

WISCONSIN- PART B
Table A - Issues Identified in the State Performance Plan

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p>Indicator 1: Percent of youth with individualized education programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>On page 6 of the SPP, the State provided baseline data from 2002-2003, rather than the required 2004-2005 data.</p>	<p>The State must include, in the APR, due February 1, 2007, both baseline data from FFY 2004 (July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005) and progress data from FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006). Failure to include these data may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>
<p>Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>On page 17 of the SPP, the State provided baseline data from 2002-2003, rather than the required 2004-2005 data.</p>	<p>The State must include, in the APR, due February 1, 2007, both baseline data from FFY 2004 (July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005) and progress data from FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006). Failure to include these data may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>
<p>Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Percent of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup. B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards. C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards. <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>On page 23 of the SPP, the State indicated that it does not currently track the number of children with IEPs participating in regular assessments with accommodations, but will begin to do so with the Fall 2005 assessment.</p>	<p>The State must provide complete information as required under Indicator 3B in the APR, due February 1, 2007. Failure to include this information may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p>Indicator 5: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;¹</p> <p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>On page 37 of the SPP, the State indicated that the data that it reported for Indicator 5 may not be fully accurate. The State explained that school districts have struggled with the difference between the amount of removal and the amount of special education received. As a result of this confusion, “placement data submitted by districts may not have accurately reflected the actual number of children placed in the least restrictive environment.” The State described its efforts to ensure the accuracy of future data.</p>	<p>The State must include, in the APR, due February 1, 2007, both accurate baseline data from FFY 2004 (July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005) and progress data from FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006). Failure to include these data may affect OSEP’s determination of the State’s status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>
<p>Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>An evaluation of the sampling plan for Indicator 7 indicated that it was not technically sound (see OSEP’s February 14, 2006 memorandum). Data will lack validity if based on a sampling plan that is not technically sound. OSEP is concerned because the State’s plan is to use these invalid data to establish entry level data for this Indicator. The submission of invalid data is inconsistent with Federal statute and regulations, including section 616(b)(2)(B) of the IDEA, and will affect OSEP’s determination of the State’s status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>	<p>As indicated in the February 14, 2006 OSEP memorandum, if a revised sampling plan has not been accepted by OSEP by the time the State submits its FFY 2005 APR on February 1, 2007, the State must submit a revised sampling methodology with its FFY 2005 APR, that describes how data were collected. In the FFY 2005 APR, the State also needs to explain how the State addressed the deficiencies in the data collection noted in the attachment to the OSEP memorandum. If the State decides not to sample, but rather gather census data, please inform OSEP and revise the SPP accordingly.</p>
<p>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.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))</p>	<p>OSEP is unable to determine whether the plan included for new Indicator 9 will result in the collection of the required data by the submission of the APR, due February 1, 2007.</p>	<p>The State must ensure that any activities or strategies regarding this Indicator result in the collection of the needed baseline data, for the required time period, and that the baseline data and any other required data are reported in the APR. Failure to report the required data in the APR may affect OSEP’s determination of the State’s status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>

¹ At the time of the release of this package, revised forms for collection of 618 State reported data had not yet been approved. Indicators will be revised as needed to align with language in the 2005-2006 State reported data collections.

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p>Indicator 10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))</p>	<p>OSEP is unable to determine whether the plan included for new Indicator 10 will result in the collection of the required data by the submission of the APR, due February 1, 2007.</p>	<p>The State must ensure that any activities or strategies regarding this indicator result in the collection of the required baseline data, for the required time period, and that the baseline data and any other required data are reported in the APR. Failure to report the required data in the APR may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>
<p>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. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>The State did not use the required measurement in reporting its data. The State provided data regarding the percent of children referred by Part C who were <u>found eligible</u> by their third birthday, not, as required by the SPP instructions, the percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who were found eligible for Part B, and who <u>had an IEP developed and implemented</u> by their third birthdays.</p>	<p>The State must include the required data and calculations in reporting its performance on this indicator in the APR due by February 1, 2007. Failure to include these data may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>
<p>Indicator 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>Noncompliance: The State reported an 84% level of compliance for Indicator 16 in the SPP, specifically the requirement at 34 CFR §300.660.</p>	<p>The State must ensure that this noncompliance is corrected and include data in the APR, due February 1, 2007, that demonstrate compliance with this requirement. The State should review and, if necessary revise, its improvement strategies included in the SPP to ensure they will enable the State to include data in the APR that demonstrate full compliance with this requirement. Failure to demonstrate compliance at that time may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>
<p>Indicator 20: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>While the State provided information indicating that all State-reported data (under section 618 of the IDEA, in the SPP and in the APRs) is 100% accurate, information provided under other Indicators of the SPP (e.g., Indicators 1, 2, and 5) reported that the data provided were not completely accurate and/or complete.</p>	<p>The State should reconsider the baseline data provided for Indicator 20 of the SPP and provide accurate information, including improvement activities, in the APR, due February 1, 2007. Failure to accurately report information in this Indicator may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>