

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2012 SPP/APR Response Table

Part B SPP/APR Indicators

1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]
2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]
3. 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/AMO targets for the disability subgroup. [Results Indicator] B. Participation rate for children with IEPs on statewide assessments. [Results Indicator] C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards. [Results Indicator]
4. Rates of suspension and expulsion 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; [Results Indicator] 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. [Compliance Indicator]
5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served: A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. [Results Indicator]
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]
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]
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]
9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]

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]
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. [Compliance Indicator]
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. [Compliance Indicator]
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. [Compliance Indicator]
14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were: A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school; B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school. C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school. [Results Indicator]
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. [Compliance Indicator]
18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]
19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]
20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]

Timeliness of State Complaint and Due Process Hearing Decisions
(Collected as Part of IDEA Section 618 Data rather than through an SPP/APR Indicator)

Timely Resolution of State Complaints: 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.

Timely Adjudication of Due Process Hearing Requests: Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 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.

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2012 SPP/APR Results Data Summary

INDICATOR	FFY 2011 DATA	FFY 2012 DATA	FFY 2012 TARGET
1. Graduation	67.1%	68.6%	≥ 85% ¹
2. Drop Out	2.46%	1.96%	≤ 2.19% ²
3. A. Percent of Districts Meeting AYP for Disability Subgroup -- Reading	100%	77.6%	≥ 90%
A. Percent of Districts Meeting AYP for Disability Subgroup -- Math	100%	71.7%	≥ 90%
B. Statewide Assessment Participation Rate	See Attached Table	See Attached Table	See Attached Table
C. Proficiency Rate	See Attached Table	See Attached Table	See Attached Table
4. A. Percent of Districts with Significant Discrepancy in Suspension/Expulsion	.90%	1.13%	≤ 2.05%
5. Educational Environment for Children with IEPs 6-21			
A. In Regular Education 80% or More of Day	59.42%	61.91%	≥ 65%
B. In Regular Education Less than 40% of Day	10.01%	9.97%	≤ 9.4%
C. In Separate Schools, Residential Facilities, or Homebound/Hospitals	1.20%	1.23%	≤ 0.9%
6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending:			
A. Regular early childhood program and receiving majority of special education and related services in regular early childhood program;	30.98%	32.56%	≥ 32%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.	25.89%	22.25%	≤ 25%
7. Preschool Outcomes	See Attached Table	See Attached Table	See Attached Table
8. Parents Reporting Schools Facilitated Parent Involvement	78.3%	77.58%	≥ 77.5%
14. Percent of Youth No Longer in School, within One Year of Leaving High School:			
A. Enrolled in Higher Education	34.62%	29.8%	≥ 44.5%
B. Enrolled in Higher Education or Competitively Employed	64.52%	59.4%	≥ 71.5%
C. Enrolled in Higher Education or Other Postsecondary Education or Training or Competitively Employed or in Some Other Employment	78.83%	72.9%	≥ 83%
18. Hearing Requests Resolved through Resolution Session Agreements	50%	41.18%	≥ 57%
19. Mediations Held that Resulted in Mediation Agreements	82.86%	75.51%	≥ 82%

¹ As used in this table, the symbol “≥” means that, to meet the target, the State’s data must be greater than or equal to the established target.

² As used in this table, the symbol “≤” means that, to meet the target, the State’s data must be less than or equal to the established target.

3.B Statewide Assessments:

Participation rate for children with IEPs

Grade	FFY 2011 Data	FFY 2012 Data	FFY 2012 Target	FFY 2011 Data	FFY 2012 Data	FFY 2012 Target
	Reading	Reading	Reading	Math	Math	Math
3	99%	99.2%	≥ 95%	99%	99.4%	≥ 95%
4	99%	99.5%	≥ 95%	99%	99.6%	≥ 95%
5	99%	99.4%	≥ 95%	99%	99.4%	≥ 95%
6	99%	99.2%	≥ 95%	99%	99.3%	≥ 95%
7	99%	99.2%	≥ 95%	99%	99.3%	≥ 95%
8	98%	98.9%	≥ 95%	99%	98.9%	≥ 95%
HS	97%	97.8%	≥ 95%	97%	97.4%	≥ 95%

3.C Statewide Assessments:

Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards

Grade	FFY 2011 Data	FFY 2012 Data	FFY 2012 Target	FFY 2011 Data	FFY 2012 Data	FFY 2012 Target
	Reading	Reading	Reading	Math	Math	Math
3	17%	17.4%	≥ 25.8%	32%	28.8%	≥ 35.6%
4	17%	15.6%	≥ 25.8%	30%	27.6%	≥ 35.6%
5	15%	15.6%	≥ 25.8%	26%	25.1%	≥ 35.6%
6	14%	13.3%	≥ 25.8%	20%	22.4%	≥ 35.6%
7	14%	13.9%	≥ 25.8%	18%	17.8%	≥ 35.6%
8	11%	13.3%	≥ 25.8%	16%	16.1%	≥ 35.6%
HS	14%	13.9%	≥ 25.8%	14%	14.4%	≥ 35.6%

7. Percent of Preschool Children Aged 3 through 5 with IEPs Who Demonstrate Improved Outcomes

Summary Statement 1³	FFY 2011 Data	FFY 2012 Data	FFY 2012 Target
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	80.5%	78.2%	≥ 79.8%
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	82.87%	79.5%	≥ 82.7%
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	83.5%	78.2%	≥ 82.6%
Summary Statement 2⁴	FFY 2011 Data	FFY 2012 Data	FFY 2012 Target
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	69.1%	72.5%	≥ 70.3%
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	59.2%	60.8%	≥ 70.5%
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	79.7%	81.3%	≥ 80.7%

³ **Summary Statement 1:** Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

⁴ **Summary Statement 2:** The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Wisconsin FFY 2012 Results Data Summary Notes

INDICATOR 3:

3A: The State has chosen to continue to report AYP data based on targets established under the No Child Left Behind Act.

3B: The State provided a Web link to 2012 publicly-reported assessment results.

3C: The State provided a Web link to 2012 publicly-reported assessment results.

INDICATOR 4A:

The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”

The State reported that five 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.

The State reported that 419 of 443 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of four students with disabilities suspended/expelled for more than ten days.

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 2012. The State identified noncompliance through this review.

The State reported that it revised (or required the affected districts to revise), the districts’ 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, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2012.

For the district identified with a significant discrepancy in FFY 2011 whose policies, procedures and practices were reviewed, consistent with 34 CFR §300.170(b), the State reported on whether there were changes to the policies, procedures, and practices since the last review; if so, whether those changes comply with requirements regarding the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure compliance with the IDEA, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b); and whether practices in this area continue to comply with applicable requirements.

The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was corrected in a timely manner.

REQUIRED ACTIONS

The State must report, in its FFY 2013 APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2012 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 each 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 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 09-02.⁵ In the FFY 2013 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

⁵ OSEP Memorandum 09-02 (OSEP Memo 09-02), dated October 17, 2008, requires that the State report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance: (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.

INDICATOR 7:

REQUIRED ACTIONS

The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2013 in the FFY 2013 APR.

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2012 SPP/APR Compliance Summary

INDICATOR	FFY 2011 DATA	FFY 2012 DATA	FFY 2012 TARGET	CORRECTION OF FINDINGS OF NONCOMPLIANCE IDENTIFIED IN FFY 2011
4B. Significant disproportionality in suspension/expulsion by race/ethnicity, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	0%	0%	0%	The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 was corrected in a timely manner.
9. Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.	0%	0%	0%	The State reported that both of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 were corrected in a timely manner.
10. Disproportionate representation by disability of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	0%	0%	0%	The State reported that all five of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 were corrected in a timely manner.
11. Timely Initial Evaluation	98.91%	98.80%	100%	The State reported that all 26 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 were corrected in a timely manner.
12. Early Childhood Transition	99.23%	99.33%	100%	The State reported that it did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2011.
13. Secondary Transition	79.28%	98.75%	100%	The State reported that all 14 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 were corrected in a timely manner.
15. Timely Correction	100%	100%	100%	The State reported that all 1,007 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 were corrected in a timely manner.

INDICATOR	FFY 2011 DATA	FFY 2012 DATA	FFY 2012 TARGET	CORRECTION OF FINDINGS OF NONCOMPLIANCE IDENTIFIED IN FFY 2011
20. Timely and Accurate Data	100%	100%	100%	

Wisconsin Part B FFY 2012 State Complaint and Hearing Data from IDEA Section 618 Data Reports

REQUIREMENT	FFY 2011 DATA	FFY 2012 DATA
Timely resolution of complaints	100%	100%
Timely adjudication of due process hearing requests	100% (based on two due process hearings)	100% (based on five due process hearings)

Wisconsin FFY 2012 Compliance Data Summary Notes

INDICATOR 4B: The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”

The State reported that six 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 2012. 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 identified noncompliance in four LEAs regarding their practices, but that the State “conducted additional data reviews and interviews using standard protocols” and determined that “there was no evidence that the noncompliant practices contributed to the significant discrepancies, 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 425 of 443 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of four students with disabilities suspended/expelled for more than ten days for a given race/ethnicity.

The State reported that it will verify correction of the noncompliance identified in FFY 2012.

For the one district identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2011 whose policies, procedures, and practices were reviewed, consistent with 34 CFR §300.170(b), the State reported on whether there were changes to the policies, procedures, and practices since the last review; if so, whether those changes comply with requirements regarding the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure compliance with the IDEA, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b); and whether practices in this area continue to comply with applicable requirements.

The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was corrected in a timely manner.

INDICATOR 9: 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.

The State reported that it did not identify any areas of noncompliance in seven of the eight districts, and that in the other district the State identified noncompliance with Part B evaluation requirements through the State’s procedural compliance self-assessment, but that the noncompliance did not result of in inappropriate identification.

The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”

The State reported that 312 of 447 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten students with disabilities in each race/ethnicity category and were excluded from the calculation.

INDICATOR 10: The State reported that 34 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.

The State reported that it did not identify any areas of noncompliance in 22 of the 34 districts, and that in the other 12 districts the State identified noncompliance with Part B child find, evaluation, and or eligibility requirements. The State reported that it found that noncompliance through the following: (1) a substantiated IDEA complaint based on child find, evaluation, and/or eligibility requirements and/or (2) student-specific errors based on child find, evaluation, and/or eligibility requirements determined through the procedural compliance self-assessment. The State further reported that it “conducted additional data reviews and interviews using standard protocols,” and “there was no evidence that the noncompliance resulted in inappropriate identification for the student-specific errors.”

The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”

The State reported that 312 of 447 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten students with disabilities in each race/ethnicity category and were excluded from the calculation.

INDICATOR 11:

REQUIRED ACTIONS

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2012, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2013 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2013 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

INDICATOR 12:

REQUIRED ACTIONS

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2012, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2013 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2013 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

INDICATOR 13:

REQUIRED ACTIONS

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2012, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2013 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2013 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

INDICATOR 15:

REQUIRED ACTIONS

In responding to Indicators 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2013 SPP/APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.