

**Wisconsin Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State did not provide targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 data for this indicator are 79.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 79.20%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 80%.</p> <p>The State reported the required graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This means that the State submitted the most recent graduation data that the State reported to the Department as part of its Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR).</p>	<p>With the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State must submit a revised SPP that includes targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the targets for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 targets and the FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 revised targets. The revised targets for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 are more rigorous than the previously-established targets.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 2.38%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 2.59%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of <math>\leq 2.49\%</math>.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 targets.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 94% for reading and 98% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 92% for reading and 96% for math. The State met its FFY 2009 targets of 80%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

**Wisconsin Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																																															
<p>assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 targets.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 412 1583 816"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Grade</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="3"><u>Reading</u></td> <td colspan="3"><u>Math</u></td> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>98.96%</td> <td>99%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>99.52%</td> <td>99%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>99.04%</td> <td>99%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>99.42%</td> <td>99%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>99.25%</td> <td>99%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>99.42%</td> <td>99%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>99.20%</td> <td>99%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>99.44%</td> <td>99%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>99.21%</td> <td>99%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>99.42%</td> <td>99%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>99.01%</td> <td>99%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>99.30%</td> <td>99%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS</td> <td>97.40%</td> <td>97%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>97.44%</td> <td>97%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 98.96% for third grade reading. The State met its FFY 2009 targets.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	<u>Grade</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>		<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>			3	98.96%	99%	95%	99.52%	99%	95%	4	99.04%	99%	95%	99.42%	99%	95%	5	99.25%	99%	95%	99.42%	99%	95%	6	99.20%	99%	95%	99.44%	99%	95%	7	99.21%	99%	95%	99.42%	99%	95%	8	99.01%	99%	95%	99.30%	99%	95%	HS	97.40%	97%	95%	97.44%	97%	95%	
<u>Grade</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>																																																											
	<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>																																																													
3	98.96%	99%	95%	99.52%	99%	95%																																																											
4	99.04%	99%	95%	99.42%	99%	95%																																																											
5	99.25%	99%	95%	99.42%	99%	95%																																																											
6	99.20%	99%	95%	99.44%	99%	95%																																																											
7	99.21%	99%	95%	99.42%	99%	95%																																																											
8	99.01%	99%	95%	99.30%	99%	95%																																																											
HS	97.40%	97%	95%	97.44%	97%	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, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 targets.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 1182 1583 1508"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Grade</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="3"><u>Reading</u></td> <td colspan="3"><u>Math</u></td> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>50.85%</td> <td>51%</td> <td>74%</td> <td>57%</td> <td>55.4%</td> <td>58%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>51.43%</td> <td>51%</td> <td>74%</td> <td>58%</td> <td>58.88%</td> <td>58%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>47.59%</td> <td>46%</td> <td>74%</td> <td>51%</td> <td>51.10%</td> <td>58%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>48.07%</td> <td>51%</td> <td>74%</td> <td>44%</td> <td>43.12%</td> <td>58%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>51.67%</td> <td>53%</td> <td>74%</td> <td>47%</td> <td>42.81%</td> <td>58%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Grade</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>		<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>			3	50.85%	51%	74%	57%	55.4%	58%	4	51.43%	51%	74%	58%	58.88%	58%	5	47.59%	46%	74%	51%	51.10%	58%	6	48.07%	51%	74%	44%	43.12%	58%	7	51.67%	53%	74%	47%	42.81%	58%	<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 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>														
<u>Grade</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>																																																											
	<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>																																																													
3	50.85%	51%	74%	57%	55.4%	58%																																																											
4	51.43%	51%	74%	58%	58.88%	58%																																																											
5	47.59%	46%	74%	51%	51.10%	58%																																																											
6	48.07%	51%	74%	44%	43.12%	58%																																																											
7	51.67%	53%	74%	47%	42.81%	58%																																																											

**Wisconsin Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues							OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	8	50.48%	48%	74%	42%	43.02%	58%	
	HS	35.84%	38%	74%	29%	29.25%	58%	
	<p>These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2008 data. The State met part of its FFY 2009 targets.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>							
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 targets.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 0.68%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 0.68%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of <math>\leq 2.73\%</math>.</p> <p>In its SPP, the State reported its definition of "significant discrepancy."</p> <p>The State reported that 408 of 442 districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement of four students suspended and expelled for more than ten days and, therefore, were excluded from the calculation.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the LEA's 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 compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2008 data. The State did not identify noncompliance through this review.</p>							<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that</p>	<p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline, using FFY 2008 data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State's submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that seven districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs. The State also reported that no districts were identified as having policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the</p>							<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p> <p>Apart from its review pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), the State identified noncompliance related to the use of positive behavioral interventions in one LEA identified with significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity,</p>

**Wisconsin Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that the number of districts excluded because of the cell size of four students with disabilities for a given race/ethnicity suspended/expelled for more than ten days varied by race, and ranged from 434 for African American students to 442 for Asian students.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the LEA’s 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 compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2008 data. In addition, apart from this review, the State identified noncompliance related to the use of positive behavioral interventions in one LEA identified with significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs, and determined that this noncompliance did not contribute to the significant discrepancy.</p>	<p>in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs, and determined that this noncompliance did not contribute to the significant discrepancy. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the LEA has corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that the LEA: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (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 district, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:</p> <p>A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;</p> <p>B. Inside the regular class less than</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 targets.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>

**Wisconsin Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>40% of the day; or C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. [Results Indicator]</p>		<p align="center"><u>FFY 2008</u> <u>Data</u></p>	<p align="center"><u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u></p>	<p align="center"><u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Target</u></p>	<p align="center"><u>Progress</u></p>	
	<p>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</p>	<p align="center">54.74</p>	<p align="center">54.58</p>	<p align="center">57.5</p>	<p align="center">-0.16%</p>	
	<p>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</p>	<p align="center">11.20</p>	<p align="center">10.97</p>	<p align="center">10.3</p>	<p align="center">0.23%</p>	
	<p>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</p>	<p align="center">1.25</p>	<p align="center">1.21</p>	<p align="center">1.05</p>	<p align="center">0.04%</p>	
	<p>These data represent progress for 5B and 5C from the FFY 2008 data. The State did not meet any of its FFY 2009 targets for this indicator.</p>					
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a: A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. [Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>					<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>7. Percent of preschool children age 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 targets. The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p>					<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 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>

**Wisconsin Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps	
<p>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"><b><u>Summary Statement 1</u></b></p>	<p align="center"><b><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></b></p>	<p align="center"><b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b></p>	<p align="center"><b><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></b></p>	<p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR.</p>	
<p><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</p>	79.0	78.4	79.2			
<p><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)</p>	81.9	82.1	82.1			
<p><b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</p>	81.8	83.4	82.0			
<p align="center"><b><u>Summary Statement 2</u></b></p>	<p align="center"><b><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></b></p>	<p align="center"><b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b></p>	<p align="center"><b><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></b></p>			
<p><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</p>	69.5	67.0	69.7			
<p><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)</p>	61.7	59.6	61.9			
<p><b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</p>	80.3	79.5	80.4			
<p>These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2008 data. The State met part of its FFY 2009 targets for this indicator.</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.</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the targets for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 targets and the revised FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 targets. The revised targets for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 are less rigorous than the previously-established</p>					<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

**Wisconsin Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
[Results Indicator]	<p>target.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 70.99%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 72.77%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 70%.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2009 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that nine districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported that 325 of 444 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement (for overrepresentation) of at least ten members in a given cell used for risk ratio analysis, and a total enrollment of 100 students for any given racial group and were excluded from the calculation. (The State has no minimum “n” size requirement for underrepresentation.)</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 0.22%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 32 districts were identified with disproportionate overrepresentation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories, 61 districts were identified with disproportionate underrepresentation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories, and 18 districts with both overrepresentation and underrepresentation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p>

**Wisconsin Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
	<p>inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported that 325 of 444 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement (for overrepresentation) of at least ten members in a given cell used for risk ratio analysis, and a total enrollment of 100 students for any given racial group and were excluded from the calculation. (The State has no minimum “n” size requirement for underrepresentation.)</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator was corrected in a timely manner.</p>	
<p>11. 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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 data for this indicator are 98.78%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 98.39%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 27 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State reported that 35 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State’s data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as</p>

**Wisconsin Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 98.72%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 96.78%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2008, the State did not make any findings of noncompliance for this indicator during FFY 2008. The State explained that it verified correction of the noncompliance, consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02, prior to issuing findings of noncompliance.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that</p>

**Wisconsin Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (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 developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>
<p>13. 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</p>	<p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported baseline data for this indicator are 71.21%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 65 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator were corrected.</p> <p>The State reported that 113 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this</p>	<p>Although OSEP did not consider data for Indicator 13 in its determinations for FFY 2009, OSEP is concerned about the State’s very low FFY 2009 data (below 75%) for this indicator. In 2012, OSEP will consider the State’s FFY 2010 data for Indicator 13 in determinations.</p>

**Wisconsin Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>indicator were corrected.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the State is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) (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 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to</p>

**Wisconsin Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:</p> <p>A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;</p> <p>B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s reported FFY2009 baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <p>A. 39.44% enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;</p> <p>B. 66.52% enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school; and</p> <p>C. 79.89% 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.</p>	<p>The State must report actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 1,460 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>In its March 10, 2010 verification letter, the State was required to submit, with its FFY 2009 APR, documentation that LEAs have complied with the data reporting provisions</p>	<p>In reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance)</p>

**Wisconsin Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
	<p>in 34 CFR §300.226(d) by reporting to the State on the number of children served with CEIS funds who received early intervening services and the number of children served with CEIS funds who received early intervening services and subsequently received special education and related services during the preceding two-year period. The State provided the required information.</p>	<p>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 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 4B, 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</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, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 98.31%. The State met its FFY 2009 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>

**Wisconsin Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
available in the State. [Compliance Indicator]		
17. Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines. [Compliance Indicator]	The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.  The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on four due process hearings. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 100%.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.
18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]	The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 targets.  The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 66.70%. The State reported that two of three resolution sessions resulted in settlement agreements. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 54%.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.
19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]	The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 targets.  The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 91.3%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 92.59%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 79%.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.
20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]	The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.  The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 100%.	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). In

**Wisconsin Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.