Michigan Part B
State Performance Plan
Annual Performance Report
(SPP/APR) in Historic Format

As required by 20 U.S.C. 1416
Sec. 616(b)(1) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* 2004

The official FFY 2013 SPP/APR was submitted to the United States Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) through the new GRADS360 website on February 2, 2015. A version of the official Part B SPP/APR (APR-2013B-MI.pdf) has been provided by the OSEP and is available on the OSE website.

This historic format of the SPP/APR will no longer be provided after this year. Michigan is providing this historic format version to provide additional information pertaining to improvement activities and progress that is not included in the APR-2013B-MI.pdf GRADS360 document. Publication of the SPP/APR in future years will only be available in the GRADS360 format.

MICHIGAN Department of
Education

Office of Special Education

State Performance Plan & Annual Performance Report
Table of Contents

Page

Introduction to Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2013 through 2018 February 2015

General Overview of the State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2013

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education (OSE) developed the federal fiscal year (FFY) 2013-2018 State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) in collaboration with the Office of Great Start, Early Childhood Education & Family Services (OGS/ECE&FS), the Division of Accountability Services (DAS), other state agency offices and OSE grantees, the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) and the Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC). This SPP/APR document includes a report of Michigan's indicator overviews, targets, actual performance data for FFY 2013, progress and/or slippage in meeting the state's "measurable and rigorous targets", and the results from the FFY 2012 improvement activities.

The historic version of the SPP and the current versions of the SPP Extension and APR can be found on the MDE website at www.michigan.gov/ose-eis (select "Annual Performance Report/State Performance Plan" in the left column under Special Education).

Recent changes

The Bureau of Assessment and Accountability (BAA) was reorganized during FFY 2012 and became the DAS. In order to minimize confusion with districts and other stakeholders, the DAS decided to continue using the BAA acronym associated with many of its web-based applications and documents.

The OGS is currently undergoing a reorganization. For FFY 2013 SPP/APR reporting, we will continue to use the name of the unit within OGS that was in effect during this reporting year which was the OGS/ECE&FS.

Effective March 28, 2013, *Public Act 436 of 2012*, known as the Local Fiscal Stability and Choice Act Process, provided that if there are one or more conditions indicative of probable financial stress in a local school district, the state superintendent may conduct a preliminary review. If warranted after the preliminary review, the state superintendent may recommend the creation of a review team. Should the review team determine that a financial emergency exists, one course of action is the appointment of an emergency manager by the governor (http://www.michigan.gov/treasury/0,1607,7-121-1751_51556-198770--,00.html). Upon appointment of the emergency manager, the chief administrative officer and governing body of the local school district are prohibited from exercising any powers of offices without written approval of the emergency manager. If a district is unable to provide an adequate debt reduction plan, the state superintendent may decide to dissolve the school district. Since the enactment of this law, several districts have had an emergency manager appointed and some districts have been dissolved.

In September of 2012, the Education Achievement Authority of Michigan (EAA) began operation as an independent district. The EAA is a statewide school system that was established through an inter-local agreement between Eastern Michigan University and the Detroit City School District. The system is designed to transform lowest performing schools in the state of Michigan into stable, financially responsible public schools that provide the conditions, tools, resources, supports and safe learning environments in which teachers can help students make significant academic gains. The EAA is currently responsible for operating 15 Detroit Public Schools (DPS), which were transferred from DPS to the EAA by the district's Emergency Manager via interlocal agreements and as a result of the schools' performance history.

The School Reform Officer position is an Executive Director appointed by the State Superintendent. The School Reform Officer leads the Department's State School Reform/Redesign Office. Established by state statute in January 2010, the School Reform Officer's position and the State School Reform/Redesign District (SSRRD) were created to provide opportunities to leverage reform efforts that will significantly contribute to the transformation of the state's Priority Schools. Initially, the SSRRD's responsibilities were exclusively transferred to the EAA in 2012. However, the EAA no longer has an exclusive contract to lead the state's lowest performing schools. Current priority areas for the State School Reform/Redesign Office include innovative models for (1) a high-performing SSRRD, (2) the African American Male Initiative, (3) fiscal models for the SSRRD, (4) data quality protocols, and (5) an efficient and effective progress monitoring system.

This combined SPP/APR document reflects statewide summary data from Michigan's districts and state agency education programs. In this document, the term "district" or "local" refers to all local education agencies (LEAs), public school academies (PSAs), intermediate school districts (ISDs)/educational service agencies, and state agencies that provide direct services to students. The number of districts within Michigan varies from year to year due to openings, consolidations and closures. The number fluctuates between 880 and 910 with about 98 percent of these districts reporting students with an individualized education program (IEP). Approximately 62 percent of the districts are traditional LEAs, 31 percent are PSAs, 6 percent are ISDs and 1 percent are state agencies. The state agency education programs include educational programs operated by Michigan's Departments of Community Health, Corrections, and Human Services.

Within each indicator, the number of districts included in the calculations varies depending on the data requirements (e.g., not all districts had a preschool program or a secondary program).

In the future, Michigan will be using the wording Educator Preparation Institution rather than Institution of Higher Education as it is a more accurate term to identify our teacher preparation programs. Not all Institutions of Higher Education prepare students for the field of education.

Michigan is using the title "Early Childhood Educational Environments: Ages 3 through 5" for Indicator 6. This is more reflective of the children being served in Michigan and is the language used in the measurement table.

Process Used to Develop the SPP/APR

<u>Leadership</u>

The OSE is comprised of the administrative team and three units: the administrative team is responsible for providing leadership and direction for the organization; the Performance Reporting Unit (PR) that is responsible for data, monitoring, and Determinations; the Program Accountability Unit (PA) that has a responsibility of state complaints, hearings, and rule promulgation; and the Program Finance Unit that provides oversight for the federal and state special education funding structures.

The OSE implemented a new SPP Core Team structure for the FFY 2012 reporting year. In prior years, there was a single team comprised of administrators and consultants. Due to increased demand on our staff and a need for additional expertise, the decision was made to create multiple teams.
The SPP/APR Core Teams included the OSE:
- OSE PR Data and SPP Coordinators
- OSE SPP/APR Consultant
- IDEA Grant Funded Initiatives' Directors
- PR Data Analysts and Consultants
- PA Consultants
- OSE Support Staff

The Core Teams provided global direction and oversight during the SPP/APR development. The Core Teams made recommendations on the required elements of each indicator report which contributed to the accuracy and coherence of the final report. The Core Teams also addressed specific issues related to individual SPP/APR indicators.

A work team was created for each SPP/APR indicator. Each work team had an indicator lead, co-lead, staff member from compliance, data person, and administrative support. As appropriate, work teams included staff from:
- the OSE
- the OGS/ECE&FS
- Michigan's IDEA Grant Funded Initiatives
- the DAS
- Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI)
- external providers of data services to the OSE.

The indicator teams examined data, data collection strategies, variables that impacted progress and slippage, and improvement activities.

The OSE director, supervisors from the OSE PA and PR Units, and the OGS/ECE&FS Supervisor of Preschool and Early Elementary Programs completed a final read of the SPP/APR and related documents to ensure completeness and accuracy.

National Guidance and Support

The following national technical assistance centers, networks and organizations provided the MDE with SPP/APR-related consultation and/or resources:

- Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS)
- Consortium for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE)
- DaSy: The Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems
- Data Accountability Center (including the former National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM))
- Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Center
- Education Information Management Advisory Consortium (EIMAC)
- Great Lakes East Comprehensive Center
- National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE)
- National Dissemination Center for Children with Disabilities (NICHCY)
- National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities
- National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC)
- National Post-School Outcomes Center (NPSO)
- National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC)
- North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC)
- National Implementation Research Network (NIRN).

Stakeholder Involvement

The OSE continues, when appropriate, to actively seek input from stakeholders. Over the past couple of years the OSE has sought input from the OSE State Data Advisory Committee, the SEAC, the MICC, school districts, professional organizations, universities, United States Department of Education funded educational centers and other State of Michigan agencies. Stakeholders are involved in the development of new indicator targets and in the development of the State Systemic Improvement Plan. Reference the Indicator 17 SPP/APR section for details of stakeholder involvement. Additional information about the historic involvement of stakeholders in the SPP and APR processes are presented in the historic Part B SPP and SPP Extension documents at http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-6530_6598_31834---,00.html.

Data Systems and Improvements

This year's SPP/APR continues to reflect improved district data entry, state collection, verification and analysis practices. The OSE collaborated with data systems' technical experts to ensure compliance with all data collection requirements and improved data validity and reliability including:

- The BAA coordinated statewide student assessment data, including the re-introduction of the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Access alternate assessment.

- The CEPI enhanced the Michigan Student Data System to:
  - Provide data quality support in the collection of preschool outcomes data.
  - Enhance the ability for districts to verify discipline data in a secure manner consistent with the *Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act* and *Michigan's Identity Theft Protection Act*.
- Collaborative work between the OSE and the CEPI to enhance public reporting and access to data via the MI School Data portal.
- Public Sector Consultants assisted with the alignment of data elements feeding into the public reporting database, the Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System (CIMS) Workbook, and the Determinations data set.
- Wayne State University's Center for Urban Studies maintained data portals for local and state views of disproportionate representation, parent involvement and postsecondary outcomes data for the general public and through secure login for districts.
- The HighScope Educational Research Foundation supported the analysis of preschool outcomes data.

Monitoring and Reporting

The OSE continued its implementation of the CIMS. Electronic CIMS Workbooks were issued in August, December and April providing districts with information about their performance on key compliance and results indicators. Findings of noncompliance were issued through the CIMS Workbooks based on data reviews and focused monitoring activities.

To ensure timely correction of findings, districts were required to submit corrective action plans (CAPs) within 45 days of findings being issued. The OSE reviewed and approved each CAP. Districts submitted progress reports per an established calendar and were required to request closure within the CIMS Workbook once all activities were completed and the districts indicated they were in compliance including student level CAPs. The OSE verified correction of noncompliance. Verification included correction of each individual case of noncompliance and a review of new data submissions or record reviews to determine whether or not the district was correctly implementing specific regulatory requirements and changes in their policies, procedures and practices. Districts were notified of the status of their CAPs within the CIMS Workbooks. Technical assistance was provided throughout the year to ensure correction of noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year, including verification (reference Appendix C).

State Complaints

The OSE utilizes a single-tier complaint system. All state complaints are completed using this system. This single-tier system allows the ISDs and the OSE to jointly investigate complaints resulting in the opportunity to encourage and support the use of local resolution and methods of alternative dispute resolution.

During FFY 2013, the OSE implemented a new database that tracks state complaints and was designed to integrate data more efficiently from state complaints, due process complaints and mediation. Due to issues with the data entry and reporting software that have arisen over the past year, the OSE is reviewing possible alternatives to collect and report these data.

IDEA Grant Funded Initiatives

The OSE has developed a system to advance evidence-based practices in the field of education to support diverse learners.

The OSE is currently funding 10 projects that address needs identified through new federal and/or state mandates, data analysis, systemic compliance findings or stakeholder-based input. For detailed information, reference Appendix *B*. These projects are:

- Center for Educational Networking (CEN)
- Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System (CIMS)
- Michigan Alliance for Families
- Michigan Department of Education, Low Incidence Outreach
- Michigan's Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative (MiBLSi)
- Michigan's Integrated Mathematics Initiative (MI)^2
- Michigan's Integrated Technology Supports (MITS)
- Michigan Special Education Mediation Program (MSEMP)
- Reaching and Teaching Struggling Learners (RTSL)
- Statewide Autism Resources and Training (START).

Collaboration among Districts and State Entities

Given federal expectations for increasing alignment between the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (ESEA) and the IDEA, the OSE, along with the IDEA Grant Funded Initiatives, continued collaboration and coordination with districts and state agencies. The OSE continued to expand and improve communication systems with stakeholders involved in implementing the IDEA and the approved ESEA flexibility waiver. For example, regular community-of-practice calls, webinars, and face-to-face meetings with ISD special education directors and monitors occurred throughout the year. The OSE, in partnership with organizations such as the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education and the Michigan Pupil Accounting and Attendance Association, provided workshops and information at general membership meetings and through webinars. The OSE PR Monitoring and Technical Assistance Team have been collaborating with the MDE Office of Education Improvement & Innovation and the DAS to align school improvement activities within the school improvement framework.

Professional Development

The Office of Professional Preparation Services (OPPS) within the MDE is responsible for ensuring qualified educators by implementing requirements for their initial preparation and certification, and certificate renewal based on appropriate professional development to enhance instruction and achievement for all students. The OSE staff collaborates with the OPPS pertaining to the qualifications required

for teachers, teacher consultants, administrators, and licensed/certified personnel that are responsible in the education and/or provision of services to students with disabilities.

Public Reporting

Michigan's 2014 IDEA Public Reporting on the performance of individual districts on required indicators (Indicators 1-14) was accomplished through:

- Collaboration with stakeholder groups: The OSE collaborated with groups such as the SEAC, the Michigan Alliance for Families and the OSE Data Advisory Committee regarding the content and format of the public reports.
- Shared leadership with ISDs: The OSE collaborated with ISD personnel to provide information to district staff and the public.
- General announcement: An MDE deputy superintendent sent a memorandum to all superintendents and PSA administrators announcing the availability of the public reports.
- District preview of public reporting: The OSE ensured that districts had ample opportunity to preview the data. The preview period enabled districts to prepare communications for their communities and plans for improvement. A memorandum was sent to all special education listservs and the data were made available to the public.
- Media advisory: The MDE's Office of Communications distributed a media advisory announcing the availability of public reporting.
- Posting on the MDE website at www.michigan.gov/ose-eis: During the last week in May of 2014, the OSE posted individual districts' performance on the required indicators with comparisons to state or federal targets and state performance. This posting also provided the opportunity to easily view district performance across all indicators in a spreadsheet or PDF.

Public reporting on Michigan's performance was supplemented by posting the current SPP/APR on the MDE website http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-6530_6598_31834---,00.html.

Components of a System of General Supervision

According to the NCSEAM, a system of general supervision should include, at a minimum, each of the following components that inform and interact with each other:

1. State Performance Plan (SPP)
2. Policies, Procedures and Effective Implementation
3. Data on Processes and Results
4. Targeted Technical Assistance and Professional Development
5. Effective Dispute Resolution
6. Integrated Monitoring Activities
7. Improvement, Correction, Incentives and Sanctions
8. Fiscal Management.

State Performance Plan

Michigan's historic State Performance Plan (SPP) consisted of 20 indicators for *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA Part B) (ages 3 through 21). Each of the SPP indicators provide a measurable indication of the performance in specific legal priority areas under Part B: Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), Disproportionality, and Effective General Supervision, including Child Find and Effective Transitions. The current combined State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) contains 18 indicators.

Compliance indicators have targets set by the federal government's Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) and require targets of either 0 or 100 percent. Results indicators have targets set by the Office of Special Education with stakeholder input. Stakeholders include the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) which is Michigan's state advisory panel to the State Board of Education and the Michigan Department of Education (MDE); school administrators; parents; and the MDE, Office of Special Education (OSE) staff members are actively and routinely involved in all aspects of the SPP/APR, especially in establishing and revising targets for results indicators.

The SPP/APR is both a historic and living document. The current SPP/APR was developed following a strategic work plan, will be revised as needed and is being used as a roadmap to guide improvement efforts at the state and local level. The information pertaining to the SPP/APR is communicated in language understandable to the general public.

Policies, Procedures and Effective Implementation

Michigan has policies, procedures and implementation strategies that align with and support the implementation of the IDEA. The policies and procedures are enforceable under state law and/or policies through the imposition of sanctions when necessary. The policies and procedures include descriptions of activities to identify noncompliance, methods of requiring correction of noncompliance and the range of sanctions that can be used to enforce correction. Districts also have policies and procedures in place to ensure that all personnel necessary to carry out the requirements of IDEA are appropriately and adequately prepared; and that these policies and procedures guarantee a free, appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE).

To ensure the implementation of the IDEA, it is necessary to coordinate efforts across state and local agencies. Interagency agreements or memoranda of understandings are used to facilitate these efforts.

Data on Processes and Results

Data are routinely collected throughout the year through several state information systems. Districts regularly update their data to assure timely and accurate

information. Verification of the data is achieved through multiple methods and activities including district and state level previews to the submitted data, data quality reports, trend analyses of data at the district and state levels, and on-site monitoring visits.

The collected data are used for both state and district level reporting for the SPP/APR, Public Reporting, monitoring, district determinations and for generating ad hoc data requests. In addition, the data assists the OSE in determining areas in need of technical assistance and professional development and allocation of resources.

Targeted Technical Assistance and Professional Development

A large portion of the OSE's technical assistance is linked to specific SPP/APR indicators, especially the compliance indicators, through the identification and correction of noncompliance.

Technical assistance and professional development activities are provided through posted documents and videos on the state's websites; help-desks; toll-free phone lines; electronic and paper versions of documents; coaching; mentoring; local, regional, and statewide learning opportunities; training sessions and from other technical assistance providers. Technical assistance and professional development activities are evaluated to improve future activities.

Effective Dispute Resolution

The OSE provides training and support for the timely resolution of complaints, mediations and due process actions. Information for all interested parties is provided through Michigan's websites; toll-free phone lines; electronic and paper versions of documents; coaching; mentoring; local, regional, and statewide learning opportunities; and training sessions. Several of our IDEA Grant Funded Initiatives are directly engaged with dispute resolution activities including providing mediation, facilitation and training services for working through disputes between school districts and parents or guardians of children with special needs, so that children with disabilities promptly receive the services they need to develop and succeed in school.

Issues are entered into and tracked through a state data system to identify whether patterns or trends exist, identify districts for monitoring activities, ensuring that all related corrective actions have been implemented and noncompliance has been corrected.

Integrated Monitoring Activities

Michigan integrates monitoring strategies across all components of the general supervision system. Multiple data sources and methods are used to monitor districts. Selected monitoring activities ensure continuous examination of performance for compliance and results. This includes on-site and off-site monitoring activities. Monitoring protocols focus on specific priority areas selected based on state performance and improvement needs.

The Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System (CIMS) was designed to help districts analyze and interpret data to track monitoring activities within a single software application. The CIMS promotes positive learning outcomes for diverse learners and ensures compliance with the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA) and the *Michigan Administrative Rules for Special Education* (MARSE). The CIMS reflects the priorities of the IDEA and the State Performance Plan and is aligned with the School Improvement Framework. The OSE, along with districts, use the CIMS reports to:

- Analyze overall performance around individualized education programs (IEPs).
- Analyze compliance.
- Review high rates of suspensions and expulsions, and overall graduation rates among students with an IEP.
- Improve district-level educational services and performance of students with an IEP.
- Serve as a repository of evidence-based practices and technical assistance materials.

Improvement, Correction, Incentives and Sanctions

The enforcement of regulations, policies and procedures is required by the IDEA and MARSE. The CIMS is the monitoring system used by the OSE and the OGS/ECE&FS. The state uses this system to ensure compliance with the IDEA and the MARSE to promote positive student outcomes.

The CIMS reflects the priorities of the IDEA and the State Performance Plan (SPP), and aligns with the Michigan School Improvement Framework.

In assessing the performance of its locals, the OSE monitors data collected through:

- Focused monitoring activities (on-site, state-verified desk audit or state-verified self-review)
- Data reviews
- Other activities (e.g., specific request for data, ISD plan).

Michigan evaluates the performance of each local, relative to the SPP indicator targets. If areas of noncompliance with the IDEA or state rules are identified, the state issues a finding of noncompliance to the local. A finding is a dated, written notification that includes both the citation of the statute, rule or regulation, and a description of the data supporting the state's conclusion that there is noncompliance with that statute or regulation. All identified noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year, including verification. If the local did not reach a target on a results indicator, they would be required to develop an improvement plan.

Fiscal Management

Michigan has a system of Fiscal Accountability that implements processes and procedures that provide oversight for the application, receipt, distribution, use and monitoring of IDEA funds at the state and local level. The Federal Part B application is completed and submitted timely and accurately. Procedures are followed to ensure the Use of Funds and Maintenance of State Financial Support are completed correctly.

Upon receipt of Part B funds, Administrative and Other State Level Activities spending plans are developed following procedures that ensure allowable spending levels and use. Part B funds are distributed in a timely manner implementing the federally required funding formula.

LEAs submit applications that are reviewed for completeness and allowable use for approval. Fiscal Monitoring is an ongoing process that includes Program Fiscal Reviews conducted by fiscal experts through both on-site and desk reviews on a three cycle rotation. Risk factors are taken into consideration. LEA A-133 Single Audits are reviewed. Findings are resolved through corrective action and the recapture of any misspent funds.

The LEA fiscal monitoring oversight and technical assistance ensures that local school districts are meeting all Part B fiscal requirements including LEA Maintenance of Effort, Coordinated Early Intervening Services (both voluntary and required amounts when significant disproportionality is identified), Proportionate Share, Excess Cost, and funding new or significantly expanding charter schools.

Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY[1] 2013 (2013-2014)

Overview of Indicator 1 (Graduation) Report Development:

1. See Introduction to the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR).
2. The Office of Special Education (OSE) staff performed an extensive data analysis of four years of Michigan student cohort data (2008-2009 through 2011-2012). The intent of the analysis was to identify those variables that promote graduation and decrease dropout for students with an Individualized Education Program (IEP). These connections will inform strategic improvement planning for increased graduation rates.
3. The 2013 cohort four-year graduation rate is calculated by tracking individual students who first enrolled in ninth grade and graduated four years later with a regular diploma. The number of "on-track graduated" students is used as the numerator and is divided by the total count of all cohort status categories (on-track graduated, other completer, off-track continuing, dropout). Students that are not included in the calculations are those students that transferred out of the public school system or are deceased. This is the same method used for all students in the state of Michigan.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE[2]/Graduation   (Results Indicator)

Indicator 1: Percent of youth with an IEP graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement: States must report using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.

---

[1] Federal Fiscal Year
[2] Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Actual**
Calculations using *Leaver Graduation Rate Methodology*			
2004	69.7%		
2005		>80.0%	70.6%
2006		>80.0%	69.0%
2007		>80.0%	69.3%

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Actual**
Calculations using *Cohort Four-Year Graduation Rate Methodology* And the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Prescribed One Year Data Lag			
2008 (using 2007-2008 school year data)	58.0%	>80.0%	58.0%
2009 (using 2008-2009 school year data)		>80.0%	57.3%
2010 (using 2009-2010 school year data)		>80.0%	57.4%
2011 (using 2010-2011 school year data)		>80.0%	51.9%
2012 (using 2011-2012 school year data)		>80.0%	53.5%
2013 (using 2012-2013 school year data)		>80.0%	**53.63%***
Percent = [(# of youth with an IEP who entered ninth grade in 2009-2010 and received a regular diploma within four years) divided by the (total # of youth with an IEP in the cohort)] times 100. *[8,034 ÷ 14,980] X 100			

Source: Single Record Student Database, Michigan Student Data System, Graduation/Dropout Review and Comment Application

Measurable and Rigorous Targets						
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
Data	53.63%					

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2013:

Michigan did not meet its FFY 2013 graduation rate target of 80 percent or greater. The four-year cohort graduation rate for FFY 2013 was 53.63 percent. Further analysis of graduation rates showed an improvement in the three-year trend for students with an IEP. The fifth year graduation rate of 61.86 percent continues to show an increase over the four year graduation rate of 53.63 percent. An extra year of high school is beneficial for students with an IEP in achieving a high school diploma.

The development of a data model identifying the variables that were positively and negatively associated with graduation and dropout provides the OSE with critical information that can be used to develop strategic direction of data support, professional development and leadership capacity building. The potential of the model is to move past the small incremental gains experienced in prior years. With the advent of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) and the emphasis of results driven accountability, future improvement may be more attainable through the use of these analysis results related specifically to Michigan students with an IEP.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Timelines	Activities	Status
	PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	
2011-2014	1. Leverage community and state level resources to provide districts with targeted assistance and professional development to increase graduation rates of students with an IEP.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.
Improvement Activity 1 Details: **Technical Assistance for Local and Regional Districts** On Track Graduation Project The Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) Midwest and Dropout Research Alliance provided professional development and technical assistance to fifteen local high schools in Michigan to support implementation of the Early Warning Signs (EWS) in an effort to assure more students are on track for graduation. Results will be shared with the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) when the research project concludes.		

Timelines	Activities	Status

Early Warning Sign Data Support

Reaching and Teaching Struggling Learners Initiative (RTSL) has provided technical assistance to local districts regarding the link between the use of the EWS to identify student risks and providing interventions early so that students with an IEP and other vulnerable student groups can get back on track for "on time" graduation. Presentations were provided to the following groups: The Upper Peninsula Special Educator's Conference, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and three separate intermediate school districts (ISDs).

Multi-Tiered Systems of Support for Behavior and Reading

As of June 2014, 21 ISDs, 23 local education agencies (LEA), and 69 schools were formally participating with Michigan's Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative's (MiBLSi) support model to scale up capacity for a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS). Based on this investment within the ISD/LEA structure of project participants, there is potential to impact 232 local school districts, 805 schools, and 367,510 students in Michigan.

MiBLSi provides technical assistance and professional development for districts to support schools to help students become successful in both reading and social behavior. Through this support, students with an IEP are more likely to matriculate through secondary school with their classmates, thereby increasing their chances to graduate.

The following data depict implementation fidelity and student outcomes for schools participating in the District Support Model at various stages of implementation. Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports (PBIS) fidelity data, discipline referral data, and out-of-school suspension data were gathered from the PBIS Evaluation for schools that participated with MiBLSi and reflected data from all students enrolled in a school that has voluntarily participated with MiBLSi. Reading outcome data were gathered from results of the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP). Over time, aggregate data collected on participating schools have demonstrated improved outcomes.

PBIS Fidelity: Benchmarks of Quality (BOQ) is a team self-assessment used to evaluate the extent to which universal schoolwide PBIS is being implemented. A total score of 70 percent on the BOQ (criterion total) indicates a minimum threshold or implementation fidelity of schoolwide PBIS. Schools with total scores below 70 percent should not expect to see improvements in student behavior because a score below 70 percent is one indicator that a school is not implementing schoolwide PBIS with fidelity. Beginning in 2010-2011, the median project BOQ score was 58.5 percent. There were 46 schools that submitted BOQ data during the 2013-2014 school year. For these 46 schools, the median BOQ total score was 70 percent. Fifty percent of the 46 schools met or exceeded the BOQ criterion total score of 70 percent.

Timelines	Activities	Status
Discipline Referrals: Major discipline referral data are collected and calculated "per 100 students per day" so that comparisons can be made across schools with differing enrollments. In the 2010-2011 school year, the project median for discipline referrals was .542 per 100 students per day. In 2012-2013 school year, it was .464 per 100 students per day. In 2013-2014 school year, it was .22 per 100 students per day. These data indicate a decreasing trend in discipline referrals.		

Suspensions: Data on out-of-school suspensions are collected and calculated "per 100 students per day" so comparisons can be made across schools with differing enrollments. In 2012-2013, the average for the project schools was .081 suspensions per student per day. During 2013-2014, the project average was .069 suspensions per student per day; a decrease in suspensions for schools participating with MiBLSi.

MEAP Results: Schools participating in MiBLSi have demonstrated an increase across time in the percent of students proficient in reading as measured by the MEAP. In 2010-2011, the project average for schools with students proficient in MEAP reading was 61 percent. During 2012-2013, the average percent proficient was 64 percent. In 2013-2014, the average percent proficient was 65 percent.

State Level Data Support for the Early Warning Signs to Promote On Time Graduation

Early Warning System Tool
RTSL staff has also worked with MDE's Division of Accountability Services (DAS) to launch an Early Warning Sign tool so that state level data, targeting middle school student risk factors, can be prepared and provided to Michigan schools. This project is in the pilot stage and planned for launch in early 2015.

Cross-Office Collaboration within Michigan Department of Education for Graduation Promotion

Multi-Tiered System of Support for Graduation and Dropout
RTSL staff, colleagues from DAS, and coworkers associated with the Superintendent's Dropout Challenge worked with MDE's Office of Education Improvement and Innovation to collaborate so that all stakeholders could support a unified vision of MTSS. This vision of MTSS will encompass professional development pertaining to graduation and dropout.

Timelines	Activities	Status
2011-2014	2. Provide policy and data guidance to support a long-term, outcomes-based approach to student-centered planning.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.

Improvement Activity 2 Details:

The Michigan Transitions Outcomes Project (MI-TOP) supported a regional online webinar promoting the use of the EWS tool with the help of Dr. Mindee O'Cummings. As a follow up, during the spring institute, transition coordinators were able to embed the Early Warning Signs work into their Michigan Electronic Grant System (MEGS+) grant annual goals. Transition coordinators were supported

Part B State Performance Plan & Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) for FFY 2013 (2013-2014)
(OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 7/31/2015)

Indicator 1 Page 18

Timelines	Activities	Status
	with data support tools to explore whether they had valid and reliable graduation and dropout data. They were also provided with data entry processes resources using the Center for Educational Performance and Information and MI School Data websites. MI-TOP also created the BackStory Engagement Tracker App for schools to observe and track student engagement factors, including the EWS, and use real time data when creating a Transition IEP.	
2013-2014	3. Develop and test a model using state level student data that can reliably identify students at risk of dropping out and students likely to graduate.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.

Improvement Activity 3 Details:

OSE conducted a multivariate analysis to study the initial class of students with an IEP to graduate under the Michigan Merit Curriculum (MMC). The MMC is a rigorous set of high school standards. The analysis determined the correlations between graduation and students with an IEP. From a pool of 200 variables such as poverty, migrant student status, residency, age, gender, and research based EWS (e.g., attendance, behavior, and course proficiency), the following variables were identified to be statistically significant and positively linked to graduation. A student's:

- Promotion to tenth grade
- Gender (female)
- Positive score on the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) in mathematics
- Disability eligibility category (speech and language impairment)

The following variables that predicted lower odds of graduating were a student's:
- Absenteeism
- In-and out-of school suspensions
- Placement in the general education setting less than 40 percent of the school day
- Poverty
- Disability eligibility categories (autism, emotional impairment, cognitive impairment, and/or severe multiple impairment)

These correlations will provide the OSE with a data based direction for professional development to improve student results. The validation for the EWS research and the emergence of poverty and gender will present powerful opportunities to collaborate across the offices within the MDE and across state agencies.

Timelines	Activities	Status
2013-2014	4. Disseminate the risk and protective factors associated with students with an IEP that emerged as a result of the data model described in the new activity above so that districts can assist students to matriculate through secondary school with their classmates toward graduation.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.

Timelines	Activities	Status
Improvement Activity 4 Details:		
The multivariate analysis provided findings that were significant beyond implications for improvement in graduation and dropout prevention (Indicator 2). The connections between dropout and achievement in reading and math will support the SSIP and cross indicator team planning efforts. The correlational link with dropout to poverty has a potential for cross-office work within the MDE between Title I (Office of Field Services) and the OSE. With this potential for deeper work, strategic dissemination of this model will occur over the next few years as the OSE works on its SSIP plan and the student identified measurable result.		

Michigan Part B FFY 2012 SPP/APR Response Table from the Office of Special Education Programs

Indicator Status			OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
FFY 2011 DATA	**FFY 2012 DATA**	**FFY 2012 TARGET**	The OSEP listed no required actions in the FFY 2012 Response Table for Indicator 1.	None required at this time.
51.9%	53.5%	≥ 80.0%		

Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY[3] 2013 (2013-2014)

Overview of Indicator 2 (Dropout) Report Development:
1. See Introduction to the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR).
2. The Office of Special Education (OSE) staff performed an extensive data analysis of four years of Michigan student cohort data (2008-2009 through 2011-2012). The intent of the analysis was to identify those variables that promote graduation and decrease dropout for students with an individualized education program (IEP). These connections will inform strategic improvement planning for increased graduation rates.
3. The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) has indicated that states could calculate the dropout rate using either: the methodology outlined in the FFY 2013 Measurements Table (reference Measurement below); or the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year as determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data. Michigan has elected to report the annual event dropout rate in their FFY 2013 SPP/APR. The dropout rate is calculated by dividing the number of students with an IEP that dropped out during the year by the number of students with an IEP in the fall student data collection. Students that were not included in the calculations were those students that transferred out of the public school system, had a temporary school-recognized absence due to suspension or illness, or who were deceased.
4. Michigan is setting a new baseline based on FFY 2011 data.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE[4]/Dropout

(Results Indicator)

Indicator 2: Percent of youth with an IEP dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement: States must report a percentage using the number of youth with an IEP (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with an IEP who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

---

[3] Federal Fiscal Year
[4] Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Actual**
Calculations using *Leaver Dropout Rate Methodology*			
2004	25.5%		
2005		<13.0%	25.2%
2006		<11.5%	28.9%
2007		<10.0%	28.1%
Calculation using *CSPR[5] Event Dropout Rate Methodology*[6], and using the Office of Special Education Program's Prescribed One Year Data Lag			
2008 (using 2007-2008 school year data)	7.6%	<10.0%	7.6%
2009 (using 2008-2009 school year data)		<9.5%	7.2%
2010 (using 2009-2010 school year data)		<9.0%	6.1%
2011 (using 2010-2011 school year data)		<8.0%	9.5%
2012 (using 2011-2012 school year data)		<8.0%	9.4%
2013 (using 2012-2013 school year data)	<9.50%		**8.63%***
Percent = [(# of youth with an IEP who dropped out of high school in one year) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP who were enrolled in grades 9-12 in the same year)] times 100. This includes students ages 14-21 who were in ungraded programs and matched by age to grades 9-12. *[5,243 ÷ 60,727] X 100			

Source: Michigan Student Data System, Graduation and Dropout Review and Comment Application

---

[5] Consolidated State Performance Report
[6] The new methodology makes the two rates not comparable.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets						
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**
Target ≤	Baseline is FFY 2011	9.25%	9.00%	8.75%	8.50%	8.25%
Data	**9.50%**					

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2013:

Michigan recently increased the graduation requirements for students to graduate. The Michigan Merit Curriculum (MMC) first impacted the class of 2011 and the historic baseline (7.6 percent) and previous targets are not representative of current dropout data. Based on this, Michigan has decided to set a new baseline using the FFY 2011 data as the baseline year. The new baseline for FFY 2013 is 9.50 percent. Michigan engaged their stakeholder groups to establish the targets for FFY 2014 through 2018.

During FFY 2012 and FFY 2013, the OSE developed a data model of variables associated with graduation and dropout indicators that can guide stakeholders toward a more strategic direction of data support, professional development and leadership capacity building. The potential of the model is to move past the small incremental gains that have occurred in the past several years.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Timelines	Activities	Status
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2011-2014	1. Leverage community and state level resources to provide districts with targeted assistance and professional development to increase graduation rates of students with an IEP.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.

Improvement Activity 1 Details:

Early Warning Sign (EWS) Data Support

During the 2013-2014 school year, Reaching and Teaching Struggling Learners Initiative (RTSL) has provided technical assistance (TA) to local districts regarding the link between the use of the EWS to identify student risks and providing interventions early so that students with an IEP and other vulnerable student groups can get back on track for "on time" graduation. Presentations were provided to the following groups: The Upper Peninsula Special Educator's Conference, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and three separate intermediate school districts (ISDs).

Multi-Tiered Systems of Support for Behavior and Reading

As of June 2014, 21 ISDs, 23 local education agencies (LEAs), and 69 schools were formally participating with Michigan's Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative's (MiBLSi) support model to scale up capacity for a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS). Working directly with 21 ISDs, 1 stand-alone school district represents the potential to impact 232 LEAs, 805 schools, and 367,510 students in Michigan.

MiBLSi provides TA and professional development for districts to support schools to help students become successful in both reading and social behavior. Through this support, students with an IEP are more likely to matriculate through secondary school with their classmates, thereby increasing their chances to graduate.

The following data depicts implementation fidelity and student outcomes for schools participating in the District Support Model at various stages of implementation. Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports (PBIS) fidelity data, discipline referral data, and out-of-school suspension data were gathered from the PBIS Evaluation for schools that participated with MiBLSi and reflected data from all students enrolled in a school that has voluntarily participated with MiBLSi. Reading outcome data were gathered from the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) Data System or requested directly from schools participating with MiBLSi.

The Benchmarks of Quality (BOQ) is a team self-assessment used to evaluate the extent to which universal schoolwide PBIS is being implemented. A total score of 70 percent on the BOQ (criterion total) indicates a minimum threshold or implementation fidelity of schoolwide PBIS. Schools with total scores below 70 percent should not expect to see improvements in student behavior because a score below 70 percent is one indicator that a school is not implementing schoolwide PBIS with fidelity. Beginning in the 2010-2011 school year, the median project BOQ score was 58.5 percent. There were 46 schools that submitted BOQ data during the 2013-2014 school year. For these 46 schools, the median BOQ total score was 70 percent. Fifty percent of the 46 schools met or exceeded the BOQ criterion total score of 70 percent.

The following implementation effectiveness, behavior and reading results describe the dynamic relationships among data sets that may or may not include the same schools:

Discipline Referrals
Major discipline referral data are collected and calculated "per 100 students per day" so that comparisons can be made across schools with differing enrollments. In the 2010-2011 school year, the project median for discipline referrals was .542 per 100 students per day. In the 2012-2013 school year, it was .464 per 100 students per day. In the 2013-2014 school year, it was .22 per 100 students per day. These data indicate a decreasing trend in problem behavior.

Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Results
Schools participating in MiBLSi have demonstrated an increase across time in the percent of student proficient in reading as measured by the MEAP. In 2010-2011, the project average for schools with student proficient in MEAP reading was 61 percent. During the 2012-2013 school year, the average percent proficient was sixty-four. In the 2013-2014 school year, the average percent proficient was sixty-five.

State Level Data Support for the EWS to Promote On Time Graduation

Early Warning System Tool
RTSL staff has also worked with the Michigan Department of Education's (MDEs), Division of Accountability Services (DAS) to launch an EWS tool so that state level data, targeting middle school student risk factors, can be prepared and provided to Michigan schools. This project is in the pilot stage and planned for launch in early 2015.

Cross-Office Collaboration within the MDE for Graduation Promotion

Multi-Tiered System of Support for Graduation and Dropout
RTSL staff, colleagues from DAS, and coworkers associated with the Superintendent's Dropout Challenge worked with MDE's Office of Education Improvement and Innovation (OEII) to collaborate so that all stakeholders could support a unified vision of MTSS. This vision of MTSS will encompass professional development pertaining to graduation and dropout.

Priority and Focus School Supports for Dropout Prevention
During the 2012-2013 school year, all offices participated in providing six webinars to focus and priority school leadership on each of the six Institute of Education Science Practice Guide for Dropout Prevention recommendations:
1. Utilize data systems that support a realistic estimate of the number of students at high risk for dropping out.
2. Assign adult advocates to students at risk of dropping out.
3. Provide academic support and enrichment to improve academic performance.
4. Implement programs to improve students' classroom behavior and social skills.
5. Personalize the learning environment and instructional process.
6. Provide rigorous and relevant instruction to better engage students in learning and provision of skills.

<u>Regional Educational Laboratory Bridge Event for School Improvement Facilitators</u>
The OEII, the OSE, and the Office of School Support, with the support of the Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) Midwest, hosted a bridge event in December 2013 for more than 100 school improvement facilitators and Title I coaches to link dropout prevention with school improvement. The daylong event highlighted the research and practice efforts of Dr. Ruth Curran Neild, author of "Falling off Track in 9th Grade."

Timelines	Activities	Status
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2011-2013	2. Provide policy and data guidance to support a long-term, outcomes-based approach to student-centered planning.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.

Improvement Activity 2 Details:

The Michigan Transitions Outcomes Project (MI-TOP) worked in collaboration with RTSL to support a regional online webinar in the five regions of Michigan to increase knowledge and skills to implement the use of the EWS tool with the help of Dr. Mindee O'Cummings. Participants spent time in teams creating a plan to implement EWS during the 2014-2015 school year. Also as a follow up, during the spring institute, ISD Transition Coordinators were able to embed the EWS work into their Michigan Electronic Grant System (MEGS+) grant annual goals. ISD Transition Coordinators were supported with data support tools to explore whether they had valid and reliable graduation and dropout data. They were also provided with data entry processes and resources using the Center for Educational Performance and Information and MI School Data websites. MI-TOP also created and piloted the BackStory Engagement Tracker App for school staff to observe and track student engagement factors, including the EWS, and use real time data when creating the transition section of the IEP.

Evaluation		
2011-2014	3. Develop and test a model using state level student data that can reliably identify students at risk of dropping out and students likely to graduate.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.

Improvement Activity 3 Details:

The OSE conducted an analysis of the first class of students with disabilities to graduate under the MMC. The MMC is a more rigorous set of high school standards. The analysis was requested to determine what the correlations were between graduation and students with disabilities. A pool of 200 variables such as poverty, migrant student status, residency, age, gender, and the EWS (i.e., attendance, behavior, and course proficiency) were used in the analysis.

The following variables that predicted greater odds of a student dropping out were:

- Absenteeism
- In-and out-of school suspensions
- Poverty
- Disability eligibility categories (emotional impairment, specific learning disability)

The following variables were identified as predicting lower odds of the student dropping out:

- Promotion to tenth grade
- Gender (female)
- Positive score on the MEAP in mathematics
- Disability eligibility categories (speech and language impairment, severe multiple impairment, autism spectrum disorder)

These correlations will provide the team with a data based direction for professional development to improve student results. The validation for the EWS research and the emergence of poverty and gender will present powerful opportunities to collaborate across the offices within MDE and across state agencies.

Timelines	Activities	Status
2013-2014	4. Disseminate the risk and protective factors associated with students with an IEP that emerged as a result of the data model described in activity four so that districts can assist students to matriculate through secondary school with their classmates toward graduation.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.

Improvement Activity 4 Details:

The final analysis of the data was completed mid-July of 2014. The RTSL and MI-TOP projects disseminated the report to ISD Transition Coordinators and their teams at the joint October 2014 institute. Information on strategies to assist students with disabilities matriculate through secondary school were provided at the event and several participants indicated they plan to provide professional development to LEA administrators and staff.

Michigan Part B FFY 2012 SPP/APR Response Table from the Office of Special Education Programs

Indicator Status			OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
FFY 2011 Data	FFY 2012 Data	FFY 2012 Target	The OSEP listed no required actions in the FFY 2012 Response Table for Indicator 2.	None required at this time.
9.5%	9.4%	<u><8.0</u>		

Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY[7] 2013 (2013-2014)

Overview of Indicator 3 (Statewide Assessment) Report Development:

1. See Introduction to the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR). Michigan's Educational Assessment System is comprised of the following state assessments: the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) for students in grades 3-9, the Michigan Merit Examination (MME) for students in grade 11, Michigan's alternate assessment program based on alternate achievement standards (MI-Access), Michigan's alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards (MEAP-Access), World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) Access for English language learners (ELL), WIDA Alternate Access for ELLs, and WIDA-ACCESS Placement Test (W-APT). Michigan's English language arts (ELA) and mathematics assessments received approval through the U.S. Department of Education (USED) peer review process.

2. Michigan is now reporting Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) at the elementary, middle and high school levels, instead of grade levels utilized in the historic APRs.

3. Procedures for determining if districts have met proficiency targets have not changed under Michigan's approved *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (ESEA) Flexibility Request (approved in July 2012, amended and approved July 2013). Some important features to highlight include:

   a. The Michigan School Accountability Scorecards use a color coding system. The colors are in rank order from highest to lowest. They are: green, lime, yellow, orange and red. Colors are based on meeting targets in the different Scorecard components which include proficiency. More information about Michigan's District and School Accountability Scorecards and assessment results can be found at http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-22709_25058---,00.html.

   b. Rules for Safe Harbor use a four-year slope methodology (http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/ScorecardGuide_426897_7.pdf).

   c. Proficiency targets have been set for each school, differentiated by district, school and subject area (but not by subgroup). The purpose of the differentiated targets is to assist schools in reaching a proficiency target of 85 percent by 2022. The data in Table 1: A represents districts that have met or exceeded an average state Scorecard target and may not represent districts meeting their individually set targets.

4. Proficiency rates in ELA and mathematics for children with an IEP continues to show improvement as displayed in Tables 4 and 5.

5. Information pertaining to Michigan's public reporting of the participation and proficiency of students with an IEP on the state assessments is located at: https://www.mischooldata.org/SpecialEducationEarlyOn/AnnualPublicReporting/Indicator ReportSelected2.aspx?Portal_NumberOfComparisonGroups=0&Common_Locations=1-A,0,0,0&Common_SchoolYear=12&Common_SpecEdIndicator=AYPMathProficiency~Ade quateYearlyProgress or

---

[7] Federal Fiscal Year

https://www.mischooldata.org/SpecialEducationEarlyOn/AnnualPublicReporting/Public_Reporting_File_Masked_2014-08-12.xls.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE[8]/Statewide Assessment

(Results Indicator)

Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with individualized education programs (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.

   B. Participation rate for children with an IEP.

   C. Proficiency rate for children with an IEP against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

A. AYP percent = [(# of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's average Scorecard targets) divided by the (total # of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size)] times 100.

B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with an IEP participating in the assessment) divided by the (total # of children with an IEP enrolled during the testing window, calculated separately for reading and math)]. The participation rate is based on all children with an IEP, including both children with an IEP enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

C. Proficiency rate percent = ([(# of children with an IEP enrolled for a full academic year scoring at or above proficient) divided by the (total # of children with an IEP enrolled for a full academic year, calculated separately for reading and math)].

---

[8] Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment

Table 1: A — Districts Meeting AYP/AMO Objectives for Disability Subgroup

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Actual**
2005	**100%**		
2006		≥88.00%	92.70%
2007		≥91.00%	98.50%
2008		≥94.00%	99.40%
2009		≥97.00%	99.70%
2010		≥98.00%	96.60%
2011		≥98.00%	72.30%
2012 represents a change in how districts meet the "target." Calculations are based on requirements of Michigan's approved ESEA Flexibility Request			
2012		≥98.00%	12.10%
2013		≥85.0%	**16.31%***
Percent = [(# of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the state's minimum "n" size that meet the state's Scorecard targets for the disability subgroup) divided by the (total # of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the state's minimum "n" size)] times 100. *[9][100 ÷ 613] x 100			

Source: Michigan Department of Education (MDE)/Division of Accountability Services (DAS)

Measurable and Rigorous Targets						
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**
Target ≥	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%
Data	**16.31%**					

---

[9] Increase in district numbers over last year due to inclusion of districts less than 30 students per grade level yet the sum totals over 30 for all grades this year.

Table 2: B - Participation — Participation of children with an IEP in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards; and alternate assessment against modified achievement standards[10].

Participation Rate	Elementary School		Middle School		High School	
	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math
a. # of Children with an IEP in assessed grades[11,12]	43,687	43,688	45,546	45,541	12,732	12,726
b. # and % of Children with an IEP in regular assessment with no accommodations	20,901	17,565	20,433	14,022	3,764	3,119
	47.84%	40.21%	44.86%	30.79%	29.56%	24.51%
c. # and % of Children with an IEP in regular assessment with accommodations	5,070	10,545	5,964	12,976	5,795	6,357
	11.61%	24.14%	13.09%	28.49%	45.52%	49.95%
d. # and % of Children with an IEP in alt. assessment against grade level standards	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
e. # and % of Children with an IEP in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards	6,992	6,694	7,646	7,594	2,466	2,468
	16.00%	15.32%	16.79%	16.68%	19.37%	19.39%
f. # and % of Children with an IEP in alternate assessment against modified achievement standards	10,237	8,295	10,860	10,197	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
	23.43%	18.99%	23.84%	22.39%	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Total # and Overall Participation Rate[13]	43,200	43,099	44,903	44,789	12,025	11,944
	98.89%	98.65%	98.59%	98.35%	94.45%	93.86%

Source: MDE/DAS

---

[10] Participation data does not include Limited English Proficiency students who, at the time of testing, were in the United States for less than 10 months and participated in the WIDA in place of the regular reading assessment.

[11] Students included in a, but not b-f above are the result of Michigan's enrollment data being gathered on 10/2/13 for fall assessments and 2/12/14 for spring assessments, with the assessment windows occurring from 10/1/13- 11/9/13 (grades 3-8) and 2/11/14 - 3/22/14 (grade 11). In addition, Michigan does not count students with invalid scores as assessed.

[12] The enrollment numbers differ slightly within a grade band due to student mobility as Michigan assesses mathematics and reading during different weeks in the assessment window.

[13] The bottom row represents the total numbers and rates of children with an IEP who participated in state assessment.

Table 3: B – Participation of Children with an IEP

Measurable and Rigorous Targets

FFY	Reading		
	Elementary School	Middle School	High School
2005-2013 Target[14]	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
2011 Actual	98.64%	98.38%	92.55%
2012 Actual	98.47%	98.29%	93.90%
2013 Actual	98.89%	98.59%	94.45%
2013 Status	**Target Met**	**Target Met**	**Target Not Met**

Measurable and Rigorous Targets

FFY	Mathematics		
	Elementary School	Middle School	High School
2005-2013 Target[7]	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
2011 Actual	98.45%	98.20%	91.34%
2012 Actual	98.21%	98.05%	93.29%
2013 Actual	98.65%	98.35%	93.86%
2013 Status	**Target Met**	**Target Met**	**Target Not Met**

Measurable and Rigorous Targets						
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**
Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Summary Information FFY 2013 Participation	
Students with an IEP Participating in State Reading Assessment	**Students with an IEP Participating in State Mathematics Assessment**
• Number of students with an IEP enrolled in tested grade levels = 101,965 • Number of students with an IEP participating = 100,128 • Percentage of students with an IEP participating = 98.20 percent	• Number of students with an IEP enrolled in tested grade levels = 101,955 • Number of students with an IEP participating = 99,832 • Percentage of students with an IEP participating = 97.92 percent

Source: MDE/DAS

---

[14] The ESEA requires that a minimum of 95 percent of all students participate in state assessment (general and alternate). Michigan set the same participation targets for students with an IEP.

Table 4: C — Proficiency of children with an IEP against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards

Proficiency Rate	Elementary School		Middle School		High School	
	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math
a. Number of Children with an IEP in assessed grades	43,687	43,688	45,546	45,541	12,732	12,726
Total # of Participants (Reference Table 2B)	43,200	43,099	44,903	44,789	12,025	11,944
b. # and % of Children with an IEP in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations[15]	8,853	4,957	6,408	2,109	799	163
	20.49%	11.50%	14.27%	4.71%	6.64%	1.36%
c. # and % of Children with an IEP in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations	1,346	1,177	1,546	830	1,508	237
	3.12%	2.73%	3.44%	1.85%	12.54%	1.98%
d. # and % of Children with an IEP in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against grade level standards	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
e. # and % of Children with an IEP in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured against alternate achievement standards	5,258	4,989	6,530	5,596	2,175	1,783
	12.17%	11.58%	14.54%	12.49%	18.09%	14.93%
f. # and % of Children with an IEP in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured against modified achievement standards	5,042	4,769	6,794	5,262	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
	11.67%	11.07%	15.13%	11.75%	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Total # and Overall Proficiency Rate for Children with an IEP[16]	20,499	15,892	21,278	13,797	4,482	2,183
	47.45%	36.87%	47.39%	30.80%	37.27%	18.28%

Source: MDE/DAS

---

[15] Students included in a, but not b-e above are the result of Michigan's enrollment data being gathered on 10/2/13 for fall assessments and 2/12/14 for spring assessments, with the assessment windows occurring from 10/1/13- 11/9/13 (grades 3-8) and 2/11/14 - 3/22/14 (grade 11). In addition, Michigan does not count students with invalid scores as assessed.

[16] The total overall proficiency rates include children assessed with both the general and alternate assessments.

Table 5: C – Proficiency of Children with an IEP

Measurable and Rigorous Targets - Reading			
FFY	**Elementary School**	**Middle School**	**High School**
2011 Baseline	34.79%	27.85%	20.98%
2012 Target	n/a*	n/a*	n/a*
2012 Actual	38.17%	34.03%	21.13%
2013 Target	70.00%	67.00%	62.00%
2013 Actual	47.45%	47.39%	37.27%
2013 Status	**Target Not Met**	**Target Not Met**	**Target Not Met**

*Baseline and actual data being presented for historical perspective. SPP targets were documented at the grade levels for this reporting year.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets - Mathematics			
FFY	**Elementary School**	**Middle School**	**High School**
2011 Baseline	30.95%	24.59%	18.27%
2012 Target	n/a*	n/a*	n/a*
2012 Actual	36.47%	27.34%	18.02%
2013 Target	49.00%	46.00%	41.00%
2013 Actual	36.87%	30.80%	18.28%
2013 Status	**Target Not Met**	**Target Not Met**	**Target Not Met**

*Baseline and actual data being presented for historical perspective. SPP targets were documented at the grade levels for this reporting year.

Source: MDE/DAS

Measurable and Rigorous Targets							
	FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**
Reading	**Elementary School**	70%	72%	74%	76%	77%	79%
	Middle School	67%	70%	72%	74%	76%	78%
	High School	62%	65%	68%	71%	74%	76%
Mathematics	**Elementary School**	49%	53%	58%	62%	67%	71%
	Middle School	46%	50%	55%	60%	65%	70%
	High School	41%	47%	52%	58%	63%	69%

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2013:

Michigan did not meet its FFY 2013 target of 85.00 percent for districts meeting Scorecard objectives for the disability subgroup. However, the percentage of districts meeting objectives has increased over FFY 2012. Proficiency targets were not met in reading or mathematics at any grade level.

An important clarification on the Michigan state AMO targets:
- The state AMO target is actually a target average. Targets have been set individually by district, school and subject, giving reasonable targets for each school to become 85 percent proficient in 2022.

Overall participation rates remained the same, Michigan met its FFY 2013 participation targets for students with an IEP in elementary and middle school in reading and mathematics. Participation rate for high school was not met. Michigan reviewed high school participation data to determine root cause of low participation rate. Details are included in the improvement activities below.

Displayed in Table 5 are data that shows Michigan's students with an IEP did not meet the revised proficiency targets in any grade levels in reading or mathematics. However, steady progress has been made in proficiency rates over FFY 2012 in all grades for reading, except grade 11. In mathematics, proficiency rates also improved in every grade except grade 11, which shows a slight decline.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Timelines	Activities	Status
PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
2011-2014	1. The Assessment Selection Guidelines (ASG) document will be revised for 2014-2015 to provide instructions and training scenarios that include students who had previously taken the AA-MAS and future options, based on the grade level content. Transition activities with instructions for IEP teams to transition students back to the general assessment will be conducted during statewide conferences in August and September of 2013.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.
Improvement Activity 1 Details:		
The ASG document is currently under review. Guidance on participation transition for students who typically have been assessed using the AA-MAS was provided to local districts through ongoing electronic communications, the Division of		

Timelines	Activities	Status
	Accountability Services (DAS) fall conferences in 2013 and the Michigan State Testing Conference in early 2014.	
2011-2014	2. Continue to collaborate with the Office of Special Education (OSE) in monitoring implementation of accommodations and disseminate information on the appropriate use of assessment accommodations, using conference sessions, joint presentations with accommodations/assistive technology groups and newsletter articles.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.
	Improvement Activity 2 Details:	
	Collaborative communications including extensive list-serve contacts usage between Office of Standards and Assessment (OSA) and OSE have helped to broaden training and communications throughout the 2013-2014 school year.	
2013-2014	3. The Michigan Department of Education will compare the participation rates for grade 11 over the past five years with other subgroups and overall 11th grade participation to determine if the current trend is related specifically to students with an IEP, or if the participation rates are attributed to other factors. It will be a collaboration between members from the DAS and the OSE. A recommendation will be made to the participating offices from this collaboration regarding potential improvement activities based on the results.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.
	Improvement Activity 3 Details:	
	A comparison of participation rates was completed for grade 11. The comparison looked at the participation rate for the MME (all students), participation rate for the MME (students without an IEP) and trends were compared to all assessments for students with an IEP. In both Math and Reading, participation rates for all students and for students without an IEP was less than 95 percent in 2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014. On average, the participation rates for the MME for students without an IEP ranged from 0.5 percent to 1.5 percent higher than all assessments for students with an IEP. The trends from year to year were consistent. For example, the participation rates for both groups remained the same between 2010-2011 and 2011-2012, increased between 2011-2012 and	

Timelines	Activities	Status
2012-2013 and decreased between 2012-2013 and 2013-2014. While the Indicator 3 team acknowledges that the target has not been met, the trend does not appear to be related specifically to students with an IEP.		

Michigan Part B FFY 2012 SPP/APR Response Table from the Office of Special Education Programs

Indicator Status				OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
				The OSEP listed no required action in the FFY 2012 Response Table for Indicator 3A.	None required at this time.

INDICATOR	FFY 2011 DATA	FFY 2012 DATA	FFY 2012 TARGET
3. A. Percent of Districts Meeting AYP for Disability Subgroup		12.1%	Baseline data

INDICATOR 3A: The State is reporting Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) data used for accountability reporting under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as a result of ESEA flexibility. The State has reported FFY 2012 baseline data for this indicator based on AMOs.

3.B Statewide Assessments
Participation rate for children with IEPs*

Grade	FFY 2012 Data Reading	FFY 2012 Target Reading	FFY 2012 Data Math	FFY 2012 Target Math
3	98.1%	$\geq$95%	97.8%	$\geq$95%
4	98.6%	$\geq$95%	98.3%	$\geq$95%
5	98.7%	$\geq$95%	98.5%	$\geq$95%
6	98.5%	$\geq$95%	98.1%	$\geq$95%
7	98.2%	$\geq$95%	98.0%	$\geq$95%
8	98.3%	$\geq$95%	98.1%	$\geq$95%
HS	93.9%	$\geq$95%	93.3%	$\geq$95%

*The FFY 2011 columns were removed from the Michigan Part B FFY 2012 SPP/APR Response Table for readability.

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

The OSEP listed no required action in the FFY 2012 Response Table for Indicator 3B.

None required at this time.

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
3.C Statewide Assessments: **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.*** See table below. *The FFY 2011 columns were removed from the Michigan Part B FFY 2012 SPP/APR Response Table for readability. INDICATOR 3C: The State provided a Web link to 2012 publicly-reported assessment results.	The OSEP listed no required action in the FFY 2012 Response Table for Indicator 3C.	None required at this time.

Grade	FFY 2012 Data Reading	FFY 2012 Target Reading	FFY 2012 Data Math	FFY 2012 Target Math
3	36.8%	>74%	36.4%	>58%
4	38.1%	>74%	37.6%	>60%
5	39.5%	>75%	35.4%	>59%
6	37.3%	>72%	32.3%	>57%
7	31.0%	>67%	26.3%	>57%
8	33.7%	>70%	23.3%	>55%
HS	21.1%	>67%	18.0%	>54%

Part B State Performance Plan & Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) for FFY 2013 (2013-2014) (OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 7/31/2015)

Indicator 3 Page 41

Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY[17] 2013 (2013-2014)

Overview of Indicator 4A (Suspension/Expulsion) Report Development:

1. See Introduction to the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR).
2. Michigan continues to require all districts to report suspension and expulsion data for students with an individualized education program (IEP) in the state's Michigan Student Data System (MSDS).
3. Significant discrepancy was calculated using only data on students with an IEP since comparable data are not available for the general school population.
4. School year 2012-2013 data are reported in this indicator for the FFY 2013 APR.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE[18]/Suspension/Expulsion

(Results Indicator)

Indicator 4A: 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 an IEP. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with an IEP) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Definition of Significant Discrepancy:

A district was identified as having a significant discrepancy in rates of suspensions and/or expulsions if more than five percent of its students with an IEP received out-of-school suspensions/expulsions for greater than ten days cumulatively during the school year. Districts that exceeded the five percent threshold, but had fewer than five students with an IEP suspended/expelled for more than ten days, were exempt from consideration as having a significant discrepancy.

---

[17] Federal Fiscal Year
[18] Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Actual**
Calculations Using Previous Definition of Significant Discrepancy			
2005	1.2%		
2006		< 10.0%	1.5%
2007		< 9.0%	1.4%
OSEP[19] Prescribed a One Year Data Lag for This Indicator			
2008 (2007-2008 data)		< 9.0%	1.4%
Calculations Using Current Definition of Significant Discrepancy			
2009 (2008-2009 data)	5.1%	< 5.5%	5.1%
2010 (2009-2010 data)		< 5.0%	2.8%
2011 (2010-2011 data)		< 4.5%	3.1%
2012 (2011-2012 data)		< 4.5%	2.2%
2013 (2012-2013 data)		< 4.5%	**3.56%***
Percent = [(# of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with an IEP) divided by the (# of districts in the state[20])] times 100. *[31 ÷ 870] X 100			

Source: MSDS

Measurable and Rigorous Targets						
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**
Target <	4.50%	4.30%	4.10%	3.90%	3.70%	3.50%
Data	3.56%					

---

[19] Office of Special Education Programs
[20] Number of districts in the state that reported students with an IEP

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2013:

Michigan met its FFY 2013 target of less than 4.50 percent for Indicator 4A. During the 2012-2013 school year, 3.56 percent of the districts in the state that met the minimum "n" size had more than 5 percent of their students with an IEP suspended/expelled for more than ten days cumulatively. Ten districts were excluded from the significant discrepancy calculation because they had fewer than five students with an IEP suspended/expelled for greater than ten days.

Review of Policies, Procedures and Practices
Michigan continues to provide monitoring and technical assistance (TA) to ensure identified districts are compliant with the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA). Targeted initiatives, such as the Michigan's Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative (MiBLSi) and the Restorative Practice Pilot Project (http://focus.cenmi.org/focus-on-results/articles/early-data-is-promising-for-michigan-restorative-practice-pilot-project), reduces the occurrence of problem behavior and emphasizes alternatives to suspension (e.g., using positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS), the use of suspension/expulsion tracking systems and the sharing of discipline data among local staff members).

Twenty-five of the thirty-one districts were newly identified for focused monitoring. During the 2013-14 school year, the Office of Special Education (OSE) conducted twenty-five focused monitoring on-site reviews of these districts' policies, procedures and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of PBIS, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA. Twenty-one of the twenty-five districts that were focused monitored were issued findings of noncompliance due to their policies, procedures and/or practices. These districts were required to submit and implement a corrective action plan (CAP).

Six of the thirty-one districts were not monitored. Five of these had been focused monitored for suspension/expulsion during the previous year. All five districts had findings of noncompliance specific to Indicator 4A. These five districts corrected the areas of noncompliance and their CAPs were verified and closed by the OSE. The sixth district merged with another district and the newly merged district received a focused monitoring visit for Indicator 4B.

Discussion of Activities Completed:

Timelines	Activities	Status
IMPROVE COLLABORATION/COORDINATION		
2011-2014	1. The OSE will work with MiBLSi personnel to identify districts with high rates of suspension and expulsion. This information will identify districts in need of support and gives them priority for selection in MiBLSi participation.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.

Timelines	Activities	Status
	Improvement Activity 1 Details:	

Improvement Activity 1 Details:

The OSE and MiBLSi have developed a document that outlines the ways in which the project adds value to intermediate school districts (ISDs) and districts to help them address high priority needs. The collaboration of MiBLSi, the OSE, and ISDs addressing suspension and expulsion for students with an IEP is included in this document and is available on the web at:
http://miblsi.cenmi.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=WalZjI3VhkQ%3d&tabid=2238.

In April 2014, the OSE provided MiBLSi with a list of districts that were identified in 2014 with a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for children with an IEP. MiBLSi reviewed this list of districts and compared it with the group of ISDs that submitted applications to MiBLSi for participation in 2014. Priority for participation was given to ISDs with districts identified for Indicator 4A. One of the two new ISDs that are planning to partner with MiBLSi included two districts that have been identified for 4A. As of June 2014, 13 percent (4 of 31) of all districts identified for 4A are being supported by ISDs that are currently participating with MiBLSi. All districts identified with significant discrepancy were provided with TA made available through their CIMS workbook.

The OSE and the MiBLSi continued to collaborate. Five meetings were held during the school year (August, November, February, May and June) in which three OSE staff members met with two MiBLSi staff members to discuss progress toward improvement activities, review data, and plan future supports to address suspension/expulsion.

	PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	
2011-2014	2. MiBLSi will provide training, coaching and TA to participating districts to implement a Multi-Tier System of Support (MTSS) with fidelity in order to reduce the number or duration of out-of-school suspensions/expulsions and increase students' academic achievement.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.

Improvement Activity 2 Details:

As of June 2014, MiBLSi formally provided professional development to 21 ISDs, 23 local education agencies, and 69 schools with the MiBLSi model to scale up capacity for a MTSS.

MiBLSi has worked primarily with elementary and middle schools as a method for preventing school dropout through early intervention. When schools help students become successful both academically and socially/behaviorally early on, they are more likely to matriculate through secondary school with their classmates, thereby increasing their chances to graduate.

Timelines	Activities	Status

The following data depict implementation fidelity and student outcomes for schools participating in the District Support Model at various stages of implementation. PBIS fidelity data, discipline referral data and out-of-school suspension data were gathered from the PBIS Evaluation for schools that participated with MiBLSi and reflected data from all students enrolled in a school that has voluntarily participated with MiBLSi. Reading outcome data were gathered from the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) Data System or requested directly from schools participating with MiBLSi.

The Benchmarks of Quality (BOQ) is a team self-assessment used to evaluate the extent to which universal PBIS is being implemented. A total score of 70 percent on the BOQ (criterion total) indicates a minimum threshold or implementation fidelity of schoolwide PBIS. Schools with total scores below 70 percent should not expect to see improvements in student behavior because a score below 70 percent is one indicator that a school is not implementing schoolwide PBIS with fidelity. There were 46 schools that submitted BOQ data during the 2013-2014 school year. For these 46 schools, the median BOQ total score was 70 percent. Fifty percent of the 46 schools met or exceeded the BOQ criterion total score of 70 percent.

The following implementation effectiveness, behavior and reading results describe the dynamic relationships among data sets that may or may not include the same schools:

Office Discipline Referrals (ODR): We examine schools that have both BOQ fidelity data and ODR. The data were analyzed to discern the impact that fidelity has on student outcomes. For schools that met criterion on the BOQ, the median rate of major discipline referrals per 100 students per day was 0.22 (n=20 schools). The median rate of discipline referrals for schools that did not meet criterion on the BOQ was 0.31 (n=5 schools). This suggests that schools implementing PBIS with fidelity had slightly lower rates of problem behaviors than schools not implementing PBIS with fidelity. This pattern is consistent with pervious analyses. Typically, schools implementing with greater fidelity demonstrate lower rates of problem behavior than schools not implementing PBIS with fidelity. Caution should be taken when interpreting these differences due to the small number of schools and differing sizes of the groups.

Reading Achievement: For schools that met or exceeded criterion on the BOQ (n=14 schools), the median percent of students that were on track in the area of reading was 74 percent (n=8 schools) compared to 73 percent (n=6 schools) in schools that did not meet criterion on the BOQ. These results should be interpreted with caution given the very small number of schools that did not meet criterion on the BOQ and also had DIBELS Next data.

Out-of-School Suspensions: Based on data gathered through MSDS, the median percent of students with at least one out-of-school suspension was 3.65 percent for schools that met criterion on the BOQ (16 of 23). For schools that did not meet criterion on the BOQ (12 of 23) the median percent of students with at least one out-of-school suspension was 5.93 percent. (Reflected in Table 1 below are the MSDS data for both districts that

Timelines	Activities	Status

met criterion on the BOQ and those districts that did not.) This demonstrates that schools implementing PBIS with fidelity suspended a smaller proportion of students than schools not implementing PBIS with fidelity.

Table 1:

Criterion on BOQ	Descriptive Statistic	School Year 2013-2014
Met	Median % students w/1 or more OSS	3.65
Met	Mean % students w/1 or more OSS	7.76
Met	Number of schools with out-of-school suspensions	16
Met	Number of schools	23
Met	Percent of schools with no out-of-school suspensions	30.43%
Not Met	Median % students w/1 or more OSS	5.93
Not Met	Mean % students w/1 or more OSS	7.36
Not Met	Number of schools with out-of-school suspensions	12
Not Met	Number of schools	23
Not Met	Percent of schools with no out-of-school suspensions	48.0%

Source: MSDS

The above data demonstrates the positive outcomes achieved by schools participating with MiBLSi when those schools are implementing PBIS with fidelity. In the future, MiBLSi plans to evaluate the impact on student outcomes when schools implement an *integrated* model of MTSS (behavior and reading) and when districts and ISDs have the internal capacity to support and sustain implementation of MTSS.

	IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING	
2012-2014	3. Review and analyze the results of local corrective action plans to identify districts with continued or multiple noncompliance issues and to improve TA to locals and monitors.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.

Improvement Activity 3 Details:

The OSE created and implemented a system of general supervision monitoring. Units within the OSE and ISD staff referred districts with chronic problems, including discipline problems, for general supervision monitoring.

The OSE staff created a Discipline Toolkit and trained ISD monitors and TA providers how to use this toolkit to assist districts. The document, *Technical Assistance for Reducing Suspension and Expulsion*, also known as the Toolkit, was designed to provide

Timelines	Activities	Status
technical assistance to districts in regards to overall rates and disproportionality around the areas of suspensions and expulsions of all students. The Toolkit is publicly available for use by all districts and is required for some districts. Each district participating in required Toolkit activities is assigned a TA provider by the OSE. The TA providers assist districts in analyzing data to perform a root-cause analysis, developing a plan, facilitating monthly meetings to review data, and determining necessary interventions. Included in the Toolkit are guidance documents, literature, and research based practices. The Toolkit has been posted on the CIMS website for public access. Additionally, the OSE amended the selection criteria to ensure a larger number of districts were selected for a monitoring activity specific to discipline. Following the monitoring activity, all districts with findings of noncompliance were provided with TA and required to develop and implement CAPs specific to the noncompliance.		
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT		
2012-2014	4. Develop, implement and refine a Multi-Tiered System of Support scalable model to address suspension/expulsion statewide.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.
Improvement Activity 4 Details: The OSE and MiBLSi have designed a comprehensive support structure in Michigan by partnering with ISDs to develop the capacity of local school districts to implement an integrated MTSS that results in improved academic achievement and behavior for all students when implemented with fidelity. This framework and the statewide professional development model included schoolwide positive behavior support as a foundational component that addressed needs that had been identified in part through suspension and expulsion data. As of June 2014, 21 ISDs and 2 local school districts were partnering with the OSE and MiBLSi across three cohorts. This represents the potential to impact 232 local school districts, 805 schools and 367,510 students in Michigan.		
PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
2012-2014	5. MiBLSi will provide training, coaching and TA to participating districts to reduce the number or duration of out-of-school suspensions/expulsions.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.
Improvement Activity 5 Details: Please reference activity number two. Activity number five is a duplicate of activity number two.		

Timely Correction of FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the state made during FFY 2012 (the period from July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013)	7
2. Number of FFY 2012 findings the state verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the local educational agencies (LEAs) of the finding)	6
3. Number of FFY 2012 findings not verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2) above]	1*

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance and/or Not Corrected):

4. Number of FFY 2012 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	1
5. Number of FFY 2012 findings the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	1
6. Number of FFY 2012 findings not verified as corrected [(4) minus (5) above]	0

* This number reflects districts with noncompliance which are also reported in the Indicator 4B report.

Correction of FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance

Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
4A/B	115	The district's practices related to the suspension/ expulsion of students with an IEP were not compliant with IDEA regulations.	Finding issued: April 15, 2013 Summary of Activities: The OSE required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of a progress report. State staff and TA providers were assigned and district was under close OSE supervision. The status of the correction of noncompliance was included in monthly meetings and conference calls. The district was also required to use the newly created Discipline Toolkit. Status: Verified as corrected by TA provider and ISD monitors and closed by the OSE on October 31, 2014.

Michigan Part B FFY 2012 SPP/APR Response Table from the Office of Special Education Programs

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response:
The State reported that 19 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 13 of 848 districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement of fewer than five students with an IEP 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 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. In the FFY 2013 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. | Michigan identified 7 districts that were found to have noncompliant policies, procedures and/or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy in FFY 2012. Six districts corrected within one year of notification. One district corrected beyond one year.

All correction of noncompliance was verified by the state that each LEA with noncompliance: (1) 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, dated October 17, 2008; and (2) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100 percent compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or the state data system.

For additional information pertaining to the correction of noncompliance, reference *Michigan's Continuous* |

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response:
The State reported that it revised (or required the affected districts to revise), 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, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2012. For districts 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		*Improvement and Monitoring System* details in Appendix C attachment located on the Introduction Page.

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response:
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.		

Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY[21] 2013 (2013-2014)

Overview of Indicator 4B (Suspension/Expulsion by Race/Ethnicity) Report Development:

1. See Introduction to the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR).
2. In accordance with federal reporting requirements, the 2012-2013 school year data were reviewed using the seven race and ethnicity codes specified by the United States Department of Education, specifically:
   a. A student coded as Hispanic, is reported as Hispanic, regardless of any additional race codes indicated.
   b. All other students coded in the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS) with multiple races are counted in the "Two or More Races" category.
3. Findings of noncompliance were reported and corrective action plans (CAP) were submitted and monitored through the Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System (CIMS) Workbook. For additional information pertaining to timely correction of noncompliance please refer to Appendix C.
4. Michigan does not collect universal suspension/expulsion data on general education students; therefore, comparison data with that population is not available.
5. Per conference call with the OSEP state contact on April 8, 2015, Michigan has no required action in GRADS360 for this indicator.

Monitoring Priority: Suspension/Expulsion by Race/Ethnicity

(Compliance Indicator)

Indicator 4B:

Percent of districts that have: (a) 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 an individualized education program (IEP); 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 support, and procedural safeguards. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year of children with an IEP; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements

---

[21] Federal Fiscal Year

> relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and support, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (#of districts in the state times 100)].
>
> Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Definition of Significant Discrepancy:

Michigan defined "significant discrepancy" as a suspension/expulsion rate greater than or equal to 3.6 percent for students with an IEP in any racial/ethnic group who received out-of-school suspensions/expulsions for greater than ten days cumulatively during the school year. In the 2009-2010 school year, 1.8 percent of students with an IEP were suspended/expelled for greater than ten days and that number was doubled to create the 3.6 percent threshold for calculating significant discrepancy. In order for a district to be included in the analyses, there needed to be at least 30 students with an IEP enrolled in the district. For these selected districts the data were analyzed for each race/ethnicity with ten or more students with an IEP enrolled in the district.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Actual**
Old Methodology Using Risk Ratio			
2009 (2008-2009 data)	6.5%	0%	6.5%
Using New Acceptable Methodology per the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)			
2010 (2009-2010 data)	3.3%	0%	3.3%
2011 (2010-2011 data)		0%	4.9%
2012 (2011-2012 data)		0%	2.9%
2013 (2012-2013 data)		0%	**6.21%***
Percent = [(#of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year of children with an IEP; 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 support, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (#of districts in the state times 100)].			
*[54 ÷ 870] X 100			

Source: Michigan Student Data System (MSDS), verification review, CIMS

Measurable and Rigorous Targets						
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	6.21%					

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2013:

Michigan did not meet its FFY 2013 zero percent target for Indicator 4B. During the 2012-2013 school year, 6.21 percent of the districts in the state that met the minimum "n" size had more than or equal to 3.6 percent of their students with an IEP suspended/expelled for more than ten days cumulatively in one or more racial/ethnic groups with noncompliant policies, procedures and/or practices that may have contributed to the significant discrepancy. There were 130 districts that had fewer than 30 students with an IEP that were not included in the calculation.

Review of Policies, Procedures and Practices
FFY 2013 reporting is based on the 2012-2013 school year data. There were 123 districts identified as having a significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity in the rates of suspension and expulsion prior to monitoring. During February and March, based on the focused monitoring criteria, the Office of Special Education (OSE) conducted on-site reviews and desk audits of these districts' policies, procedures and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

After monitoring, 54 districts were found to have noncompliant policies, procedures and/or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy. Each of these districts was issued a finding of noncompliance in April 2014 and was required to develop and implement a CAP to come into compliance as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year including verification. Displayed in the table below are the number of districts with findings of noncompliance by racial/ethnic groups which had a significant discrepancy.

Racial/Ethnic Group with Significant Discrepancy	Number of Districts[22] With Significant Discrepancy
American Indian	2
Asian	0
Black	37
Hispanic	13
White	21
Two or More Races	16

Sources: MSDS, CIMS

---

[22] Twenty-two districts had a significant discrepancy in more than one racial/ethnic group.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Timelines	Activities	Status
	PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	
2010-2014	1. Provide training and TA to locals, TA providers and monitors for locals with high suspension/expulsion rates.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.
Improvement Activity 1 Details:		
Each district with findings of noncompliance was paired with a state TA provider to assist the district in the development of CAPs and training activities. Multiple presentations and learning opportunities were provided to these districts to enhance staff skills related to suspension and expulsion.		
	IMPROVE COLLABORATION/COORDINATION	
2010-2014	2. The OSE will work with Michigan's Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative (MiBLSi) personnel to identify and encourage MiBLSi participation by districts with high rates of suspension and expulsion.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.
Improvement Activity 2 Details:		
The OSE and MiBLSi have developed a document that outlines the ways in which the project adds value to intermediate school districts (ISDs) and districts to help them address high priority needs. The collaboration among MiBLSi, the OSE and ISDs around addressing suspension and expulsion for students with an IEP is included in this document and is available on the web at http://miblsi.cenmi.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=WalZjI3VhkQ%3d&tabid=2238. In April 2014, the OSE provided MiBLSi with a list of districts that were identified in 2014 with a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for students with an IEP by race/ethnicity. MiBLSi reviewed this list of districts and compared it with the group of ISDs that submitted applications to MiBLSi for participation in 2014. Priority for participation was given to ISDs with districts identified for Indicator 4B. One of the two potential new ISDs that will partner with MiBLSi included one district that was identified for 4B. As of June 2014, 43 percent (23 of 54) of all districts identified for 4B were being supported by ISDs that were participating with MiBLSi. Five meetings were held across the school year (August, November, February, May and June) in which three OSE staff met with two MiBLSi staff to discuss progress toward improvement activities, review data and plan future supports to address suspension/expulsion.		

Timelines	Activities	Status
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2012-2014	3. Review and analyze the results of local CAPs to identify districts with continued or multiple noncompliance issues and to improve TA to locals and monitors.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.

Improvement Activity 3 Details:

The OSE modified the system of general supervision monitoring. Units within the OSE and ISD staff referred districts with chronic problems, including discipline problems, for general supervision monitoring.

The OSE developed a Discipline Toolkit and trained ISD monitors and TA providers how to use this toolkit to assist districts. The Discipline Toolkit has been posted on the CIMS website for public access.

Additionally, the OSE amended the selection criteria to ensure a larger number of districts were selected for a monitoring activity specific to discipline. Following the monitoring activity, all districts with findings of noncompliance were provided with TA, and required to develop and implement CAPs specific to the noncompliance.

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT		
2012-2014	4. Develop, implement and refine a multi-tiered system of support (MTSS) scalable model to address suspension/expulsion statewide.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.

Improvement Activity 4 Details:

The OSE and MiBLSi have designed a comprehensive support structure in Michigan by partnering with ISDs to develop the capacity of local school districts to implement an integrated MTSS with fidelity that resulted in improved academic achievement and behavior for all students. This framework and the statewide professional development model included schoolwide positive behavior support as a foundational component that addressed the needs that have been identified in part through suspension and expulsion data.

As of June 2014, 21 ISDs and 2 local school districts (participating independent of their associated ISDs) were partnering with the OSE and MiBLSi across three cohorts. This represents the potential to impact 232 local school districts, 805 schools, and 367,510 students in Michigan.

Timelines	Activities	Status
PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
2012-2014	5. MiBLSi will provide training, coaching and TA to participating districts to implement a MTSS with fidelity in order to reduce the number or duration of out-of-school suspensions/expulsions and increase students' academic achievement in reading.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.

Improvement Activity 5 Details:

As of June 2014, MiBLSi formally provided professional development to 21 ISDs, 23 local education agencies and 69 schools with the MiBLSi model to scale up capacity for a MTSS.

MiBLSi has worked primarily with elementary and middle schools as a method for preventing school dropout through early intervention. When schools help students become successful both academically and socially/behaviorally early on, they are more likely to matriculate through secondary school with their classmates, thereby increasing their chances to graduate.

The following data depict implementation fidelity and student outcomes for schools participating in the District Support Model at various stages of implementation. PBIS fidelity data, discipline referral data, and out-of-school suspension data were gathered from PBIS Evaluation for schools that voluntarily participated with MiBLSi and reflected data from all students enrolled in a school. Reading outcome data were gathered from the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) Data System or requested directly from schools participating with MiBLSi.

The Benchmarks of Quality (BOQ) is a team self-assessment used to evaluate the extent to which universal PBIS is being implemented. A total score of 70 percent on the BOQ (criterion total) indicates a minimum threshold or implementation fidelity of schoolwide PBIS. Schools with total scores below 70 percent should not expect to see improvements in student behavior because a score below 70 percent is one indicator that a school is not implementing schoolwide PBIS with fidelity. There were 46 schools that submitted BOQ data during the 2013-2014 school year. For these 46 schools, the median BOQ total score was 70 percent. Fifty percent of the 46 schools met or exceeded the BOQ criterion total score of 70 percent.

The following implementation effectiveness, behavior and reading results describe the dynamic relationships among data sets that may or may not include the same schools:

Timelines	Activities	Status

Office Discipline Referrals[23] (ODR): We examined schools that have both benchmark of quality (BOQ) fidelity data and ODR. The data were analyzed to discern the impact that fidelity had on student outcomes. For schools that met criterion on the BOQ, the median rate of major discipline referrals per 100 students per day was 0.22 (n=20 schools). The median rate of discipline referrals for schools that did not meet criterion on the BOQ was 0.31 (n=5 schools). This suggests that schools implementing PBIS with fidelity had slightly lower rates of problem behaviors than schools not implementing PBIS with fidelity. This pattern is consistent with previous analyses. Typically, schools implementing with greater fidelity demonstrate lower rates of problem behavior than schools not implementing PBIS with fidelity. Caution should be taken when interpreting these differences due to the small number of schools and differing sizes of the groups.

Table 1:Implementation of PBIS by Race/Ethnicity

Student Race/Ethnicity	Schools Implementing PBIS with Fidelity (BOQ Total Score at or above 70%, n=13)		Schools Not Implementing PBIS with Fidelity (BOQ Total Score below 70%, n=5)	
	Percent of Enrollment	Percent with 1 or more major ODR	Percent of Enrollment	Percent with 1 or more major ODR
American Indian or Alaskan Native	<1%	15%	2%	29%
Asian	3%	8%	3%	16%
African American/Black	6%	26%	5%	18%
Hispanic/Latino	3%	43%	5%	15%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	<1%	7%	<1%	<1%
White	85%	14%	82%	12%
Two or More Races	2%	7%	3%	9%

Source: MiBLSi Database

Revealed in Table 1 is whether or not a school implements PBIS with fidelity. American Indian/Alaskan Native, African American/Black, and Hispanic/Latino students were referred for disciplinary infractions at higher rates compared to their White peers. MiBLSi is currently developing a pilot model that may help to better address equitable disciplinary practices in schools. Caution should be taken when interpreting this data due to the small number of schools and differing sizes of the groups.

---

[23] Office Discipline referrals are considered major discipline infractions that cause interruption in instruction for two or more minutes to address the problem behavior.

Timelines	Activities	Status

Out-of-School Suspensions: Based on data gathered through MSDS, the median percent of students with at least one out-of-school suspension was 3.65 percent for schools that met criterion on the BOQ (16 of 23). For schools that did not meet criterion on the BOQ (12 of 23) the median percent of students with at least one out-of-school suspension was 5.93 percent. Reflected in Table 2 below are the MSDS data for both districts that met criterion on the BOQ and those districts that did not. This demonstrates that schools implementing PBIS with fidelity suspended a smaller proportion of students than schools not implementing PBIS with fidelity. This is the first step towards reducing disproportionality in suspensions and expulsions.

Table 2: Percent of Students Suspended

Criterion on BOQ	Descriptive Statistic	School Year 2013-2014
Met	Median % students w/1 or more OSS	3.65
Met	Mean % students w/1 or more OSS	7.76
Met	Number of Schools with out-of-school suspensions	16
Met	Number of Schools	23
Met	Percent of Schools with no out-of-school suspensions	30.43%
Not Met	Median % students w/1 or more OSS	5.93
Not Met	Mean % students w/1 or more OSS	7.36
Not Met	Number of Schools with out-of-school suspensions	12
Not Met	Number of Schools for	23
Not Met	Percent of Schools with no out-of-school suspensions	48.0%

Source: MSDS

The above data suggests positive outcomes achieved by schools participating with MiBLSi when those schools are implementing PBIS with fidelity. These data represent the small number of schools that have begun implementing an integrated model of MTSS under the District Support Model. In the future, MiBLSi plans to evaluate the impact on student outcomes when schools implement an integrated model of MTSS (behavior and reading) and when districts and ISDs have the internal capacity to support and sustain implementation of MTSS.

Timely Correction of FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the state made during FFY 2012 (the period from July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013)	25
2. Number of FFY 2012 findings the state verified as timely corrected [corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding]	24
3. Number of FFY 2012 findings not verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2) above]	*1

*This number reflects seven districts with noncompliance which were also reported in the Indicator 4A report.

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance and/or Not Corrected):

4. Number of FFY 2012 findings not timely corrected [same as the number from (3) above]	1
5. Number of FFY 2012 findings the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	1
6. Number of FFY 2012 findings not verified as corrected [(4) minus (5) above]	0

Correction of FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance

FFY 2012 Correction of Noncompliance			
Indicator	**District Identifier**	**Nature of Noncompliance**	**Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance**
4A/B	115	The district's practices related to the suspension/expulsion of students with an IEP were not compliant with IDEA regulations.	Finding issued: April 15, 2013 Summary of Activities: The OSE required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of a progress report. State staff and TA providers were assigned and district was under close OSE supervision. The status of the correction of noncompliance was included in monthly meetings and conference calls. The district was also required to use the newly created Discipline Toolkit. Status: Verified as corrected by TA provider and ISD monitors and closed by the OSE on October 31, 2014.

Michigan Part B FFY 2012 SPP/APR Response Table from the Office of Special Education Programs

Indicator Status			OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response:
FFY 2011 Data	**FFY 2012 Data**	**FFY 2012 Target**	Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2012, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2013 APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2012 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 2013 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.	The state identified 25 districts that were found to have noncompliant policies, procedures and/or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy in FFY 2011. Twenty-four districts corrected within one year of notification. One district corrected beyond one year.
4.9%	2.9%	0%		
Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2011				All correction of noncompliance were verified by the state that each LEA with noncompliance: (1) 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, dated October 17, 2008; and (2) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100 percent compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or the state data system.
The State reported that 56 of 57 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining finding was subsequently corrected by December 30, 2013.				
The State reported that 112 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				For additional information pertaining to the correction of noncompliance, reference Michigan's Continuous Improvement

Part B State Performance Plan & Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) for FFY 2013 (2013-2014) (OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 7/31/2015)

Indicator 4B Page 62

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response:
the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2011. The State also reported that 25 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 103 of 848 districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement of 30 students with an IEP. The State reported that it revised (or required the affected districts to revise), 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, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2012. For districts identified with significant		and Monitoring System details in Appendix C on the Introduction Page.

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response:
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.		

Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY[24] 2013 (2013-2014)

Overview of Indicator 5 (Educational Environments) Report Development:
1. See Introduction to the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR).
2. Michigan has decided to reset baseline for Indicator 5C: Percent of children with an IEP aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. New baseline for component C has been established based on 1) a change in policy that the state will no longer revise aggregated data prior to submission and 2) the current baseline set in 2005 is not representative of recent data submissions. The value 5.50% is a more accurate representation of what actually exists.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE[25] / Educational Environments: Ages 6 through 21

(Results Indicator)

Indicator 5: Percent of children with an IEP aged 6 through 21 served:

  A. Inside the regular class 80 percent or more of the day;

  B. Inside the regular class less than 40 percent of the day; and

  C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

A. Percent = [(# of children with an IEP served inside the regular class 80 percent or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with an IEP)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of children with an IEP served inside the regular class less than 40 percent of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with an IEP)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of children with an IEP served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with an IEP)] times 100.

---

[24] Federal Fiscal Year
[25] Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment

Measurable and Rigorous Targets A. Increase the percentage of students served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day			
FFY	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Actual**
2005	54.0%		
2006		$\geq$ 55.0%	50.3%
2007		$\geq$ 57.0%	53.5%
2008		$\geq$ 59.0%	57.6%
2009		$\geq$ 61.0%	61.1%
2010		$\geq$ 63.0%	61.6%
2011		$\geq$ 63.0%	62.7%
2012		$\geq$ 63.0%	64.3%
2013		$\geq$ 63.0%	**65.37%***
Percent = [(# of children with an IEP served in the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with an IEP)] times 100. *[117,621 ÷ 179,940] X 100			

Measurable and Rigorous Targets						
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**
Target $\geq$	63.00%	63.25%	63.50%	63.75%	64.00%	64.25%
Data	**65.37%**					

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
B. Decrease the percentage of students served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day			
FFY	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Actual**
2005	17.9%		
2006		≤ 16.9%	18.5%
2007		≤ 15.4%	16.8%
2008		≤ 13.9%	15.0%
2009		≤ 12.4%	14.0%
2010		≤ 11.9%	12.5%
2011		≤ 11.9%	11.9%
2012		≤ 11.9%	11.4%
2013		≤ 11.9%	**11.24%***
Percent = [(# of children with an IEP served in the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with an IEP)] times 100. *[20,233 ÷ 179,940] X 100			

Measurable and Rigorous Targets						
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**
Target ≤	11.90%	11.80%	11.70%	11.60%	11.50%	11.40%
Data	**11.24%**					

Measurable and Rigorous Targets C. Decrease the percentage of students served in separate facilities			
FFY	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Actual**
2005	5.2%		
2006		$\leq$ 5.1%	5.0%
2007		$\leq$ 5.1%	4.8%
2008		$\leq$ 5.0%	4.9%
2009		$\leq$ 4.9%	4.9%
2010		$\leq$ 4.8%	5.2%
2011		$\leq$ 4.8%	5.5%
2012		$\leq$ 4.8%	5.3%
2013	$\leq$ 5.50%		**5.12%***
Percent = [(# of children with an IEP served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with an IEP)] times 100. *[9,204 ÷ 179,940] X 100			

Source for A-C: Michigan Student Data System

Measurable and Rigorous Targets						
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**
Target <	Baseline is FFY 2011	5.36%	5.32%	5.28%	5.24%	5.15%
Data	**5.50%**					

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2013:

Michigan met its FFY 2013 5A and 5B targets. The percentage of students served inside the general education class 80 percent or more of the day continued its upward trend. The percentage of students served inside the general education class for less than 40 percent of the day continued its downward trend. Michigan set a new baseline for measurement 5C using FFY 2011 data. New targets were set with stakeholder input.

<u>Focused Monitoring Activities</u>
Focused monitoring was not conducted during FFY 2013 for Indicator 5. Data were not available for monitoring due to changes in the timeline to report the data to the United States Department of Education. In lieu of focused monitoring, district educational setting data were analyzed by the OSE and districts who did not meet one or more of the state targets were sent a data alert letter in the Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System Workbook. The letter reflected the state

targets and the local data. Districts were asked to review their data submission for the 2014-2015 school year and warned of a potential for selection for focused monitoring in FFY 2014 if their data continued to not meet state targets.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Timelines	Activities	Status
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2011-2014	1. Review data for the districts whose percentage of students with an IEP in general education greater than or equal to 80 percent of the day and for those districts whose students with an IEP in separate facilities did not meet the state targets. Apply selection criteria to determine level of monitoring activity needed to help districts review policies, procedures and practices related to educational environment data and require them, as needed, to develop and implement improvement activities.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.
Improvement Activity 1 Details:		
The OSE reviewed data for districts whose percentage of students with an IEP in general education was greater than or equal to 80 percent of the day and for those districts whose students with an IEP in separate facilities did not meet the state targets. These districts were sent a data alert letter. No districts received a focused monitoring visit in FFY 2013.		
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2011-2014	2. For 100 percent of districts whose monitoring activity has led to the issuance of a finding of noncompliance, assign a technical assistance provider and provide professional development to the district team to assist them with identifying resources, including programs available through the IDEA Grant Funded Initiatives which may align with their improvement activities.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.

Timelines	Activities	Status
Improvement Activity 2 Details: There were no districts for whom a monitoring activity has led to the issuance of a finding of noncompliance.		

Michigan Part B FFY 2012 SPP/APR Response Table from the Office of Special Education Programs

Indicator Status				OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
	FFY 2011 Data	FFY 2012 Data	FFY 2012 Target	The OSEP listed no required actions in the FFY 2012 Response Table for Indicator 5.	None required at this time.
A	62.7%	64.3%	≥ 63.0%		
B	11.9%	11.4%	≤11.9%		
C	5.5%	5.3%	≤4.8%		

Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY[26] 2013 (2013-2014)

Overview of Indicator 6 (Early Childhood Educational Environments: Ages 3 through 5) Report Development:
1. See Introduction to the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR).
2. FFY 2011 was the first year data were collected and used to establish baseline. Targets were set for FFY 2012 with stakeholder input.
3. Data used in reporting this indicator include kindergarten and first grade students who were five years old at the time of the fall child count date.
4. Michigan plans to reset targets in FFY 2014 once an additional year of data are available.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE[27]/ Early Childhood Educational Environments: Ages 3 through 5

(Results Indicator)

Indicator 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with an individualized education program (IEP) 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.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement:
A. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with an IEP attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with an IEP)] times 100.
B. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with an IEP attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with an IEP)] times 100.

---

[26] Federal Fiscal Year
[27] Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
A. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with an IEP attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program.			
FFY	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Actual**
2011 (2011-2012)	27.2%		
2012 (2012-2013)		≥28.2%	28.4%
2013 (2013-2014)		≥28.20%	**28.40%***

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with an IEP attending a regular early childhood program (1) at least 10 hours per week or (2) less than 10 hours per week and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with an IEP)] times 100.

*((5,038 + 788) ÷ 20,511) X 100

Measurable and Rigorous Targets					
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**
Target ≥	28.20%	28.20%	28.20%	28.20%	28.20%	28.20%
Data	**28.40%**					

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
B. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with an IEP attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.			
FFY	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Actual**
2011 (2011-2012)	44.2%		
2012 (2012-2013)		≤43.2%	43.9%
2013 (2013-2014)		≤43.20%	**41.73%***

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with an IEP attending a (1) separate special education class, (2) separate school or (3) residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with an IEP)] times 100.

*((8,093 + 461 + 5) ÷ 20,511) X 100

Source for A & B: Michigan Student Data System (MSDS)

Measurable and Rigorous Targets					
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**
Target ≤	43.20%	43.20%	43.20%	43.20%	43.20%	43.20%
Data	**41.73%**					

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2013:

Michigan met its FFY 2013 target for Indicator 6 in both of the measurement categories. The percentage of children aged 3 through 5 with an IEP receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program remained constant at 28.40 percent. The percent of children aged 3 through 5 with an IEP attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility decreased to 41.73 percent.

Michigan continues to provide statewide trainings and technical assistance (TA) focused on accurate identification and coding of the educational environments data. The training and TA included in-person trainings, online training and dissemination of guidance documents to assist school personnel in reporting the appropriate education environment for students with an IEP for all three, four and five-year old children.

It should be noted that Michigan has few publically funded regular early childhood programs for three-year old children. Head Start, a comprehensive child development program that serves children from birth to age five, pregnant women, and their families and the Great Start Readiness Program, which is a state-funded preschool program for four-year old children at risk of school failure, are the only publically funded preschool options available for children. Efforts continue to increase resources, available program options and targeted efforts to embed interventions in the regular early childhood program.

Discussion of data

In comparing the FFY 2013 data to the FFY 2012 data, the following trends were noted with regard to educational environment and age.

Measurement category A: Of the children reported in category A, the number of three-year olds decreased by .02 percent, four-year olds increased by .80 percent and there was a decrease of .78 percent for five-year olds. Additional analyses of the data revealed that of the 5,826 total children, 4,023 (69.1 percent) were four and five-year old children that may be in one of three settings; a developmental kindergarten, kindergarten or first grade classroom. This percentage of children increased from last year by 4 percent and is a result in the change to an earlier eligible for enrollment date for kindergarten. The date changed from December 1 to November 1, effective for the 2013-2014 school year.

Measurement category B: There was a decrease in the percentage of children attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility, Michigan decreased the percentage of each age group three, four and five-year-old children by .85, .86 and .46 percent respectively. The decrease in 6B may be attributed to the expansion of the state-funded preschool program with increased resources and available program options for four-year old children, heightened awareness of the Office of Special Education Program's (OSEP) memo dated

February 29, 2012[28], and additional statewide guidance and TA regarding least restrictive environment (LRE) requirements for preschool children with an IEP.

The variation in category A and the decrease in category B may also be partially attributed to the intensive statewide trainings and technical assistance (TA) focused on accurate identification and coding of the educational environments. The training and TA included in-person trainings, online training and dissemination of guidance documents to assist school personnel in reporting the appropriate education environment for students with an IEP for all three, four and five-year old children.

Training and TA were also provided throughout the state on Indicator 7 (Preschool Child Outcomes). LRE considerations were integrated into both the in-person and online outcomes trainings. In the outcomes trainings, it was discussed and understood by staff and administrators that collaboration between the classroom teachers and the specialists providing the services to students with an IEP result in higher quality assessment and collection of Preschool Outcomes data.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Timelines	Activities	Status
	PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	
2012-2014	1. Increase access to professional development on the benefits of educating preschool children in inclusive settings with typically developing peers. These professional development opportunities will include: conference presentations, online training and webinars.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.
Improvement Activity 1 Details:		
The Office of Great Start/Early Childhood Education & Family Services (OGS/ECE&FS) and its TA grantee, Clinton County Regional Educational Service Agency (CCRESA), presented 90-minute breakout sessions on appropriate identification and coding of educational environments and a session on embedding special education services in the regular early childhood classroom at the following conferences: Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, Michigan Collaborative Early Childhood Conference, Upper Peninsula Special Education Conference, Michigan Council for Exceptional Children Conference and the Michigan Division for Early Childhood Conference.		
OGS/ECE&FS and its TA grantee CCRESA updated and recorded a webinar to help districts understand and utilize the developed documents on determining appropriate educational environments. The online training and TA documents were made available on CCRESA's website at http://eotta.ccresa.org/Training.php?Cat=21		

---

[28] Office of Special Education Program's (OSEP) memo dated February 29, 2012 (http://www2.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/memosdcltrs/preschoollre22912.pdf)

Timelines	Activities	Status
2012-2014	2. Provide targeted TA to participating intermediate school districts (ISD) pertaining to: (1) options for settings for preschool aged children with IEPs and (2) assisting in the identification of appropriate placements for preschool aged children with IEPs based on the individual needs of the child for the LRE. Targeted TA will occur in the following phases: • Phase I: Indicator 6 and Indicator 7 data will be reviewed and shared with all ISDs in the state. • Phase II: Of the interested ISDs, four will be selected for individualized intensive TA based on Indicator 6 and 7 data to be provided over the next two years. Effectiveness of the TA will be measured over two years.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.

Improvement Activity 2 Details:

OGS/ECE&FS disseminated two TA documents to assist districts to determine appropriate educational environment codes. The educational environment worksheet provided a detailed explanation of each code. The second document was an educational environment decision tree to assist districts to select the appropriate environment codes for three, four and five-year old children with an IEP.

Phase I of Targeted TA: Indicator 6 and Indicator 7 data were shared with each ISD and their local districts. Local districts received this data in the April 15, 2014 Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System Workbook.

OGS/ECE&FS and its TA grantee CCRESA updated and recorded a webinar to help districts understand and utilize the developed documents on determining appropriate educational environments. The online training and TA documents are available on CCRESA's website.

Phase II of Targeted TA: Four ISDs expressed interest in individualized intensive TA for Indicator 6 and Indicator 7. Full-day workshops were provided to staff from each ISD in their respective area. Additionally, staff attended breakout sessions at conferences where both coding of environmental codes and embedding services in the preschool environment were discussed. TA was provided to three districts in the lower part of Michigan and one district in the upper peninsula of Michigan.

Timelines	Activities	Status
2013-2014	3. Development of tiered workgroups to focus on state level and local level challenges to inclusion. • Phase I - Recruit and convene a workgroup of decision makers at the state level who are in charge of and responsible for Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE), Great Start Readiness Program (GSRP), Office of Special Education (OSE), Head Start, Great Start Regional Resource Centers, Great	Reference Improvement Activity details below.

Timelines	Activities	Status
	Start to Quality team, State Aid, Pupil Accounting to initiate an open dialogue and discussion to identify and address barriers, including funding logistics, to include preschool aged children with IEPs in these general education programs/settings. • Phase II – Upon completion of Phase I, develop and convene a separate workgroup that represents the district and local levels to focus on identification of strategies for including children with IEPs in state and federally funded preschool programs as well as in other general education preschool settings. • Phase III – Upon completion of Phase I and Phase II collaboration of the two workgroups outlined above in the two phases to focus on identifying solutions for overcoming additional barriers, sharing of inclusionary practices and funding logistics. Statewide distribution of best practice documents garnered from Phase I and Phase II.	

Improvement Activity 3 Details:

Phase I of the recruitment of stakeholders and decision makers with a vested interest in early childhood special education is in progress and will remain a focus for the coming year.

Public Act 196 of 2014 (School Aid Act for FFY 2014-2015) Section 32d(5)(b) states that "GSRP requires that at least 90 percent of participating children live in families with income less than 250 percent of federal poverty level." This section was recently updated and the following language was passed into law stating: "All age-eligible children served in foster care or who are experiencing homelessness or who have individualized education plans recommending placement in an inclusive preschool setting shall be considered to live within families with household income equal to or less than 250 percent of the federal poverty level regardless of actual family income." This should impact inclusionary options for children in our state-funded preschool programs throughout the state. This legislative strategy is a different approach to impacting inclusive preschool environments and may contribute to greater inclusionary settings for children with special needs with their peers. This will enable Phase I to continue to be at the forefront of conversations for inclusionary practices and embedded services for preschool children where a regular early childhood program is the LRE for a child.

Phase II of the recruitment of stakeholders that represent the district and local level to focus on the inclusionary practices for three, four and five-year old children occurred this past year within the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education (MAASE) Early Childhood Community of Practice (EC-CoP) group. Voluntary members of the EC-CoP created a LRE Project Team and wrote a proposal to MAASE requesting support for a special project to accurately identify current

Timelines	Activities	Status
practices and barriers to including preschool-aged children with an IEP in the regular early childhood program. Upon approval of the special project, members of the EC-CoP developed a 15 question online survey that was distributed to various listservs inviting their participation and seeking input from both district and local levels. The survey yielded responses from 219 early childhood professionals in one of five roles: Special Education Administrator, Early Childhood Administrator, Special Education Teacher, General Early Childhood Education Teacher and Ancillary Service Provider. Submitted survey responses were collected and the LRE Project Team is in the process of analyzing and reflecting on the data. Phase III of the collaboration of the two workgroups is an ongoing commitment that will remain a focus for the coming year.		

Michigan Part B FFY 2012 SPP/APR Response Table from the Office of Special Education Programs

Indicator Status				OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
	FFY 2011 DATA	FFY 2012 DATA	FFY 2012 TARGET	The OSEP listed no required actions in the FFY 2012 Response Table for Indicator 6.	None required at this time.
A.	27.2%	28.4%	≥28.2 %		
B.	44.2%	43.9%	≤43.2%		

Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY[29] 2013 (2013-2014)

Overview of Indicator 7 (Preschool[30] Outcomes) Report Development:

1. See Introduction to the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR).
2. Michigan plans to reset targets in FFY 2014 once an additional year of data are available.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE[31]/ Preschool Outcomes

(Results Indicator)

Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with an individualized education programs (IEP) 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

Outcomes:

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.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

    a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with an IEP assessed)] times 100.

    b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with an IEP assessed)] times 100.

    c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not

---

[29] Federal Fiscal Year
[30] Data collection is for children, ages 2 years, 6 months through age 5, who received services for a minimum of six consecutive months. The Preschool Outcomes data collection ends at either 6 years of age or kindergarten entry, whichever comes first.
[31] Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment

reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with an IEP assessed)] times 100.

d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with an IEP assessed)] times 100.

e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with an IEP assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes

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.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = [# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)] divided by [# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d)] times 100.

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.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = [# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)] divided by [the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets for Outcome A:			
Positive Social-Emotional Skills (including social relationships)			
Summary Statement 1: Of those children who entered the program below expectation in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.			
FFY	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Actual**
2008	86.8%		
2009		≥86.0%	85.5%
2010		≥87.0%	81.1%
2011		≥87.0%	81.1%
2012		≥87.0%	84.5%
2013		≥87.0%	**85.16%***
Percent = [# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)] divided by [# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d)] times 100. *[(1,205 + 1,424) ÷ (29 + 429 + 1,205 + 1,424)] X 100			
Summary Statement 2: The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.			
FFY	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Actual**
2008	60.7%		
2009		≥60.0%	59.8%
2010		≥61.0%	56.5%
2011		≥61.0%	54.0%
2012		≥61.0%	55.4%
2013		≥61.0%	**57.00%***
Percent = [# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)] divided by [the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100. *[(1,424 + 780) ÷ (29 + 429 + 1,205 + 1,424 + 780)] X 100			

Source: Michigan Student Data System (MSDS), HighScope Education Research Foundation

Measurable and Rigorous Targets for Outcome A: Positive Social-Emotional Skills (including social relationships)	**Numerator**	**Denominator**	**FFY 2013 Target**	**FFY 2013 Data**
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	2,629	3,087	≥87.00%	85.16%
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	2,204	3,867	>61.00%	57.00%

Measurable and Rigorous Targets for Outcome B: Acquiring and Using Knowledge and Skills			
Summary Statement 1: Of those children who entered the program below expectation in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.			
FFY	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Actual**
2008	86.5%		
2009		>86.0%	86.8%
2010		>87.0%	82.2%
2011		>87.0%	82.2%
2012		>87.0%	85.5%
2013		>87.0%	**86.49%***
Percent = [# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)] divided by [# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d)] times 100. *[(1,196 + 1,647) ÷ (36 + 408 + 1,196 + 1,647)] X 100			
Summary Statement 2: The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.			
FFY	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Actual**
2008	58.0%		
2009		>58.0%	58.2%
2010		>59.0%	56.6%
2011		>59.0%	53.7%
2012		>59.0%	55.5%
2013		>59.0%	**57.59%***
Percent = [# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)] divided by [the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100. *[(1,647 + 580) ÷ (36 + 408 + 1,196 + 1,647 + 580)] X 100			

 Source: MSDS, HighScope Education Research Foundation

Measurable and Rigorous Targets for Outcome B: Acquiring and Using Knowledge and Skills	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Target	FFY 2013 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	2,843	3,287	> 87.00%	86.49%
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	2,227	3,867	>59.00%	57.59%

Measurable and Rigorous Targets for Outcome C: Use of Appropriate Behaviors to Meet their Needs			
FFY	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Actual**
2008	88.2%		
2009		>88.0%	87.7%
2010		>89.0%	80.6%
2011		>89.0%	81.3%
2012		>89.0%	84.8%
2013		>89.0%	**85.04%***

Percent = [# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)] divided by [# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d)] times 100.

*[(1,075 + 1,517) ÷ (38+ 418 +1,075 + 1,517)] X 100

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

FFY	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Actual**
2008	72.3%		
2009		>72.0%	71.6%
2010		>73.0%	62.5%
2011		>73.0%	58.7%
2012		>73.0%	59.0%
2013		>73.0%	**60.41%***

Percent = [# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)] divided by [the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100.

*[(1,517 + 819) ÷ (38+ 418 +1,075 + 1,517 + 819)] X 100

Source: MSDS, HighScope Education Research Foundation

Measurable and Rigorous Targets for Outcome C: Use of Appropriate Behaviors to Meet their Needs	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Target	FFY 2013 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	2,592	3,048	>89.00%	85.04%
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	2,336	3,867	>73.00%	60.41%

Measurable and Rigorous Targets						
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**
Target A1 $\geq$	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%
Target A2 $\geq$	61.00%	61.00%	61.00%	61.00%	61.00%	61.00%
Target B1 $\geq$	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%
Target B2 $\geq$	59.00%	59.00%	59.00%	59.00%	59.00%	59.00%
Target C1 $\geq$	89.00%	89.00%	89.00%	89.00%	89.00%	89.00%
Target C2 $\geq$	73.00%	73.00%	73.00%	73.00%	73.00%	73.00%

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2013:

Michigan did not meet its FFY 2013 targets for any of the six Indicator 7 summary statements. The 2013-2014 school year was the fourth year in which the data were collected through the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS). As anticipated, the transition of data collection from Scantron sheets to the MSDS continued to demonstrate improved data consistency, reduced errors, tracked and matched multiple records for individual child-level data.

Displayed in Table 1 are the numbers of exit and entry records received this year. The number of records submitted during the 2013-2014 school year was the largest since collecting these data through the MSDS. The increase is a result of the ongoing training and technical assistance that was provided throughout the year.

Table 1: Number of All Records Received by Year

Year	Data Source	Exit	Entry	Unclear*	Total
2007-2008	Scan Sheets	2,157	5,777	101	8,035
2008-2009	Scan Sheets	4,513	8,267	276	13,056
2009-2010	Scan Sheets	6,162	8,457	241	14,860
2010-2011	MSDS	3,738	5,618	194	9,550
2011-2012	MSDS	5,743	7,811	0	13,554
2012-2013	MSDS	4,955	8,150	0	13,105
2013-2014	MSDS	5,418	9,358	0	14,776

Source: MSDS, HighScope Education Research Foundation
*There was no indication on the Scantron sheets whether the data were exit or entry.

Presented in Table 2 are the number of records that had matched entry and exit assessment data by year. Among the 5,375 records with exit assessment data this year, 4,336 (469 + 3,867) were found to have entry assessment data in the MSDS. The matching rate of 80.7 percent for this year was the highest since the 2007-2008 school year; the first year child outcomes data were collected. As in previous years, only children with a minimum of six months between entry and exit assessment dates were included in the reported sample.

Table 2: Number of Records with Matched Entry & Exit Assessment Data by Year

Year	Number of children with exit data**	Number of Matched Children		% of Matching
		Not included (months between entry and exit < 6)	Included (months between entry and exit >6)	
2007-2008	2,154	161	1,107	58.87%
2008-2009	4,243	311	2,691	70.75%
2009-2010	6,333	443	4,462	77.45%
2010-2011	3,882	127	2,648	71.48%
2011-2012	5,602	398	3,825	75.38%
2012-2013	4,920	356	3,551	79.41%
2013-2014	5,375	469	3,867	80.67%

 Source: MSDS, HighScope Education Research Foundation
 **The number of children reported are unduplicated data. For the 2009-2011 years, additional records were corrected and included in the counts.

Presented in Table 3 are the results for Summary Statements 1 and 2 by outcome for the 2013-2014 school year, as well as the previous six years. Rates for the three outcomes for Statement 1 increased compared to the last two years, with two outcomes almost reaching the level attained in 2009-2010 (the first year targets were in place). For Summary Statement 2, the FFY 2013 results for the three outcomes were also higher than those of the previous year. The percentages for Summary Statement 2 in the most recent three years were substantially lower than those in the 2009-2010 school year, especially for the Appropriate Action to Meet the Needs outcome.

Table 3: Summary Statement Results by Year

Summary Statement	Outcome	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Statement 1 Below expectation at entry, increased growth at exit	Social/Emotional	85.9%	86.3%	85.5%	81.1%	81.1%	84.5%	85.16%
	Knowledge/Skill	83.8%	86.3%	86.8%	82.2%	82.2%	85.5%	86.49%
	Appropriate Action	85.1%	88.0%	87.7%	80.6%	81.3%	84.8%	85.04%

Summary Statement	Outcome	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Statement 2 Functioning within age expectation at exit	Social/Emotional	60.0%	60.1%	59.8%	56.5%	54.0%	55.4%	57.00%
	Knowledge/Skill	55.7%	57.6%	58.2%	56.6%	53.7%	55.5%	57.59%
	Appropriate Action	70.7%	72.2%	71.6%	62.5%	58.7%	59.0%	60.41%

Source: MSDS, HighScope Education Research Foundation

In order to understand why FFY 2013 increased from FFY 2012 in each of the six summary statements, the Michigan Department of Education examined the change in children's demographic characteristics including eligibility between FFY 2008 (our baseline year) and FFY 2013.

Provided in Table 4 are the eligibility categories of the population of children assessed (with matched entry and exit data) as a percentage. Analysis of six years of data indicates that children with speech and language impairment as a primary eligibility category were more likely to progress to or maintain at age appropriate levels in the three outcome areas, compared to children with other disabilities. Children with a cognitive impairment or multiple impairments were less likely to be functioning at a level equal to typically developing peers at program exit.

Table 4: Eligibility categories of the population of children assessed (with entry and exit)

Eligibility Category	FFY 2008 n=2,691	FFY 2009 n=4,462	FFY 2010 n=2,648	FFY 2011 n=3,825	FFY 2012 n=3,551	FFY 2013 n=3,867
Autism Spectrum Disorder	6.8%	7.3%	7.2%	9.0%	9.9%	**10.37%**
Cognitive Impairment	2.4%	2.9%	3.6%	4.2%	3.9%	**3.65%**
Deaf/ Blindness	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Early Childhood Developmental Delay	18.3%	18.1%	19.9%	17.1%	18.1%	17.15%
Emotional Impairment	0.4%	0.5%	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0.47%
Hearing Impairment	1.0%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.7%	0.62%
Other Health Impairment	4.1%	3.2%	4.0%	4.7%	4.4%	4.16%
Physical Impairment	1.4%	1.6%	1.8%	1.9%	1.5%	1.42%
Severe Multiple Impairment	0.9%	0.9%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	**1.81%**

Eligibility Category	FFY 2008 n=2,691	FFY 2009 n=4,462	FFY 2010 n=2,648	FFY 2011 n=3,825	FFY 2012 n=3,551	FFY 2013 n=3,867
Specific Learning Disability	0.7%	1.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%	0.18%
Speech and Language Impairment	64.7%	64.1%	60.4%	59.7%	58.9%	59.89%
Traumatic Brain Injury	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.13%
Visual Impairment	0.3%	0.4%	0.1%	0.3%	0.3%	0.16%

Source: MSDS, HighScope Education Research Foundation

These data reveal a change in the needs of children served in Early Childhood Special Education programs. When compared to the FFY 2008 baseline data, fewer children with hearing impairment, speech and language impairment, and traumatic brain injury were served while there was an increase in the percentage of children in three of the categories (reference bolded numbers in the table).

Summary of the Findings for This Year's Performance

While progress is noted, given minimal change in the rates from the previous year for Summary Statement 2, Michigan focused the analysis on understanding the change observed in rates for Summary Statement 1. The first step was to examine whether the change in the rates from the previous year was related to any differences in the sample characteristics, developmental level at program entry, and duration of services received (represented by the number of months between entry and exit assessments).

No major differences were found in demographic characteristics or primary disability in the samples between the two past years. Differences by category for gender, race/ethnicity, and primary disability were all within one percentage point. Children's average age at entry and exit tests were also almost identical across the two years.

There was also no difference in the number of months between the entry and exit assessments. In addition, there were no major changes in the sample associated with the children's developmental level at program entry. Among the 21 categories examined for the three outcomes (seven levels each), 17 had a difference within one percentage point and four had a difference of approximately 1.5 percentage points, and one had a difference close to two percentage points.

In FFY 2008, Michigan's targets were based on matched entry and exit records for 2,691 children. Of these children, nearly 65 percent were speech and language eligible. Comparing Michigan to the national average for each of the summary statements it became evident that there was not enough trend data when determining the initial targets. In addition, the population initially examined was not reflective of the children currently served. Michigan plans to establish a new

baseline along with new targets next year taking into consideration all available state data, stakeholder input, national performance trends, and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) requirements.

Displayed in Table 5 is a comparison of Michigan's targets and reported data to the national averages for the past three years. As highlighted in this table, Michigan's data are similar to the national averages. For FFY 2013, Michigan's data are higher in four of the six summary statements (note the bolded numbers) compared to the national averages. This analysis supports the need to reassess Michigan's targets after another year of data collection.

Table 5: Michigan Compared to National Data for Summary Statements

| Summary Statements by Year Comparing | | | | | | | | | |
| Michigan's Targets and Actual Data with National Averages | | | | | | | | | |
Summary Statement	Outcome	MI Targets	FFY 2010 MI Data	FFY 2010 National Average	FFY 2011 MI Data	FFY 2011 National Average	FFY 2012 MI Data	FFY 2012 National Average	FFY 2013 MI Data
Statement 1 Below expectation at entry, increased growth at exit	**Social/ emotional**	87.0%	81.1%	79.0%	81.1%	79.0%	84.5%	81.0%	**85.16%**
	Knowledge/ skill	87.0%	82.2%	79.0%	82.2%	80.0%	85.5%	80.0%	**86.49%**
	Appropriate action	81.0%	80.6%	78.0%	81.3%	77.0%	84.8%	80.0%	**85.04%**
Statement 2 Functioning within age expectation at exit	Social/ emotional	60.0%	56.5%	61.0%	54.0%	59.0%	55.4%	60.0%	57.00%
	Knowledge/ skill	53.0%	56.6%	54.0%	53.7%	53.0%	55.5%	52.0%	**57.59%**
	Appropriate action	66.0%	62.5%	66.0%	58.7%	65.0%	59.0%	64.0%	60.41%

Source: MSDS, HighScope Education Research Foundation, DaSy Center

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Timelines	Activities	Status
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2011-2014	1. Implement technical assistance and professional development for all service areas to improve early childhood outcomes, targeting service areas not meeting targets.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.
Improvement Activity 1 Details: The Office of Great Start/Early Childhood Education & Family Services (OGS/ECE&FS) and its TA grantee, Clinton County Regional Educational Service Agency (CCRESA), presented 90-minute breakout sessions on preschool child outcomes at the following conferences: Michigan Association of Administrators of		

Timelines	Activities	Status

Special Education, Michigan Collaborative Early Childhood Conference, Upper Peninsula Special Education Conference, Michigan Council for Exceptional Children Conference and the Michigan Division for Early Childhood Conference.

Professional development for all service areas included the provision of an online Preschool Child Outcomes training (eotta.ccresa.org). This training was offered free of charge and was available for administrators and personnel in the field. There were 121 participants registered for this training during FFY 2013.

Regional trainings on preschool child outcomes were provided throughout the state between July 1, 2013 and June 30, 2014. There were 120 participants registered for these trainings. The locations of these two trainings were selected based on targeted school districts that reported low outcome data, reflected missing data, or requested the training.

Additional trainings were provided this year on child outcomes data and improving the quality of Preschool Child Outcomes data. There were 48 participants that participated in the face-to-face training and 36 individuals who viewed the online-recorded webinar.

In addition to the face-to-face and online training and technical assistance (TA) opportunities, TA was provided for personnel via telephone and email from both the training contractor and the Michigan Department of Education.

Timelines	Activities	Status
2013-2014	Development of tiered workgroups to focus on state level and local level challenges to inclusion. • Phase I - Recruit and convene a workgroup of decision makers at the state level who are in charge of and responsible for Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE), Great Start Readiness Program (GSRP), Office of Special Education (OSE), Head Start, Great Start Regional Resource Centers, Great Start to Quality team, State Aid, Pupil Accounting to initiate an open dialogue and discussion to identify and address barriers, including funding logistics, to include preschool aged children with IEPs in these general education programs/settings. • Phase II – Upon completion of Phase I, develop and convene a separate workgroup that represents the district and local levels to focus on identification of strategies for including children with IEPs in state and federally funded preschool	Reference Improvement Activity details below.

Timelines	Activities	Status
	programs as well as in other general education preschool settings. • Phase III – The two groups will collaborate to focus on identifying solutions for overcoming additional barriers, sharing of inclusionary practices and funding logistics. Statewide distribution of best practice documents garnered from Phase I and Phase II.	

Improvement Activity 2 Details:

Phase I of the recruitment of stakeholders and decision makers with a vested interest in early childhood special education considering the impact Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) has on yielding higher preschool child outcomes is in progress and will remain a focus for the coming year.

Phase II of the recruitment of stakeholders that represent the district and local level to focus on the inclusionary practices for three, four and five-year-old children occurred this past year within the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education (MAASE) Early Childhood Community of Practice (EC-CoP) group.

Phase III of the collaboration of the two workgroups is an ongoing commitment that will remain a focus for the coming year.

Michigan Part B FFY 2012 SPP/APR Response Table from the Office of Special Education Programs

Indicator Status				OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
Percent of Preschool Children Aged 3 through 5 with IEPs Who Demonstrate Improved Outcomes				The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2013 in the FFY 2013 APR.	Michigan has included actual target data. Additional analyses are presented pertaining to progress data.
Summary Statement 1[32]	**FFY 2011 Data**	**FFY 2012 Data**	**FFY 2012 Target**		
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	81.1%	84.5%	≥ 87.0%		
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	82.2%	85.5%	≥ 87.0%		
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	81.3%	84.8%	≥ 89.0%		
Summary Statement 2[33]	**FFY 2011 Data**	**FFY 2012 Data**	**FFY 2012 Target**		
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	54.0%	55.4%	≥ 61.0%		
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	53.7%	55.5%	≥ 59.0%		
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	58.7%	59.0%	≥ 73.0%		

[32] **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.

[33] **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

Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY[34] 2013 (2013-2014)

Overview of Indicator 8 (Facilitated Parent Involvement) Report Development:

1. See Introduction to the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR).
2. Statewide surveys were mailed to all parents of children between the ages of 3 and 5 years who received special education services and approximately one-third of all parents of students between the ages of 6 and 21 years who received special education services.
3. Both surveys were developed by the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) and were available in English, Spanish and Arabic. Families also were given the option to complete the survey online or via a telephone interview using Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing technology.
4. The survey responses comparing the child/student characteristics to the special education population were representative, with the exception of racial/ethnic composition and disability category. Additional analyses of the responses determined that the differences were not statistically significant, therefore; even though the survey sample was not representative in terms of race/ethnicity and disability category, the Indicator 8 results were not affected.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE[35]/Facilitated Parent Involvement

(Results Indicator)

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. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a) (3) (A))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

---

[34] Federal Fiscal Year
[35] Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment

Measurable and Rigorous Targets Children Between the Ages of 3 and 5 Years			
FFY	**Baseline[36]**	**Target**	**Actual**
2007	34.0%		
2008		>34.5%	36.8%
2009		>35.0%	47.8%
2010		>35.5%	50.1%
2011		>35.5%	48.0%
2012		>35.5%	49.0%
2013		>45.00%	**49.30%***
Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100. *[2,519 ÷ 5,110] X 100			

Source: The NCSEAM Parent Survey and Wayne State University (WSU)/Center for Urban Studies (CUS)

Measurable and Rigorous Targets						
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**
Target ≥	45.00%	45.50%	46.00%	46.50%	47.00%	47.50%
Data	49.30%					

Measurable and Rigorous Targets Students Between the Ages of 6 and21 Years			
FFY	**Baseline[37]**	**Target**	**Actual**
2007	20.5%		
2008		>21.0%	25.1%
2009		>21.5%	26.2%
2010		>22.0%	25.9%
2011		>22.0%	27.3%

---

[36] New baseline was set in FFY 2007
[37] New baseline was set in FFY 2007

Measurable and Rigorous Targets Students Between the Ages of 6 and21 Years			
FFY	**Baseline[37]**	**Target**	**Actual**
2012		$\geq$22.0%	29.5%
2013		$\geq$24.80%	**27.92%***
Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100. *[4,165 ÷ 14,918] X 100			

Source: The NCSEAM Parent Survey and WSU/CUS

Measurable and Rigorous Targets						
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**
Target $\geq$	24.80%	25.20%	25.60%	26.00%	26.40%	26.80%
Data	27.92%					

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2013:

Michigan met both of the Indicator 8 FFY 2013 targets for children between the ages of 3 and 5 years and for students between the ages of 6 and 21 years.

Compared to the FFY 2012 Part B parent surveys, the percentage of parents of children between the ages of 3 and 5 years at or above the standard in FFY 2013 was higher. There is insufficient information available to determine if the change is attributable to specific activities or to normal variation.

Compared to the FFY 2012 Part B parent surveys, the percentage of parents of students between the ages of 6 and 21 years at or above the standard in FFY 2013 was lower. There is insufficient information to attribute the decrease in percentage to specific activities at this time.

Discussion of FFY 2013 Data

Survey Instrument
There were two versions of the survey for parents of children/students receiving special education services:
- One for parents of children between the ages of 3 and 5.
- One for parents of students between the ages of 6 and 21.

The parent survey for children ages 3 through 5 years contained 37 NCSEAM items measuring "Efforts to Partner with Parents", while the parent survey for students between the ages of 6 and 21 included 25 items measuring this same construct.

The survey for children between the ages of 3 and 5 years also contained an additional 13 NCSEAM items measuring "Quality of Services" for a total of 50 items.

Sampling
Surveys were disseminated to all parents of children between the ages of 3 and 5 years who received special education services and approximately one-third of all parents of students between the ages of 6 and 21 years who received special education services.[38] Parents of students between the ages of 6 and 21 years were selected to participate in the survey using the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) approved cohort sampling plan.

Approximately one-third of local school districts within every intermediate school district (ISD) were selected to participate in the survey for students between the ages of 6 and 21 years. The exception is the one district with a student population greater than 50,000 that participates on an annual basis.

Response Rates
There were 5,110 respondents for the children between the ages of 3 and 5 years survey (30.0 percent response rate) and 14,918 for the students between the ages of 6 and 21 years survey (26.6 percent response rate), for a total number of 20,028 responses (27.4 percent total response rate). Rasch analysis was used to generate a score for all respondents.

Representativeness of the Sample
Comparisons of child/student characteristics between the statewide population and respondent sample revealed that the responses are representative of the entire Michigan Part B special education population with the exception of the proportion of children between the ages of 3 and 5 years and students between the ages of 6 and 21 years in terms of racial/ethnic composition and disability category.

Due to the sampling procedure used, the ratio of survey respondents with children between the ages of 3 and 5 years to respondents with students between the ages of 6 and 21 years is greater than the ratio found in the state. However, because results are presented for each sample separately, there is no need to apply weights[39] to each sample in order to adjust these proportions.

---

[38] In households with more than one child/student receiving special education services, one child/student was randomly selected and parents were asked to respond to the survey based on their experiences with that child/student.
[39] Weights are commonly used to adjust survey results for under- and over-representation of specific subgroups in a sample population. Weighting provides an estimate of the results that would be found if the distribution of a particular characteristic in the sample were identical to the distribution in the overall population.

**FFY 2013 Parent Survey Respondents' Child's
Race/Ethnicity Compared to the State**

Race/ Ethnicity	3-5 Years Sample	3-5 Years Statewide Population	6-21 Years Sample	6-21 Years Cohort 1 Population
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.41% (n=21)*	0.75% (n=128)	0.91% (n=136)	0.91% (n=511)
Asian	2.68% (n=137)*	2.10% (n=357)	1.09% (n=163)	0.97% (n=547)
African American/Black	11.66% (n=596)*	14.45% (n=2,457)	20.17% (n=3,009)*	24.43% (n=13,715)
Hispanic/Latino	5.81% (n=297)*	7.08% (n=1,204)	6.78% (n=1,012)*	7.21% (n=4,045)
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	**	0.10% (n=17)	**	0.07% (n=37)
White	76.07% (n=3,887)*	72.30% (n=12,297)	68.38% (n=10,201)*	63.86% (n=35,845)
Two or More Races	3.29% (n=168)	3.23% (n=549)	2.61% (n=389)	2.55% (n=1,433)

Source: The NCSEAM Parent Survey and WSU/CUS
*Difference between sample and statewide is statistically significant.
** = Number is not reported because there are fewer than ten (10) students.

**FFY 2013 Parent Survey Respondents' Child's
Disability Compared to the State**

Disability	3-5 Years Sample	3-5 Years Statewide Population	6-21 Years Sample	6-21 Years Cohort 1 Population
Cognitive Impairment	1.76% (n=90)	1.42% (n=242)	8.94% (n=1,333)	8.82% (n=4,951)
Emotional Impairment	**	0.07% (n=12)	5.70% (n=850)	5.94% (n=3,333)
Hearing Impairment	1.33% (n=68)	1.35% (n=229)	1.39% (n=207)	1.37% (n=771)
Visual Impairment	0.53% (n=27)	0.45% (n=76)	0.42% (n=63)	0.41% (n=232)
Physical Impairment	1.59% (n=81)	1.69% (n=287)	1.31% (n=196)*	1.07% (n=598)
Speech and Language Impairment	58.24% (n=2,976)*	61.34% (n=10,434)	21.20% (n=3,162)*	22.68% (n=12,732)

Disability	3-5 Years Sample	3-5 Years Statewide Population	6-21 Years Sample	6-21 Years Cohort 1 Population
Early Childhood Developmental Delay	21.86% (n=1,117)*	20.52% (n=3,490)	1.25% (n=187)	1.25% (n=700)
Specific Learning Disability	**	0.07% (n=12)	33.95% (n=5,064)*	36.81% (n=20,662)
Severe Multiple Impairment	2.07% (n=106)	1.90% (n=324)	1.04% (n=155)	1.05% (n=588)
Autism Spectrum Disorder	6.32% (n=323)	6.10% (n=1,037)	10.77% (n=1,607)*	8.24% (n=4,625)
Traumatic Brain Injury	**	0.11% (n=18)	0.25% (n=38)	0.25% (n=143)
Deaf-Blindness			**	**
Other Health Impairment	5.99% (n=306)*	4.99% (n=848)	13.77% (n=2,054)*	12.10% (n=6,793)

Source: The NCSEAM Parent Survey and WSU/CUS
*Difference between sample and statewide is statistically significant.
** = Number is not reported because there are fewer than ten (10) students.

The tables above summarize respondents' children's/student's race/ethnicity and disability in comparison to statewide demographics. To determine if the difference in racial/ethnic and disability distribution made a significant impact on the findings related to this indicator, weights were applied to adjust the sample sizes for each racial/ethnic and disability group. Weights were calculated by dividing the proportion of each group in the Part B population by the corresponding proportion in the sample.

A comparison of the unweighted results and results after weighting by race/ethnicity and disability showed no statistically significant difference in the scores (see table below). Therefore, even though the sample was not representative in terms of race/ethnicity and disability category, the Indicator 8 results were not affected.

Indicator 8 Results Before and After Weighting for Race/Ethnicity and Disability

	Unweighted		Weighted by Race/Ethnicity		Weighted by Disability	
	n	% at or above standard	n	% at or above standard	n	% at or above standard
Children Ages 3-5 Years Sample	5,110	**49.3%**	5,109	**49.4%**	5,099	**49.2%**
Students Ages 6-21 Years Sample	14,918	**27.9%**	14,873	**27.6%**	14,891	**28.0%**
	mean	standard deviation	mean	standard deviation	mean	standard deviation
Children Ages 3-5 Years Sample	622.03	141.06	622.31	140.97	621.92	141.07
Students Ages 6-21 Years Sample	540.16	131.50	539.19	131.42	540.54	131.62

Source: The NCSEAM Parent Survey and WSU/CUS

Additional details regarding the sampling and weighting procedures are available in the State Performance Plan (SPP) Extension at www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/MI_PartB_SPP_Ext_FFY_2012_446667_7.pdf.

Results

A final score was derived from responses to all the items in the "Efforts to Partner with Parents" scale.[40] Scores ranged from 184 to 906, with an average of 622 for the children between the ages of 3 and 5 years sample and from 169 to 836 with an average of 540 for the students between the ages of 6 and 21 years sample.

Through stakeholder input garnered from focus groups, the NCSEAM set a national standard score of 600. According to the NCSEAM, "The standard is not about agreement with a single item. Given the consistent pattern in families' responses to the items, a high likelihood of agreement with the threshold item implies the same or greater likelihood of agreement with items located 'below' this one on the scale."[41] The percentage of parent survey scores of 600 or higher is used to measure this indicator. In FFY 2013, 49.30 percent of parents with children ages 3-5 and 27.92 percent of parents with children ages 6-21 met the standard.

---

[40] From the Avatar International, Inc. report, "*Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* Part B Special Education Parent Survey Results Pertaining to OSEP SPP/APR Indicator 8."
[41] http://www.nectac.org/~ppts/meetings/nationalDec05/elbaumBatya056Dec19-handout.ppt

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Timelines	Activities	Status
	PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	
2013-2014	1. MDE staff and ISD monitors will develop tools to support Local Education Agencies that decide to hold consistent and regular (monthly or quarterly, including online) joint trainings for educators and parents using "a cooperative team approach". Key parent organizations, Parent Advisory Committees, and other stakeholders will be included in the development of the training.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.
Improvement Activity 1 Details:		
The training tools have been developed and are available to the districts from the Michigan Alliance for Families. In the future, these training tools will be available on the CIMS website and the Michigan Alliance for Families website.		
2013-2014	2. By January 2015, ISD monitors will provide quarterly training sessions to improve communication and the dissemination of materials for parents in order to increase parental understanding of student progress toward achieving quality goals. Activities include: A. Continue to provide professional development for teachers on how to write quality goals, where progress monitoring accurate and meaningful. B. Continue to provide professional development for teachers on how to monitor student goals using audience friendly graphic displays of data. C. Begin to provide accessible professional development for parents on: o How to request up-to-date progress monitoring data. o How to read basic information provided in graph form. o The parents' role in students' progress toward goals. How parents and educators can work together to help each student achieve his/her goals.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.

Timelines	Activities	Status
Improvement Activity 2 Details:		
The Indicator Team decided to delay implementation of part A and B of Improvement Activity 2. For part C of this improvement activity, training was made available to ISDs. Michigan Alliance for Families offered training to parents.		

Michigan Part B FFY 2012 SPP/APR Response Table from the Office of Special Education Programs

Indicator Status				OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a response group that was not representative of the population. OSEP notes that the State included strategies or improvement activities to address this issue in the future.				In the FFY 2013 APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2013 data are from a group representative of the population, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.	Reference response details below.
	FFY 2011 Data	FFY 2012 Data	FFY 2012 Target		
A	48.0%	49.0%	≥35.5%		
B	27.3%	29.5%	≥22.0%		
Michigan Response:					
The survey responses comparing the child/student characteristics to the special education population were representative, with the exception of racial/ethnic composition and disability category. A comparison of the unweighted results and results after weighting by race/ethnicity and disability showed no statistically significant difference in the scores.					

Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY[42] 2013 (2013-2014)

Overview of Indicator 9 (Disproportionate Representation—Child with a Disability) Report Development:

1. See Introduction to the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR).
2. Business rules for data collection were reviewed and updated. Please see Appendix D for the business rules applied to the FFY 2012-2013 for this indicator.
3. There were no districts that met the criteria for focused monitoring. In lieu of focused monitoring, districts that exceeded a risk ratio of 2.5 for two consecutive years were sent a monitoring activities report (MAR) in the Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System (CIMS) Workbook. Refer to Appendix C for additional information pertaining to timely correction of noncompliance.

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation—Child with a Disability

(Compliance Indicator)

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. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.
Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."
Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2013, describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum 'n' size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2013 reporting period, i.e., after June 30, 2014. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.

---

[42] Federal Fiscal Year

Definition of Disproportionate Representation:

Michigan's operational definition of districts with disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification includes:

	Over-Representation
Step 1: Identify Districts with Disproportionate Representation	For the FFY 2013 APR, the two school years considered were FFY 2012 (2012-2013) and FFY 2013 (2013-2014). A verified ratio[43] greater than 2.5 for two consecutive years for any racial/ethnic group in one of six eligibility categories was used to identify districts for focused monitoring activities.
Step 2: Analyze Identification Policies, Practices and procedures	As a result of analyzing disproportionate data and applying selection criteria, the Office of Special Education (OSE) issued a MAR for districts that had a risk ratio (RR) greater than 2.5 for both years and either had a corrective action plan (CAP) in the current monitoring cycle or had an on-site visit in the past school year that resulted in no findings.

---

[43] In cases where the sum of all other students with an individualized education program (IEP) equals fewer than ten, an alternate risk ratio (ARR) was calculated for the race under consideration, per IDEA Data Center (IDC) recommendation. ARR was calculated when the racial/ethnic distribution of the district's student population varied significantly from the state racial distribution which was used to calculate weighted risk ratios/ARR. The RR compared identification rates by race/ethnicity with the district's student population.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Actual**
2006	0.3%	0%	
2007		0%	0.3%
2008		0%	0.1%
2009		0%	0.1%
2010		0%	0.2%
2011		0%	0.1%
2012		0%	0.2%
2013		0%	**0.00%***
Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the state)] times 100. *[0 ÷ 835] X 100			

Source: Michigan Student Data System, CIMS

Measurable and Rigorous Targets						
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	**0.00%**					

During the 2013-2014 school year, the OSE analyzed FFY 2012 and FFY 2013 data for 835 districts. There were 199 districts excluded from the disproportionate representation calculations because they had fewer than 30 students with an individualized education program (IEP) enrolled.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2013:

Michigan met its FFY 2013 target of zero percent for Indicator 9. None of the districts met the criteria for focused monitoring.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Timelines	Activities	Status
	IMPROVE DATA COLLECTION	
2011-2014	Review and update as necessary the procedures for extracting and analyzing data in the determination of disproportionate representation.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.
Improvement Activity 1 Details: The OSE met with the contracted researchers, who conduct the analysis, to review the business rules and procedures.		
	PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	
2011-2014	2. Ensure involvement of districts in: • Review of the data that resulted in their identification for disproportionate representation; • Review of their policies, procedures and practices used to identify whether these are determinants of the disproportionate data; and • Development of any necessary CAP.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.
Improvement Activity 2 Details: The OSE notified districts with data results in May 2014 and provided usernames and passwords to allow district access to the data. There were no reviews of district policies, practices and procedures because none of the districts met the criteria for focused monitoring as they had been monitored the prior year, therefore, no corrective action plans were issued.		
	PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	
2011-2014	3. Provide technical assistance in the development and implementation of a CAP to districts whose identification policies, procedures and practices are a determinant for the disproportionate representation of students from racial/ethnic groups.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.
Improvement Activity 3 Details: No corrective action plans were issued so technical assistance wasn't necessary.		

Timely Correction of FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the state made during FFY 2012 (the period from July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013)	2
2. Number of FFY 2012 findings the state verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the local educational agency (LEA) of the finding)	2
3. Number of FFY 2012 findings not verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance and/or Not Corrected):

4. Number of FFY 2012 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
5. Number of FFY 2012 findings the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	0
6. Number of FFY 2012 findings not verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Michigan Part B FFY 2012 SPP/APR Response Table from the Office of Special Education Programs

Indicator Status				OSEP Analysis and Next Steps
Michigan Part B FFY 2012 SPP/ APR Compliance Summary				Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2012 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2013 APR, that the districts identified in FFY 2012 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified
FFY 2011 Data	**FFY 2012 Data**	**FFY 2012 Target**	**CORRECTION OF FINDINGS OF NONCOMPLIANCE IDENTIFIED IN FFY 2011**	
0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	The State reported that all three of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 were corrected in a timely manner.	
The State reported that three districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that two districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.				

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps
The State provided its definition of "disproportionate representation." The State reported that 182 of 820 districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement of 30 students with an IEP.	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 2013 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.
Michigan Response: Two districts were identified in FFY 2012 as having disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic subgroups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification policies, practices and/or procedures. The OSE verified, through on-site visits and the completion of the district's CAP activities, that both districts: 1) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance within one year of notification, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the local education agency, and 2) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100 percent compliance) based on a review of updated data consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.	

Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY[44] 2013 (2013-2014)

Overview of Indicator 10 (Disproportionate Representation—Eligibility Categories) Report Development:

1. See Introduction to the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR).
2. Business rules for data collection were reviewed and updated. Please see Appendix D for the business rules applied to the FFY 2012-2013 for this indicator.
3. Findings of noncompliance were reported and corrective action plans (CAPs) were submitted and monitored through the Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System (CIMS) Workbook. Refer to Appendix C for additional information pertaining to timely correction of noncompliance.

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation—Eligibility Categories

(Compliance Indicator)

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))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2013, describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum 'n' size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2013, i.e., after June 30, 2014. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.

---

[44] Federal Fiscal Year

Definition of Disproportionate Representation:

Michigan's operational definition of districts with disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification includes:

	Over-Representation
Step 1: Identify Districts with Disproportionate Representation	For the FFY 2013 APR, the two school years considered were FFY 2012 (2012-2013) and FFY 2013 (2013-2014). A verified ratio[45] greater than 2.5 for two consecutive years for any racial/ethnic group in one of six eligibility categories was used to identify districts for focused monitoring activities.
Step 2: Analyze Identification Policies, Practices and Procedures	As a result of analyzing disproportionate data and applying selection criteria, the Office of Special Education (OSE) completed a focused monitoring activity including either an on-site visit or issued a Monitoring Activities Report (MAR) for districts that had a risk ratio (RR) greater than 2.5 for both years. The OSE reviewed district processes, student records and conducted interviews to determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification policies, practices or procedures. This resulted in a focused monitoring report that included any findings of noncompliance.

---

[45] In cases where the sum of all other students with an individualized education program (IEP) equals fewer than ten, an alternate risk ratio (ARR) was calculated for the race under consideration, per IDEA Data Center (IDC) recommendation. ARR was calculated when the racial/ethnic distribution of the district's student population varied significantly from the state racial distribution which was used to calculate weighted risk ratios/ARR. The RR compared identification rates by race/ethnicity with the district's student population.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Actual**
2005	1.7%		
2006		0%	3.2%
2007		0%	1.7%
2008		0%	1.4%
2009		0%	0.9%
2010		0%	0.7%
2011		0%	1.1%
2012		0%	1.3%
2013		0%	**2.04%***
Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the state)] times 100. *[17 ÷ 835] X 100			

Source: Michigan Student Data System, CIMS

Measurable and Rigorous Targets						
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	2.04%					

During the 2013-2014 school year, the OSE analyzed FFY 2012 and FFY 2013 data for 835 districts; of those districts, 199 were excluded from the disproportionate representation calculations because they had fewer than 30 students with an IEP enrolled. Based on the focused monitoring selection criteria, 36 districts were identified for a focused monitoring activity.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2013:

Michigan did not meet its FFY 2013 target of zero percent for Indicator 10. Of the 36 districts with data indicating over-representation, seventeen districts were identified with one or more findings of disproportionate representation due to over-representation as a result of inappropriate identification policies, procedures and/or practices. One district was identified because of over-representation of White students in the category of other health impairment. Six districts were identified for over-representation of Black students in the category of cognitive impairment. Three districts were identified because of over-representation of Black students in the category of specific learning disability. One district was identified because of over-representation of Hispanic students in the category of specific learning

disability. One district was identified because of over-representation of White students in the category of specific learning disability. One district was identified because of over-representation of Hispanic students in the category of speech and language Impairment. One district was identified because of over-representation of Black students in the category of speech and language impairment. One district was identified because of over-representation of White students in the category of speech and language impairment. Two districts were identified for over-representation of White students in the category of autism spectrum disorder. One district was identified for over-representation of Black students in the category of emotional impairment. Each of the districts with findings of noncompliance developed a CAP with technical assistance (TA) provided by the OSE.

FFY 2013 Disproportionate Over-Representation Analysis: Number and percent of identified districts[46] with findings by disability category and racial/ethnic group.

Race/ Ethnicity	Autism Spectrum Disorder		Cognitive Impairment		Emotional Impairment		Other Health Impairment		Specific Learning Disability		Speech and Language Impairment	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Asian	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
African American/ Black	0	0.0%	6	0.35%	1	0.06%	0	0.0%	3	0.18%	1	0.06%
Hispanic/ Latino	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.06%	1	0.06%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
White	2	0.12%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.06%	1	0.06%	1	0.06%
Two or More Races	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

---

[46] A district may appear more than once in the table due to multiple findings.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Timelines	Activities	Status
	IMPROVE DATA COLLECTION	
2011-2014	1. Review and update as necessary the procedures for extracting and analyzing data in the determination of disproportionate representation.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.
Improvement Activity 1 Details: The OSE met with the contracted researchers, who conduct the analysis, to review the business rules and procedures.		
	PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	
2011-2014	2. Ensure involvement of districts in: • Review of the data that resulted in their identification for disproportionate representation; • Review of their policies, procedures and practices used to identify whether these are determinants of the disproportionate data; and • Development of any necessary CAP.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.
Improvement Activity 2 Details: The OSE: • Provided districts with data results in May and provided user names and passwords to allow district access to the data. • Reviewed district policies, procedures and practices used to identify whether these are determinants of the disproportionate data. • Required district development of CAPs as necessary.		
	PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	
2011-2014	3. Provide TA in the development and implementation of a CAP to districts whose identification policies, procedures and practices are a determinant for the disproportionate representation of students from racial/ethnic groups in specific disabilities.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.
Improvement Activity 3 Details: As part of the CIMS process, a TA provider was assigned to each district identified with findings of noncompliance to assist with the development and implementation		

Timelines	Activities	Status
of a CAP to ensure appropriate policies, procedures and practices. The TA provider worked with the district until correction was verified and the finding closed.		

Timely Correction of FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the state made during FFY 2012 (the period from July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013)	11
2. Number of FFY 2012 findings the state verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the local educational agency (LEA) of the finding)	11
3. Number of FFY 2012 findings not verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance and/or Not Corrected):

4. Number of FFY 2012 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
5. Number of FFY 2012 findings the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	0
6. Number of FFY 2012 findings not verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Michigan Part B FFY 2012 SPP/APR Response Table from the Office of Special Education Programs

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps
<table><tr><td colspan="4">**Michigan Part B FFY 2012 SPP/APR Compliance Summary**</td></tr><tr><td>**FFY 2011 Data**</td><td>**FFY 2012 Data**</td><td>**FFY 2012 Target**</td><td>**CORRECTION OF FINDINGS OF NONCOMPLIANCE IDENTIFIED IN FFY 2011**</td></tr><tr><td>1.1%</td><td>1.3%</td><td>0.0%</td><td>The State reported that all three of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 were corrected in a timely manner.</td></tr></table> The State reported that 23 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that 11 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification. The State provided its definition of "disproportionate representation." The State reported that 182 of 820 districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement of 30 students with an IEP and were excluded from the calculation.	Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2012 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2013 APR, that the districts identified in FFY 2012 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, 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 2013 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.
Michigan Response: Twenty-three districts were identified in FFY 2012 as having disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic subgroups. Eleven of the 23 districts had findings of noncompliance in special education and related services that were the result of inappropriate identification policies, procedures and/or practices. All districts have corrected their findings of noncompliance within one year of notification.	

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps
The OSE verified, through on-site visits and the completion of the district's CAP activities, that the district: 1) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance within one year of notification, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, and 2) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100 percent compliance) based on a review of updated data consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.	

Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY[47] 2013 (2013-2014)

Overview of Indicator 11 (Child Find) Report Development:

1. See Introduction to the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR).
2. The Office of Special Education (OSE) continued to intensify collaborative efforts within and across the Performance Reporting (PR) and Program Accountability (PA) units to collect and verify data, disseminate accurate information and provide technical assistance (TA) to all stakeholders about Child Find, and the timely completion of initial evaluations and individualized education programs (IEPs).
3. Per the Office of Special Education Program's (OSEP) guidance, Michigan included student records reported with an evaluation outcome in FFY 2013 and parental consent obtained at the end of the previous school year.
4. Findings of noncompliance were reported and corrective action plans (CAPs) were submitted and monitored through the Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System (CIMS) Workbook. For additional information pertaining to timely correction of noncompliance please refer to Appendix C on the Introduction Page.

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision/Child Find

(Compliance Indicator)

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.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:
a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

Account for children included in a but not included in b. Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Actual**
2005	80.5%[48]		
2006		100%	96.2%
2007		100%	87.1%
2008		100%	95.3%
2009		100%	99.1%
2010		100%	99.4%
2011		100%	99.4%
2012		100%	99.6%
2013		100%	**99.72%***

Percent = [(# of children whose evaluations were completed within 30 school days or agreed upon extension) divided by (# of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received)] times 100.

*[27,440 ÷ 27,516] X 100

Source: Michigan Student Data System (MSDS)

Measurable and Rigorous Targets						
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.72%					

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2013:

Michigan did not meet its FFY 2013 target of 100 percent for Indicator 11. Michigan had an increase (1,916) in the number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received and an increase in the rate of compliance.

Michigan's consistent high percentage of student evaluations within the 30 school day timeline or an agreed upon extension for this indicator is due in part to the continued TA and outreach provided by the OSE PR and PA Units. Through the CIMS, districts were provided with ongoing supports and access to current and consistent information.

---

[48] Based on the OSEP approved cohort with data from one-third of the state. Since that time, Michigan has moved to a statewide data collection.

Child Find Data for FFY 2012 – FFY 2013

Child Find Categories	FFY 2012[49]	FFY 2013
(a) # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.	25,600	27,516
(b) # of children whose evaluations were completed within 30 school days or a mutually agreed upon extension.	25,506	27,440
# of children included in (a) but not included in (b).	94	76

Source: MSDS

For the late IEPs, the following table presents the reasons districts gave and the number and percent of eligible and ineligible children reported for each reason.

Reason for Late IEP	Eligible Children with a Late IEP	Ineligible Children with a Late IEP
IEP Not Timely: External report not available	10	2
IEP Not Timely: Personnel not available for evaluation	14	8
IEP Not Timely: Personnel not available for IEP	35	7
Total	59	17

Source: MSDS

For the late IEPs, the number of calendar days beyond the required 30 school day timeline[50] (or agreed-upon extension) ranged from one day to 90 days. The following table presents the number and percent of late IEPs by range of days late.

Range of Days Beyond 30	Number of Late IEPs	Percent of Late IEPs
1-5 days	30	39.47%
6-10 days	14	18.42%
11-15 days	7	9.21%
16-20 days	7	9.21%
21-25 days	0	0%
26-30 days	6	7.89%
> 30 days	12	15.79%

Source: MSDS

---

[49] Includes student records reported with an evaluation outcome in FFY 2012 and parental consent obtained at the end of the previous school year.
[50] Michigan's state established timeframe within which the evaluation must be completed.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Timelines	Activities	Status
CLARIFY/EXAMINE/DEVELOP POLICIES AND PROCEDURES		
2013-2014	The OSE will collaborate with targeted stakeholders to develop and continuously review an internal system of communication, data collection and follow-up to ensure the implementation of Michigan's Child Find policies, procedures and practices.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.

Improvement Activity Details:
1. The OSE developed a new system to receive inquiries regarding Child Find, collect data and refer callers to the appropriate local educational agency (LEA).
2. The OSE initiated and engaged with Clinton County RESA Office of Innovative Projects and Pace and Partners Inc. to develop and implement a new initiative, "Build Up Michigan." Build Up Michigan targets parents of children 3-5 years old in an effort to increase appropriate identification of young children (http://buildupmi.org).
3. The OSE gave presentations throughout the state of Michigan regarding a proposed new rule set. The rule set was developed to clarify the process for initial evaluations and is reflective of and aligned with the IDEA regulations. Presentations were given to LEAs, intermediate school districts and parent advisory committees. The OSE established a workgroup for nonpublic schools regarding the responsibilities of Child Find in the nonpublic setting.

Timely Correction of FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1.	Number of findings of noncompliance the state made during FFY 2012 (the period from July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013)	64
2.	Number of FFY 2012 findings the state verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	60
3.	Number of FFY 2012 findings not verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	4

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance and/or Not Corrected):

4. Number of FFY 2012 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	4
5. Number of FFY 2012 findings the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	4
6. Number of FFY 2012 findings not verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Correction of FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance

FFY 2012 Correction of Noncompliance			
Indicator	**District Identifier**	**Nature of Noncompliance**	**Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance**
11	244	Child Find (Failure to evaluate for all suspected disabilities in a timely manner.)	Finding issued: December 15, 2012 as a result of data submitted through MSDS. Summary of Activities: As a result of Child Find noncompliance, the district provided professional development on initial timelines. Additionally, the district implemented an initial timeline procedure to ensure that all team members followed the same protocol for Child Find. The district also implemented a weekly reporting system to ensure that all staff maintained compliance. The district also implemented an automated system of reminders of upcoming IEP dates. Status: The finding was verified and closed by the OSE on July 22, 2014.
11	477	Child Find (Failure to evaluate for all suspected disabilities in a timely manner.)	Finding issued: December 15, 2012 as a result of data submitted through MSDS. Summary of Activities: As a result of Child Find noncompliance, the district developed a written

FFY 2012 Correction of Noncompliance			
Indicator	**District Identifier**	**Nature of Noncompliance**	**Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance**
			procedure regarding initial evaluation timelines. Professional development was provided to staff regarding the new procedures. Status: The finding was verified and closed by the OSE on May 28, 2014.
11	717	Child Find (Failure to evaluate for all suspected disabilities in a timely manner.)	Finding issued: December 15, 2012 as a result of data submitted through MSDS. Summary of Activities: As a result of Child Find noncompliance, the district implemented a monthly reporting feature within their IEP data system to identify and track all initial IEPs. Key staff involved with initial evaluations were notified and updated regularly to ensure ongoing compliance. Status: The finding was verified and closed by the OSE on August 20, 2014.
11	874	Child Find (Failure to evaluate for all suspected disabilities in a timely manner.)	Finding issued: December 15, 2012 as a result of data submitted through MSDS. Summary of Activities: As a result of Child Find noncompliance, the district developed procedures to address initial timeline extensions. Additionally, training on the new procedures was provided on 1/24/2014 to initial evaluation staff. Status: The finding was verified and closed by the OSE on May 28, 2014.

Michigan Part B FFY 2012 SPP/APR Response Table from the Office of Special Education Programs

Indicator Status			OSEP Analysis and Next Steps
FFY 2011 DATA	**FFY 2012 DATA**	**FFY 2012 TARGET**	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.
99.4%	99.6%	100%	

CORRECTION OF FINDINGS OF NONCOMPLIANCE IDENTIFIED IN FFY 2011
The State reported that 58 of 59 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining finding was subsequently corrected by September 18, 2013.

Michigan Response:

Noncompliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements that the state identified in FFY 2012 as a result of the review conducted was corrected and verified in 60 districts within one year of notification. Four districts were corrected beyond one year.

The state verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified by the state: (1) had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, dated October 17, 2008; and (2) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100 percent compliance) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring and/or entered into the state data system.

Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY[51] 2013 (2013-2014)

Overview of Indicator 12 (Early Childhood Transition) Report Development:

1. See Introduction to the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR).
2. Findings of noncompliance were reported and corrective action plans (CAPs) were *submitted* and monitored through the Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System (CIMS) Workbook. For additional information pertaining to timely correction of noncompliance, please refer to Appendix C on the Introduction Page.

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision/Early Childhood Transition

(Compliance Indicator)

Indicator 12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an individualized education program (IEP) developed and implemented by their third birthdays. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

a) # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
b) # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
c) # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
d) # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
e) # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

Account for children included in (a) but not included in b, c, d or e. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e)] times 100.

---

[51] Federal Fiscal Year

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Actual**
2005	92.1%		
2006		100%	91.5%
2007		100%	93.9%
2008		100%	97.8%
2009		100%	98.7%
2010		100%	98.6%
2011		100%	99.4%
2012		100%	98.4%
2013		100%	**97.26%***
Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e)] times 100. *[2,873 ÷ (3,295 – 214 – 123 - 4)] X 100			

Source: Michigan Student Database System (MSDS), data verification activity

Measurable and Rigorous Targets						
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.26%					

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2013:

Michigan did not meet its FFY 2013 target of 100 percent for Indicator 12.

In the 2013-2014 school year, there were 3,295 children being served in Part C who also participated in Michigan birth through three special education programs and services. Of these children, 2,873 were found eligible for Part B services and had an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday. There were a total of 81 children that had a late IEP. These were distributed across 36 local school districts located within 15 of Michigan's intermediate school districts (ISDs). All 81 children with a late IEP had an IEP developed and implemented during the 2013-2014 school year. Districts identified the following reasons for noncompliance: personnel unavailable, late notification from Part C to Part B, timeline began in a previous district or unknown (reference Table 2 for details). Districts noted that lack

of available staff was a result of the funding cuts experienced over the past several years.

Increased training and technical assistance (TA) opportunities offered by the Office of Special Education (OSE) and the Office of Great Start/Early Childhood Education & Family Services (OGS/ECE&FS) staff improved districts' ability to identify and ensure correction of noncompliance and increase collaboration between the Part C and Part B systems. Through the CIMS, districts were notified, offered tools for systemic data improvement, and required to review and revise, if necessary, the transition process. Many ISDs developed plans and interagency agreements that led to stronger compliance and improved transitions of children from Part C to Part B. Additionally, there was an increase over the previous year in training and TA sessions provided, both on-site to ISDs and throughout the state at preschool conferences, focusing on the revised definition of potentially eligible. This updated definition specifies the population of children in Part C who are also currently receiving special education programs and services. Since those children are already receiving special education services, there is a greater likelihood that they will be eligible for special education services at age three.

During data verification, the OGS/ECE&FS confirmed that the majority of the districts do have clear procedures and protocols for the transition between Part C exit and Part B entry. However, issues were identified that could have contributed to the decreased percent of compliance this year. The 2013-2014 school year was the second year data for this indicator were collected in the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS). Previously, data were collected in the Michigan Compliance Information System (MI-CIS), which was decommissioned on September 30, 2012. Without MI-CIS, districts contracted with data system vendors to assist with data collection and reporting requirements. It was determined the business rules for some of the local district's data systems were not aligned with the MSDS business rules thus affecting their data collection and reporting fields. Although this is the second year districts are working with their local data systems, adjustments to their business rules to address issues that were uncovered last year during the data review were made after the 2013-2014 collection year began. Therefore, those changes will not be realized until the 2014-2015 school year. IEPs assigned to the unknown category (55 IEPs) may have an earlier IEP on file on a combined IFSP/IEP form; however, the districts did not enter the data into MSDS.

Districts receiving findings of noncompliance for Part C to Part B transition were required to complete a CAP to ensure correction of noncompliance. Districts were required to address personnel issues in CAPs and ensure on-time completion of IEPs even with staff shortages. Additionally, districts were required as part of their CAP activity to review the Transition webinar, developed by the OGS, which emphasizes the updated business rules for MSDS. This will enable districts to collaborate with their local data system vendors to ensure alignment with MSDS data collection fields.

Completed CAPs were verified by ISD monitors through a data sample. Districts were required to correct noncompliance as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year, including verification.

Table 1: Analysis of Early Childhood Transition Data for FFY 2013

Early Childhood Transition Categories	FFY 2013
a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination.	3,295
b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays.	214
c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,873
d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.	123
e. # of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	4

Source: MSDS, data verification activity

Presented in Table 2 are the reasons districts gave for late IEPs and the number of eligible and ineligible children reported with each reason:

Table 2: Reported Reasons for Late IEP

Reason for Late IEP	Number of Eligible Children with Late IEPs	Number of Ineligible Children with Late IEPs
Late notification from Part C (less than 90 days before third birthday)	28	1
Extenuating family circumstances	0	0
Unable to arrange mutually agreeable evaluation/IEP times	0	0
Personnel unavailable to complete within timeline	20	1
Timeline began in previous district	0	0
Unknown	28	3
Total	**76**	**5**

Source: MSDS, data verification activity

Displayed in Table 3 are the number of ISDs with late IEPs and Table 4 includes the number and percent of late IEPs by days beyond a child's third birthday:

Table 3:

Number of Late IEPS	Number of ISDs
1	6
2 - 3	2
≥ 4	7

Table 4:

Range of Days Beyond Third Birthday	Number of Late IEPs	Percent of Late IEPs
1-10 days	14	17.28%
11-50 days	23	28.40%
51-100 days	17	20.99%
>100 days	27	33.33%

Timely Correction of FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the state made during FFY 2012 (the period from July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013)	28
2. Number of FFY 2012 findings the state verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the local education agency (LEA) of the finding)	28
3. Number of FFY 2012 findings not verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance and/or Not Corrected):

4. Number of FFY 2012 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
5. Number of FFY 2012 findings the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	0
6. Number of FFY 2012 findings not verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Timelines	Activities	Status
PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
2012-2014	1. Provide targeted TA to ISDs and LEAs pertaining to 1) transition timeline guidance and documentation, and 2) assisting in the identification of potentially eligible children to ensure the timelines for Part C, Transition Conference, and Part B, IEP by age three, are met.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.
Improvement Activity 1 Details:		
Personnel from the OGS/ECE&FS provided on-site TA assistance to LEA staff members and ISD planner/monitors which incorporated review of their transition policies and procedures and suggested recommendations for changes to current practices.		
2012-2014	2. Provide professional development on transition timeline guidelines and procedures in various formats including: conference presentations, online training, and webinars.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.
Improvement Activity 2 Details:		
The OGS/ECE&FS and its TA grantee, Clinton County Regional Educational Service Agency (CCRESA), presented 90-minute breakout sessions on transition practices at the following conferences: Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, Michigan Collaborative Early Childhood Conference, Upper Peninsula Special Education Conference, Michigan Council for Exceptional Children Conference and the Michigan Division for Early Childhood Conference. Professional development for all service areas included the provision of an online Transition training session (eotta.ccresa.org). This training was offered free of charge and was available for administrators and personnel in the field. There were 61 participants registered for this training during FFY 2013.		

Timelines	Activities	Status
— The OGS/ECE&FS and the OSE developed and disseminated transition guidance documents to the field to assist in answering commonly asked transition questions. In addition to the face-to-face and online training and TA opportunities, TA was provided for personnel via telephone and email from both the training contractor and the Michigan Department of Education (MDE).		
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2011-2014	3. Target local educational agencies determined to be out of compliance for TA and take appropriate corrective action.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.

Improvement Activity 3 Details:

Personnel from the OSE, Performance Reporting Unit and Monitoring and Technical Assistance Team along with OGS/ECE&FS provided targeted training and TA on transition noncompliance for both Part C and Part B LEA staff members. Part C, *Early On®*, staff were included in the professional development trainings where late notification from Part C to Part B was deemed a primary reason for noncompliance.

On-site TA assistance provided to LEA staff members incorporated review of their transition policies and procedures, and recommendations for changes to current practices. Student level record reviews to verify correction of noncompliance were conducted.

Districts receiving findings of noncompliance for Part C to Part B transition were required to complete a CAP to ensure correction. Districts needed to perform a root cause analysis to determine the reason for noncompliance.

IMPROVE DATA COLLECTION		
2013-2014	4. Develop and implement data quality checks within the MSDS.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.

Improvement Activity 4 Details:

Information will continue to be collected from the field to determine the data quality checks that need to be developed and implemented within MSDS. This is an ongoing commitment that will remain a focus for the coming year.

Michigan Part B FFY 2012 SPP/APR Response Table from the Office of Special Education Programs

Indicator Status			OSEP Analysis and Next Steps
FFY 2011 DATA	FFY 2012 DATA	FFY 2012 TARGET	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
99.4%	98.4%	100%	
The State reported that twenty-eight findings of noncompliance identified in			

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps
FFY 2011 were corrected in a timely manner.	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 the OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2013 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Michigan Response:

For the 28 districts not in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) that the state identified in FFY 2012 as a result of the review, conducted a review and analysis of local reports and data, developed a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submitted progress reports.

The CAPs were closed and verified by the state. Each LEA with noncompliance identified by the state was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100 percent compliance) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring and/or entered into the state data system.

Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY[52] 2013 (2013-2014)

Overview of Indicator 13 (Secondary Transition) Report Development:
1. See Introduction to the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR).
2. Michigan requires each district serving students age 16 and older to participate annually in the statewide secondary transition student record checklist.
3. In FFY 2013, both the list of students in the sample and the data entry process continued to be integrated into the Continuous Improvement Monitoring System (CIMS) Workbook.
4. Findings of noncompliance were reported and corrective action plans (CAPs) were submitted and monitored through the CIMS *Workbook*. For additional information pertaining to timely correction of noncompliance please refer to Appendix C on the Introduction Page.

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision / Secondary Transition

(Compliance Indicator)

Indicator 13: Percent of youth with an individualized education program (IEP) 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of youth with an IEP 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) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

---

[52] Federal Fiscal Year

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Actual**
2009	74.3%	100%	74.3%
2010		100%	99.2%
2011		100%	98.6%
2012		100%	98.0%
2013		100%	**98.70%**

Percent = [(# of youth with an IEP 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) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

*[9,610 ÷ 9,737] X 100

Source: CIMS, Secondary Transition Checklist

Measurable and Rigorous Targets						
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.70%					

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2013:

Michigan did not meet its FFY 2013 target of 100 percent for Indicator 13, however, the compliance rate increased by 0.70 percent. Michigan has maintained a compliance rate between 98 and 99 percent since FFY 2010, with overall response rates also steady at 86 percent in FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and 85 percent in FFY 2013.

Discussion of FFY 2013 Data:

Representativeness of sample

Using the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) approved sampling frame, a sample of 9,737 students with an IEP was obtained from among the population of 38,126 eligible students. This sample was checked for representativeness (age, race/ethnicity, gender and disability) against the population of eligible students from the fall 2013 Special Education Child Count. A proportions test was used to

determine if the sample varied significantly from the population of eligible students on age, race/ethnicity, gender and disability. This test was conducted at the state level and for Michigan's only district with more than 50,000 enrolled students.

There was a significant difference in Michigan's largest school district between the population of eligible students and the final Indicator 13 sample for one racial/ethnic group (Black). Weighted data and unweighted data did not vary significantly.

As displayed in Table 1, there were significant differences between the population of eligible students and the final Indicator 13 sample for certain ages, racial/ethnic groups, gender and disabilities at the state level.

Table 1:

Comparison of Population and Sample (state level)				
	Special Education Child Count Population	Special Education Child Count Percent	Sample Population	Sample Percent
Age				
Age 16*	14,303	37.52%	3,875	39.80%
Age 17*	12,865	33.74%	3,445	35.38%
Age 18	6,145	16.12%	1,563	16.05%
Age 19*	2,171	5.69%	421	4.32%
Age 20*	1,458	3.82%	242	2.49%
Age 21*	1,184	3.11%	191	1.96%
Gender				
Female	13,348	35.01%	3,476	35.70%
Male	24,778	64.99%	6,261	64.30%
Race/Ethnicity				
American Indian or Alaska Native*	371	0.97%	137	1.41%
Asian*	359	0.94%	72	0.74%
African American/Black*	8,414	22.07%	1,512	15.53%
Hispanic/Latino	2,032	5.33%	477	4.90%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	41	0.11%	10	0.10%
White*	26,137	68.55%	7,332	75.30%
Two or More Races	772	2.02%	197	2.02%

Comparison of Population and Sample (state level)				
	Special Education Child Count Population	Special Education Child Count Percent	Sample Population	Sample Percent
Disability Category				
Autism Spectrum Disorder	3,502	9.19%	864	8.87%
Deaf-Blindness	6	0.02%	1	0.01%
Emotional Impairment*	3,443	9.03%	680	6.98%
Hearing Impairment	480	1.26%	124	1.27%
Severe Multiple Impairment*	980	2.57%	173	1.78%
Cognitive Impairment*	6,406	16.80%	1,440	14.79%
Other Health Impairment	4,760	12.48%	1,271	13.05%
Physical Impairment	389	1.02%	97	1.00%
Specific Learning Disability*	17,173	45.04%	4,845	49.76%
Speech & Language Impairment	647	1.70%	148	1.52%
Traumatic Brain Injury	182	0.48%	52	0.53%
Visual Impairment	158	0.41%	42	0.43%

*Difference between Special Education Child Count Population and sample is statistically significant ($p<.05$).

The significant variation in the sample percent compared to the population percent for these demographic categories can be partially explained by the data collection protocol that removes students who are no longer receiving services in their sampled district due to the following exit reasons: graduation, deceased, exiting, moving or no longer eligible for special education services. The demographic categories with the greatest differences are among Black students (under-represented) and White students (over-represented).

Weights were applied to each demographic category that varied significantly from the population to compute a weighted compliance rate. Michigan's unweighted baseline FFY 2013 Indicator 13 compliance rate of 98.70 percent was then compared to weighted results for each of the demographic categories (age, race/ethnicity and disability). Weighted results were not significantly different than unweighted results, therefore unweighted results are reported.

FFY 2013 Indicator 13 Weighted and Unweighted Compliance Rates (state level)			
	N	**# Compliant Records**	**Compliance Rate**
Age (Weighted)	9,737	9,609	98.69%
Race/Ethnicity (Weighted)	9,217	9,084	98.56%
Disability (Weighted)	9,951	9,823	98.71%
[(# Compliant Records ÷ N) X 100 = Compliance Rate]			
Unweighted Data	9,737	9,610	98.70%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Timelines	Activities	Status
	PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	
2011-2014	1. Use graduation, dropout, secondary transition and postsecondary outcomes data to develop and implement technical assistance (TA) and personnel development for district staff to enhance transition IEP compliance and quality.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.
Improvement Activity 1 Details: The Michigan Transition Outcomes Project (MI-TOP) and Reaching and Teaching Struggling Learners (RTSL) worked in collaboration with the National High School Center to support an online webinar in the five regions of Michigan to increase knowledge and skills to implement the use of the Early Warning Signs (EWS) tool. Research shows that use of EWS increases graduation and decreases dropout rates. Participants spent time in teams creating a plan to implement EWS during the 2014-2015 school year. Also as a follow up, during the spring institute, Intermediate School District (ISD) Transition Coordinators were able to embed the EWS work into their Michigan Electronic Grant System (MEGS+) grant annual goals. ISD Transition Coordinators were supported with data support tools to explore whether they had valid and reliable graduation and dropout data. They were also provided with data entry processes and resources using the Center for Educational Performance and Information, and MI School Data websites. Additionally, MI-TOP provided targeted district training based on identified supports needed in their Transition Coordination grant.		
2011-2014	2. Provide professional development to ISD Transition Coordinators to enhance transition IEP compliance and quality.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.
Improvement Activity 2 Details: As a requirement of the Transition Coordination grant the ISD Transition Coordinators are required to attend the MI-TOP supported professional development opportunities. The MI-TOP hosted two Transition Leadership Institutes, with support from RTSL, Michigan Rehabilitation Services, Bureau of		

Timelines	Activities	Status
	Services for Blind Persons and Michigan Transition Services Association, where the focus was on the components of transition planning and how they could engage students in the process to increase positive post-school outcomes.	
2011-2014	3. Provide policy and data guidance to support a long-term, outcomes-based approach to student-centered planning.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.
Improvement Activity 3 Details:		

Improvement Activity 3 Details:

The MI-TOP hosted two Transition Leadership Institutes, in April and May, to guide ISD Transition Coordinators and their education and agency stakeholders through a process to use their data to analyze the current state of transition in their local communities as determined by evidence based practices shown to decrease dropout, increase graduation, and increase successful post-school outcomes for students with an IEP. Teams prioritized their needs and created an annual strategic plan. This cross-partner plan informed and supported the MEGS+ transition coordination grant annual goal. MI-TOP provides professional development and TA to support the implementation of these plans.

The MI-TOP provided professional learning opportunities face-to-face and online to increase the knowledge and skills of stakeholders to implement student centered planning practices. The focus was on student engagement in the IEP process and transition planning with culturally and linguistically diverse youth and their families. In addition, the MI-TOP hosted nine family community conversations across the state to hear and assist local stakeholders in supporting family identified needs.

The MI-TOP has created and piloted the BackStory web portal and student engagement app for school staff to observe and track student engagement factors (e.g., self-determination, post-school goals, EWS) and to use real time data when creating the transition section of the IEP. These tools are currently being implemented in pilot locations with a plan to be provided statewide at no cost to schools or their staff.

Timely Correction of FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the state made during FFY 2012 (the period from July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013)	32
2. Number of FFY 2012 findings the state verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the local educational entity (LEA) of the finding)	32
3. Number of FFY 2012 findings not verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2) above]	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance and/or Not Corrected):

4. Number of FFY 2012 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
5. Number of FFY 2012 findings the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	0
6. Number of FFY 2012 findings not verified as corrected [(4) minus (5) above]	0

Michigan Part B FFY 2012 SPP/APR Response Table from the Office of Special Education Programs

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps
<table><tr><th>FFY 2011 DATA</th><th>FFY 2012 DATA</th><th>FFY 2013 TARGET</th></tr><tr><td>98.6%</td><td>98.0%</td><td>100%</td></tr></table> **CORRECTION OF FINDINGS OF NONCOMPLIANCE IDENTIFIED IN FFY 2011** The State reported that all 32 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 were corrected in a timely manner.	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 Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps
Michigan Response: Thirty-two districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2012 have corrected findings of noncompliance within one year of notification. The OSE verified that these 32 districts with noncompliance: (1) had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, dated October 17, 2008; and (2) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100 percent compliance) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring and/or entered into the state data system.	

Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY[53] 2013 (2013-2014)

Overview of Indicator 14 (Postsecondary Outcomes) Report Development:
1. See Introduction to the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR).
2. The State Performance Plan (SPP) targets for Indicator 14 were reset with stakeholder input for FFY 2013 reporting.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision/Postsecondary Outcomes
(Results Indicator)

Indicator 14: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had individualized education programs (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. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B)).

Measurement
- A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- C. Percent 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 = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment.) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets
A. Percent enrolled in higher education

FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2009	32.6%		32.6%
2010		>34.3%	31.7%
2011		>34.3%	33.3%
2012		>34.3%	38.3%
2013		>32.80%	**33.58%***

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

*[270 ÷ 804] X 100

Source: National Post-School Outcomes Center Survey

Measurable and Rigorous Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >	32.80%	33.00%	33.20%	33.40%	33.60%	33.90%
Data	**33.58%**					

Measurable and Rigorous Targets
B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed

FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2009	55.5%		55.5%
2010		>58.4%	53.0%
2011		>58.4%	61.0%
2012		>58.4%	62.2%
2013		>59.00%	**63.18%***

B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

*[(270 + 238) ÷ 804] X 100

Source: National Post-School Outcomes Center Survey

Measurable and Rigorous Targets					
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**
Target ≥	59.00%	59.50%	60.00%	60.50%	61.00%	61.50%
Data	**63.18%**					

Measurable and Rigorous Targets
C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment

FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2009	68.0%		68.0%
2010		≥71.4%	67.1%
2011		≥71.4%	72.2%
2012		≥71.4%	73.5%
2013		≥71.50%	**77.11%***

C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

*[(270 + 56 + 238 + 56) ÷ 804] X 100

Source: National Post-School Outcomes Center Survey

Measurable and Rigorous Targets					
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**
Target ≥	71.50%	72.00%	72.50%	73.00%	73.50%	74.00%
Data	**77.11%**					

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2013:

Michigan met all three of its FFY 2013 targets for Indicator 14. Several factors contributed to Michigan's performance on Indicator 14:

- Michigan has experienced high unemployment rates in the past several years but has recently seen marked improvement in the economy resulting in increased employment, including workers with disabilities.
- Michigan's economy has improved and enrollments in postsecondary education institutes have declined overall, especially at community colleges. Fall enrollment in Michigan's 28 community colleges has fallen from 260,179 in 2010 to 212,867 this year, an 18 percent decline.

- Over the past several years, the Michigan Transition Outcomes Project (MI-TOP) improvement efforts have emphasized employment for students with an IEP, provided professional development on evidence-based practices for employment and emphasized the importance of paid work experience prior to exiting secondary school.
- The MI-TOP aligns its efforts around Indicators 1 (Graduation), 2 (Dropout), 8 (Facilitated Parent Involvement), 13 (Secondary Transition) and 14 (Postsecondary Outcomes) and collaborative efforts with the Michigan Rehabilitation Services, Bureau of Services for Blind Persons, and other agencies all focused on improving student outcomes.
- Improvement in outcome category B and C may be due to increased employment opportunities and supports, and changes in admission policies for non-diploma students.

Discussion of FFY 2013 Data:

Displayed in Table 1 are the numbers of respondents within the four outcome categories for FFY 2012 and FFY 2013. There were increases in the percent of former students that were competitively employed, in some type of education or training program, or in some other employment. There was a decrease in the percent of former students who were enrolled in higher education.

Table 1: Number of Respondents by Data Outcome Category

	Outcome Category	FFY 2012		FFY 2013	
		Number	Number	Number	Percent
1	Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	305	38.3%	270	33.58%
2	Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	191	24.0%	238	29.60%
3	Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school	51	6.4%	56	6.97%
4	In some other employment within one year of leaving high school	39	4.9%	56	6.97%
	Categories 1 through 4 - TOTAL	**586**	73.5%	**620**	77.11%
	Leavers not captured by categories 1 through 4	211	26.5%	184	22.89%
	TOTAL	797	100.0%	804	100.0%

Source: Modified National Post-School Outcomes Center Survey

Creation of Weights Based on Sample and Population Distribution:

The National Post-School Outcomes Center's *Postsecondary Outcomes Survey* (See Appendix E) was used to collect information from former students who had exited school (e.g., graduated, dropped out, obtained a GED, other completers) in the previous academic year.

Using the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) approved sampling plan, a total of 3,979 surveys were mailed to Cohort 1: 540 surveys were undeliverable and 804 responses were received (23.4 percent response rate). A proportions test was used to identify representativeness of the respondent group, compared to the cohort population, on race/ethnicity, exit status and disability.

Weights were calculated by dividing the proportion of each of the subgroups in the Indicator 14 population by the corresponding proportion in the sample. For example, in the Indicator 14 population the proportion of former students identified as White was .69. In the survey sample, the proportion of White former students was .738. Dividing .69 by .738 yields 0.935. Therefore, the weight assigned to White former students was 0.935. The proportion of African American/Black former students in the population was .219 but in the survey sample it was .174, making the weight 1.259. This computation was repeated for the remaining racial and ethnic groups as well as for exit status and disability.

Presented in Table 2 are the results of the analyses, indicating that White former students were overrepresented in the respondent group, and African American/Black students were underrepresented. In terms of exit status, former students who graduated from high school with a diploma were overrepresented in the respondent group, while those former students who dropped out of high school were underrepresented. Former students with autism spectrum disorder were overrepresented while former students with cognitive impairment were underrepresented.

Table 2:

Comparison of Cohort Population and Respondent Group				
Demographic Characteristics	**Cohort Population**		**Respondent Group**	
	Number	**Percent**	**Number**	**Percent**
Race/Ethnicity				
White *	2,744	69.0%	593	73.8%
African-American/Black*	873	21.9%	140	17.4%
Hispanic/Latino	214	5.4%	34	4.2%
Asian	29	0.7%	8	1.0%
American Indian or Alaska Native	52	1.3%	10	1.2%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific-Islander	4	0.1%	2	0.2%

Comparison of Cohort Population and Respondent Group				
Demographic Characteristics	**Cohort Population**		**Respondent Group**	
	Number	**Percent**	**Number**	**Percent**
Two or More Races	63	1.6%	17	2.1%
Exit status				
Dropped out*	548	13.8%	62	7.7%
Graduated*	3,122	78.5%	675	84.0%
Other completers	308	7.7%	67	8.3%
Disability category				
Autism Spectrum Disorder*	203	5.1%	77	9.6%
Cognitive Impairment*	371	9.3%	47	5.8%
Emotional Impairment	382	9.6%	64	8.0%
Hearing Impairment	77	1.9%	21	2.6%
Other Health Impairment	501	12.6%	110	13.7%
Physical Impairment	42	1.1%	15	1.9%
Severe Multiple Impairment	7	0.2%	2	0.2%
Specific Learning Disability	2,295	57.7%	445	55.3%
Speech & Language Impairment	59	1.5%	12	1.5%
Traumatic Brain Injury	26	0.7%	10	1.2%
Visual Impairment	15	0.4%	1	0.1%

Source: Modified National Post-School Outcomes Center Survey
*Difference between cohort population and respondent group is statistically significant ($p<.05$).

The original results and weighted results are presented in Table 3 below. Differences between the respondent group and weighted respondent group for the race/ethnicity, exit status, and disability categories were found not to be statistically significant. This suggests that even though the respondent group is not representative in terms of students' race/ethnicity, exit status, and disability, the results are not affected in a statistically significant manner. Therefore, the state is reporting unweighted exit status data for FFY 2013.

Table 3:

Indicator 14 Results Before and After Weighting								
Measurement Category	Unweighted		Weighted by ethnicity		Weighted by exit status		Weighted by disability	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
	(N=804)		(N=805)		(N=804)		(N=808)	
A	270	33.6%	267	33.1%	253	31.5%	256	31.7%
B	508	63.2%	504	62.7%	495	61.6%	500	61.8%
C	620	77.1%	616	76.6%	607	75.4%	616	76.3%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Timelines	Activities	Status
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2011-2014	1. Provide policy and data guidance to support a long-term, outcomes-based approach to student-centered planning.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.

Student centered planning:
The MI-TOP hosted the Transition Leadership Institute in April and May to guide intermediate school district (ISD) Transition Coordinators and their education and agency stakeholders through a process to use their data to analyze the current state of transition in their local communities as determined by evidence based practices shown to decrease dropout, increase graduation and increase successful post-school outcomes for students with disabilities. Teams prioritized their needs and created an annual strategic plan. This cross-partner plan informed and supported the Michigan Electronic Grant System (MEGS+) transition coordination grant annual goal. The MI-TOP provides professional development and technical assistance to support the implementation of these plans.

The MI-TOP provided professional learning opportunities face-to-face and online to increase the knowledge and skills of stakeholders to implement student centered planning practices. The focus was on student engagement in the IEP process and transition planning with culturally and linguistically diverse youth and their families. In addition, the MI-TOP hosted nine family community conversations across the state to hear and assist local stakeholders to support family identified needs.

Student level data collection:
The MI-TOP has created and piloted the BackStory web portal and student engagement application for school staff to observe and track student engagement factors (e.g., self-determination, post-school goals, early warning signs (EWS)) and to use real time data when creating the transition section of the IEP. These

Timelines	Activities	Status
tools are currently being implemented in pilot locations with a plan to be provided statewide at no cost to schools or their staff. **Dropout prevention and student engagement:** The MI-TOP and the Reaching Teaching Struggling Learners project collaborated to support an online webinar in the five regions of Michigan to increase knowledge and skills to implement the use of the EWS tool. Participants spent time in teams creating a plan to implement the EWS tool during the 2014-2015 school year. As a follow up, during the spring institute, ISD Transition Coordinators were able to embed the EWS work into their MEGS+ grant annual goals. ISD Transition Coordinators were supported with data support tools to explore whether they had valid and reliable graduation and dropout data. They were also provided with data entry processes and resources using the Center for Educational Performance and Information and the MI School Data websites.	
2013-2014	Review existing data collection methodologies and explore alternate strategies to increase survey response rates.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.
In the spring of 2014, the Office of Special Education and the MI-TOP SPP Indicator 14 team hosted staff from the National Post-School Outcomes Center (NPSO) to conduct strategic planning to improve survey response rates. The NPSO staff led the team through a logic model process, identifying current inputs and outputs, and identifying goals, activities, and next steps. From this planning process, the team determined one of the barriers to survey response was the lack of survey recognition. Surveys arrive at the student's last known address in an unrecognizable envelope. To improve the chance of the survey being opened, the MI-TOP has solicited the Center for Educational Networking to assist the team in creating a branding strategy where students will receive information on the survey prior to exiting school with the same "brand" as they receive the survey one year after exit. A second major barrier was the lack of current and accurate contact information. Districts are not required to update contact information after a student's data has been entered into their data management system. Therefore, if a student's data is entered into the district's data system in kindergarten, the student stays until exiting and if the district has not updated any change in contact information, the information remains the same as from the kindergarten year. The MI-TOP is working with ISD Transition Coordinators to update student contact information, preferably at the senior IEP, and submit it via preaddressed postcard. Of the 57 ISD Transition Coordinators, 30 volunteered to work with our contractor to get current student contact information.	

Michigan Part B FFY 2012 SPP/APR Response Table from the Office of Special Education Programs

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps
The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a response group that was not representative of the population. OSEP notes that the State included strategies or improvement activities to address this issue in the future.	In the FFY 2013 APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2013 data are from a group representative of the population, and if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.

14. Percent of Youth No Longer in School, within One Year of Leaving High School:	FFY 2011 Data	FFY 2012 Data	FFY 2012 Target	
A. % Enrolled in higher education	33.3%	38.3%	≥34.3%	
B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	61.0%	62.2%	≥58.4%	
C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed	72.2%	73.5%	≥71.4%	

Michigan Response:

Even though the survey respondents were not representative of the cohort population, the differences between the respondent group and weighted respondent group for the race/ethnicity, exit status, and disability categories were found not to be statistically significant. This suggests that even though the respondent group is not representative in terms of students' race/ethnicity, exit status, and disability, the results are not affected in a statistically significant manner. Therefore, the state is reporting unweighted exit status data for FFY 2013.

Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY[54] 2013 (2013-2014)

Overview of Indicator 15 (Resolution Session Agreements) Report Development:

1. See Introduction to the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR).
2. During FFY 2013, there were 56 due process complaints filed. This is a decrease from the 86 due process complaints filed in 2012.
3. Of the 56 complaints filed, 28 required a resolution session. Of the 28 resolution sessions conducted, 16 (57 percent) resulted in a resolution session settlement agreement.
4. In addition to the complaints resolved through a resolution session settlement agreement, 32 complaints were resolved through mediation or other informal resolution processes.
5. The improvement activities continue to focus on increasing parent and district understanding of the requirements and use of resolution sessions to resolve due process complaints.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision/Resolution Session Agreements   (Results Indicator)

Indicator 15: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B))

Measurement: Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Actual**
2005	36.4%		
2006		>36.0%	45.3%
2007		>37.0%	64.3%
2008		>38.0%	46.6%
2009		>40.0%	46.3%
2010		>42.0%	64.7%
2011		>42.0%	60.3%
2012		>42.0%	54.0%
2013		>42.0%	**57.14%***
Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.[55] *(16 ÷ 28) X 100			

 Source: myCaseLoad

---

[54] Federal fiscal year
[55] See the Analysis of Hearing Request Data for FFY 2012 – FFY 2013 table on the next page.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets						
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**
Target ≥	42.00%	44.00%	46.00%	48.00%	50.00%	52.00%
Data	**57.14%**					

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2013:

Michigan met its FFY 2013 target of greater than or equal to 42 percent for Indicator 15. During FFY 2013, 28 resolution sessions were required and conducted, of which 16 (57.14 percent) resulted in a resolution session settlement agreement.

Fifty-six due process complaints were filed in FFY 2013. Twenty-eight complaints did not require a resolution session because:
- The parties waived the resolution session
- The parties attempted to resolve the complaint through mediation
- The district was the complainant
- The complaint was withdrawn by the complainant
- The complaint was dismissed by the administrative law judge before the resolution period elapsed.

During FFY 2013 the percentage of resolution sessions conducted declined, however, the percentage of settlement agreements resulting from resolution sessions increased. There was an increase in the percentage of due process complaints that did not require a resolution session, and an increase in the percentage of complaints resolved through mediation or were withdrawn based on other means of resolution between parents and districts.

Analysis of Hearing Request Data for FFY 2013

	FFY 2012	**FFY 2013**
(3) Total Hearing requests[56]	86	56
(3.1) Resolution sessions (Percent of total hearing requests)	50 (58.1%)	28 (50.00%)
(a) Number of resolution session settlement agreements (Percent of resolution sessions)	27 (54.0%)	16 (57.14%)

Source: myCaseLoad

---

[56] Parents now file a "due process complaint" per *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* language, which is synonymous with Hearing Requests as referenced in this indicator.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed

Timelines	Activities	Status
PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
2011-2014	1. Provide ongoing training of all stakeholders regarding new rules and procedures relative to resolution session requirements.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.
Improvement Activity 1 Details: Technical assistance (TA) was provided throughout the year by the Office of Special Education (OSE) regarding pending rule changes and changes to the resolution session procedures. TA was provided through trainings at the local school districts, intermediate school districts, parent advisory committees, OSE director's updates at the Michigan Department of Education Fall Forum, Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education (MAASE) general meetings, MAASE Summer Institute, memos to the field and dissemination of the revised resolution session summary form and the accompanying instructions for completion.		
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2011-2014	2. Review biannually and change, as needed, due process complaint rules and procedures.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.
Improvement Activity 2 Details: The OSE proposed changes to administrative rules relative to districts' responsibilities and requirements for conducting resolution sessions and submitting information/data. The proposed administrative rules provide the OSE authority for compliance determinations that current OSE procedures do not include. The proposed rules were submitted to the appropriate state rule making agencies in December 2013 and public comment was received in March 2014. Due to concerns raised by the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules, the rule promulgation process has been stopped.		

Michigan Part B FFY 2012 SPP/APR Response Table from the Office of Special Education Programs

Indicator Status			OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
FFY 2011 Data	**FFY 2012 Data**	**FFY 2012 Target**	The OSEP listed no required actions in the FFY 2012 Response Table for Indicator 15.	None required at this time.
60.3%	54.0%	≥ 42.0%		

Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY[57] 2013 (2013-2014)

Overview of Indicator 16 (Mediation Agreements) Report Development:
1. See Introduction to the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR).
2. During FFY 2012, the Office of Special Education (OSE), the Michigan Special Education Mediation Program (MSEMP) and the Special Education Advisory Committee analyzed multiple years of mediation data along with target values reported by other states and decided to change the Michigan target from a single value of 80 percent to a range of 75-85 percent.
3. The improvement activities continue to focus on increasing the use of mediation throughout the state in order to help parents and educators resolve conflicts relative to special education programs/services collaboratively.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision/ Mediation Agreements
(Results Indicator)

Indicator 16: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Actual**
2004	72.7%		
2005		≥74.0%	87.7%
2006		≥75.0%	80.4%
2007		≥76.0%	80.4%
2008		≥77.0%	78.8%
2009		≥78.5%	84.5%
2010		≥80.0%	77.4%
2011		≥80.0%	79.0%
2012		≥80.0%	78.0%
2013		≥75-85%	**81.25%***
Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100. *[(8 + 31) ÷ 48] X 100			

Source: Michigan Mediation Database

---

[57] Federal Fiscal Year

Measurable and Rigorous Targets						
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	75-85%	75-85%	75-85%	75-85%	75-85%	75-85%
Data	**81.25%**					

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2013:

Michigan met its FFY 2013 target agreement rate range of 75-85 percent for Indicator 16 with an actual agreement rate of 81.25 percent. Mediation requests for FFY 2013 totaled 90. The number of mediations conducted was 48 of which 39 cases reached agreement (reference Table 1). The number of mediations requested and held dropped sharply from FFY 2012. The decrease may have been due to a reduction in staff available for outreach activities and a sustained interest in facilitated individualized education program (IEP) team meetings among school districts and parents. In order to provide a continuum of alternative dispute resolution services in FFY 2013, Michigan facilitated 93 IEP team meetings and two due process resolution sessions.

Table 1: Analysis of Mediation Data for FFY 2012 – FFY 2013

	FFY 2012	FFY 2013
(2.1) Mediations held	82	48
(a)(i) Mediations agreements related to due process complaints that resulted in complete agreement (Percent of mediations held)	8 (9.8%)	8 (16.7%)
(b)(i) Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints that resulted in complete agreement (Percent of mediations held)	56 (68.3%)	31 (64.5%)
Total Mediation Agreements (2.1)(a)(i) + (2.1)(b)(i) (Percent of mediations held)	64 (78.0%)	39 (81.2%)

Source: Michigan Mediation Database

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Timelines	Activities	Status
Program Development		
2011-2014	1. Increase the mediation agreement rate by reconfiguring training based on the redesign of the training curriculum that uses the following steps: • Analyze issue trends in disputes • Determine what parts of IDEA/ *Michigan Administrative Rules for Special Education* are necessary to trainees • Conduct focus groups with mediators to identify mediation challenges, obstacles to agreement and techniques for overcoming both • Survey best training practices in Michigan and from other states • Compile and analyze internal and external evaluation data and trends.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.
Improvement Activity 1 Details: In FFY 2013, Michigan's agreement rate rose to 81.25 percent, a 3.25 percent increase from the previous year. The OSE and the MSEMP discussed options for revising mediator training and conducted a survey of and focus group with the MSEMP mediators for their suggestions to improve the training process. Four focus areas were identified: quality control, information, neutrality and respecting the parent's voice. Potential training modules have been identified along with research journals and articles for incorporating evidence-based practices. Additional planning activities have been proposed for FFY 2014 under a renewed grant agreement between the OSE and the MSEMP.		
Provide Technical Assistance		
2013-2014	2. Provide materials to potential participants (e.g., the MSEMP and Dispute Resolution Centers' website) to increase skill development and retention regarding the mediation and IEP facilitation processes utilizing multiple formats, e.g. webinars, short videos, print materials and new research on collaborative communication and dispute resolution. An evaluation plan will be developed and implemented to determine the impact of these additional learning supports.	Reference Improvement Activity details below.

Timelines	Activities	Status
Improvement Activity 2 Details:		
During FFY 2013, the MSEMP disseminated information and training to parents and educators throughout the state. The program reached parents through the Michigan Alliance for Families, Family Voices and the MSEMP's activities. The MSEMP reached educators through major conferences such as the new intermediate school district monitor training, Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education Summer Institute, the Michigan Transition Services Association annual meeting and school district engagements. Dissemination included live presentations, webinars, a video explaining the MSEMP workshops, conference exhibit tables, print materials and the MSEMP website. Evaluation instruments were developed to measure participant learning during workshop sessions.		

Michigan Part B FFY 2012 SPP/APR Response Table from the Office of Special Education Programs

Indicator Status			OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
FFY 2011 Data	**FFY 2012 Data**	**FFY 2012 Target**	The OSEP listed no required actions in the FFY 2012 Response Table for Indicator 16.	None required at this time.
79.0%	78.0%	>80.0%		

Acronyms Used in the APR

AA-MAS	Alternate Assessments based on Modified Achievement Standards
ALJ	Administrative Law Judge
AMO	Annual Measurable Objectives
APR	Annual Performance Report
ARR	Alternate Risk Ratio
ASD	Autism Spectrum Disorders
AYP	Adequate Yearly Progress
BAA	Bureau of Assessment and Accountability
BOQ	Benchmarks of Quality
CADRE	Consortium for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education
CAP	Corrective Action Plan
CBM	Curriculum Based Measures
CCRESA	Clinton County Regional Education Service Area
CEN	Center for Educational Networking
CEPI	Center for Educational Performance and Information
CIMS	Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System
CIV	Continuous Improvement Verification
CSPR	Consolidated State Performance Report
CUS	Center for Urban Studies
DAC	Data Accountability Center
DAS	Division of Accountability Services
DIBELS	Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills
ECE&FS	Early Childhood Education & Family Services
ECO	Early Childhood Outcomes
EC-CoP	Early Childhood Community of Practice
EAA	Education Achievement Authority
EIMAC	Education Information Management Advisory Consortium
ELA	English Language Arts
ELL	English Language Learners
EPI	Educator Preparation Institution
ESEA	*Elementary and Secondary Education Act*
EWS	Early Warning Signs
FAPE	Free Appropriate Public Education
FFY	Federal Fiscal Year
GEMS	Grant Electronic Monitoring System
GSRP	Great Start Readiness Program
IDEA	*Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*
IEP	Individualized Education Program
IES	Institute for Education Sciences
ISD	Intermediate School District
K	Kindergarten
LEA	Local Educational Agency
LRE	Least Restrictive Environment
MAASE	Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education
MAF	Michigan Alliance for Families
MAR	Monitoring Activities Report

MARSE	Michigan Administrative Rules for Special Education
MDE	Michigan Department of Education
MEAP	Michigan Educational Assessment Program
MEGS+	Michigan Electronic Grant System
MI²	Michigan's Integrated Mathematics Initiative
MiBLSi	Michigan's Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative
MICC	Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council
MI-CIS	Michigan Compliance Information System
MI-TOP	Michigan Transition Outcomes Project
MITS	Michigan's Integrated Technology Supports
MMC	Michigan Merit Curriculum
MME	Michigan Merit Examination
MSDS	Michigan Student Data System
M-STEP	Michigan Student Test of Educational Progress
MSEMP	Michigan Special Education Mediation Program
MTAT	Monitoring and Technical Assistance Team
MTSS	Multi-tiered System of Support
NAEP	National Assessment of Educational Progress
NASDSE	National Association of State Directors of Special Education
NCES	National Center for Education Statistics
NCRRC	North Central Regional Resource Center
NCSEAM	National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring
NECTAC	National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center
NICHCY	National Dissemination Center for Children with Disabilities
NPSO	National Post-School Outcomes Center
NRP	National Reading Panel
NSTTAC	National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center
ODR	Office Discipline Referrals
OEII	Office of Education Improvement and Innovation
OFS	Office of Field Services
OGS	Office of Great Start
OSE	Office of Special Education
OSEP	Office of Special Education Programs
PA	Program Accountability
PACs	Parent Advisory Committees
PBIS	Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports
PD	Professional Development
PR	Performance Reporting
PSA	Public School Academy
PSC	Public Sector Consultants
PTI	Parent Training and Information Center
RAP	Review and Analysis Process
RCPS	Rapid-Cycle Problem Solving
REL	Regional Educational Laboratory
RR	Risk Ratio
RRCP	Regional Resource Center Program
RTSL	Reaching and Teaching Struggling Learners
SBE	State Board of Education

SEAC	Special Education Advisory Committee
S-iMR	State-identified Measurable Result
SISEP	State Implementation & Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices
SPP	State Performance Plan
SSIP	State Systemic Improvement Plan
START	Statewide Autism Resources and Training
TA	Technical Assistance
USED	United States Department of Education
WIDA	World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment
WRR	Weighted Risk Ratio
WSU	Wayne State University

FFY 2013 Annual Performance Report

Appendix A:

Students with an Individualized Education Program

Fall 2013 Special Education Child Count

Ages Birth to 26

Number of Michigan Students with an IEP Primary Disability Categories (2013-2014 School Year)		
Disability Categories	**Number**	**%**
Autism Spectrum Disorder	17,412	8.36
Cognitive Impairment	20,338	9.76
Deaf-Blindness	23	.01
Early Childhood Developmental Delay	7,004	3.36
Emotional Impairment	12,088	5.80
Hearing Impairment	2,806	1.35
Other Health Impairment	23,457	11.26
Physical Impairment	2,338	1.12
Severe Multiple Impairment	3,777	1.81
Specific Learning Disability	65,780	31.57
Speech & Language Impairment	51,905	24.91
Traumatic Brain Injury	570	.27
Visual Impairment	835	.40
Total	**208,333**	**100**

Number of Michigan Students with an IEP Race/Ethnicity by Gender (2013-2014 School Year)					
Race/Ethnicity	**Female**	**%***	**Male**	**%***	**Total**
American Indian or Alaska Native	684	34.70	1,287	65.30	**1,971**
Asian	971	34.59	1,836	65.41	**2,807**
African American or Black	14,175	33.23	28,486	66.77	**42,661**
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	66	37.71	109	62.29	**175**
White	47,500	33.61	93,819	66.39	**141,319**
Hispanic or Latino	4,766	35.03	8,839	64.97	**13,605**
Two or More Races	2,017	34.81	3,778	65.19	**5,795**
Total	**70,179**	33.69	**138,154**	66.31	**208,333**

*Percent is within the Race/Ethnicity category.

Number of Michigan Students with an IEP Age Group by Gender (2013-2014 School Year)					
Age Group	Female	%*	Male	%*	Total
Birth-2	1,554	35.13	2,870	64.87	4,424
3-5	6,356	30.99	14,155	69.01	20,511
6-21	60,879	33.83	119,061	66.17	179,940
22-26	1,390	40.20	2,068	59.80	3,458
Total	70,179	33.69	138,154	66.31	208,333

*Percent is within the Age Group category.

Number of Michigan Students with an IEP Primary Disability by Age Group (2013-2014 School Year)									
Disability Category[1]	Age Group								
	Birth-2	%*	3-5	%*	6-21	%*	22-26	%*	Total
ASD	61	0.35	1,343	7.71	15,370	88.27	638	3.66	17,412
CI	11	0.05	359	1.77	18,041	88.71	1,927	9.47	20,338
D-B	1	4.35	1	4.35	17	73.91	4	17.39	23
ECDD	1,454	20.76	3,805	54.33	1,745	24.91	0	0.00	7,004
EI	0	0.00	34	0.28	11,999	99.26	55	0.45	12,088
HI	146	5.20	280	9.98	2,366	84.32	14	0.50	2,806
OHI	817	3.48	916	3.91	21,639	92.25	85	0.36	23,457
PI	263	11.25	319	13.64	1,702	72.80	54	2.31	2,338
SMI	88	2.33	403	10.67	2,701	71.51	585	15.49	3,777
SLD	2	0.00	22	0.03	65,697	99.87	59	0.09	65,780
SLI	1,535	2.96	12,914	24.88	37,454	72.16	2	0.00	51,905
TBI	11	1.93	24	4.21	503	88.25	32	5.61	570
VI	35	4.19	91	10.90	706	84.55	3	0.36	835
Total	4,424	2.12	20,511	9.85	179,940	86.37	3,458	1.66	208,333

*Percent is within the Disability Category.
[1] ASD = Autism Spectrum Disorder   CI = Cognitive Impairment
 D-B = Deaf-Blindness   ECDD = Early Childhood Developmental Delay
 EI = Emotional Impairment   HI = Hearing Impairment
 OHI = Other Health Impairment   PI = Physical Impairment
 SMI = Severe Multiple Impairment   SLD = Specific Learning Disability
 SLD = Speech & Language Impairment   TBI = Traumatic Brain Injury
 VI = Visual Impairment

Number of Michigan Students with an IEP Grade/Setting (2013-2014 School Year)		
Grade/Setting	**Number**	**%**
Kindergarten	10,460	5.02
First Grade	12,327	5.92
Second Grade	12,709	6.10
Third Grade	14,014	6.73
Fourth Grade	15,309	7.35
Fifth Grade	15,273	7.33
Sixth Grade	15,221	7.31
Seventh Grade	15,542	7.46
Eighth Grade	15,368	7.38
Ninth Grade	16,066	7.71
Tenth Grade	15,651	7.51
Eleventh Grade	13,631	6.54
Twelfth Grade	13,070	6.27
Secondary Transition	7,077	3.40
Early Childhood	16,615	7.98
Total	**208,333**	**100**

FFY 2013 Annual Performance Report

Appendix B:

Michigan's IDEA Grant Funded Initiatives

Center for Educational Networking

The Center for Educational Networking (CEN) provides communication support services for the Michigan Department of Education, Office of Special Education (OSE) and the OSE's IDEA Grant Funded Initiatives to help them communicate more effectively with audiences that support students with disabilities.

CEN supports communication efforts by providing infrastructure supports and services in the following areas:

Document and Information Services

- Consultation
- Writing
- Editing
- Proofreading
- Document Development
- Communication Planning
- Message Development
- Graphic Design
- Online Surveys

Web and Technology Services

- Consultation
- Website Development
- Website Maintenance
- Setup and Maintenance of Listservs

Event Management Services

- Event Coordination and Support
- Online Registration
- Webinars and Virtual Meetings

For more information about the Center for Educational Networking, go to http://www.cenmi.org.

The Michigan Transition Outcomes Project

The Michigan Transition Outcomes Project (MI-TOP) facilitates the development of effective systems that support students to achieve positive postsecondary outcomes. These systems contain measurable student-focused planning, student development activities, and continuous family and community involvement. The project supports the implementation of effective transition practices to ensure all students are prepared for postsecondary education, employment, and independent living.

For more information about the Michigan Transition Outcomes Project, go to http://mi-top.cenmi.org.

Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System

The Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System (CIMS) was designed to help intermediate and local districts analyze and interpret data to track monitoring activities within a single software application. The CIMS promotes positive learning outcomes for diverse learners and ensures compliance with the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA) and the *Michigan Administrative Rules for Special Education*. The CIMS reflects the priorities of the IDEA and the State Performance Plan and is aligned with the School Improvement Framework. The Office of Special Education, along with intermediate and local school districts, use the CIMS reports to:

- Analyze overall performance around individualized education programs (IEPs)
- Analyze compliance
- Review high rates of suspensions and expulsions and overall graduation rates among students with an IEP
- Improve district-level educational services and performance of students with an IEP.

For more information about the Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System, go to http://cims.cenmi.org.

Michigan Special Education Mediation Program

The Michigan Special Education Mediation Program (MSEMP) provides services through the Community Dispute Resolution Program, a network of 18 conflict resolution centers across the state. MSEMP provides mediation, facilitation, and training services for working through disputes between school districts and parents or guardians of children with special needs, so that children with disabilities promptly receive the services they need to develop and succeed in school. The mediation process is intended to resolve disputes by sharing ideas on what the student needs, versus placing blame. The process helps participants find solutions for the good of the student in a non-legal way, thereby avoiding a lengthy and expensive court process. The use of mediation is voluntary and has to be agreed to by both the parent and the school district. Parents initiate nearly 60 percent of all MSEMP mediations. MSEMP is administered by Dispute Resolution Education Resources, Inc., a Lansing-based nonprofit organization.

For more information about the Michigan Special Education Mediation Program, go to http://msemp.cenmi.org/.

Michigan's Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative

Michigan's Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative (MiBLSi) is designed to support school districts (intermediate and local districts) in developing local implementation capacity of an integrated reading and behavior multi-tiered system of supports. Through this work, students become better readers with the social

skills necessary to succeed. Schools that have been using the MiBLSi process are finding that reading scores increase as disruptive behaviors decrease. This integrative academic and behavior model results in educators recovering instructional time previously lost to addressing discipline issues and also quality instruction results in less problem behavior. MiBLSi also helps schools use student data to intervene early with students who are struggling in reading and/or with behavior issues. District teams are supported through training, coaching, technical assistance, and the development/dissemination of implementation materials. MiBLSi is in the process of creating a sustainable and scalable statewide program.

For more information about Michigan's Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative, go to http://miblsi.cenmi.org/.

Michigan's Integrated Technology Supports

Michigan's Integrated Technology Supports (MITS) is a statewide project providing resources and training to improve physical and cognitive accessibility of the educational environment for all students. MITS advocates a proactive, thoughtful consideration process to determine student needs. Additionally, MITS promotes flexible instructional methodologies and materials that seek to address learner variability from the outset of the instructional planning process. MITS has an extensive lending library of assistive technologies available for trial use to Michigan's public schools. MITS is closely aligned with Michigan's Integrated Math Initiative [(Mi)^2] which supports many of the same project goals regarding accessible education. MITS and (Mi)^2 will be merged in October 2014 as Accessible Learning Environments.

For more information about Michigan's Integrated Technology Supports, go to http://mits.cenmi.org/.

Michigan's Integrated Mathematics Initiative

Michigan's Integrated Mathematics Initiative (Mi)^2 assists the state in creating a cohesive and collaborative system of support and professional development among existing mathematics resources with an emphasis on increasing the accessibility of math for students who struggle. During the 2013-2014 school year, (Mi)^2 trained teams consisting of math content experts and special education leaders throughout the state in the "Enhancing Mathematics Instruction for Students with Learning Difficulties: Algebraic Expressions & Equations (Grade 6-8)" course developed by the Education Development Center. Course offerings will expand during the 2014-2015 school year to include elementary grades.

Michigan's Integrated Mathematics Initiative publishes a monthly newsletter and (Mi)^2 staff are available to work directly with schools and individuals to locate and utilize key resources for effective mathematics instruction.

Michigan's Integrated Mathematics Initiative is closely aligned with Michigan's Integrated Technology Initiative (MITS) which supports many of the same project goals regarding accessible education. The Michigan's Integrated Mathematics Initiative and MITS will be merged in October 2014 as Accessible Learning Environments.

For more information about the Michigan's Integrated Mathematics Initiative, go to http://mi2teams.cenmi.org/.

Michigan Alliance for Families

The Michigan Alliance for Families is our state's federally funded Parent Training and Information center and is also a Michigan Department of Education IDEA Grant Funded Initiative. The Michigan Alliance for Families provides information, support, and education to parents whose children receive special education supports, from birth to age 26. The Michigan Alliance for Families also helps parents to become more active in their children's school as a way of improving services and results for children and young adults with special education needs. The Michigan Alliance for Families helps parents understand the rights of their children and to effectively communicate and advocate for their children's needs. The Michigan Alliance for Families offers training to parents around the state on topics such as Content of the IEP, and Communication and Advocacy. The Michigan Alliance for Families mentors emerging parent leaders involved with Local Interagency Coordinating Councils, Parent Advisory Committees, the Special Education Advisory Committee, the Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council, and other groups. In addition to the work they do with and on behalf of children and families, the Michigan Alliance for Families supports the other IDEA Grant Funded Initiatives to facilitate their work with families.

For more information about the Michigan Alliance for Families, go to http://www.michiganallianceforfamilies.org/.

Reaching and Teaching Struggling Learners

The Reaching and Teaching Struggling Learners (RTSL) initiative supports schools in their efforts to improve student results through secondary redesign and dropout prevention. Each participating school has a team consisting of principals, parents, counselors, general educators, special educators, and school improvement leaders who work with struggling learners who may be at risk for academic failure and disengagement. The teams build data fluency to identify areas of need, select evidence-based interventions and then work to stabilize the multi-tiered system of support they create. While RTSL is designed to reduce the risk of dropout among students during middle and high school, the teams also are working to support post-secondary success. RTSL has found that earning trust between students, staff and families, and building leadership increases the likelihood of student achievement and resilience.

For more information about the Reaching and Teaching Struggling Learners initiative, go to http://rtsl.cenmi.org.

Statewide Autism Resources and Training (START)

The Statewide Autism Resources and Training (START) project was funded by the Michigan Department of Education, Office of Special Education to provide training, technical assistance and resources to educators serving students with Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD) that increases local capacity, promotes collaboration across the state with the goal to improve outcomes for students with ASD. In the START project, a statewide collaborative system is emphasized that includes all intermediate school districts in Michigan. The focus of the START project has become systems-level change initiated and implemented by school staff and administrators willing to commit to using evidence-based practices in the areas of educational programming, professional development, parent-professional collaboration and cross district/county collaboration.

For more information about the START Project, go to www.gvsu.edu/autismcenter.

FFY 2013 Annual Performance Report

Appendix C:

Overview of the

Continuous Improvement and

Monitoring System as

Developed and Implemented in Michigan

Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System Overview

The Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System (CIMS) is the monitoring system used by the Michigan Department of Education, Office of Special Education (OSE) and the Office of Great Start, Early Childhood Education & Family Services. The state uses this system to ensure compliance with the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA) and the *Michigan Administrative Rules for Special Education* and promote positive student outcomes.

The CIMS was designed to help the state and its locals[58] analyze and interpret data as well as record all monitoring activities in a single location. The CIMS reflects the priorities of the IDEA and the State Performance Plan (SPP), and aligns with the Michigan School Improvement Framework.

In assessing the performance of its locals, the OSE monitors data collected through:
- Focused monitoring activities (on-site, state-verified desk audit or state-verified self-review)
- Data reviews
- Other activities

Michigan evaluates the performance of each local, relative to the SPP indicator targets. If areas of noncompliance with the IDEA or state rules are identified, the state issues a finding of noncompliance to the local. A finding is a dated, written notification that includes both the citation of the statute, rule or regulation, and a description of the data supporting the state's conclusion that there is noncompliance with that statute or regulation. All identified noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year, including verification. If the local did not reach a target on a results indicator, they would be required to develop an improvement plan. During Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2012, the electronic CIMS Workbooks were launched on August 15, 2012, December 15, 2012 and April 15, 2013.

Elements of the CIMS Process
The CIMS process and tools include the following:

Electronic Workbooks
Electronic workbooks help locals organize information and activities related to the monitoring process. Each local is issued a CIMS Workbook three times a year. Each workbook contains a series of reports—some for informational purposes and some that require action on the part of the local.

Reports Containing Local Data
Reports and other tools in the electronic workbook are designed to assist locals with their continuous improvement process. The CIMS Workbook guides users by providing a list of tasks that must be completed depending on the local's

---

[58] A comprehensive term used in the CIMS to describe local educational agencies, public school academies (charter schools), service areas (intermediate school districts) and state agencies. It means the same as "districts".

performance on SPP indicators and other state priorities. The CIMS Workbook provides the necessary reports, forms and resources to successfully complete reports and activities, and helps locals organize, implement and track their status.

The CIMS Workbook contains the following reports:

- **A Local Strand Report** – divides the SPP indicators into compliance and results indicators and provides an annual measure of a local's performance relative to each of the SPP indicator targets.
- **A Determinations Report** – provides an annual rating of a local's performance in meeting the requirements of the IDEA.
- **A Monitoring Activities Report (MAR)** – gives information on the OSE monitoring activities that affect the local, including notification of upcoming on-site reviews, state-verified desk audits or state-verified self-reviews. Each workbook provides the locals with information regarding their performance on other issues identified by the OSE monitoring activities. A MAR may require action. The local reviews the report each monitoring cycle and makes sure required actions are performed and completed by the due date. For example, if the local does not meet the state graduation target, the local must identify the root cause of the underperformance, share this hypothesis with the school improvement team and submit a response through the CIMS Workbook to the OSE for consideration by the specified date.
- **A Special Education Focused Monitoring Report –** provides a written notification issued to a local by the OSE citing any areas of noncompliance found during any monitoring activity including focused monitoring or data reviews.

Review and Analysis Process (RAP) Teams

Each local must form a RAP team to review and analyze CIMS reports. Each team provides oversight, guidance and structure in the corrective action or improvement planning process. The RAP team is responsible for: (1) reviewing and analyzing local reports and data, and (2) completing the assigned tasks. The work is organized into three categories: compliance and correction, results and improvement, and student and child data.

Compliance and Correction

If a local is issued a Report of Findings, it must address the noncompliance by: (1) identifying the root cause(s) of the areas of noncompliance and developing and submitting a corrective action plan (CAP), (2) implementing the CAP and (3) completing the verification of correction process.

The electronic workbook contains probe questions and CAP forms to guide this process. The OSE requires that research-based practices are used and a list of scientifically-based guidance resources is posted to the CIMS website at http://cims.cenmi.org/. The OSE reviews and approves all submitted CAPs following a standard protocol. If necessary, the district is required to clarify or modify the CAP prior to the OSE approval. Assigned technical assistance (TA) providers assist with the CAP process for all focused monitoring findings.

RAP teams track the implementation and effectiveness of correction and improvement activities through the workbook and internal processes. Progress reports are submitted to the OSE per an established schedule (see chart below). Once all activities are completed, the local requests closure of the CAP.

Corrective Action Plan Dates			
Workbook Starts	**CAP Due**	**Progress Report**	**Closeout**
April 15	June 1	October 1	December 1
August 15	October 1	February 15	April 1
December 15	February 1	June 1	September 15

There are two prongs of verification of correction used by the OSE:
- Prong 1 – The local has corrected each individual case of noncompliance.
- Prong 2 – The local is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100 percent compliance) based on the state's review of new data per established indicator timeframes.

Verification activities may include:
- A review of updated policies, procedures or practices.
- A review of the results of student record reviews to ensure student level correction.
- Evidence that training or TA was obtained.
- A review of new data submitted through the state data systems.

Based on this review, the OSE establishes that the identified noncompliance has been corrected and the local is correctly implementing the specific statutory or regulatory requirement(s). Once evidence of correction is verified, the OSE notifies the local, closes the CAP and issues a closeout report.

If correction of noncompliance is not completed before the CIMS Workbook due date, the OSE mandates TA, training or other enforcement action to promptly bring the local into compliance. A finding remains active until correction is verified by the OSE.

Results and Improvement
Each April, locals are issued a Strand Report that compares the local's performance on SPP indicators to state targets. The August CIMS Workbook contains a data snapshot or a shorter version of the Strand Report. Locals that fail to meet state targets for results indicators are issued results transmittals. The results transmittals require locals to review their district data, respond to probe questions, and create improvement activities to address performance on the indicator. Regional monitors from the intermediate school district (ISDs) are available to support this activity

which is intended to be aligned with and incorporated into school and district improvement activities. If issued a Results Transmittal in any of the workbooks, the local then convenes a RAP team and conducts the activities described above.

Student and Child Data
In addition to addressing SPP indicators, locals may be asked to verify data. Specific directions on how to complete student data activities are provided to locals through the CIMS Workbook, community-of-practice webinars and guidance documents available on the CIMS website.

A Systemic Approach Leads to Improvement

The CIMS provides locals the tools to see the same data and information the state sees when making monitoring decisions. In addition to helping the state and locals keep track of the tasks and activities required by the IDEA, the CIMS helps locals put special education monitoring into context, defines a predictable schedule of events and establishes a system of improvement.

Information is stored in a single electronic location; this includes CAP progress reports, student level data and evidence of correction on findings of noncompliance. Locals are provided processes and tools via the CIMS website to guide the improvement and correction activities within a prescribed calendar which will lead to compliance and improved outcomes for students with an individualized education program.

FFY 2013 Annual Performance Report

Appendix D:

**Business Rules for Calculation of Local Education Agency
Disproportionate Representation in Special Education and
Related Services for All Disabilities and for Specific Categories
of Disabilities by Race/Ethnicity**

Office of Special Education
Michigan Department of Education (MDE)

Procedures for Calculation of LEA Disproportionate Representation by
Race/Ethnicity in Special Education
(All Disabilities and for Specific Categories of Disabilities)

November 2013 Revision

1. Disproportionate representation calculations use data from the fall 2012 and fall 2013 Michigan Student Data System (MSDS)[59] general collections including the Special Education Count files.   Only students with an Individualized Education Program (IEP), ages 6 through 21, per the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA) Part B definition, are counted.[60] (The residency codes of students are drawn from the data in MSDS, and the disability category is based on the information in the MSDS special education child count.) Resident district data refers to the students that live within a district's boundaries with the following exceptions: students attending public school academies, schools of choice, non-public schools, registered home-schools and entities serving adjudicated students are only reflected in their operating district.

2. Calculations are performed for all districts with 30 or more students with an IEP.

3. Calculations are performed for each of the following racial/ethnic subgroups (American Indian, Asian, Black, Hispanic, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White, or Two or More Races) within a district if the total enrollment in the operating district (including special education) for all other racial/ethnic subgroups (total enrollment comparison group) is more than 100.

4. Calculations are performed for each racial/ethnic subgroup with 10 or more students in a given disability category (autism spectrum disorder, cognitive impairment, emotional impairment, other health impairment, specific learning disability and speech and language impairment).

5. A Weighted Risk Ratio (WRR) is used to determine disproportionate representation for a particular racial/ethnic subgroup when the district's student population is similar to the state racial/ethnic distribution and there are at least 10 students in the given disability category in all other racial/ethnic subgroups (disability comparison group).

    - For Indicator 9, the comparison group is all students with an IEP of any other racial/ethnic subgroup.

---

[59] MSDS is the statewide data system for all schools/students.
[60] Students who have been placed in facilities for adjudicated youth (as indicated by the student residency code in MSDS) are excluded. Also excluded are students enrolled in the Operating District Number 84020.

- For Indicator 10, the comparison group is all students in the specific disability category among the other racial/ethnic subgroups.

  See the following URL page 16 to 18 for additional resource information: http://therightidea.tadnet.org/assets/1250

6. A Risk Ratio (RR) is used instead of the WRR to determine disproportionate representation when the racial/ethnic distribution of the district's student population varies significantly from the state racial/ethnic distribution. The RR compares identification rates by race/ethnicity against the district's total student population. Specifically:
    - For Indicator 9, if the number of white or black students with an IEP in a given district is equal to zero, the MDE will forego use of the WRR in favor of the RR in that district. This also applies to Indicator 10, where the number of white or black students in a specific disability category in a given district is equal to zero.
    - For Indicator 9, when the number of white or black students with an IEP in a given district is fewer than three, if the WRR value is greater than or equal to 2.5 and the RR value is less than or equal to 1.5 (so that the difference between the two measures is greater than or equal to one), MDE will forego use of the WRR in favor of the RR in that district. This also applies to Indicator 10, where the number of white or black students in a specific disability category in a given district is fewer than three.

  See the following URL page 8 to 12 for additional resource information: http://therightidea.tadnet.org/assets/1250

7. An Alternate Risk Ratio (ARR) is used to determine disproportionate representation for a particular racial/ethnic subgroup when there are fewer than 10 students with an IEP in all other racial/ethnic subgroups (disability comparison group).   Note: It is not appropriate to forego use of the ARR in favor of the RR unless there are zero black or white students in a given district.
    - For Indicator 9, the comparison group is all students with an IEP of any other racial/ethnic subgroup.
    - For Indicator 10, the comparison group is all students in the specific disability category among the other racial/ethnic subgroups.

  See the following URL page 21 to 22 for additional resource information: http://therightidea.tadnet.org/assets/1250

8. Two sets of the three ratios (WRR, ARR and/or RR) are calculated, using the operating district and resident district data, for each racial/ethnic group across all disabilities and for each racial/ethnic group within each of the six designated disability categories. Operating district data refers to where the students attend school. All students are included in operating district counts including non-public students being served by the public district.

- If there is an operating district ratio but no resident district ratio (due to a small number of resident students), the operating district ratio is used to determine disproportionate representation.
- If there is no operating district ratio, but there is a resident district ratio, the resident district is not considered for disproportionate representation.
- Public School Academies (PSAs) have only one set of ratios as they are only operating districts.
- Students participating in intermediate school district center programs are reflected in resident district counts.

9. The lower of the district's selected operating district ratio or resident district ratio is used to determine disproportionate representation. Districts are considered to have disproportionate representation when the appropriate ratio (WRR, ARR or RR) is greater than 2.5 for two consecutive years for any racial/ethnic group across all disabilities or for any racial/ethnic group within a single disability category.

10. Districts identified as having disproportionate representation per the above business rules will have an opportunity to verify their data. Upon completion of the verification process, the results will be reviewed in conjunction with data from multiple sources to determine appropriate focused monitoring activities.

Resident District Definition for Analyzing
Disproportionate Representation Data

The purpose of the revised resident district definition is to include only those students that districts have an opportunity to influence/educate. The "resident" definition excludes students enrolled in schools of choice, non-public, registered home-schools and entities serving adjudicated students. Resident district is calculated in the following way.

1. Begin with the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS) Fall Collection resident count.

2. Subtract students with the following Student Residency codes:

    i. Schools of Choice (Codes 02 and 03)
    ii. Non-Public School (Codes 04 and 08)
    iii. Registered Home-Schools (Codes 07 and 15)
    iv. Juvenile Detention (Codes 09 and 12)
    v. New Public School Academies (PSAs) (Code 10)

3. Filter out all PSAs as identified by the EEM (Educational Entity Master) https://cepi.state.mi.us/EEM/EntitySearchQuick.aspx

4. The MSDS resident student count WILL include the following Student Residency codes:

   - Non-K-12 (Code 01)
   - No Cooperative Agreement, no release, not exempted (Code 05)
   - All other non-resident students (Code 06)—(Please note: Operating districts do the MSDS submission—hence these are non-residents of the OPERATING district.) This will include those students who are residents but through an IEP have been placed in another district.
   - School for the Deaf (Code 11) assigned to the students' resident ISDs. Students with an IEP who are served by a Department of Community Health facility (Code 13)
   - All other resident students (Code 14)

The same parameters set for determining resident district count for the special education population are applied to the general education population for comparison.

The calculation for operating districts includes:
   - PSA, Schools of Choice students, non-public school and registered home-school students who receive special education ancillary services.

FFY 2013 Annual Performance Report

Appendix E:

Postsecondary Outcomes Survey

Postsecondary Outcomes Survey

You can use a pen or pencil. | Like this: ●   Not like this: ✓   ⊗   ⊘

Postsecondary School Section

1. At any time since leaving high school, ***have you ever*** attended any school, job training, or education program?

   *(Please FILL IN **ONE** circle)*

   ①   No   ***(Go to question 4)***

   ②   Yes   ***(Go to question 2)***

2. Did you complete an entire term?

   *(Please FILL IN **ONE** circle)*

   ①   No

   ②   Yes

3. Describe the kind of school or job training program you attended.

   *(Please FILL IN **ALL** circles that apply)*

   ①   High school completion document or certificate (Adult Basic Education, GED)

   ②   Short-term education or employment training program (Job Corps, Michigan Works, Summer Employment Program, etc.)

   ③   Vocational Technical School – less than 2-year degree program

   ④   Community or Technical College to obtain a 2 year degree

   ⑤   College or University to earn a 4 or more year degree

   ⑥   On a mission, in the Peace Corps, VISTA, etc.

   ⑦   Enrolled in studies while incarcerated in jail or prison

   ⑧   Other (please specify):

   _____

Employment Section

4.	At any time since leaving high school, *have you ever* worked? *(Please FILL IN __ONE__ circle)*	① No ② Yes	*(Go to question 9)* *(Go to question 5)*

5.	Since leaving high school, have you worked at any time for a total of 3 months (about 90 days)? *(Please FILL IN __ONE__ circle)*	① No ② Yes

6.	Think about your most recent job. Did you work on average 20 or more hours per week (or about half time of a 40-hour week)? *(Please FILL IN __ONE__ circle)*	① No ② Yes

7.	Again, thinking about your most recent job, were you paid at least minimum wage ($7.40 an hour if you are age 18 or older; $7.25 an hour if you are age 17 or younger; or $2.65 an hour if you worked in a job where you earned regular tips such as waitstaff in a restaurant)? *(Please FILL IN __ONE__ circle)*	① No ② Yes

8. Where was your most recent job?

   *(Please FILL IN **ONE** circle)*

   ① In a company, business, or service with people with and without disabilities

   ② In the military

   ③ In supported employment (paid work with services and wage support to the employer)

   ④ Self-employed

   ⑤ In your family's business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering)

   ⑥ In sheltered employment (where most workers have disabilities)

   ⑦ Employed while in jail or prison

   ⑧ Other (please specify):
   _____

9. What is your relationship to the former student in question?

   *(Please FILL IN **ONE** circle)*

   ① I am the former student

   ② I am a parent, guardian, or caregiver of the former student

   ③ Other (please specify):

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.
Please return it to us in the self-addressed envelope or to:

Dr. Lyke Thompson, Post-School Survey
Wayne State University/Center for Urban Studies
5700 Cass Avenue, 2207 A/AB
Detroit MI 48202