

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2010 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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>OSEP’s FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table, dated June 20, 2011, required the State to include in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, a revised SPP that included targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 and revised improvement activities for FFY 2010 and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 data for this indicator are 79.86%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 79.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 85%.</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>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013.</p> <p>In reporting data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR, States must use the same data they used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.</p>							
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 2.67%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 2.38%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of $\leq 2.39\%$.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>							
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 93% for reading and 88% for math. The FFY 2009 data for reading were 94%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 98% for math. The State met its FFY 2010 targets of 85%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>							
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 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 1463 1583 1503"> <tr> <td>Grade</td> <td>FFY 2009</td> <td>FFY 2010</td> <td>FFY 2010</td> <td>FFY 2009</td> <td>FFY 2010</td> <td>FFY 2010</td> </tr> </table>	Grade	FFY 2009	FFY 2010	FFY 2010	FFY 2009	FFY 2010	FFY 2010	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
Grade	FFY 2009	FFY 2010	FFY 2010	FFY 2009	FFY 2010	FFY 2010			

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues							OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																																															
[Results Indicator]	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>Data</u></th> <th><u>Data</u></th> <th><u>Target</u></th> <th><u>Data</u></th> <th><u>Data</u></th> <th><u>Target</u></th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="3"><u>Reading</u></th> <th colspan="3"><u>Math</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>99%</td> <td>99%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>99%</td> <td>99%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>99%</td> <td>99%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>99%</td> <td>99%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>99%</td> <td>99%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>99%</td> <td>100%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>99%</td> <td>99%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>99%</td> <td>99%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>99%</td> <td>99%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>99%</td> <td>99%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>99%</td> <td>99%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>99%</td> <td>99%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS</td> <td>97%</td> <td>97%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>97%</td> <td>97%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data remained unchanged from the FFY 2009 data, except for fifth grade math, for which they represent progress. The State met its FFY 2010 targets.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>								<u>Data</u>	<u>Data</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Data</u>	<u>Data</u>	<u>Target</u>		<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>			3	99%	99%	95%	99%	99%	95%	4	99%	99%	95%	99%	99%	95%	5	99%	99%	95%	99%	100%	95%	6	99%	99%	95%	99%	99%	95%	7	99%	99%	95%	99%	99%	95%	8	99%	99%	95%	99%	99%	95%	HS	97%	97%	95%	97%	97%	95%	
	<u>Data</u>	<u>Data</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Data</u>	<u>Data</u>	<u>Target</u>																																																																	
	<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>																																																																			
3	99%	99%	95%	99%	99%	95%																																																																	
4	99%	99%	95%	99%	99%	95%																																																																	
5	99%	99%	95%	99%	100%	95%																																																																	
6	99%	99%	95%	99%	99%	95%																																																																	
7	99%	99%	95%	99%	99%	95%																																																																	
8	99%	99%	95%	99%	99%	95%																																																																	
HS	97%	97%	95%	97%	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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Grade</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="3"><u>Reading</u></th> <th colspan="3"><u>Math</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>51%</td> <td>51%</td> <td>80.5%</td> <td>55.4%</td> <td>54%</td> <td>68.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>51%</td> <td>53%</td> <td>80.5%</td> <td>58.88%</td> <td>55%</td> <td>68.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>46%</td> <td>54%</td> <td>80.5%</td> <td>51.10%</td> <td>51%</td> <td>68.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>51%</td> <td>53%</td> <td>80.5%</td> <td>43.12%</td> <td>46%</td> <td>68.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>53%</td> <td>53%</td> <td>80.5%</td> <td>42.81%</td> <td>44%</td> <td>68.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>48%</td> <td>53%</td> <td>80.5%</td> <td>43.02%</td> <td>43%</td> <td>68.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS</td> <td>38%</td> <td>36%</td> <td>80.5%</td> <td>29.25%</td> <td>31%</td> <td>68.5%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress, slippage, and remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>							<u>Grade</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>		<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>			3	51%	51%	80.5%	55.4%	54%	68.5%	4	51%	53%	80.5%	58.88%	55%	68.5%	5	46%	54%	80.5%	51.10%	51%	68.5%	6	51%	53%	80.5%	43.12%	46%	68.5%	7	53%	53%	80.5%	42.81%	44%	68.5%	8	48%	53%	80.5%	43.02%	43%	68.5%	HS	38%	36%	80.5%	29.25%	31%	68.5%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<u>Grade</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																																																																	
	<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>																																																																			
3	51%	51%	80.5%	55.4%	54%	68.5%																																																																	
4	51%	53%	80.5%	58.88%	55%	68.5%																																																																	
5	46%	54%	80.5%	51.10%	51%	68.5%																																																																	
6	51%	53%	80.5%	43.12%	46%	68.5%																																																																	
7	53%	53%	80.5%	42.81%	44%	68.5%																																																																	
8	48%	53%	80.5%	43.02%	43%	68.5%																																																																	
HS	38%	36%	80.5%	29.25%	31%	68.5%																																																																	
4. Rates of suspension and	The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP							OSEP appreciates the State's																																																															

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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>accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0.45%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 0.68%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of ≤ 2.51%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that two districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs.</p> <p>The State reported that 415 of 442 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of four students with disabilities suspended/expelled for more than 10 days.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the districts’ 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 districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010. The State identified noncompliance through this review.</p> <p>The State did not report on the result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), i.e., the State did not report whether it revised (or required the affected districts to revise), the district’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 for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010.</p>	<p>efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State did not report the results of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010.</p> <p>In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report whether, as a result of the review, the State revised, or required the affected districts to revise 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 for the districts identified with noncompliance in FY 2010.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2010 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b). When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that the LEA with noncompliance identified by the State: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data</p>

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</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 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>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%. The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that five 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 reported that it reviewed the districts’ 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 districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010.</p> <p>The State reported that 433 of 442 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of four students with disabilities for any given race/ethnicity suspended/expelled for more than 10 days.</p> <p>The State also reported that no districts were identified as having policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. The State reported that it found noncompliance in two districts as the result of its review of their</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2010 have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (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</p>

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
	<p>policies, procedures or practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, but that it also determined that those policies, procedures, and practices did not contribute to the 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.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 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; B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 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="550 727 1583 1203"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td align="center">54.58</td> <td align="center">56.11</td> <td align="center">60</td> <td align="center">1.53%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">10.97</td> <td align="center">10.56</td> <td align="center">10</td> <td align="center">0.41%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td align="center">1.21</td> <td align="center">1.2</td> <td align="center">1</td> <td align="center">0.01%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.</p>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	54.58	56.11	60	1.53%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	10.97	10.56	10	0.41%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	1.21	1.2	1	0.01%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	54.58	56.11	60	1.53%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	10.97	10.56	10	0.41%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	1.21	1.2	1	0.01%																		
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:</p> <p>A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR.</p>	<p>The State must provide FFY 2011 baseline data, an FFY 2012 target, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 in the SPP that it submits with the FFY 2011</p>																				

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																												
regular early childhood program; and B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. [Results Indicator; New]		APR.																												
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 knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's reported data for this indicator are: <table border="1" data-bbox="548 630 1583 1505"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 630 957 727"><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th data-bbox="957 630 1163 727"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 630 1373 727"><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1373 630 1583 727"><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 727 957 865">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 727 1163 865">78.4</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 727 1373 865">79.3</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 727 1583 865">79.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 865 957 1032">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 865 1163 1032">82.1</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 865 1373 1032">80.7</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 865 1583 1032">82.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1032 957 1138">Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 1032 1163 1138">83.4</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1032 1373 1138">82.1</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1032 1583 1138">82.2</td> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 1138 957 1235"><u>Summary Statement 2</u></th> <th data-bbox="957 1138 1163 1235"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 1138 1373 1235"><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1373 1138 1583 1235"><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1235 957 1373">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 1235 1163 1373">67.0</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1235 1373 1373">65.7</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1235 1583 1373">69.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1373 957 1505">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 1373 1163 1505">59.6</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1373 1373 1505">54.7</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1373 1583 1505">70.1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	78.4	79.3	79.4	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	82.1	80.7	82.3	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	83.4	82.1	82.2	<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	67.0	65.7	69.9	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication)	59.6	54.7	70.1	OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR. The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2011 with the FFY 2011 APR.
<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																											
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	78.4	79.3	79.4																											
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	82.1	80.7	82.3																											
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	83.4	82.1	82.2																											
<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																											
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	67.0	65.7	69.9																											
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication)	59.6	54.7	70.1																											

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps				
	(%)								
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="533 280 957 383">Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 280 1163 383">79.5</td> <td data-bbox="1163 280 1373 383">78.6</td> <td data-bbox="1373 280 1583 383">80.5</td> </tr> </table>				Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	79.5	78.6	80.5	
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	79.5	78.6	80.5						
<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>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.</p> <p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 78.27%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 70.99%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 72.5%.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p>				<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that eight 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 314 of 444 districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement of ten students with disabilities in a given cell used for risk ratio analysis, and a total enrollment of 100 students for any given racial group. The cell size of ten is not used for calculating under-representation.</p> <p>The State reported that it made four findings of noncompliance during the course of its examination of whether the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification, but that the noncompliance did not result in inappropriate identification.</p>				<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the four districts identified in FFY 2010 with noncompliance have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (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</p>				

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</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’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 27 districts were identified with disproportionate representation 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 inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported that 314 of 444 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of at least 10 students with disabilities in each race/ethnicity category and a total of 100 students with disabilities in each race/ethnicity, and were excluded from the calculation. The State explained that: (1) an LEA will be identified when one racial group has a total enrollment of 100 students, even if the other racial groups represented in the LEA have a total enrollment of less than 100 students; and (2) the cell size of ten is not used in calculating under-representation because, with under-representation, the issue is the low numbers of students identified in special education.</p> <p>The State reported that it made six findings of noncompliance in the areas of child find, evaluation, and/or eligibility requirements.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the six districts identified in FFY 2010 with noncompliance have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (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 Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 97.67%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 98.78%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State’s data demonstrating</p>

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 37 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>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 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 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 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 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise</p>

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		them, if necessary to ensure compliance.
<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 FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 99.03%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 98.72%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2009, the State did not make any findings of noncompliance for this indicator during FFY 2009. 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 2011 APR, 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 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 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 2011</p>

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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 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>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 72.16%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 71.21%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 62 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, 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 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 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,</p>

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
		<p>unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 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="550 862 1583 1406"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Enrolled in higher education</td> <td>39.44</td> <td>41.52</td> <td>41.5</td> <td>2.08%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed</td> <td>66.52</td> <td>69.57</td> <td>69.6</td> <td>3.05%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed</td> <td>79.89</td> <td>83.26</td> <td>83.3</td> <td>3.37%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data. The State met all of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.</p>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Enrolled in higher education	39.44	41.52	41.5	2.08%	B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	66.52	69.57	69.6	3.05%	C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed	79.89	83.26	83.3	3.37%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Enrolled in higher education	39.44	41.52	41.5	2.08%																		
B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	66.52	69.57	69.6	3.05%																		
C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed	79.89	83.26	83.3	3.37%																		

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.	
<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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 1,409 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in timely correcting findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009.</p> <p>When reporting in the FFY 2011 APR on the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 4A, 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report on correction of</p>

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.
<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 available in the State.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</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 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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 100%. These data are based on three due process hearings. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR §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 reported, as of January 31, 2012, that five of nine resolution sessions resulted in settlement agreements. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 55%.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2010. The State is not required to meet its targets or provide improvement activities in any fiscal year in which fewer than ten resolution sessions were held.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 86.54%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 91.3%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 80%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2010 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). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>