

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2007 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 and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 79.20%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 80.39%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 84.08%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</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 and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 2.59%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 2.61%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of no more than 1.672%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</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's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 94% for reading and 94% for math.</p> <p>The FFY 2006 data were 94.44% for reading. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 97.22% for math.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 targets of 80%.</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 level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1247 1419 1455"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Target</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="3">Reading</td> <td colspan="3">Math</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>98.34%</td> <td>98.30%</td> <td>95.00%</td> <td>99.20%</td> <td>99.14%</td> <td>95.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Grade	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target		Reading			Math			3	98.34%	98.30%	95.00%	99.20%	99.14%	95.00%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
Grade	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target																	
	Reading			Math																			
3	98.34%	98.30%	95.00%	99.20%	99.14%	95.00%																	

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues							OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																																									
<p>standards. [Results Indicator]</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="548 233 1419 480"> <tr><td>4</td><td>98.64%</td><td>98.19%</td><td>95.00%</td><td>99.24%</td><td>98.68%</td><td>95.00%</td></tr> <tr><td>5</td><td>98.75%</td><td>98.81%</td><td>95.00%</td><td>99.33%</td><td>98.97%</td><td>95.00%</td></tr> <tr><td>6</td><td>98.98%</td><td>98.68%</td><td>95.00%</td><td>98.90%</td><td>98.69%</td><td>95.00%</td></tr> <tr><td>7</td><td>98.98%</td><td>98.55%</td><td>95.00%</td><td>99.20%</td><td>98.57%</td><td>95.00%</td></tr> <tr><td>8</td><td>98.45%</td><td>98.17%</td><td>95.00%</td><td>98.55%</td><td>98.08%</td><td>95.00%</td></tr> <tr><td>HS</td><td>96.61%</td><td>96.00%</td><td>95.00%</td><td>96.70%</td><td>95.96%</td><td>95.00%</td></tr> </table> <p>These data represent progress in 5th grade reading. The State met its FFY 2007 targets.</p>	4	98.64%	98.19%	95.00%	99.24%	98.68%	95.00%	5	98.75%	98.81%	95.00%	99.33%	98.97%	95.00%	6	98.98%	98.68%	95.00%	98.90%	98.69%	95.00%	7	98.98%	98.55%	95.00%	99.20%	98.57%	95.00%	8	98.45%	98.17%	95.00%	98.55%	98.08%	95.00%	HS	96.61%	96.00%	95.00%	96.70%	95.96%	95.00%																						
4	98.64%	98.19%	95.00%	99.24%	98.68%	95.00%																																																											
5	98.75%	98.81%	95.00%	99.33%	98.97%	95.00%																																																											
6	98.98%	98.68%	95.00%	98.90%	98.69%	95.00%																																																											
7	98.98%	98.55%	95.00%	99.20%	98.57%	95.00%																																																											
8	98.45%	98.17%	95.00%	98.55%	98.08%	95.00%																																																											
HS	96.61%	96.00%	95.00%	96.70%	95.96%	95.00%																																																											
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 662 1419 1114"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Target</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="3">Reading</td> <td colspan="3">Math</td> </tr> <tr><td>3</td><td>50.64%</td><td>51.47%</td><td>74.00%</td><td>52.97%</td><td>53.90%</td><td>58.00%</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>52.35%</td><td>50.20%</td><td>74.00%</td><td>53.21%</td><td>51.72%</td><td>58.00%</td></tr> <tr><td>5</td><td>52.74%</td><td>52.60%</td><td>74.00%</td><td>46.54%</td><td>46.66%</td><td>58.00%</td></tr> <tr><td>6</td><td>50.98%</td><td>50.95%</td><td>74.00%</td><td>42.36%</td><td>41.07%</td><td>58.00%</td></tr> <tr><td>7</td><td>49.47%</td><td>49.53%</td><td>74.00%</td><td>42.55%</td><td>40.62%</td><td>58.00%</td></tr> <tr><td>8</td><td>47.85%</td><td>46.97%</td><td>74.00%</td><td>36.64%</td><td>36.73%</td><td>58.00%</td></tr> <tr><td>HS</td><td>33.40%</td><td>31.82%</td><td>74.00%</td><td>28.80%</td><td>25.79%</td><td>58.00%</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress in part and slippage in part from the FFY 2006 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 targets.</p>	Grade	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target		Reading			Math			3	50.64%	51.47%	74.00%	52.97%	53.90%	58.00%	4	52.35%	50.20%	74.00%	53.21%	51.72%	58.00%	5	52.74%	52.60%	74.00%	46.54%	46.66%	58.00%	6	50.98%	50.95%	74.00%	42.36%	41.07%	58.00%	7	49.47%	49.53%	74.00%	42.55%	40.62%	58.00%	8	47.85%	46.97%	74.00%	36.64%	36.73%	58.00%	HS	33.40%	31.82%	74.00%	28.80%	25.79%	58.00%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
Grade	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target																																																											
	Reading			Math																																																													
3	50.64%	51.47%	74.00%	52.97%	53.90%	58.00%																																																											
4	52.35%	50.20%	74.00%	53.21%	51.72%	58.00%																																																											
5	52.74%	52.60%	74.00%	46.54%	46.66%	58.00%																																																											
6	50.98%	50.95%	74.00%	42.36%	41.07%	58.00%																																																											
7	49.47%	49.53%	74.00%	42.55%	40.62%	58.00%																																																											
8	47.85%	46.97%	74.00%	36.64%	36.73%	58.00%																																																											
HS	33.40%	31.82%	74.00%	28.80%	25.79%	58.00%																																																											
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion: A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0.68%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 1.14%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of no more than 2.96%.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 and 2006 with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.170(b) was corrected. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to</p>																																																															

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State, with the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe the results of the State's examination of data from <u>FFY 2007</u> (the State provided this information); • 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 <u>FFY 2006</u> data (the State provided this information and reported that no noncompliance was identified); and • Include, for districts identified with significant discrepancies based on <u>FFY 2005</u> 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; at a minimum, whether there have been changes to the policies and procedures since the last review, and, 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 requirements. The State reported that it had reviewed the two districts’ policies, procedures and practices, and that no noncompliance was identified. 	<p>improve performance.</p> <p>As noted in the revised Part B Indicator Measurement Table, in reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must again describe the results of the State’s examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008). In addition, the State must describe the review, and if appropriate revision of policies, procedures and practices related to the development and implementation of the IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the districts identified with significant discrepancies based on <u>FFY 2007</u> data, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion: 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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<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 and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 381 1467 859"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Target</th> <th>Progress</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td>51.09</td> <td>53.57</td> <td>53</td> <td>2.48%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>12.01</td> <td>11.24</td> <td>10.9</td> <td>0.77%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>1.35</td> <td>1.26</td> <td>1.15</td> <td>0.09%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for this indicator from the FFY 2006 data.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target for 5A, but did not meet its targets for 5B and 5C.</p>		FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress	A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	51.09	53.57	53	2.48%	B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	12.01	11.24	10.9	0.77%	C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	1.35	1.26	1.15	0.09%	<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 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress																		
A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	51.09	53.57	53	2.48%																		
B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	12.01	11.24	10.9	0.77%																		
C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	1.35	1.26	1.15	0.09%																		
<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, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Although States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007, the State revised the improvement activities for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>																				
<p>7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p>	<p>The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide baseline data, targets and</p>																				

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps			
<p>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]</p>	<p align="center">07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</p>	<p align="center">Social Emotional</p>	<p align="center">Knowledge & Skills</p>	<p align="center">Appropriate Behavior</p>	<p>improvement activities with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>			
<p>a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</p>						<p align="center">3</p>	<p align="center">2</p>	<p align="center">2</p>
<p>b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</p>						<p align="center">13</p>	<p align="center">16</p>	<p align="center">10</p>
<p>c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</p>						<p align="center">19</p>	<p align="center">26</p>	<p align="center">12</p>
<p>d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</p>						<p align="center">29</p>	<p align="center">36</p>	<p align="center">22</p>
<p>e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</p>						<p align="center">36</p>	<p align="center">20</p>	<p align="center">54</p>
<p>Total (approx. 100%)</p>						<p align="center">100.00 %</p>	<p align="center">100.00 %</p>	<p align="center">100.00 %</p>
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 73.41%. The FFY 2006 data were 73.57%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 76.1%. The State informed OSEP in its FFY 2007 APR that it revised its Part B and 619 (Preschool) parent surveys. The State submitted revised copies of the surveys with its FFY 2007 APR.</p>				<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</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</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 0%.</p>				<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>			

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%. The State reported that no districts were identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services based on the State's calculation of the data.</p>	
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%. The State reported that no districts were identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories based on the State's calculation of the data.</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). [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 98.20%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 96.48%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%. The State reported that all six of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner. OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, data demonstrating correction of the noncompliance identified in FFY 2006, including the three remaining monitoring findings of noncompliance based on FFY 2005 data. The State reported that all findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006, including the three findings based on FFY 2005 data, were corrected within one year of identification.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the timely initial evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was corrected in a timely manner. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR. The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has completed the initial evaluation, although late, unless the</p>

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<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 and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 89%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 74.35%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 77 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, data demonstrating the correction of noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR, including reporting correction of the noncompliance related to the 98 LEAs found out of compliance based on data collected by the LEAs for FFY 2005. The State reported full correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR, including reporting correction of the noncompliance related to the 98 LEAs found out of compliance based on data collected by the LEAs for FFY 2005.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of the described technical assistance.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was timely corrected.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR. The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to</p>

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 postsecondary goals. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 39.35%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 26.9%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 79 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>ensure compliance.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>Although the State is not required to report data for this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must report on the timely correction of the noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR. The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed an IEP that includes the required transition content for each youth, unless the youth is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p>
<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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 69%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 65%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 66%.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2007 data, the State reported that the respondent group was not representative of the population, and included improvement activities to address this issue.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints,</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in timely correcting noncompliance reported</p>

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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 reported that all 1617 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>OSEP’s June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, information demonstrating that it notifies LEAs of identified noncompliance in a timely manner. In its FFY 2007 APR, the State provided information demonstrating that it notifies each LEA of findings of noncompliance in a timely manner, and provided timelines for the issuance of monitoring findings.</p>	<p>by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e).</p> <p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance, the State must report that it has: (1) corrected all instances of noncompliance (including noncompliance identified through the State’s monitoring system, through the State’s data system and by the Department); and (2) verified that each LEA with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 95%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in achieving 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</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on two due process hearings. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR</p>

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>§300.515.</p>
<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 2007 reported data for this indicator are 76%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 67%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 52%.</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 2007 reported data for this indicator are 92%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 88%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of at least 77%.</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 revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 91.7%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>