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>98.71%</td> <td>98.45%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>98.61%</td> <td>98.55%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS</td> <td>96.33%</td> <td>96.61%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>96.42%</td> <td>96.70%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 targets.</p>	Grade	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target		Reading			Math			3	99.15%	98.34%	95%	99.14%	99.20%	95%	4	99.13%	98.64%	95%	99.26%	99.24%	95%	5	99.57%	98.75%	95%	99.46%	99.33%	95%	6	99.22%	98.98%	95%	99.30%	98.90%	95%	7	98.99%	98.98%	95%	98.98%	99.20%	95%	8	98.71%	98.45%	95%	98.61%	98.55%	95%	HS	96.33%	96.61%	95%	96.42%	96.70%	95%	<p>provided information in the FFY 2006 APR demonstrating that it has a process in place to identify noncompliance with sections 612(a)(16) and 614(d)(1)(A)(i)(VI) of IDEA. OSEP appreciates the State's effort in resolving this issue.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
Grade	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target																																																											
	Reading			Math																																																													
3	99.15%	98.34%	95%	99.14%	99.20%	95%																																																											
4	99.13%	98.64%	95%	99.26%	99.24%	95%																																																											
5	99.57%	98.75%	95%	99.46%	99.33%	95%																																																											
6	99.22%	98.98%	95%	99.30%	98.90%	95%																																																											
7	98.99%	98.98%	95%	98.98%	99.20%	95%																																																											
8	98.71%	98.45%	95%	98.61%	98.55%	95%																																																											
HS	96.33%	96.61%	95%	96.42%	96.70%	95%																																																											
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 948 1419 1398"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="3">Reading</td> <td colspan="3">Math</td> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>50.37%</td> <td>50.64%</td> <td>67.5%</td> <td>49.65%</td> <td>52.97%</td> <td>47.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>52.94%</td> <td>52.35%</td> <td>67.5%</td> <td>48.21%</td> <td>53.21%</td> <td>47.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>49.76%</td> <td>52.74%</td> <td>67.5%</td> <td>43.00%</td> <td>46.54%</td> <td>47.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>47.00%</td> <td>50.98%</td> <td>67.5%</td> <td>37.35%</td> <td>42.36%</td> <td>47.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>47.12%</td> <td>49.47%</td> <td>67.5%</td> <td>36.27%</td> <td>42.55%</td> <td>47.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>49.19%</td> <td>47.85%</td> <td>67.5%</td> <td>34.86%</td> <td>36.64%</td> <td>47.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS</td> <td>32.10%</td> <td>33.40%</td> <td>67.5%</td> <td>28.38%</td> <td>28.80%</td> <td>47.5%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress in part and slippage in part from the FFY 2005 data. The State met part of its FFY 2006 targets.</p>	Grade	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target		Reading			Math			3	50.37%	50.64%	67.5%	49.65%	52.97%	47.5%	4	52.94%	52.35%	67.5%	48.21%	53.21%	47.5%	5	49.76%	52.74%	67.5%	43.00%	46.54%	47.5%	6	47.00%	50.98%	67.5%	37.35%	42.36%	47.5%	7	47.12%	49.47%	67.5%	36.27%	42.55%	47.5%	8	49.19%	47.85%	67.5%	34.86%	36.64%	47.5%	HS	32.10%	33.40%	67.5%	28.38%	28.80%	47.5%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
Grade	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target																																																											
	Reading			Math																																																													
3	50.37%	50.64%	67.5%	49.65%	52.97%	47.5%																																																											
4	52.94%	52.35%	67.5%	48.21%	53.21%	47.5%																																																											
5	49.76%	52.74%	67.5%	43.00%	46.54%	47.5%																																																											
6	47.00%	50.98%	67.5%	37.35%	42.36%	47.5%																																																											
7	47.12%	49.47%	67.5%	36.27%	42.55%	47.5%																																																											
8	49.19%	47.85%	67.5%	34.86%	36.64%	47.5%																																																											
HS	32.10%	33.40%	67.5%	28.38%	28.80%	47.5%																																																											

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 1.14%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 4.0%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of no more than 3.19%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>In reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must describe the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008).</p> <p>In addition, in the FFY 2007 APR, the State must describe the review, and if appropriate revision, of policies, procedures and practices related to 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) for the districts identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2006 data. For districts identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2005 data whose policies and procedures were reviewed consistent with 34 CFR §300.170(b) and that were also identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2006 data, the subsequent review, at a minimum, must include whether there have been changes to the policies and procedures since the last review; if so, whether those changes comply with requirements regarding the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards; and whether practices in these areas continue to comply with applicable</p>

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; 4]</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 4B was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>	<p>requirements.</p>																
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p> <p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 816 1419 1195"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td>50.83%</td> <td>51.09%</td> <td>52%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>12.09%</td> <td>12.01%</td> <td>11.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>1.43%</td> <td>1.35%</td> <td>1.2%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 targets.</p>		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	50.83%	51.09%	52%	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	12.09%	12.01%	11.2%	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	1.43%	1.35%	1.2%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target															
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	50.83%	51.09%	52%															
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	12.09%	12.01%	11.2%															
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	1.43%	1.35%	1.2%															
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings,</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 6 was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>																	

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																								
home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings). [Results Indicator]																										
7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator; New]	The State's FFY 2006 reported progress data for this indicator are: <table border="1" data-bbox="548 448 1419 1133"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 448 1062 623">06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1062 448 1182 623">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1182 448 1299 623">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1299 448 1419 623">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 623 1062 691">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 623 1182 691">7%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 623 1299 691">7%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 623 1419 691">3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 691 1062 826">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 691 1182 826">7%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 691 1299 826">13%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 691 1419 826">3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 826 1062 927">c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 826 1182 927">23%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 826 1299 927">30%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 826 1419 927">17%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 927 1062 1027">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 927 1182 1027">33%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 927 1299 1027">23%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 927 1419 1027">17%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1027 1062 1133">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1027 1182 1133">30%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 1027 1299 1133">27%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 1027 1419 1133">60%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> The State provided improvement activities for this indicator. OSEP accepts those activities.	06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	7%	7%	3%	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	7%	13%	3%	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	23%	30%	17%	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	33%	23%	17%	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	30%	27%	60%	The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide progress data with the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009; and baseline data and targets with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.
06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																							
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	7%	7%	3%																							
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	7%	13%	3%																							
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	23%	30%	17%																							
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	33%	23%	17%																							
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	30%	27%	60%																							
8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 73.57%. These data represent progress from FFY 2005 data of 72.04%. The State met its	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.																								

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>children with disabilities. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>FFY 2006 target of 72.3%.</p>	
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the revised FFY 2005 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p>	<p>As required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Included information demonstrating that it examined data for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 for both overrepresentation and underrepresentation by race and ethnicity groups in special education and related services as required by 34 CFR §300.600(d)(3); and 2. Provided data demonstrating that the State has in effect policies and procedures that prevent inappropriate overidentification or disproportionate representation by race or ethnicity of children with disabilities as required by 34 CFR §300.173. <p>Once the State revised its FFY 2005 data to 0%, it was no longer required to report on the correction of previously identified noncompliance for this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP notes that the State's data for this indicator on page 63 of the FFY 2006 APR is not consistent with the data reported on page 62 of the FFY 2006 APR. OSEP assumes that the State inadvertently failed to amend the data on page 63 of the FFY 2006 APR.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the revised FFY 2005 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p>	<p>As required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State provided information demonstrating that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It examined data for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 for both overrepresentation and underrepresentation by race and ethnicity groups in specific disability categories as required by 34 CFR §300.600(d)(3); and 2. The State has in effect policies and procedures that prevent inappropriate overidentification or disproportionate representation by race or ethnicity of children with disabilities as required by 34 CFR §300.173. <p>Once the State revised its FFY 2005 data to 0%, it was no longer required to report on the correction of previously identified noncompliance for this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline).</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 96.48%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 88.41%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that three of three findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 through dispute resolution related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner. The State reported that it made sixteen monitoring findings of noncompliance based on FFY 2005 data, but that it did not notify the LEAs of these findings until February-March 2007 (FFY 2006).</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was corrected.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). The State must also include in its FFY 2007 APR data on the</p>

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR, including the 3 remaining monitoring findings of noncompliance based on FFY 2005 data.
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 74.35%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 65.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State did not make any FFY 2005 findings of noncompliance. The State reported that in August 2007 (FFY 2007) it notified ninety-eight LEAs of noncompliance based on data collected by the LEAs for FFY 2005.</p>	<p>The State reported that some LEAs were late in reporting Indicator 12 data to the State. As a result, the Department did not notify LEAs of noncompliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b).</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR, including the correction of noncompliance related to the ninety-eight LEAs found out of compliance based on data collected by the LEAs for FFY 2005.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 26.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 7.4%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 45 of 45 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b),</p>

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP, and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported baseline data for this indicator are 65%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities and targets for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the revised FFY 2005 data of 96.77%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 valid and reliable data for FFY 2004 and FFY 2005, specifically data using the correct measurement. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in timely correcting noncompliance identified under this indicator in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600. However, although the State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%, and the State's FFY 2005 data for this indicator are 96.77%, OSEP notes that the State delayed notifying 16 LEAs of noncompliance related to the timely evaluation requirements under Indicator 11 identified in FFY 2005 until February – March 2007.</p> <p>Furthermore, the State did not notify 98 LEAs until August 2007 of noncompliance related to the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b)</p>

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>(Indicator 12) based on data collected by the LEAs for FFY 2005 and reported to the State in December 2006. (The State reported that some LEAs were late in reporting their 2005-2006 data for Indicator 12; however, the State did not report when the LEAs provided the data or how many LEAs were late.)</p> <p>Pursuant to 34 CFR §300.149, WDPI must ensure that each educational program for children with disabilities administered within the State meets the requirements of Part B of IDEA. In order to comply with this requirement, as part of its general supervision responsibilities, the State must notify LEAs of identified noncompliance in a timely manner.</p> <p>In the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must provide information demonstrating that it notifies LEAs of identified noncompliance in a timely manner.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 95%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 89%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on three hearings. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely due process hearing resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 67%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 51%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 88%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of at least 76%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 92.74%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 91.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 a report on the implementation of the plan for submitting child count data under section 618 that meets the requirements in 34 CFR §300.641(a). The State provided the required information. OSEP appreciates the State's work in resolving this issue.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely and accurate data requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p>