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# Introduction

**Instructions**

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State’s systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State’s General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

## Intro - Indicator Data

**Executive Summary**

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 2004 established a requirement that all states develop and submit to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) a six-year performance plan which includes targets designed to improve the educational and functional outcomes for children with disabilities and ensure the state's compliance with the statutory and regulatory requirements of the law. The Michigan Department of Education is submitting the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), which will inform the OSEP, the stakeholders and the constituents of Michigan on the progress toward meeting those targets. To achieve the targets, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) Office of Special Education (OSE), is working to develop, implement, and refine a general supervision system based on the SPP/APR process, one which aligns with both the spirit and letter of IDEA to: 1) ensure all children with disabilities receive a free and appropriate public education (FAPE); 2) meet students’ unique needs and prepares them for further education, employment, and independent living; and 3) protect the rights of children with an individualized education program (IEP). The MDE OSE continues to develop a holistic system of general supervision, which is cohesive, robust, and responsive to the data presented in the SPP/APR.

Since 2016, the MDE OSE has been developing an increased awareness and understanding of the role of intermediate school districts (ISDs) as sub-recipients of the IDEA grant funds. This has led the MDE OSE to continue to broaden and refine the general supervision system. This work has been ongoing in coordination and with cooperation of ISDs through regularly scheduled meetings of the MDE OSE and ISD directors of special education and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup whose constituents represent ISDs, member districts, and other stakeholders. In Michigan, there are 56 local educational agencies (LEAs) known as ISDs as well as the State of Michigan operated programs. In addition, state agencies are included in some SPP/APR indicators. The instances where state agencies are included will be noted in the specific indicator.

The OSEP supports states to increase the focus on improving student outcomes through the inclusion of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). This multi-year plan requires states to focus resources and collaborative efforts to address a data-based area of state concern regarding the performance of students with an IEP. The SSIP includes baseline data, targets, and a comprehensive plan for improving the outcomes of students as well as an evaluation plan. As outlined in the SSIP the MDE has used this opportunity to undertake a comprehensive system change. The MDE has strategically expanded the SSIP work to the department as an MDE cross-office effort. An outgrowth of this strategic effort is a department-wide plan, titled Michigan’s Top 10 Strategic Education Plan. The MDE believes education impacts a student for a lifetime; therefore, the MDE has targeted strategic areas of education. The MDE in partnership with internal and external stakeholders, identified guiding principles which will aid in organizing this effort.

In addition, in February 2021, Governor Whitmer signed Executive Order 2021-02, to create the Student Recovery Advisory Council of Michigan. The task of the advisory council is to create guidance that helps local school leaders and educators build comprehensive, evidence-based, and equity-driven local recovery plans to help emerge from the COVID-19 pandemic. The Student Recovery Advisory Council of Michigan’s report, MI Blueprint for Comprehensive Student Recovery, (https://www.michigan.gov/dtmb/0,5552,7-358-82547\_56345\_106374---,00.html) provides key strategies for school districts and policymakers to help Michigan’s children begin to rebound after the brutal challenges to their education during the COVID-19 pandemic. Four of the report’s recommendations directly tie to three goals of the state’s Top 10 Strategic Education Plan– expand early childhood learning opportunities, increase the number of certified teachers in areas of shortage, and provide adequate and equitable school funding.

**Additional information related to data collection and reporting**

The MDE OSE did not observe wide systemic impact because of the COVID-19 pandemic on all indicators. However, the combination of COVID and the increased challenge staff shortages have presented, as well as a reluctance of parents to send their children to school due to safety and health reasons, the OSE did recognize educational effects from this continuing pandemic. The OSE identified some noncompliance, and the associated corrective actions were not possible to be competed in the required timelines. In addition, the implementation plan of the SSIP, was completely put on hold during 2020 as districts could not commit to the additional work pertaining to a partnership with the State related to the SSIP activities. The MDE OSE is committed to continuing to better understand challenges to effective implementation and to work to support districts in their desire to comply with all the requirements of the IDEA, while improving educational results and functional outcomes.

The MDE’s SPP/APR, including the SSIP, provides the overarching organizing structure for the MDE OSE system of general supervision. The MDE OSE is addressing eight components of general supervision: SPP/APR, including the SSIP; data on results and processes; integrated monitoring activities; policies, procedures and implementation of effective evidence-based practices; professional learning and development and technical assistance (TA); fiscal accountability and management, effective dispute resolution, and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions.

Indicators have been categorized as results elements and compliance indicators. Targets for results indicators are set by the MDE OSE with broad 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 MDE, a statewide data advisory committee, the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup, and other school administrators and parents. Compliance indicator targets, set by the OSEP, are either zero or 100%.

Data on Processes & Results
Data are routinely collected throughout the year through state information systems. ISDs and member districts are required to upload data three times each year: fall, spring and end of the year. Verification of the data is achieved through multiple methods and activities including ISD, member district, and state level previews of submitted data, data quality reports, trend analyses of data, monitoring activities, and comparisons with dispute resolution data and information.

The collected data are used for federal, state, ISD, and member district level reporting, public reporting, TA and professional learning and development, monitoring, determinations, and for generating ad hoc data responses, as well as deciding how and where to allocate resources.

**Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year**

56

**General Supervision System:**

**The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.**

MDE OSE is working to more fully develop, implement & refine the 8 components of General Supervision. Described above are the components of the SPP/APR, the SSIP & Data on Results & Processes. Below are descriptions of the other components. OSE has developed a definition of monitoring that includes both the examination of improvement of results & compliance with IDEA. In this context, monitoring should be interpreted as examinations of both educational results & functional outcomes, as well as compliance activities. Monitoring begins with examinations of data from various sources & across the programmatic, policy & fiscal areas. Monitoring protocols focus on specific priority areas selected based on state performance & improvement needs.

Integrated Monitoring Activities
MDE integrates monitoring activities across all components of the general supervision system & MDE OSE. Multiple data sources & methods are used to monitor ISDs & member districts. Monitoring is seen as a proactive, preventive & corrective approach. The monitoring activities ensure continuous examinations of performance for results & compliance.

Policies, Procedures & Effective Implementation
Michigan & MDE OSE have policies, procedures & implementation strategies which align with & support the implementation of the IDEA & Michigan Administrative Rules for Special Education (MARSE). The policies, procedures & effective implementation of evidence-based practices guidance are intended to support the IDEA goals of improved results & functional outcomes & compliance with the requirements most closely aligned with improvement. MDE OSE has been engaging in an ongoing process to ensure ISDs & member districts’ procedures are in alignment with state policies & procedures. These policies & procedures are designed to ensure a FAPE in the LRE. Interagency agreements or memoranda of understandings are used to facilitate efforts to coordinate across state & local agencies. Through the development of the SSIP, MDE OSE continues to work to ensure alignment of policies, procedures & implementation strategies.

Professional Learning & Development & TA
MDE OSE uses data, as well as input from stakeholders, to identify areas of universal need for TA & professional learning & development (PLD). MDE OSE uses several means of providing these services, including the MDE OSE website & Catamaran system. Catamaran is the system used to by the state to promote positive outcomes & ensure compliance with the IDEA & MARSE. Catamaran was designed to help ISDs & districts analyze & intepret data & keep track of all monitoring activities in a single location. Catamaran reflects the priorities of the IDEA & the SPP & is aligned with the School Improvement Framework. MDE OSE also uses meetings with ISD directors of special education, professional organization meetings & conferences to provide universal TA. In addition to universal TA, specific TA is provided based on identified needs through compliance monitoring, dispute resolution & fiscal management activities. MDE OSE has also developed a Differentiated Framework of Supports to identify ISDs’ needs in four specific categories – universal, directed (low in compliance SPP indicators), targeted (low in select results SPP indicators), or intensive (low in both compliance & results SPP indicators). Through the framework, the MDE offers ISDs support in data analysis through a data use & action process & one on one TA in areas of low compliance. MDE OSE also uses the framework to direct ISDs to accept TA when more intensive TA is warranted.

Fiscal Accountability & Management
MDE OSE has a system of fiscal management & accountability which implements processes & procedures to provide oversight for the application, receipt, distribution, use & monitoring of IDEA funds at the state & district level. Upon receipt of Part B funds, spending plans are developed for administrative & other state level activities by following procedures to ensure allowable spending levels & use. Part B funds are distributed to LEAs in a timely manner using the federally required funding formula. ISDs, as sub-recipients, submit applications which are reviewed for completeness & allowable use. Fiscal monitoring is an ongoing process which includes program fiscal reviews conducted by fiscal experts through both on-site & desk reviews. Risk factors are taken into consideration. A-133 single audits are reviewed. Findings are resolved through corrective action & the recapture of any misspent funds. The ISD fiscal monitoring oversight & TA ensures all Part B fiscal requirements are being met including maintenance of effort, coordinated early intervening services (both voluntary & required amounts when significant disproportionality is identified), proportionate share, excess cost & funding new or significantly expanding charter schools.

Effective Dispute Resolution & Implementation of Evidence-based Practices
MDE OSE provides training & support for the timely resolution of complaints, mediations & due process actions. Information for all interested parties is provided through MDE OSE websites; toll-free phone lines; email; electronic & paper versions of documents; coaching; mentoring; local, regional, & statewide learning opportunities; & training sessions. Several of MDE OSE IDEA grant-funded initiatives are directly informed dispute resolution activities. Providing mediation, facilitation & training services for working through disputes between member districts & parents or guardians of students with an IEP, ensures students with an IEP promptly receive the services needed to develop & succeed in school. Issues of concern are entered into & tracked through a state data system. The data are used to determine whether patterns or trends exist, identify member districts for monitoring activities & ensure all related corrective actions have been implemented & noncompliance has been corrected.

Improvement, Correction, Incentives & Sanctions
The enforcement of regulations, policies & procedures is required by the IDEA & MARSE. MDE OSE for Part B & Office of Great Start (OGS)/Early Childhood Education & Family Services (ECE&FS) for Part C use the Catamaran system to input monitoring data, generate reports, & assure correction of noncompliance. When noncompliance with the IDEA or MARSE is identified, the state issues a finding of noncompliance to the member district or ISD. A finding is a dated, written notification including both the citation of the statute, rule or regulation & a description of the data supporting the state's conclusion of noncompliance. Catamaran tracks all findings of noncompliance & how long it takes the member district or ISD to correct the finding of noncompliance.

Consistent with OSEP memo 09-02, MDE OSE requires member districts & ISDs to correct findings of noncompliance as soon as possible, but in no case, greater than one year from the written notification of the finding, including verification by the state. In the event the member district or ISD is unable to correct the finding of noncompliance, MDE OSE has a system in place to ensure correction occurs as soon as possible. MDE OSE assigns a TA provider to every member district & ISD unable to correct findings of noncompliance within one year. In the event, MDE OSE TA provider is unable to assist the member district or ISD in closing the finding of noncompliance, MDE OSE has a procedure in place that has a variety of incentives & sanctions to accomplish correction. MDE OSE uses the Catamaran system to review the documentation provided to verify correction or further direct the ISD or member district correction efforts.

MDE OSE continues the process of broadening & refining the design of the general supervision accountability system to support the role of the ISDs as the sub-recipients of the IDEA grant funds. The change in the accountability system is reflected in the improved data reported in the SPP/APR.

**Technical Assistance System:**

**The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.**

The MDE OSE has worked over the past few years to develop a coordinated TA system responsive to the needs of ISDs and member districts. Part of this coordination involved using the data collected through the SPP/APR, integrated monitoring activities, fiscal accountability and management, and dispute resolution processes to identify areas of both results and compliance needs. In the last two years, the MDE OSE has worked to build routines and procedures to identify and address TA needs to improve results and compliance. The sequence begins in early summer with the data used for determinations. These data are examined using a Differentiated Framework of Supports, an identification and TA response system differentiated based on specific needs for improvement of results and/or compliance The framework differentiates needs using quadrants – universal, directed, targeted or intensive. The data are further examined to determine areas where support is still needed and areas where needs are emerging. The MDE OSE has developed and continues to develop resources and TA to specifically address these needs, as well as needs identified as universal across the state.

TA is available through multiple means. A universal method is Catamaran, a repository system where resources, such as written guidance, video webinars, links, and micro-TA presentations can be accessed by all ISDs and member districts. ISDs, member districts, and the MDE OSE can access data, both results and compliance, to analyze to identify patterns and needs. Universal TA is also available through Michigan Virtual University, the MDE website, and the OSE specific section of the website. Also, information is provided about resources available at OSEP funded TA centers’ websites. For additional information, reference the PLD/TA description in the General Supervision section.

It is difficult for the MDE OSE to separate TA from PLD activities because each informs the other. Some of the interrelated activities include - documents and videos on the state’s web site; help-desks; toll-free phone lines; email, electronic and paper versions of documents; coaching; mentoring; local, regional, and statewide learning opportunities; and training sessions from other TA providers. This alignment and coordination of TA and PLD is part of the work in the SSIP to align efforts more closely across offices in the MDE.

**Professional Development System:**

**The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for children with disabilities.**

As noted above, the MDE OSE sees TA and PLD as part of a coordinated system of support for ISDs and member districts. In addition to the resources provided directly by the MDE OSE, there are those available through the MDE OSE IDEA grant funded initiatives. These initiatives include:

• The MDE, Low Incidence Outreach (MDE-LIO) (https://mdelio.org/) supports the needs of ISDs and member districts in improving the quality of education for students who have visual impairments and for students who are either deaf or hard of hearing.

• Michigan’s Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) technical assistance center (https://mimtsstac.org) previously Michigan’s Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative (MIBLSI). works on behalf of the MDE to provide a continuum of TA to ISDs, member districts, and schools in a MTSS framework.

• The Statewide Autism Resources and Training Project (START) (https://www.gvsu.edu/autismcenter/) works with schools, community partners and families to support students with autism spectrum disorder to become active, engaged members of their schools and local communities.

• The Michigan Alliance for Families (http://www.michiganallianceforfamilies.org) provides information, support, and education to parents whose children receive special education services, from birth to age 26.

• The Special Education Mediation Services (SEMS) (https://www.mikids1st.org/) is the federally funded mediation center which provides mediation and facilitation services at no cost for parents, ISDs and member districts.

• The Alt+Shift (https://www.altshift.education/) provides professional learning opportunities, resources, tiered TA, and implementation support.

Through the TA and PLD resources, the MDE OSE is working to ensure high quality and consistent information is provided to ISDs and member districts. The MDE OSE is developing a mechanism to annually review resources and usage to maintain, revise, or improve those available.

**Broad Stakeholder Input:**

**The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State’s targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State’s Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).**

The MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms including virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys and the use of discussion virtual rooms. The primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC). Information about the SEAC can be found at https://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-6598\_88192---,00.html. In addition to the agendas and minutes of meetings, presentations used in seeking stakeholder input are on this website. The location of these presentations was also shared with the ISD Directors’ at a regularly scheduled meeting. Other stakeholders include the MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board, ISD Directors, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD directors of special education, member district directors of special education, and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP in Michigan.

**Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)**

YES

**Number of Parent Members:**

54

**Parent Members Engagement:**

**Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

For nearly two years, the MDE OSE has been developing and implementing plans to engage stakeholders in target setting for the FFY 2020–2025 SPP/APR. Time has been spent on planning for and facilitating monthly meetings with the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC), where stakeholders, including parents of students with disabilities, were guided through intentional conversations designed to develop a greater understanding of each indicator and the trends over time, to enable stakeholders to provide informed feedback and input.

The SEAC is a diverse group made up of at least 51% of parents representing several ISDs across the state. The SEAC’s membership consists of approximately 54 representatives with a race/ethnicity breakdown of 81%--White, 13%--African American, 4%--Native American and 2%--Asian. The OSE team continues the work of planning and developing processes to share information and obtain meaningful input from stakeholders across the state, because membership of SEAC is not representative of the racial/ethnic populations of Michigan.

Monthly meetings have provided members with information on the SPP/APR and elicited input and feedback from the group including improvement strategies. The OSE presented to the SEAC a historical overview of the SPP/APR as well as current requirements for the FFY 2020–2025 submission. During the SEAC meetings, the OSE provided analyzed data to show trends, projections and rationale for projections. In addition, detailed information was provided to stakeholders including definitions from the OSEP indicator measurement table and other relevant state-level data ahead of monthly meetings as homework so participants could attend meetings informed and ready for rich discussions. Surveys were provided to gather feedback and recommendations on the proposed indicator targets.

The MDE OSE also presented to the Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education (MAASE), the Michigan Intermediate Special Education Directors and the Michigan Alliance for families (MAF is Michigan’s Parent Training Information Center). The MDE OSE and MAF are planning continued and expanded parent involvement in stakeholder activities. All PowerPoints are available publicly on the Michigan Department of Education's website. (https://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-6598\_88192---,00.html) The MDE OSE also provided updates to these groups on the historical trends in the SPP/APR data, as well as activities the OSE, grant funded initiatives, and the MDE are undertaking to improve results for students with an IEP and increase compliance with IDEA and MARSE. Input was provided by these stakeholder groups using a variety of methods, most commonly in the form of discussions and surveys including interactive polls at regularly scheduled meetings. This is a continuous process. The tasks requested of these groups were related to the reviewing of baselines and targets, assisting in determining an appropriate State-identified Measurable Result for the SSIP, and providing input regarding strategic improvement activities in improving outcomes for students with an IEP. Individuals were engaged in asking questions about the data and trends, target setting, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

**Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:**

**The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.**

Translation and closed captioning services were provided during stakeholder meetings. In addition, materials were provided electronically on a public website which included an overview and historical information on the indicators. The OSE also plans to continue engaging SEAC in evaluating progress towards meeting the targets of the SPP indicators and evaluating improvement activities on a regular basis. As noted above, the OSE is examining ways to broaden the involvement of diverse groups of parents. The OSE will continue to present information to various stakeholders to evaluate trends to determine appropriate improvement strategies to improve results for students with IEPs.

**Soliciting Public Input:**

**The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

The MDE OSE sought stakeholder input through multiple means and mechanisms including virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys and the use of virtual discussion rooms. The MDE OSE engaged stakeholders in target setting for the FFY 2020–2025 SPP/APR. Time was spent on planning for and facilitating monthly meetings with the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC), where stakeholders, including parents of students with disabilities, were guided through intentional conversations designed to develop a greater understanding of the indicators and the trends over time, for stakeholders to provide informed feedback and input. Additionally, the OSE will continue to engage SEAC throughout the year by providing updated data gathering input on ways to continue to improve student outcomes on both results and compliance indicators. Throughout the process, SEAC and OSE will determine when and if SPP targets need to be revised and if existing improvement activities need to be revised or new improvement activities need to be developed. As noted above, the OSE will also work more closely with MAF to broaden and extend the outreach to parents and seek public input. Also as noted above, public input was sought through presentations to MAASE, DAC, MAF, and ISD Directors.

**Making Results Available to the Public:**

**The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.**

Additional information is publicly available the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) Target Setting section at: https://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-6598\_88192---,00.html. SEAC meeting agendas and minutes are publicly posted on this site. Historical meeting minutes which include details on the review of the results indicators along with the input provided by attendees are available upon request.

**Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State’s submission of its FFY 2019 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State’s SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.**

The MDE OSE 2021 IDEA public reporting on the performance of ISDs and member districts can be found on the MI School Data portal (https://mischooldata.org/special-education-summary/) and the MDE OSE website (www.michigan.gov/specialeducation). The MDE OSE posted these data the last week of May 2021. The MDE OSE also posts the current SPP/APR, including the SSIP, on the Annual Performance Report section of the MDE OSE website (https://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-6598\_88189\_88207---,00.html).

Additional methods of informing the public include a memorandum to superintendents and a public service announcement by the deputy superintendent, collaboration with ISD directors of special education to provide information related to ISD and member district performance, and a media advisory.

## Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2020 and 2021 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2021 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

Michigan Department of Education’s Determination Response

Summary:
The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) received the federal determination of “needs assistance” for its annual performance rating on meeting the requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, or IDEA, Part B for the FFY 2019. The MDE’s score decreased slightly from 72.50% to 70.00%. Although there has been considerable improvement, the work to improve outcomes for every Michigan student with an individualized education program (IEP) must continue. There still is work to be done around the results elements, such as graduation rate, dropout rate, time students spend in the general education setting, and implementation of evidence-based practices.

The MDE Office of Special Education (OSE) staff met to review and discuss the results elements and compliance indicators for which the state received a score of zero. The MDE OSE continued to receive a zero score for two results elements.

• Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma
• Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped-Out

The MDE OSE reports, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission on (1) the technical assistance (TA) sources from which the state received assistance and (2) the actions the state has taken as a result of the TA.

The MDE OSE has accessed sources of TA and taken the actions described below.

The MDE OSE staff conducted a search on the OSEP Ideas That Work website (https://osepideasthatwork.org) for resources and the IDEA Data center website (https://ideadata.org/) for TA documentation that addressed the identified areas. In addition, Michigan attended multiple webinar and professional learning opportunities provided by the IDC and other national technical assistance centers.

The MDE OSE Response to the Elements (Graduation and Dropout)
Graduation and dropout are of educational concern for all students, not just for students with an IEP. Therefore, the MDE is addressing this concern in conjunction with the work of the OSE.

Indicator 1: Graduation Resources within the National Technical Assistance on Transition website
• Tools and Resources for Part B SPP Indicator 1 (https://transitionta.org/topics/graduation/)
Michigan provided TA to ISDs on the use of personal curriculums as a way to meet the Michigan Merit Curriculum requirements. This allows students to meet graduation requirements in a multitude of ways and thus receive a regular high school diploma. OSE has some preliminary evidence that implementing personal curriculum has a positive effect on the likelihood of students with an IEP graduating with a regular diploma.

Indicator 2: Dropout Resources within the National Technical Assistance on Transition website
• Tools and Resources for Part B SPP Indicator 2 (https://transitionta.org/topics/graduation/)

In addition, the MDE OSE accessed TA from the Office of Special Education Programs, by participating in OSEP's monthly TA calls. The MDE OSE also received TA from the OSEP via conference calls with the Michigan state contact and other OSEP leaders. The MDE OSE utilized the resources at the IDEA Data Center (IDC) website and reviewed TA materials.

The MDE OSE has participated in NCSI’s cross-state learning collaboratives. Michigan joined the Results Based Accountability and Support (RBAS) collaborative where the focus was on general supervision and creating accountability and support systems that improve outcomes for students with disabilities while ensuring compliance with IDEA. Michigan’s involvement in the cross-state learning collaborative allowed the MDE OSE staff to explore questions and challenges and learn from the experiences of colleagues in other states as well as NCSI staff.

Actions taken by the MDE as a result of the TA include the Deputy Superintendent for P-20 System and Student Transitions leading work being done with the ISDs and member districts across the state and at the MDE to improve results and compliance. A steering committee and four work groups have worked to generate and implement recommendations designed to lead to continued improvements in graduation and dropout rates, participation in Michigan's general education state-wide assessment, named the M-STEP, and national NAEP test results and participation.

The OSE also participates monthly in the National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO) calls where alternate assessments are discussed along with activities for ensuring higher expectations. Michigan has raised expectations for over 3,000 students with an IEP over the last 4 years who now may be on track to graduate with a diploma.

The MDE OSE continued to focus TA efforts on dropout rates by utilizing the OSE Data Use and Action Process with selected ISDs to determine root causes and develop strategies to improve dropout rates among the lowest performing ISDs in the state. Similarly, the MDE OSE used the data use process to analyze data in the area of discipline to target low performing ISDs and conduct root cause analysis and develop improvement activities to decrease exclusionary discipline and improve student outcomes. The MDE also provides TA to ISDs using a Michigan designed discipline toolkit. The discipline toolkit is a comprehensive tool which uses data analysis to drive root cause analysis and change adult behavior to decrease suspension and expulsion.

## Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2020 and 2021 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 24, 2021 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

OSEP issued a monitoring report to the State on June 26, 2020 and is currently reviewing the State's response submitted on September 27, 2021 and will respond under separate cover.

## Intro - Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2021 and 2022 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2022 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance.

The State must report, with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

# Indicator 1: Graduation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

**Measurement**

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

## 1 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data[[1]](#footnote-2)**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 70.78% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 80.00% | 80.00% | 80.00% | 80.00% | 80.00% |
| Data | 57.12% | 64.15% | 65.34% | 63.53% | 64.26% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 70.78% | 70.78% | 70.78% | 70.78% | 72.30% | 73.50% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms including virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys and the use of discussion virtual rooms. The primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC). Information about the SEAC can be found at https://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-6598\_88192---,00.html. In addition to the agendas and minutes of meetings, presentations used in seeking stakeholder input are on this website. The location of these presentations was also shared with the ISD Directors’ at a regularly scheduled meeting. Other stakeholders include the MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board, ISD Directors, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD directors of special education, member district directors of special education, and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP in Michigan.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 8,912 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | 1,109 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 35 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 2,536 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma** | **Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)**  | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 8,912 | 12,592 | 64.26% | 70.78% | 70.78% | N/A | N/A |

**Graduation Conditions**

**Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.**

The Michigan Merit Curriculum (MMC) (http://www.chsd.us/highschool/curriculum/Michigan%20Merit%20Curriculum%20FAQ%27s.pdf) defines a common set of required credits for graduation and provides educators with a common understanding of what students should know and be able to do for credit. MMC also provides students the learning opportunity, knowledge and skills they need to succeed in college or the workplace. Students are required to obtain a minimum of 18 credits for graduation which could be met using alternative instructional delivery methods such as alternative course work, humanities course sequences, career and technology courses, industrial technology or vocational education courses. In addition, since the graduating class of 2016, students must complete two credits of a language other than English in grades 9-12; OR an equivalent learning experience in grades K-12 prior to graduation.

The 18 required credits are based on proficiency in state content standards for content areas:
• 4 credits English language arts
• 4 credits math
• 3 credits science
• 3 credits social studies
• 1 credit physical education and health
• 1 credit visual, performing, and applied arts
• 2 credits world languages (or equivalent learning experience in grades K-12 (1 credit)
• Online learning experience course, learning or integrated learning experience

**Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Michigan resets baseline for Indicator 1 Graduation, given the change in the methodology for reporting (Exiter Graduation Rate).

## 1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 1 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 1 - Required Actions

# Indicator 2: Drop Out

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

**Measurement**

OPTION 1:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target.

With the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, States may use either option 1 or 2. States using Option 2 must provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

OPTION 1:

**Use 618 exiting data** for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023**, States must report data using Option 1 (i.e., the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA). Option 2 will not be available beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2011 | 9.50% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 9.00% | 8.75% | 8.50% | 8.25% | 8.25% |
| Data | 7.35% | 7.06% | 6.76% | 6.86% | 6.66% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target <= | 8.25% | 8.12% | 7.88% | 7.75% | 7.63% | 7.50% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms including virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys and the use of discussion virtual rooms. The primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC). Information about the SEAC can be found at https://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-6598\_88192---,00.html. In addition to the agendas and minutes of meetings, presentations used in seeking stakeholder input are on this website. The location of these presentations was also shared with the ISD Directors’ at a regularly scheduled meeting. Other stakeholders include the MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board, ISD Directors, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD directors of special education, member district directors of special education, and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP in Michigan.

**Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator**

Option 2

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 8,912 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | 1,109 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 35 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 2,536 |

**Has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012? (yes/no)**

NO

**Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)**

YES

**Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)**

YES

**Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)**

YES

**If use a different calculation methodology is yes, provide an explanation of the different calculation methodology**

The OSEP indicated states have two options for calculating the dropout rate. One option for States is to report an Event rate or students who enrolled and dropped out during the school year.

The MDE elected to use and report the annual event dropout rate for indicator 2. The dropout rate is calculated by dividing the number of students with an IEP who dropped out during the year by the number of students with an IEP in the fall student data collection. Students included in this analysis must be ages 14-21, have an IEP (22 to 26-year olds are excluded for federal reporting purposes), and enrolled in grades 9-12 or enrolled in an ungraded special education setting during the Fall 2019 data collection. Students who were excluded in the calculations were those students who transferred out of the Michigan public school system, had a temporary school-recognized absence due to suspension or illness, or who were deceased.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out** | **Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 3,492 | 63,947 | 6.66% | 8.25% | 5.46% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth**

The following are the seven Michigan Student Data System exit code descriptions which are considered dropouts for the purposes of calculating and reporting Indicator 2:

• Student left school without earning a diploma or other certification, and before reaching the maximum age (26 years of age)
• Student left adult education without earning a diploma or other certification
• Student is enlisted in the military or Job Corps (not in a primarily academic setting which offers a secondary education program) without completing school or earning a diploma
• Student is adjudicated (i.e., placed under jurisdiction of a juvenile or criminal justice authority)
• Student is placed in a recovery or rehabilitative program or is under psychiatric care.
• Student is not in school but known to be expelled with no option to return
• Student is gone; status is unknown

**Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)**

NO

**If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.**

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 2 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 2 - Required Actions

# Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator**: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

3A. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

**Measurement**

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group**  | **Group Name**  | **Baseline Year**  | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 70.06% |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 62.05% |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 60.06% |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 69.78% |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 62.42% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 60.56% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 95.00% | 95.00%  | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms including virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys and the use of discussion virtual rooms. The primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC). Information about the SEAC can be found at https://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-6598\_88192---,00.html. In addition to the agendas and minutes of meetings, presentations used in seeking stakeholder input are on this website. The location of these presentations was also shared with the ISD Directors’ at a regularly scheduled meeting. Other stakeholders include the MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board, ISD Directors, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD directors of special education, member district directors of special education, and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP in Michigan.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

03/30/2022

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs\* | 14,490 | 14,336 | 12,662 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 8,910 | 3,869 | 920 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 196 | 3,892 | 5,506 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 1,166 | 1,244 | 1,246 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

03/30/2022

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs\* | 14,661 | 14,512 | 12,773 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 7,680 | 3,798 | 861 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 1,352 | 3,972 | 5,565 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 1,199 | 1,288 | 1,309 |

\*The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 10,272 | 14,490 |  | 95.00% | 70.89% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 9,005 | 14,336 |  | 95.00% | 62.81% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 7,672 | 12,662 |  | 95.00% | 60.59% | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 10,231 | 14,661 |  | 95.00% | 69.78% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 9,058 | 14,512 |  | 95.00% | 62.42% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 7,735 | 12,773 |  | 95.00% | 60.56% | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

**Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.**

For more information about Michigan’s Student Test of Educational Progress (M-STEP) and historical assessment data use the following URL link (https://www.mischooldata.org/k-12-grade/) This is a direct link to an example of state data Grades 3-8 State Testing: https://www.mischooldata.org/grades-3-8-state-testing-includes-psat-data-performance/

Assessment reports are available in three forms. Use the buttons near the top of the screen to switch between:

• Performance Level - Rather than specific scores, this report shows how many students fall into performance level categories: “Advanced,” “Proficient,” “Partially Proficient” and “Not Proficient” for M-STEP and PSAT 8/9, and “Emerging Towards,” “Attained” and “Surpassed” for MI-Access.
• Scaled Scores - This report includes a snapshot of the Mean Scaled Score by assessment content area. Scaled scores are calculated based on the total points the student scores, which are statistically adjusted and converted into a standard scale that allows direct and fair comparisons of scores from different forms of a test. Established psychometric procedures are used to ensure that a given scale score represents the same level of performance regardless of the test form.
• Proficiency - This report provides a snapshot and trend view of the number and percentage of students who scored as at or above proficient for each M-STEP subject of ELA, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies.

Annual Special Education public reporting can be found within MI School Data portal (https://www.mischooldata.org/special-education-summary/) There are two choices for viewing data on the public reporting website:

1. A downloadable Special Education (Part B) Public Reporting Excel Spreadsheet is on the Special Education Summary tab. This Excel spreadsheet contains data for all required indicators for all ISDs and member districts (data are masked).

2. Run Indicator Reports
a. On the Indicator Report Summary tab, select an ISD
b. Select either All Districts for data on the entire ISD or select any member district within the ISD from dropdown menu
c. Select the Report Year
d. Click on the “View Results” button at the bottom of the page

Provided for each indicator is a brief description, state target and performance, ISD and member district selected target and performance, and target status. In addition, the Selected Indicator Reports tab will provide additional information regarding selected indicators as well as visual graphs.

This is a direct link to an example of a school district for Indicator 3. (https://www.mischooldata.org/selected-indicator-reports/)

To select a different district, select Edit Report at top left. Use drop down menu for Member District or use blue Location Search.

Public reporting was made available in May 2021 although Statewide assessments were waived due to the pandemic. New FFY 2020 data will be publicly posted by June 1, 2022.

The measurement used by the OSEP in making determinations is different than the measurement used for Michigan’s APR. The determination measure starts with all students with an IEP who were assessed and asks the portion who used the regular assessment, while the APR B-3 Performance indicator starts with all students with an IEP enrolled and asks the portion who were assessed using any state level assessment (regular assessments and alternate assessments combined).

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Michigan resets baseline, given the FFY 2020 data have significantly changed compared to prior year’s data due to measurement changes to this indicator.

## 3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3A - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts the baseline.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State did not provide a Web link to FFY 2020 publicly-reported assessment results. OSEP notes that the State reported "New FFY 2020 data will be publicly posted by June 1, 2022."

## 3A - Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2022 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2020, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2021.

# Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator**: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3B - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group**  | **Group Name**  | **Baseline Year**  | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 15.69% |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 23.00% |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 13.97% |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 13.53% |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 8.02% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 5.09% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 15.69% | 15.70% | 16.00% | 16.70% | 17.40% | 18.20% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 23.00% | 23.00% | 23.00% | 23.50% | 24.40% | 25.30% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 13.97% | 14.00% | 14.00% | 14.00% | 14.70% | 15.40% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 13.53% | 13.80% | 14.75% | 15.70% | 16.60% | 17.50% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 8.02% | 8.02% | 8.02% | 8.50% | 9.25% | 10.00% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 5.09% | 5.50% | 5.80% | 6.10% | 6.40% | 6.70% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms including virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys and the use of discussion virtual rooms. The primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC). Information about the SEAC can be found at https://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-6598\_88192---,00.html. In addition to the agendas and minutes of meetings, presentations used in seeking stakeholder input are on this website. The location of these presentations was also shared with the ISD Directors’ at a regularly scheduled meeting. Other stakeholders include the MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board, ISD Directors, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD directors of special education, member district directors of special education, and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP in Michigan.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment | 9,106 | 7,761 | 6,426 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 1,402 | 934 | 166 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 27 | 851 | 732 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment | 9,032 | 7,770 | 6,426 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 1,190 | 339 | 69 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 32 | 284 | 258 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 1,429 | 9,106 |  | 15.69% | 15.69% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 1,785 | 7,761 |  | 23.00% | 23.00% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 898 | 6,426 |  | 13.97% | 13.97% | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 1,222 | 9,032 |  | 13.53% | 13.53% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 623 | 7,770 |  | 8.02% | 8.02% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 327 | 6,426 |  | 5.09% | 5.09% | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

**Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.**

For more information about Michigan’s Student Test of Educational Progress (M-STEP) and historical assessment data use the following URL link (https://www.mischooldata.org/k-12-grade/) This is a direct link to an example of state data Grades 3-8 State Testing: https://www.mischooldata.org/grades-3-8-state-testing-includes-psat-data-performance/

Assessment reports are available in three forms. Use the buttons near the top of the screen to switch between:

• Performance Level - Rather than specific scores, this report shows how many students fall into performance level categories: “Advanced,” “Proficient,” “Partially Proficient” and “Not Proficient” for M-STEP and PSAT 8/9, and “Emerging Towards,” “Attained” and “Surpassed” for MI-Access.
• Scaled Scores - This report includes a snapshot of the Mean Scaled Score by assessment content area. Scaled scores are calculated based on the total points the student scores, which are statistically adjusted and converted into a standard scale that allows direct and fair comparisons of scores from different forms of a test. Established psychometric procedures are used to ensure that a given scale score represents the same level of performance regardless of the test form.
• Proficiency - This report provides a snapshot and trend view of the number and percentage of students who scored as at or above proficient for each M-STEP subject of ELA, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies.

Annual Special Education public reporting can be found within MI School Data portal (https://www.mischooldata.org/special-education-summary/) There are two choices for viewing data on the public reporting website:

1. A downloadable Special Education (Part B) Public Reporting Excel Spreadsheet is on the Special Education Summary tab. This Excel spreadsheet contains data for all required indicators for all ISDs and member districts (data are masked).

2. Run Indicator Reports
a. On the Indicator Report Summary tab, select an ISD
b. Select either All Districts for data on the entire ISD or select any member district within the ISD from dropdown menu
c. Select the Report Year
d. Click on the “View Results” button at the bottom of the page

Provided for each indicator is a brief description, state target and performance, ISD and member district selected target and performance, and target status. In addition, the Selected Indicator Reports tab will provide additional information regarding selected indicators as well as visual graphs.

This is a direct link to an example of a school district for Indicator 3. (https://www.mischooldata.org/selected-indicator-reports/)

To select a different district, select Edit Report at top left. Use drop down menu for Member District or use blue Location Search.

Public reporting was made available in May 2021 although Statewide assessments were waived due to the pandemic. New FFY 2020 data will be publicly posted by June 1, 2022.

The measurement used by the OSEP in making determinations is different than the measurement used for Michigan’s APR. The determination measure starts with all students with an IEP who were assessed and asks the portion who used the regular assessment, while the APR B-3 Performance indicator starts with all students with an IEP enrolled and asks the portion who were assessed using any state level assessment (regular assessments and alternate assessments combined).

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Michigan resets baseline, given the FFY 2020 data have significantly changed compared to prior year’s data due to measurement changes to this indicator.

## 3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3B - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts the baseline.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State did not provide a Web link to FFY 2020 publicly-reported assessment results. OSEP notes that the State reported "New FFY 2020 data will be publicly posted by June 1, 2022."

## 3B - Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2022 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2020, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2021.

# Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time

of testing.

## 3C - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group**  | **Group Name**  | **Baseline Year**  | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 59.35% |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 71.95% |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 72.47% |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 50.29% |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 52.80% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 61.19% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 59.35% | 59.35% | 59.35% | 61.30% | 62.50% | 62.50% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 71.95% | 71.95% | 71.95% | 73.80% | 74.50% | 75.00% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 72.47% | 72.50% | 72.50% | 72.80% | 73.10% | 73.30% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 50.29% | 50.30% | 50.30% | 51.50% | 51.70% | 51.90% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 52.80% | 52.80% | 52.80% | 53.80% | 54.00% | 54.20% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 61.19% | 61.19% | 61.19% | 61.30% | 61.50% | 61.70% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms including virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys and the use of discussion virtual rooms. The primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC). Information about the SEAC can be found at https://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-6598\_88192---,00.html. In addition to the agendas and minutes of meetings, presentations used in seeking stakeholder input are on this website. The location of these presentations was also shared with the ISD Directors’ at a regularly scheduled meeting. Other stakeholders include the MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board, ISD Directors, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD directors of special education, member district directors of special education, and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP in Michigan.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment | 1,166 | 1,244 | 1,246 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | 692 | 895 | 903 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment | 1,199 | 1,288 | 1,309 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | 603 | 680 | 801 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 692 | 1,166 |  | 59.35% | 59.35% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 895 | 1,244 |  | 71.95% | 71.95% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 903 | 1,246 |  | 72.47% | 72.47% | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 603 | 1,199 |  | 50.29% | 50.29% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 680 | 1,288 |  | 52.80% | 52.80% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 801 | 1,309 |  | 61.19% | 61.19% | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

**Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.**

For more information about Michigan’s Student Test of Educational Progress (M-STEP) and historical assessment data use the following URL link (https://www.mischooldata.org/k-12-grade/) This is a direct link to an example of state data Grades 3-8 State Testing: https://www.mischooldata.org/grades-3-8-state-testing-includes-psat-data-performance/

Assessment reports are available in three forms. Use the buttons near the top of the screen to switch between:

• Performance Level - Rather than specific scores, this report shows how many students fall into performance level categories: “Advanced,” “Proficient,” “Partially Proficient” and “Not Proficient” for M-STEP and PSAT 8/9, and “Emerging Towards,” “Attained” and “Surpassed” for MI-Access.
• Scaled Scores - This report includes a snapshot of the Mean Scaled Score by assessment content area. Scaled scores are calculated based on the total points the student scores, which are statistically adjusted and converted into a standard scale that allows direct and fair comparisons of scores from different forms of a test. Established psychometric procedures are used to ensure that a given scale score represents the same level of performance regardless of the test form.
• Proficiency - This report provides a snapshot and trend view of the number and percentage of students who scored as at or above proficient for each M-STEP subject of ELA, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies.

Annual Special Education public reporting can be found within MI School Data portal (https://www.mischooldata.org/special-education-summary/) There are two choices for viewing data on the public reporting website:

1. A downloadable Special Education (Part B) Public Reporting Excel Spreadsheet is on the Special Education Summary tab. This Excel spreadsheet contains data for all required indicators for all ISDs and member districts (data are masked).

2. Run Indicator Reports
a. On the Indicator Report Summary tab, select an ISD
b. Select either All Districts for data on the entire ISD or select any member district within the ISD from dropdown menu
c. Select the Report Year
d. Click on the “View Results” button at the bottom of the page

Provided for each indicator is a brief description, state target and performance, ISD and member district selected target and performance, and target status. In addition, the Selected Indicator Reports tab will provide additional information regarding selected indicators as well as visual graphs.

This is a direct link to an example of a school district for Indicator 3. (https://www.mischooldata.org/selected-indicator-reports/)

To select a different district, select Edit Report at top left. Use drop down menu for Member District or use blue Location Search.

Public reporting was made available in May 2021 although Statewide assessments were waived due to the pandemic. New FFY 2020 data will be publicly posted by June 1, 2022.

The measurement used by the OSEP in making determinations is different than the measurement used for Michigan’s APR. The determination measure starts with all students with an IEP who were assessed and asks the portion who used the regular assessment, while the APR B-3 Performance indicator starts with all students with an IEP enrolled and asks the portion who were assessed using any state level assessment (regular assessments and alternate assessments combined).

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Michigan resets baseline, given the FFY 2020 data have significantly changed compared to prior year’s data due to measurement changes to this indicator.

## 3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3C - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts the baseline.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State did not provide a Web link to FFY 2020 publicly-reported assessment results. OSEP notes that the State reported "New FFY 2020 data will be publicly posted by June 1, 2022."

## 3C - Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2022 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2020, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2021.

# Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator**: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3D - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group**  | **Group Name**  | **Baseline Year**  | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 28.60 |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 40.66 |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 42.34 |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 23.04 |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 28.00 |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 29.18 |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A <= | Grade 4 | 28.60 | 25.00  | 23.80 | 22.60 | 21.40 | 20.25 |
| Reading | B <= | Grade 8 | 40.66 | 34.30 | 33.00 | 31.75 | 30.50 | 29.20 |
| Reading | C <= | Grade HS | 42.34 | 42.00 | 40.50 | 39.00 | 37.60 | 36.00 |
| Math | A <= | Grade 4 | 23.04 | 21.60 | 20.10 | 18.60 | 17.20 | 15.70 |
| Math | B <= | Grade 8 | 28.00 | 23.30 | 21.60 | 19.90 | 18.20 | 16.40 |
| Math | C <= | Grade HS | 29.18 | 26.10 | 23.60 | 22.00 | 20.40 | 18.80 |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms including virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys and the use of discussion virtual rooms. The primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC). Information about the SEAC can be found at https://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-6598\_88192---,00.html. In addition to the agendas and minutes of meetings, presentations used in seeking stakeholder input are on this website. The location of these presentations was also shared with the ISD Directors’ at a regularly scheduled meeting. Other stakeholders include the MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board, ISD Directors, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD directors of special education, member district directors of special education, and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP in Michigan.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 72,733 | 77,717 | 81,897 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 9,106 | 7,761 | 6,426 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 32,183 | 48,061 | 43,958 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 30 | 1,416 | 2,162 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 1,402 | 934 | 166 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 27 | 851 | 732 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 72,420 | 77,737 | 81,899 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 9,032 | 7,770 | 6,426 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 26,445 | 27,447 | 27,002 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 39 | 551 | 1,064 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 1,190 | 339 | 69 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 32 | 284 | 258 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards**  | **Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards**  | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 15.69% | 44.29% |  | 28.60 | 28.60 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 23.00% | 63.66% |  | 40.66 | 40.66 | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 13.97% | 56.31% |  | 42.34 | 42.34 | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards**  | **Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards**  | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 13.53% | 36.57% |  | 23.04 | 23.04 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 8.02% | 36.02% |  | 28.00 | 28.00 | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 5.09% | 34.27% |  | 29.18 | 29.18 | N/A | N/A |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Michigan sets FFY 2020 as baseline as this is a new indicator.

## 3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3D - OSEP Response

The State has established the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts the baseline.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 3D - Required Actions

# Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

**Data Source**

State discipline data, including State’s analysis of State’s Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons:

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n and/or cell size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its 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 that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 4A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2019 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 4.10% | 3.90% | 3.70% | 3.50% | 1.45% |
| Data | 1.34% | 1.48% | 2.05% | 2.41% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target <= | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms including virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys and the use of discussion virtual rooms. The primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC). Information about the SEAC can be found at https://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-6598\_88192---,00.html. In addition to the agendas and minutes of meetings, presentations used in seeking stakeholder input are on this website. The location of these presentations was also shared with the ISD Directors’ at a regularly scheduled meeting. Other stakeholders include the MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board, ISD Directors, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD directors of special education, member district directors of special education, and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP in Michigan.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

0

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy** | **Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 0 | 57 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))**

Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State

**State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology**

An ISD is identified as having a significant discrepancy in rates of suspensions and/or expulsions when more than five percent of students with an IEP received out-of-school suspensions/expulsions for greater than 10 days cumulatively during the school year. ISDs exceeding the five percent threshold with fewer than five students with an IEP suspended/expelled for more than 10 days, were not identified as having a significant discrepancy.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The MDE OSE reports 56 LEAs in the Introduction because there are 56 LEAs that are the subrecipient of IDEA funding. However, in Michigan, there are State Agencies, such as the Department of Health and Human Services, which provide services to students with an IEP. Indicators 4A, 4B, 9 and 10 count these students at the aggregate level. State agencies are not an LEA and therefore are not included in the Introduction section. However, State agencies are included in these indicators.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 data)**

**Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.**

Not applicable

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 |  |  | 0 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FFY 2018 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2018**

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

The MDE OSE ensured the LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 is correctly implementing regulatory requirements (100% compliance) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through student record reviews verified by ISDs and the MDE OSE.

Each individual case of noncompliance was corrected, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. The State reviewed data subsequent to the initial finding to determine that noncompliance has been corrected. Verification activities included: (1) a review of updated policies, procedures and/or practices and (2) a review of new data submitted through state data systems. When data submitted demonstrated continued noncompliance there was additional training and a review of more recent student records. Based on this review, the State established the identified noncompliance has been corrected and the LEA is correctly implementing the specific statutory or regulatory requirement(s). When correction of noncompliance was not completed within one year, the State mandated increased TA, training or other enforcement action to promptly bring the LEA into compliance. A finding remains active until correction is verified by the State.

Each individual case of noncompliance was verified as corrected by a review of the student file conducted onsite by the ISD and submitted to and reviewed by the State. After the subsequent reviews, this LEA was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements per OSEP memo 09-02.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

Each individual case of noncompliance was verified as corrected by a review of the student file by the ISD and submitted to and reviewed by the MDE OSE in a student-level corrective action plan documented in Catamaran unless the student is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

## 4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b) was partially corrected. When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each district with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2018: (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 district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

Each individual case of noncompliance was verified as corrected by a review of the student file conducted onsite by the ISD and submitted to and reviewed by the State. After the subsequent reviews, this LEA was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements per OSEP memo 09-02. All FFY 2018 findings of noncompliance have been verified as corrected.

## 4A - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 4A - Required Actions

# Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Compliance Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

 A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

**Data Source**

State discipline data, including State’s analysis of State’s Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons:

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices 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.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

## 4B - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2019 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 3.58% | 1.84% | 5.07% | 3.86% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

0

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity** | **Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements** | **Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 1 | 0 | 57 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology**

An ISD is identified as having a significant discrepancy in rates of suspensions and/or expulsions when more than five percent of students with an IEP received out-of-school suspensions/expulsions for greater than 10 days cumulatively during the school year. ISDs exceeding the five percent threshold for each race/ethnicity with fewer than five students with an IEP suspended/expelled for more than 10 days, were not identified as having a significant discrepancy.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Michigan reports 56 LEAs in the Introduction because there are 56 LEAs that are the subrecipient of IDEA funding. However, in Michigan, there are State Agencies, such as the Department of Health and Human Services, which provide services to students with an IEP. Indicators 4A, 4B, 9 and 10 count these students at the aggregate level. State agencies are not an LEA and therefore are not included in the Introduction section. However, State agencies are included in these indicators.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 data)**

**Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.**

The MDE OSE conducted a review of the one ISD identified with significant discrepancy. As part of the monitoring, Michigan reviewed the ISD’s policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required. After the completion of monitoring activities, the ISD was not found to have noncompliant policies, procedures and/or practices which contributed to the significant discrepancy.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FFY 2018 | 6 | 6 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2018**

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

The MDE OSE ensured each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 is correctly implementing regulatory requirements (100% compliance) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through student record reviews verified by ISDs and the MDE OSE.

Each individual case of noncompliance was corrected, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. The State reviewed data subsequent to the initial finding to determine that noncompliance has been corrected. Verification activities included: (1) a review of updated policies, procedures and/or practices and (2) a review of new data submitted through state data systems. If the data submitted demonstrated continued noncompliance, there was additional training and a review of more recent student records. Based on this review, the State established the identified noncompliance has been corrected and the LEA is correctly implementing the specific statutory or regulatory requirement(s).

Each individual case of noncompliance was verified as corrected by a review of the student file conducted onsite by the ISD a nd submitted to and reviewed by the State. After the subsequent reviews, this LEA was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements per OSEP memo 09-02. All FFY 2018 findings of noncompliance have been verified as corrected.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

Each individual case of noncompliance was verified as corrected by a review of the student files by the ISD and submitted to and reviewed by the MDE OSE in a student-level corrective action plan documented in Catamaran unless the student is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. All FFY 2018 findings of noncompliance have been verified as corrected.

## 4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 C.F.R. §300.170(b) was not corrected. When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each district with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2018: (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 district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

Each individual case of noncompliance was verified as corrected by a review of the student files by the ISD and submitted to and reviewed by the MDE OSE in a student-level corrective action plan documented in Catamaran unless the student is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

For the member district with uncorrected noncompliance the MDE OSE provided a technical assistant who reviewed the cause of the ongoing noncompliance and mandated the use of TA, training, and other enforcement action to ensure prompt compliance. The TA provider continued to work with the member district and determine why and what actions need to be taken until noncompliance was corrected and verified by the state. The verification ensures the member district is meeting the regulatory requirements and is achieving 100 percent compliance. All FFY 2018 findings of noncompliance have been verified as corrected.

## 4B - OSEP Response

## 4B- Required Actions

# Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served:

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

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

C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

**Measurement**

 A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

 B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

 C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)]times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.*

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6.Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

## 5 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline**  | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| A | 2020 | Target >= | 63.50% | 63.75% | 64.00% | 64.25% | 64.25% |
| A | 69.92% | Data | 66.39% | 66.89% | 67.19% | 67.66% | 68.58% |
| B | 2020 | Target <= | 11.70% | 11.60% | 11.50% | 11.40% | 11.40% |
| B | 9.93% | Data | 10.86% | 10.90% | 11.10% | 10.97% | 10.55% |
| C | 2020 | Target <= | 5.32% | 5.28% | 5.24% | 5.15% | 5.15% |
| C | 4.98% | Data | 5.16% | 4.96% | 4.83% | 4.79% | 4.71% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 69.92% | 69.92% | 70.00% | 70.25% | 70.50% | 70.75% |
| Target B <= | 9.93% | 9.93% | 9.75% | 9.70% | 9.65% | 9.60% |
| Target C <= | 4.98% | 4.98% | 4.98% | 4.97% | 4.96% | 4.95% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms including virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys and the use of discussion virtual rooms. The primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC). Information about the SEAC can be found at https://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-6598\_88192---,00.html. In addition to the agendas and minutes of meetings, presentations used in seeking stakeholder input are on this website. The location of these presentations was also shared with the ISD Directors’ at a regularly scheduled meeting. Other stakeholders include the MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board, ISD Directors, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD directors of special education, member district directors of special education, and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP in Michigan.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 | 181,390 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 126,832 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 18,004 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools | 8,514 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities | 180 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements | 332 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Education Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 126,832 | 181,390 | 68.58% | 69.92% | 69.92% | N/A | N/A |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 18,004 | 181,390 | 10.55% | 9.93% | 9.93% | N/A | N/A |
| C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3] | 9,026 | 181,390 | 4.71% | 4.98% | 4.98% | N/A | N/A |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Michigan resets baseline, given the FFY 2020 data have significantly changed compared to FFY 2019 data due to measurement changes to this indicator, which require the inclusion of five-year-old kindergarten students in Indicator 5 as opposed to including in Indicator 6 Preschool Educational Environments.

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 5 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 5 - Required Actions

# Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program 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.

 C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

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

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

**Measurement**

 A. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs 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 ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

 B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

 C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.*

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (*e.g.*, 75-85%).Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under IDEA section 618, explain.

## 6 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data – 6A, 6B**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| **A** | Target >= | 28.20% | 28.30% | 28.50% | 28.80% | 28.80% |
| **A** | Data | 29.72% | 29.89% | 28.68% | 30.24% | 28.24% |
| **B** | Target <= | 43.20% | 42.00% | 41.50% | 41.00% | 41.00% |
| **B** | Data | 39.25% | 38.72% | 38.51% | 36.08% | 37.31% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms including virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys and the use of discussion virtual rooms. The primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC). Information about the SEAC can be found at https://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-6598\_88192---,00.html. In addition to the agendas and minutes of meetings, presentations used in seeking stakeholder input are on this website. The location of these presentations was also shared with the ISD Directors’ at a regularly scheduled meeting. Other stakeholders include the MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board, ISD Directors, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD directors of special education, member district directors of special education, and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP in Michigan.

Additionally, the Office of Great Start within the Department of Education has two inclusion initiatives that are taking place. First, the MDE has awarded seven ISDs monies to improve their preschool inclusion efforts, the targets were discussed with these stakeholders as well as the stakeholders from our second initiative, a statewide preschool inclusion stakeholder group consisting of 55 individuals representing the diverse areas and populations of Michigan, where the focus is improving opportunities for inclusion to increase child outcomes for all children.

**Targets**

**Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.**

Inclusive Targets

**Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.**

Target Range not used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

| **Part** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | 2020 | 19.46% |
| **B** | 2020 | 46.03% |
| **C** | 2020 | 2.82% |

**Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 19.46% | 19.50% | 19.50% | 20.25% | 21.00% | 21.75% |
| Target B <= | 46.03% | 46.00% | 46.00% | 45.75% | 45.50% | 45.25% |

**Inclusive Targets – 6C**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target C <= | 2.82% | 2.82% | 2.82% | 2.82% | 2.82% | 2.80% |

**Prepopulated Data**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

**Date:**

07/07/2021

| **Description** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **3 through 5 - Total** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total number of children with IEPs | 4,735 | 6,484 | 983 | 12,202 |
| a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program | 615 | 1,595 | 165 | 2,375 |
| b1. Number of children attending separate special education class | 2,333 | 2,551 | 519 | 5,403 |
| b2. Number of children attending separate school | 60 | 115 | 38 | 213 |
| b3. Number of children attending residential facility | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| c1**.** Numberof children receiving special education and related services in the home | 209 | 122 | 13 | 344 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5**

| **Preschool Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program | 2,375 | 12,202 | 28.24% | 19.46% | 19.46% | N/A | N/A |
| B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 5,616 | 12,202 | 37.31% | 46.03% | 46.03% | N/A | N/A |
| C. Home | 344 | 12,202 |  | 2.82% | 2.82% | N/A | N/A |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Michigan resets baseline, given the FFY 2020 data have significantly changed compared to FFY 2019 data due to measurement changes to this indicator which require the inclusion of five-year old kindergarten students in Indicator 5 as opposed to including in Indicator 6 Preschool Educational Environments.

Due to changes in the MSDS system, several primary educational setting codes could be entered for this age group which had not been available previously. Additionally, with Michigan’s continued training and TA around inclusion, Michigan is getting higher reliability in the data from past potential coding errors.

Per the requirement of OSEP, children age 5 who are not in preschool were removed from the B6 data collection, and that impacted data significantly. In a given year, Michigan has over 7,000 children that are five-years-old who are not in preschool but were collected as such in the past based on age. The removal of these children from the data collection and reporting had a significant impact on both 6A, inclusive settings and 6B, separate settings.

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 6 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 6 - Required Actions

# Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

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

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

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

**Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:**

**Summary Statement 1**: Of those preschool children who entered 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.

**Instructions**

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.” If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

## 7 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| A1 | 2011 | Target >= | 86.50% | 87.00% | 87.50% | 88.00% | 88.00% |
| A1 | 81.10% | Data | 87.90% | 88.36% | 88.31% | 88.39% | 88.61% |
| A2 | 2011 | Target >= | 55.00% | 55.10% | 55.20% | 55.30% | 55.30% |
| A2 | 54.00% | Data | 58.02% | 57.82% | 58.08% | 60.61% | 54.02% |
| B1 | 2011 | Target >= | 87.50% | 88.00% | 88.50% | 89.00% | 89.00% |
| B1 | 82.20% | Data | 89.11% | 90.17% | 89.94% | 88.23% | 89.62% |
| B2 | 2011 | Target >= | 56.10% | 56.30% | 56.40% | 56.50% | 56.50% |
| B2 | 53.70% | Data | 58.93% | 57.13% | 57.41% | 57.65% | 53.49% |
| C1 | 2011 | Target >= | 86.50% | 87.25% | 87.75% | 88.25% | 88.25% |
| C1 | 81.30% | Data | 88.47% | 88.66% | 89.14% | 87.71% | 88.39% |
| C2 | 2011 | Target >= | 59.20% | 59.30% | 59.40% | 59.50% | 59.50% |
| C2 | 58.70% | Data | 61.25% | 60.89% | 61.67% | 61.55% | 57.29% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A1 >= | 88.00% | 88.00% | 88.00% | 88.00% | 88.00% | 88.00% |
| Target A2 >= | 57.00% | 57.00% | 58.00% | 58.00% | 59.00% | 59.00% |
| Target B1 >= | 86.00% | 86.00% | 87.00% | 87.00% | 88.00% | 88.00% |
| Target B2 >= | 56.00% | 56.00% | 56.50% | 56.50% | 57.00% | 57.00% |
| Target C1 >= | 86.00% | 86.00% | 87.00% | 87.00% | 88.00% | 88.00% |
| Target C2 >= | 59.00% | 59.00% | 59.50% | 59.50% | 60.00% | 60.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms including virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys and the use of discussion virtual rooms. The primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC). Information about the SEAC can be found at https://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-6598\_88192---,00.html. In addition to the agendas and minutes of meetings, presentations used in seeking stakeholder input are on this website. The location of these presentations was also shared with the ISD Directors’ at a regularly scheduled meeting. Other stakeholders include the MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board, ISD Directors, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD directors of special education, member district directors of special education, and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP in Michigan.

The MDE OSE provides updates to these groups on the historical trends in the SPP/APR data (FFY 2013 through FFY 2019), as well as activities OSE, grant funded initiatives, and the MDE are undertaking to improve results for students with an IEP and increase compliance with IDEA and MARSE. Discussions with these groups took place to complete a data analysis and examine current trends in outcome data to set targets for the upcoming years that are measurable, achievable, yet rigorous. Michigan’s targets are very rigorous as compared to the averages across the nation for both summary statements in each of the Preschool Child Outcomes ranging from one through seven percentage points above the national averages.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed**

3,052

**Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)**

| **Outcome A Progress Category** | **Number of children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 19 | 0.62% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 278 | 9.11% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 1,024 | 33.55% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,049 | 34.37% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 682 | 22.35% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A1. Of those children who entered or exited the 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. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 2,073 | 2,370 | 88.61% | 88.00% | 87.47% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| 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. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 1,731 | 3,052 | 54.02% | 57.00% | 56.72% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)**

| **Outcome B Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 19 | 0.62% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 250 | 8.19% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 1,101 | 36.07% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,263 | 41.38% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 419 | 13.73% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B1. Of those children who entered or exited the 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. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 2,364 | 2,633 | 89.62% | 86.00% | 89.78% | Met target | No Slippage |
| 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. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 1,682 | 3,052 | 53.49% | 56.00% | 55.11% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

| **Outcome C Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 19 | 0.62% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 263 | 8.62% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 982 | 32.18% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,152 | 37.75% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 636 | 20.84% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| C1. Of those children who entered or exited the 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.*Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*  | 2,134 | 2,416 | 88.39% | 86.00% | 88.33% | Met target | No Slippage |
| 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. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 1,788 | 3,052 | 57.29% | 59.00% | 58.58% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **A1** | Michigan met two of the targets set for preschool outcomes. For the preschool outcomes in which the targets were not met, slippage only occurred in summary statement A1. Growth was observed in the other three areas where targets were not met. Three of the four targets not met were in summary statement 2. Michigan closed in person learning March 2020 and many member districts were neither equipped nor trained on the use of other assessment tools that could be used virtually. Therefore, schools relied on the assessment tools that required an in-person evaluation and assessment which led to incomplete and compromised data being entered. As member districts remained virtual/remote for the 2020-2021 school year, this compounded the issue with assessment tools, as member districts were unable to acquire the training on assessment tools that could be used virtually. As a step to mitigate the impact of COVID 19 pandemic, Michigan did share with member districts resources provided through Early Childhood Technical Assistance (ECTA) center on virtual assessments to aid member districts in their assessment of children remotely.Furthermore, there were times, when families did not make their child available for either virtual services or virtual assessment. For a few member districts, the only option available was to use the most relevant data on hand and that did not reflect a full year of growth.Michigan has reviewed the methodology and procedures that were used to create the data and found no anomalies. Additional analysis of the data did not identify any discernable pattern that would explain why slippage occurred other than the potential impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. The COVID 19 pandemic impacted the completeness, validity and reliability of data, limiting the ability to collect the data despite efforts to mitigate the impact. Michigan has provided additional training on outcomes, birth through age 5, encompassing Part C and 619. Teachers and specialists are improving their COS process and providing more accurate data because of the outcomes training. The MDE OSE will continue to monitor these data and continue to provide training on the outcomes COS process, with the goal of meeting targets for FFY 2021. |

**Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)**

YES

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used?  | NO |

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)**

YES

**List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.**

State approved assessment instruments include: Assessment, Evaluation and Programming System (AEPS), Battelle Developmental Inventory, Second Edition (BDI-2), Battelle Developmental Inventory Screening Test, Brigance Inventory of Early Development -II and III (IED-II and IED-III), Carolina Curriculum for Preschoolers, Child Observation Record (COR), COR Advantage, Creative Curriculum for Preschools, Teaching Strategies Gold, and Learning Accomplishments Profile -3rd. Ed (LAP-3).

There are three components used to reach a consensus on the Child Outcome Decision Tree. The first component is the requirement for the use of one of the state approved assessment tools designed for assessment of preschool-aged children. These options consist of both criterion- and norm-referenced assessment tools. The second component is parent input and is included to acknowledge the requirement of “across all settings and situations.” The third component consists of professional expertise which is based on specialist’s knowledge of child development and age expectations as well as their ability to observe skills and behaviors across settings and situations. These three components are used in a team meeting to determine the score using the decision tree.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The MDE OSE continues to be involved in national Community of Practice calls and work groups to enhance and improve data as it relates to Preschool Child Outcomes. Additionally, the MDE OSE continues to explore the alignment and correlation of child outcome data between children receiving services in Part C of IDEA and those transitioning to Part B of IDEA within the Linking Part C and 619 Data Cohort, a cross-state TA activity sponsored by the U.S. Office of Special Education Programs’ (OSEP) Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy) and Early Childhood Technical Assistance (ECTA) Center. The impact of COVID-19 on this indicator is discussed in the slippage section for A1.

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 7 - Required Actions

# Indicator 8: Parent involvement

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** 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))

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**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.

**Instructions**

*Sampling****of parents from whom response is requested****is allowed.* *When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

Include in the State’s analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023,** when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

## 8 - Indicator Data

| **Question** | **Yes / No**  |
| --- | --- |
| Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?  | YES |
| If yes, will you be providing the data for preschool children separately? | YES |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms including virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys and the use of discussion virtual rooms. The primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC). Information about the SEAC can be found at https://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-6598\_88192---,00.html. In addition to the agendas and minutes of meetings, presentations used in seeking stakeholder input are on this website. The location of these presentations was also shared with the ISD Directors’ at a regularly scheduled meeting. Other stakeholders include the MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board, ISD Directors, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD directors of special education, member district directors of special education, and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP in Michigan.

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Baseline**  | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Preschool | 2020 | Target >= | 46.00% | 46.50% | 47.00% | 47.50% | 47.50% |
| Preschool | 78.44% | Data | 49.70% | 50.38% | 50.48% | 49.25% | 54.77% |
| School age | 2020 | Target >= | 25.60% | 26.00% | 26.40% | 26.80% | 26.80% |
| School age | 62.15% | Data | 29.59% | 28.90% | 28.14% | 30.36% | 31.45% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 78.44% | 78.44% | 78.44% | 78.44% | 78.54% | 78.64% |
| Target B >= | 62.15% | 62.15% | 62.15% | 62.15% | 62.25% | 62.35% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Preschool Children Reported Separately**

| **Group** | **Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities** | **Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Preschool | 2,420 | 3,085 | 54.77% | 78.44% | 78.44% | N/A | N/A |
| School age | 6,239 | 10,039 | 31.45% | 62.15% | 62.15% | N/A | N/A |

**The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.**

68,742

**Percentage of respondent parents**

19.09%

**Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Response Rate  | 23.06% | 19.09% |

**Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

Michigan seeks to increase the response rate and representativeness in various ways. First, the MDE-OSE provides the list of contact information of students to Wayne State University (WSU) for survey deployment. To help ensure the contact information is correct, WSU uses a survey mailing house and directory services to append phone numbers to addresses, and to update mailing addresses without personal identifiers. In order to reach as many parents as possible, the survey continues to be available in multiple modes (mail, telephone, and online).

To further achieve representativeness, the response rate from historically underrepresented groups continue to be closely monitored throughout the survey process. This monitoring process guides the use of targeted re-mails, telephone follow-up calls, and post-card reminders. Even with these additional efforts, along with efforts to secure accurate contact information, some groups continue to be underrepresented. Michigan will explore other strategies such as working with specific ISDs which have a high proportion of underrepresented groups to boost the response rate for these groups.

**Describe the analysis** **of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.**

When comparing the survey sample to the eligible population, Michigan examines parent characteristics as well as child characteristics. Specifically, Michigan assesses five demographic categories to evaluate possible nonresponse bias. These categories include child/student gender, child/student race/ethnicity, respondent race/ethnicity, disability category, and a geographic measure called ISD peer group. The state constructs tables of these attributes as they pertain to the survey-eligible population, and calculates the proportion of the eligible survey population who are in the various demographic groups. These proportions are then compared to the corresponding proportions for survey respondents. That comparison results in a difference of proportions test, in which the differences between the population and respondent groups are assessed for statistical significance. For FFY 2020, this procedure indicated that the respondent group was representative of the population in terms of child/student gender, but revealed at least one statistically significant difference with respect to child/student race/ethnicity, parent race/ethnicity, disability category, and ISD peer group.

To further test for possible effects of nonresponse bias, Michigan conducts an additional assessment to determine if the results would be meaningfully impacted by statistical weighting. For each of the demographic categories in which the respondents were not fully representative of the population, the overall results are weighted and recalculated to assess how those weighted results might differ from the unweighted results. This procedure provides an estimate of the results that would be found if the distribution of a particular characteristic in the sample was identical to the distribution in the overall population. Once the weights are applied in this way, the analyses can be performed again to obtain weighted results. With the FFY 2020 data, this assessment revealed a statistically significant difference between the school age sample’s unweighted average score and the corresponding weighted average score by respondent race/ethnicity. However, no statistically significant differences were found between the proportions of respondents who met the state standard of 60%. This suggests that, to the extent nonresponse bias has been found, the overall results were not meaningfully affected.

Michigan will use the following strategies to address the issue of nonresponse bias of the sample:
 • Mailing follow-up post cards, conducting follow-up telephone calls and interviews, mailing additional copies of the survey to non-respondents, and conducting additional calls to low-responding areas and underrepresented groups.
 • Encouraging and supporting parents to participate in the survey, using a variety of techniques, including:
 • Sending multiple letters to inform parents about the survey and providing guidance for ISD coordinators to do likewise;
 • Providing potential respondents an opportunity to ask questions;
 • Providing assurances that the survey is voluntary and confidential;
 • Offering the survey in three modes (online, paper, and telephone);
 • Making in-person visits by interviewers in selected low-response areas (if public health circumstances, due to COVID-19, allow it);
 • Providing a toll-free number for questions about the survey and/or to take the survey over the phone if desired; and
 • Offering the survey in Arabic and Spanish.

**Include in the State’s analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.**

Comparisons between the demographics of the parents responding to the survey and the demographics of children in the population reveal several statistically significant differences. In comparison to the eligible statewide population, the preschool survey sample had an underrepresentation of African American parents and multiracial parents, and an overrepresentation of Asian American parents. As described in further detail below, the school age survey is conducted using three survey cohorts. In comparison to this year’s eligible cohort population, the school age survey sample had an underrepresentation of African American parents and multiracial parents, and an overrepresentation of Asian American parents, Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander parents, and White parents.

For each of the demographic categories in which the respondents were not fully representative of the population, the overall results were weighted and recalculated to assess how those weighted results might differ from the unweighted results. This assessment revealed a statistically significant difference between the school age sample’s unweighted average score and the corresponding weighted average score by respondent race/ethnicity. However, no statistically significant differences were found between the proportions of respondents who met the state standard of 60%. Therefore, even though the respondents were not entirely representative across the demographic categories considered, the Indicator 8 results were not meaningfully affected, and unweighted results are reported. (Additional details for comparison data are available upon request.)

**The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)**

NO

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

Michigan’s strategies to ensure that future response data are representative of these demographics closely align with the strategies mentioned above for increasing the survey response rate. Michigan will use the following strategies to address the issue of response data not being representative of the state’s demographics:

• Mailing follow-up post cards, conducting follow-up telephone calls and interviews, mailing additional copies of the survey to non-respondents, and conducting additional calls to low-responding areas and underrepresented groups.
• Encouraging and supporting parents to participate in the survey, using a variety of techniques, including:
 • Sending multiple letters to inform parents about the survey and providing guidance for ISD coordinators to do likewise;
 • Providing potential respondents an opportunity to ask questions;
 • Providing assurances that the survey is voluntary and confidential;
 • Offering the survey in three modes (online, paper, and telephone);
 • Making in-person visits by interviewers in selected low-response areas (if public health circumstances, due to COVID-19, allow it);
 • Providing a toll-free number for questions about the survey and/or to take the survey over the phone if desired; and
 • Offering the survey in Arabic and Spanish.

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

For each of the various demographic groups assessed for representativeness, and for each version of the survey, difference of proportions tests were used to assess statistically significant differences between the survey-eligible population and the survey respondents. With this approach, statistically significant differences were used to indicate instances of non-representativeness. These tests used a 95% confidence level (p < 0.05 significance level) to assess whether statistically significant differences existed within the demographic groups. This difference of proportions approach takes into account the sample size and distribution of the respective populations and respondent groups.

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used?  | YES |
| If yes, has your previously approved sampling plan changed? | NO |

**Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.**

Surveys were distributed to all parents of children who are at least age 3 in preschool who received special education services in Michigan, and to approximately one third of all parents of students in kindergarten through age 21 who received such services in Michigan. Parents of students in kindergarten through age 21 were selected to participate in the school age survey using the OSEP-approved cohort sampling plan. Approximately one third of member districts within every ISD were selected to participate in the school age survey, resulting in three survey cohorts. These cohorts are reviewed annually to assess the demographic characteristics of their populations.

There were two versions of the survey for parents of children and students receiving special education services:
• One for parents of children who are at least age 3 in preschool (the “preschool survey”); and
• One for parents of students in kindergarten through age 21 (the “school age survey”).

The preschool survey contained 37 NCSEAM questions measuring “Efforts to Partner with Parents”, while the school age survey included 25 questions measuring the same construct. The preschool survey also contained an additional 13 NCSEAM questions measuring “Quality of Services”, resulting in a total of 50 items on that survey.

There were 3,085 respondents to the preschool survey (23.82% response rate) and 10,039 respondents to the school age survey (17.99% response rate) for a total of 13,124 responses from 68,742 viable respondents (19.09% total response rate). Beginning in FFY 2020, a new method was used to analyze the survey results. This method uses a percent of maximum approach to generate scores for each respondent. Each survey question about schools’ efforts to partner with parents used a six-point agreement scale ranging from “very strongly disagree” to “very strongly agree”. For each survey item, a percentage, ranging from 0% (“very strongly disagree”) to 100% (“very strongly agree”), was calculated, and these percentages were averaged for each respondent. It was determined this new method for analyzing the survey results, in addition to the need to include parents of children age 5 in kindergarten in the school age survey cohort, per OSEP requirements, would make comparisons of FFY 2020 and future results to previous years inappropriate. For this reason, FFY 2020 is a baseline year, resulting in new proposed targets for FFY 2020-2025.

An overall standard of 60% (“agree”) was used to determine whether respondents reported that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with an IEP. Of the completed surveys, all 13,124 respondents provided sufficient data to calculate an average score. For the preschool survey, 2,420 respondents (78.44%) had scores that met or exceeded the state standard, and for the school age survey, 6,239 respondents (62.15%) had scores that met or exceeded this standard. Because of the new methodology, Michigan is using the data for FFY 2020 as its new baseline for both surveys. Both of these baselines are statistically significantly higher than the state’s 60% standard.

| **Survey Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was a survey used?  | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised survey? | NO |
| If yes, provide a copy of the survey. |  |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Michigan resets baseline, given the change to the method used to analyze the survey results.

## 8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2020 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

SEE ABOVE

## 8 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State submitted its sampling plan for this indicator with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR. OSEP will follow up with the State under separate cover regarding the submission.

## 8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2021 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

# Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**Compliance indicator**: 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))

**Data Source**

State’s analysis, based on State’s Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, 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 that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§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 and/or cell 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 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 9 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target  | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.29% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services** | **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification** | **Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 0 | 0 | 56 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | N/A | N/A |

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).**

The MDE OSE’s operational definition of ISDs with disproportionate representation because of inappropriate identification includes:

Step 1: Identify ISDs with disproportionate representation data

For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the two school years examined were school year (2019-2020) and school year (2020-2021). A risk ratio greater than 2.5 for two consecutive years for any racial/ethnic group in all eligibility categories was used to identify ISDs for monitoring activities.

Calculations are performed for all ISDs with 30 or more students with an IEP. In cases where the sum of all other students with an IEP equals fewer than ten, an alternate risk ratio (ARR) was calculated for the race under consideration, per IDEA Data Center recommendation. The ARR is calculated when the number of students in the comparison group in the district is small and the risk ratio (RR) compares the identification rate for a racial/ethnic group to the identification rate for all other racial/ethnic groups.

Step 2: Analyze policies, practices and procedures

If an ISD has a risk ratio greater than 2.5 for both years, the MDE OSE conducts monitoring activities to determine whether the disproportionate representation was a result of inappropriate identification policies, practices and/or procedures. When inappropriate policies, practices, and/or procedures are found, the MDE OSE issues findings of noncompliance.

**Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.**

As noted above, when the ISD exceeded the established risk ratio for two consecutive years for specific students in special education, the ISD was determined to have disproportionate representation by race/ethnicity.

If an ISD is determined to have disproportionate representation, the MDE OSE conducts monitoring activities using IDEA regulations along with MARSE. These activities include a review of the ISD’s policies, procedures and practices related to students with an IEP. After the review it is determined whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification policies, procedures, or practices. No ISD had a risk ratio greater than 2.5 for both years.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Michigan reported 56 LEAs in the Introduction because there are 56 LEAs that are the subrecipient of IDEA funding. However, in Michigan, there are State Agencies, such as the Department of Health and Human Services, which provide services to students with an IEP. Indicators 4A, 4B, 9 and 10 count these students at the aggregate level. State agencies are not an LEA and therefore are not included in the Introduction section. However, State agencies are included in Indicators 9 and 10. The State agencies as an entity did not meet the State-established n and/or cell size and subsequently were excluded for this indicator.

Michigan resets baseline to FFY 2020 because of revisions to the Measurement Table. Specifically, with the FFY 2020 APR submission, all States are now required to provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten in addition to those aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. Therefore, the State must revise its baseline using FFY 2020 data.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 |  |  | 0 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 9 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

## 9 - Required Actions

# Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**Compliance indicator**: 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))

**Data Source**

State’s analysis, based on State’s Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, 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 that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2020, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§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 and/or cell 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 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 10 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target  | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 2.00% | 1.17% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories** | **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification** | **Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 7 | 0 | 56 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | N/A | N/A |

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).**

Michigan’s operational definition of ISDs with disproportionate representation because of inappropriate identification includes:

Step 1: Identify ISDs with disproportionate representation data.

For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the two school years considered were school year (2019-2020) and school year (20202021). A risk ratio (RR) greater than 2.5 for two consecutive years for any racial/ethnic group in one of six eligibility categories was used to identify ISDs for focused monitoring activities.

Calculations are performed for all ISDs with 30 or more students with an IEP. In cases where the sum of all other students with an IEP equals fewer than ten, an alternate risk ratio (ARR) was calculated for the race under consideration, per IDEA Data Center recommendation. The ARR is calculated when the number of students in the comparison group in the district is small and the risk ratio (RR) compares the identification rate for a racial/ethnic group to the identification rate for all other racial/ethnic groups.

Step 2: Analyze policies, practices and procedures

As a result of an ISD having a risk ratio greater than 2.5 for both years, the MDE OSE conducted monitoring activities to determine whether the disproportionate representation was a result of inappropriate identification policies, practices and/or procedures. When inappropriate policies, practices and/or procedures are found, the MDE OSE issues findings of noncompliance.

**Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.**

As noted above, when the ISD exceeded the established risk ratio for two consecutive years for specific students in special education, the ISD was determined to have disproportionate representation by race/ethnicity.

For ISDs determined to have disproportionate representation, the MDE OSE conducted monitoring activities using IDEA regulations along with the MARSE. These activities included a review of the ISD’s policies, procedures and practices related to students with an IEP. After the review it was determined whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification. No ISD had findings of noncompliance. Therefore, no corrective action plans were required.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Michigan reported 56 LEAs in the Introduction because there are 56 LEAs that are the subrecipient of IDEA funding. However, in Michigan, there are State Agencies, such as the Department of Health and Human Services, which provide services to students with an IEP. Indicators 4A, 4B, 9 and 10 count these students at the aggregate level. State agencies are not an LEA and therefore are not included in the Introduction section. However, State agencies are included in Indicators 9 and 10. The State agencies as an entity did not meet the State-established n and/or cell size and subsequently were excluded for this indicator.

Michigan resets baseline to FFY 2020 because of revisions to the Measurement Table. Specifically, with the FFY 2020 APR submission, all States are now required to provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten in addition to those aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. Therefore, the State must revise its baseline using FFY 2020 data.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 10 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

## 10 - Required Actions

# Indicator 11: Child Find

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

**Compliance indicator**: 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))

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State’s timeline for initial evaluations.

**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.

**Instructions**

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child’s previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 11 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 80.51% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 99.80% | 99.86% | 99.77% | 99.55% | 99.35% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received** | **(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 25,112 | 25,014 | 99.35% | 100% | 99.61% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)**

98

**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.**

The following information presents the reasons member districts gave for late evaluations and includes the number and percent of eligible and ineligible children reported for each reason.

Reason for Late Evaluation for Eligible Children with a Late Evaluation:
External reports not available - 5 (5.95%)
Personnel not available for evaluation - 46 (54.76%)
Personnel not available for IEP - 33 (39.29%)
Total - 84 (85.71%)

Reason for Late Evaluation for Ineligible Children with a Late Evaluation:
External reports not available - 1 (7.14%)
Personnel not available for evaluation - 8 (57.14%)
Personnel not available for IEP - 5 (35.71%)
Total - 14 (14.29%)

The following information presents the number and percent of late evaluations by the range of calendar days beyond the state’s 30-School-Day timeline:
1-5 days 38 (38.78%)
6-10 days 14 (14.29%)
11-15 days 5 (5.10%)
16-20 days 8 (8.16%)
21-25 days 0 (0.00%)
26-30 days 3 (3.06%)
> 30 days 30 (30.61%)
May not equal 100% due to rounding.

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used:**

The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted

**What is the State’s timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).**

According to the MARSE R 340.1721b for special education, the established timeline for evaluation is within 30 school days. Listed below are the codes in the state data system which describe cases where exceptions are made and included in count (b).

- Code 12: The evaluation was completed within the agreed-upon written timeline extension.

- Code 22: The IEP from the previous state was implemented while conducting a review of the existing evaluation or convening an IEP team meeting within 30 school days.

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

Student data were collected via the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS), including students with an IEP. Data necessary for completion of Indicator 11 and for assigning district accountability for the evaluation were extracted from the MSDS and are reported in the SPP/APR.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 48 | 47 | 0 | 1 |

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

The MDE OSE ensured each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 is correctly implementing regulatory requirements (100% compliance) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through student record reviews verified by ISDs and the MDE OSE.

Each individual case of noncompliance was corrected, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. The State reviewed data subsequent to the initial finding to determine that noncompliance has been corrected. Verification activities included: (1) a review of updated policies, procedures and/or practices and (2) a review of new data submitted through state data systems. If the data submitted demonstrated continued noncompliance there was additional training and a review of more recent student records. Based on this review, the State established the identified noncompliance has been corrected and the LEA is correctly implementing the specific statutory or regulatory requirement(s).

Each individual case of noncompliance was verified as corrected by a review of the student file conducted onsite by the ISD a nd submitted to and reviewed by the State. After the subsequent reviews, the LEAs with noncompliance were verified as correctly implementing the regulatory requirements per OSEP memo 09-02.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

The state conducted reviews of policies and procedures for all 48 entities with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 to ensure these were in compliance and updated as needed. The state also reviewed data, using the statewide database to determine whether the entities were evaluating students within the required state timeline, after the findings of noncompliance for all 48 entities to ensure compliant practices. Forty-seven (47) of the 48 entities were found to have compliant policies and procedures and were evaluating students with IEPs within the state established timelines. The one entity with findings that have not been verified as corrected has been provided additional training and continuing review of subsequent student records . The individual students have all been evaluated although late.

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

For the member district with ongoing noncompliance, the MDE OSE is providing a technical assistant and reviewing the cause of the ongoing noncompliance and mandating the use of TA, training and other enforcement actions to ensure prompt compliance. The MDE OSE developed a plan to bring the district into compliance which includes support from the ISD to conduct overdue evaluations. Weekly meetings are held with the district and ISD to review the progress of the district in completing evaluations and achieving 100% compliance as required by OSEP memo 09-02 by July 1, 2022. Compliance will be verified by the MDE OSE.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FFY 2018 | 14 | 13 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2018**

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

For the member district with ongoing noncompliance, the MDE OSE provided a technical assistant who reviewed the cause of the ongoing noncompliance and mandated the use of TA, training and other enforcement actions to ensure prompt compliance and is working with the member district and the ISD. The MDE OSE developed a plan to bring the district into compliance which included support from the ISD to conduct overdue evaluations. Weekly meetings are held with the district and ISD to review the progress of the district in completing evaluations and achieving compliance. Work with the district will continue until the district meets the regulatory requirements and achieves 100 percent compliance, as verified by the MDE OSE.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

The state conducted reviews of policies and procedures for all 14 entities with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 to ensure these were in compliance and updated as needed. The state also reviewed data, using the statewide database to determine whether the entities were evaluating students within the required state timeline, subsequent to the findings of noncompliance for all 14 entities to ensure compliant practices . Thirteen (13) of the 14 entities were found to have compliant policies and procedures and were implementing compliant practices. The one entity with findings that have not been verified as corrected has been provided additional training and continuing review of subsequent student records . The individual students have all been evaluated although late.

**FFY 2018**

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

For the member district with ongoing noncompliance, the MDE OSE is providing a technical assistant and reviewing the cause of the ongoing noncompliance and mandating the use of TA, training and other enforcement actions to ensure prompt compliance. The MDE OSE developed a plan to bring the district into compliance which includes support from the ISD to conduct overdue evaluations. Weekly meetings are held with the district and ISD to review the progress of the district in completing evaluations and achieving 100% compliance as required by OSEP memo 09-02 by July 1, 2022. Compliance will be verified by the MDE OSE.

## 11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that the remaining 14 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2018: (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 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

SEE ABOVE

## 11 - OSEP Response

## 11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the remaining one uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 and the remaining one uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 were corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 and FFY 2018 (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 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

# Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priorit**y: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

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

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

**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.

 f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday through a State’s policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. 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 - f)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 12 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 92.10% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 76.08% | 93.09% | 93.52% | 93.04% | 86.89% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.  | 2,766 |
| b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.  | 138 |
| c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.  | 2,464 |
| d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.  | 88 |
| e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.  | 9 |
| f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday through a State’s policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option. |  |

| **Measure** | **Numerator (c)** | **Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. | 2,464 | 2,531 | 86.89% | 100% | 97.35% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**Number of children who served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f**

67

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

Reason for late IEPs of Eligible Children with Late IEPs:
Late notification from Part C to Part B LEA
(less than 90 days before third birthday) - 1
Timeline began in previous district - 0
Personnel not available for evaluation - 8
Personnel not available for IEP - 9
External reports not available - 1
Unknown - 43
Total - 62

Reason for late IEPs of Ineligible Children with Late IEPs:
Late notification from Part C to Part B LEA
(less than 90 days before third birthday) - 0
Timeline began in previous district - 0
Personnel not available for evaluation - 3
Personnel not available for IEP - 0
External reports not available - 0
Unknown - 2
Total - 5

Number of Late IEPs: 1 - 9 ISDs
Number of Late IEPs: 2-3 - 7 ISDs
Number of Late IEPs: 4+ - 5 ISDs

Range of Days beyond third birthday, number and percent of late IEPs:
1-10 days - 14 late IEPs (20.90%)
11-50 days - 21 late IEPs (31.34%)
51-100 days - 21 late IEPs (31.34%%)
>100 days - 7 late IEPs (10.45%)
Unknown days – 4 late IEPs (5.97%)
IEP took place too early (prior to age 2 years 6 months) but member district indicated through data the child was late - 0 late IEPs (0.00%)

**Attach PDF table (optional)**

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

Data are submitted by member districts and validated within the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS). For Indicator B12, data are collected in the Fall, Spring, and End-of-Year.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Michigan updated the business rules to account for changes in data collection fields the Part C counterparts use in order to streamline data analysis. Additionally, member districts were contacted to provide an update on data that was not originally included in the data submission due to the change in the business rules during the school year. Furthermore, targeted TA has been offered to member districts demonstrating non-compliance in this indicator. Additional resources have been made available to assist in understanding the data reporting and collection of Indicator B12.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 113 | 109 | 0 | 4 |

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

The MDE OSE ensured each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 is correctly implementing regulatory requirements (100% compliance) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through student record reviews verified by ISDs and the MDE OSE.
Each individual case of noncompliance was corrected, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

The State reviewed data subsequent to the initial finding to determine that noncompliance as been corrected. Verification activities included: (1) a review of updated policies, procedures and/or practices and (2) a review of new data submitted through state data systems. If the data submitted demonstrated continued noncompliance there was additional training and a review of more recent student records. Based on this review, the State established the identified noncompliance has been corrected and the LEA is correctly implementing the specific statutory or regulatory requirement(s).

Each individual case of noncompliance was verified as corrected by a review of the student file conducted onsite by the ISD a nd submitted to and reviewed by the State. After the subsequent reviews, the LEAs were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements per OSEP memo 09-02.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

The state conducted reviews of policies and procedures for all 113 entities with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 to ensure these were in compliance and updated as needed. The state also reviewed data, using the statewide database, subsequent to the findings of noncompliance for all 113 entities to ensure compliant practices. One hundred-nine (109) of the 113 entities were found to have compliant policies and procedures and were implementing compliant practices. The four entities with findings that have not been verified as corrected have been provided additional training and continuing review of subsequent student records.

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

For the four member districts with ongoing noncompliance, the MDE OSE is providing technical assistants and reviewing the cause of the ongoing noncompliance and mandating the use of TA, training and other enforcement actions to ensure prompt compliance. The MDE OSE developed a plan to bring the district into compliance which includes support from the ISD to conduct overdue evaluations. Weekly meetings are held with the district and ISD to review the progress of the district in completing evaluations and achieving 100% compliance as required by OSEP memo 09-02 by July 1, 2022. Compliance will be verified by the MDE OSE.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FFY 2018 | 4 | 4 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2018**

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

The MDE OSE ensured each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 is correctly implementing regulatory requirements (100% compliance) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through student record reviews verified by ISDs and the MDE OSE. Each individual case of noncompliance was corrected, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

The State reviewed data subsequent to the initial finding to determine that noncompliance has been corrected. Verification activities included: (1) a review of updated policies, procedures and/or practices and (2) a review of new data submitted through state data systems. If the data submitted demonstrated continued noncompliance there was additional training and a review of more recent student records. Based on this review, the State established the identified noncompliance has been corrected and the LEA is correctly implementing the specific statutory or regulatory requirement(s).

Each individual case of noncompliance was verified as corrected by a review of the student file conducted onsite by the ISD and submitted to and reviewed by the State. After the subsequent reviews, the LEAs were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements per OSEP memo 09-02.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

For each individual case of noncompliance, the MDE OSE verified the transition from Part C to Part B activities were completed, although late, through data collected in MSDS. All individual cases of noncompliance were corrected, per OSEP Memo 09-02. All FFY 2018 findings of noncompliance have been verified as corrected.

## 12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that the remaining four uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2018: (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 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

See above

## 12 - OSEP Response

## 12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the remaining four uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2019: (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 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

# Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, 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))

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, 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.

If a State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

**Instructions**

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 13 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2018 | 92.34% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 78.34% | 81.23% | 81.00% | 92.34% | 92.94% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition** | **Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4,475 | 4,936 | 92.94% | 100% | 90.66% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

Due to the pandemic, the MDE OSE allowed extra time for ISDs to complete the transition record reviews. The extra time allowed the ISDs to verify checklist items using documents in addition to the IEP. During the current reporting year, the MDE OSE used the regularly scheduled 6-week time period for completing and verifying the accuracy of the checklists.

Michigan, along with 32 other states, uses a sampling strategy to assess statewide secondary transitions compliance rates. Since Michigan uses this strategy, the margin of sampling error should be taken into consideration when determining if slippage occurred equal to or greater than one percentage point, as is the case with issuing state determinations scores using NAEP participation rates. Once this margin of error of the samples is considered (+/-0.78 percentage points), the difference in the confidence intervals around this year’s and last years compliance rates, is less than 1 percentage point. For instance, last year’s 92.94% minus 0.78 margin of error = 92.16% is the lower bound true compliance rate with 95% confidence, and this year’s 90.66% plus 0.78 margin of error = 91.44% is the upper bound true compliance rate with 95% confidence. These two margin of error-adjusted compliance rates are less than one percentage point different from one another (92.16% minus 91.44% = 0.72 points of slippage).

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State monitoring

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

The MDE OSE used the fall Michigan Student Data System (MSDS) count of students in all member districts. To be included in measurement for this indicator, the member district had to have served at least one student aged 16 and older with an IEP. Using this criterion, a total of 624 member districts were monitored. Students meeting the criterion were selected from each ISD district. A 9-item checklist originally based on the NTACT B-13 checklist was used.

The MDE OSE used the MSDS fall collection of students with an IEP, ages 16 and over as our sample frame. Michigan uses a stratified-random sample of students from each ISD, large enough to yield a margin of error of +/- 5% with 95% confidence—between 60 to 150 students per ISD. Additionally, any member districts with a total population over 50,000 students, was sampled separately at a margin of error of +/- 5%. Michigan had one member district that met this criterion. Students who graduated or exited school during the transition review period, were removed from the sample frame. As a result, there was a statewide total sample of 4,936 students ages 16 to 21 (the federal age cut-off), for a statewide margin of error of +/- 0.78%. Results were in large part representative of Michigan students, and any small deviation of the sample from the statewide population demographics of gender, disability type, age, and ethnicity, did not yield statistically different results between raw sample and weighted sample-adjustments (90.62% to 90.72%, all non-significantly different from the raw compliance rate of 90.66%).

Using these criteria, a total of 627 member districts were monitored, with 189 member districts having some noncompliance.

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Do the State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?  | NO |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The MDE OSE has revised the checklist used to monitor for compliance with this Indicator in FFY 2018. Therefore, the MDE OSE has revised the baseline for this indicator using FFY 2018 data.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 150 | 150 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

The MDE OSE ensured each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 is correctly implementing regulatory requirements (100% compliance) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through student record reviews verified by ISDs and the MDE OSE.

Each individual case of noncompliance was corrected, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

The State reviewed data subsequent to the initial finding to determine that noncompliance has been corrected. Verification activities included: (1) a review of updated policies, procedures and/or practices and (2) a review of new data submitted through state data systems. If the data submitted demonstrated continued noncompliance there was additional training and a review of more recent student records. Based on this review, the State established the identified noncompliance has been corrected and the LEA is correctly implementing the specific statutory or regulatory requirement(s).

Each individual case of noncompliance was verified as corrected by a review of the student file conducted on-site by the ISD and submitted to and reviewed by the State. After the subsequent reviews, the LEAs were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements per OSEP memo 09-02.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

Each individual case of noncompliance was verified as corrected by a review of the student files by the ISD and submitted to and reviewed by the MDE OSE in a student-level corrective action plan documented in Catamaran unless the student is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. Each LEA is correctly implementing regulatory requirements (100% compliance) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through student record reviews verified by ISDs and the MDE. Each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

The State reviewed data subsequent to the initial finding to determine that noncompliance has been corrected. Verification activities included: (1) a review of updated policies, procedures, and/or practices and (2) a review of new data submitted through state data systems. If the data submitted demonstrated continued noncompliance there was additional training and a review of more recent student records. Based on this review, the State established the identified noncompliance has been corrected and the LEA is correctly implementing the specific statutory or regulatory requirement(s).

Each individual case of noncompliance was verified as corrected by a review of the student file conducted on-site by the ISD and submitted to and reviewed by the State. After the subsequent reviews, the LEAs were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements per OSEP memo 09-02. All FFY 2019 findings of noncompliance have been verified as corrected.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FFY 2018 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2018**

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

The MDE OSE ensured each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 is correctly implementing regulatory requirements (100% compliance) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through student record reviews verified by ISDs and the MDE OSE. Each individual case of noncompliance was corrected, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

The State reviewed data subsequent to the initial finding to determine that noncompliance has been corrected. Verification activities included: (1) a review of updated policies, procedures, and/or practices and (2) a review of new data submitted through state data systems. If the data submitted demonstrated continued noncompliance there was additional training and a review of more recent student records. Based on this review, the State established the identified noncompliance has been corrected and the LEA is correctly implementing the specific statutory or regulatory requirement(s).

Each individual case of noncompliance was verified as corrected by a review of the student file conducted onsite by the ISD and submitted to and reviewed by the State. After the subsequent reviews, the LEAs were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements per OSEP memo 09-02.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

Each individual case of noncompliance was verified as corrected by a review of the student file by the ISD and submitted to and reviewed by the MDE OSE in a student-level corrective action plan documented in Catamaran unless the student is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. All FFY 2018 findings of noncompliance have been verified as corrected.

## 13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that the remaining two uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2018: (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 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

See above

## 13 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

## 13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 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 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

# Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

 A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.

 B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

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

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**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 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.

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.

**Instructions**

*Sampling****of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school****is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2021 on students who left school during 2019-2020, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2019-2020 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

**I. *Definitions***

*Enrolled in higher education* as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

*Competitive employment* as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment”:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

*Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training* as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

*Some other employment* as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

**II. *Data Reporting***

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

 1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;

 2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);

3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);

4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

**III. *Reporting on the Measures/Indicators***

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due Feb. 1, 2023,** when reporting the extent to which the demographics of respondents are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

## 14 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Baseline**  | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| A | 2018 | Target >= | 33.20% | 33.40% | 33.60% | 33.90% | 33.90% |
| A | 28.21% | Data | 32.36% | 32.56% | 29.18% | 28.21% | 27.10% |
| B | 2018 | Target >= | 60.00% | 60.50% | 61.00% | 61.50% | 61.50% |
| B | 42.82% | Data | 63.31% | 62.96% | 64.85% | 42.82% | 40.72% |
| C | 2018 | Target >= | 72.50% | 73.00% | 73.50% | 74.00% | 75.25% |
| C | 75.19% | Data | 76.82% | 76.93% | 77.43% | 75.19% | 78.09% |

**FFY 2020 Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 28.21% | 28.21% | 28.21% | 28.21% | 28.26% | 28.31% |
| Target B >= | 42.82% | 42.82% | 42.82% | 42.82% | 42.87% | 42.92% |
| Target C >= | 75.19% | 75.19% | 75.19% | 75.19% | 75.24% | 75.29% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms including virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys and the use of discussion virtual rooms. The primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC). Information about the SEAC can be found at https://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-6598\_88192---,00.html. In addition to the agendas and minutes of meetings, presentations used in seeking stakeholder input are on this website. The location of these presentations was also shared with the ISD Directors’ at a regularly scheduled meeting. Other stakeholders include the MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board, ISD Directors, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD directors of special education, member district directors of special education, and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP in Michigan.

The MDE OSE provides updates to these groups on the historical trends in the SPP/APR data (FFY 2013 through FFY 2019), as well as activities OSE grant funded initiatives, and the MDE are undertaking to improve results for students with an IEP and increase compliance with IDEA and MARSE. These groups have begun examining current targets (set on the FFY 2018 baseline year) to consider whether changes are warranted in the future.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census | 3,331 |
| Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school | 504 |
| Response Rate | 15.13% |
| 1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school  | 116 |
| 2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school  | 85 |
| 3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed) | 33 |
| 4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed). | 143 |

| **Measure** | **Number of respondent youth** | **Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Enrolled in higher education (1) | 116 | 504 | 27.10% | 28.21% | 23.02% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2) | 201 | 504 | 40.72% | 42.82% | 39.88% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4) | 377 | 504 | 78.09% | 75.19% | 74.80% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **A** | Michigan did not meet the target of 28.21% on measure A for FFY 2020. The result on measure A represents a 4.08 percentage point slippage from FFY 2019. The decrease is NOT statistically significant. Michigan’s slippage on Indicator 14 measure A follows a similar pattern to the decreasing statewide higher education enrollment rates for students with an IEP that are also high school graduates. The statewide enrollment in higher education rate for this group has been on a steady decline: 35.4% in 2015-16; 33.0% in 2016-17; 31.2% in 2017-18; 29.2% in 2018-19; and 22.8% in 2019-20 (per MIschooldata.org). The decline in measure A in FFY 2020 may also be attributed to the COVID-19 pandemic and more precisely, the closure of in-person learning and shift to online classes and learning. A variety of articles have identified numerous negative impacts of online learning for students with disabilities. Some of the challenges faced by student with disabilities as a result of online learning are: disruption of routine, schedule, structure, pattern; no hands-on skills or training; and isolation and lack of bonding especially for non-verbal students.  |
| **C** | Michigan did not meet the target of 75.19% on measure C for FFY 2020. The result on measure C represents a 3.29 percentage point slippage from FFY 2019. The decrease is NOT statistically significant. Michigan’s slippage on indicator 14 measure C is attributed not only to the drop in higher education (i.e., group 1 and measure A), but also to the drop in some other postsecondary education or training program (i.e., group 3). More specifically, 6.55% of respondents were in some other postsecondary education or training program in FFY 2020, in comparison to 11.51% of respondents in FFY 2019.  |

**Please select the reporting option your State is using:**

Option 2: Report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

**Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Response Rate  | 22.55% | 15.13% |

**Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

The MDE-OSE and Wayne State University (WSU) seek to achieve representativeness in various ways. First, the MDE-OSE sends the list of contact information of former students to WSU for survey deployment. To help ensure the contact information is correct, WSU takes additional measures such as: sending to transition coordinators at their request the lists of survey-eligible former students to verify contact information; and using a survey mailing house and directory services to append phone numbers to addresses or to update mailing addresses (without personal identifiers). In order to reach as many former students as possible, the survey is multi-mode (mail, telephone, and online).

To further achieve representativeness, the response rate from historically underrepresented groups, such as students who dropped out of school is closely monitored throughout the survey process. This monitoring process guides the use of targeted re-mails, telephone follow-up calls, and post-card reminders. Even with these additional efforts, along with efforts to secure accurate contact information, former students who dropped out continue to be underrepresented. The MDE-OSE will explore other strategies such as working with specific ISDs which have a high proportion of underrepresented groups to boost the response rate for this group.

**Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.**

To evaluate the nonresponse bias, a test of proportions was used to compare the respondent group to the population in terms of gender, race/ethnicity, exit status, disability, and peer group (a measure of ISD level student population size determined by the geographic location of the attending school district). For gender, race/ethnicity, and peer group, the respondent group was found to be representative of the population, whereas exit status and disability group were found to be statistically significantly different. This shows that students who dropped out of high school and students with learning disabilities were less likely to respond to the survey – thus, they were underrepresented in the sample.

Michigan will use the following strategies to address the issue of nonresponse bias and the non-representativeness of the sample:
 • Mailing follow-up post cards, conducting follow-up telephone calls and interviews, mailing additional copies of the survey to non-respondents, and making additional calls to low-responding areas and underrepresented groups.
 • Encouraging and supporting former students to participate in the survey, using a variety of techniques, including:
• Sending multiple letters to inform former students or their guardians (for minors or students with cognitive development impairments) about the survey and providing guidance for ISD transition coordinators to do likewise;
• Providing potential respondents an opportunity to ask questions;
• Indicating that the survey is voluntary and confidential;
• Offering the survey in three modes (online, paper, and telephone);
• Making in-person visits by interviewers in selected low-response areas (if public health circumstances, due to COVID-19, allow it);
• Providing a toll-free number for questions about the survey and/or to take the survey over the phone if desired; and
• Offering the survey in Arabic and Spanish.

**Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.**

To test the representativeness of the respondent group (or survey sample) to the population, a test of proportions was used to compare the respondent group to the population in terms of gender, race/ethnicity, exit status, disability, and peer group. For gender, race/ethnicity, and peer group, the respondent group was found to be representative of the population, whereas exit status and disability group were found to be statistically significantly different. (Additional details available upon request.)

To determine whether these differences between the respondent group and the population made a statistically significant impact on the Indicator 14 results, statistical weights were applied to adjust the sample size for each exit status and disability group. Statistical weights are commonly used to adjust survey results for under- and overrepresentation of specific subgroups in a sample. This procedure provides an estimate of the results which would be found if the distribution of a particular characteristic in the sample was identical to the distribution in the overall population.

For Indicator 14, weights were calculated by dividing the proportion of each of the subgroups in the population by the corresponding proportion in the sample. For example, in the Indicator 14 population, the proportion of former students who graduated was .8276 and the proportion in the respondent group was .8869. Dividing .8276 by .8869 yields 0.933. Therefore, the weight assigned to graduating former students was 0.933.

This computation was repeated for the remaining exit status and disability categories. Differences in results between the unweighted respondent group and the weighted respondent group for the exit status and disability categories were found not to be statistically significant. This suggests that students’ exit status and disability groups, are not affected in a statistically significant manner. Therefore, the unweighted results are reported.

**The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)**

YES

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

Michigan’s response rate was representative of the demographics of the youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school in terms of former students’ gender, race/ethnicity, and peer group. To determine this each of the various demographic groups were assessed for representativeness, and for each version of the survey, difference of proportions tests were used to assess statistically significant differences between the survey-eligible population and the survey respondents. With this approach, statistically significant differences were used to determine any instances of non-representativeness. While none were found these tests used a 95% confidence level (p < 0.05 significance level) to assess whether statistically significant differences existed within the demographic groups. This approach considers the sample size and the distribution of the respective populations and respondent groups.

Michigan continues to use strategies to reach out in an effort to increase the response rate. The strategies used by Michigan include:

 • Mailing follow-up post cards, conducting follow-up telephone calls and interviews, mailing additional copies of the survey to non-respondents, and additional calls to low-responding areas.
 • Encouraging and supporting former students to participate in the survey, using a variety of techniques, including:
• Sending multiple letters to inform former students or their guardians (for minors or students with cognitive development impairments) about the survey and providing guidance for ISD transitions coordinators to do likewise;
• Providing potential respondents an opportunity to ask questions;
• Indicating that the survey is voluntary and confidential;
• Offering the survey in three modes (online, paper, and telephone);
• Making in-person visits by interviewers in selected low-response areas (if public health circumstances, due to COVID-19, allow it);
• Providing a toll-free number for questions about the survey and/or to take the survey over the phone if desired; and
• Offering the survey in Arabic and Spanish.

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used?  | YES |
| If yes, has your previously approved sampling plan changed? | NO |

**Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.**

The sampling frame was former students who had an IEP and exited high school across the 56 Intermediate School Districts in the State of Michigan. Students included are those who graduated, dropped out, or received a certificate. Further, only those students who were in Grade 9 through, and including, age 21 were included. Students were identified using Michigan’s Student Data System (MSDS). A sample of roughly one-third of member districts within each of the Intermediate School Districts (ISDs) in Michigan was chosen based on balanced demographic characteristics of the former student population. These selected member districts comprise a cohort. Member districts surveyed within this round of data collection comprise cohort 2. The nature of the approved sampling plan, as well as the representativeness of each cohort’s survey sample, suggests that each of the three cohorts are demographically similar.

| **Survey Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was a survey used?  | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised survey? | NO |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The response rate for FFY 2020 (15.13%) is statistically significantly lower than FFY 2019 (22.55%). The lower response rate was likely impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. Mailing information was not as reliable as in previous years. For instance, bad address bounce-backs were statistically significantly fewer this year, a key method for adjusting the response rate based upon undeliverable addresses, which is likely underestimated for the FFY 2020 survey. Telephone follow-up yielded lower completion rates as well. The smaller response sample also contributed to non-representativeness. The State will use the strategies listed in previous sections to boost response rates and improve data quality.

## 14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2020 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

See above.

## 14 - OSEP Response

The State reported that the response data for this indicator were representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. However, in its narrative, the State reported ". . . the respondent group was not representative of the population in terms of exit status and former student disability category" and "The smaller response sample also contributed to non-representativeness". Therefore, it is unclear whether the response data was representative.

The State submitted its sampling plan for this indicator with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR. OSEP will follow up with the State under separate cover regarding the submission.

## 14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2021 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

# Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Results Indicator:** 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))

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/03/2021 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 18 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/03/2021 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 7 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms including virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys and the use of discussion virtual rooms. The primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC). Information about the SEAC can be found at https://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-6598\_88192---,00.html. In addition to the agendas and minutes of meetings, presentations used in seeking stakeholder input are on this website. The location of these presentations was also shared with the ISD Directors’ at a regularly scheduled meeting. Other stakeholders include the MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board, ISD Directors, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD directors of special education, member district directors of special education, and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP in Michigan.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 36.40% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 46.00% | 48.00% | 50.00% | 52.00% | 52.00% |
| Data | 51.22% | 42.86% | 46.88% | 54.55% | 38.10% |

**Targets**

| **FFY** | **2020 (low)** | **2020 (high)** | **2021 (low)** | **2021 (high)** | **2022 (low)** | **2022 (high)** | **2023 (low)** | **2023 (high)** | **2024 (low)** | **2024 (high)** | **2025 (low)** | **2025 (high)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target >= | 45.00% | 55.00% | 45.00% | 55.00% | 45.00% | 55.00% | 45.00% | 55.00% | 45.00% | 55.00% | 45.00% | 55.00% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target (low)** | **FFY 2020 Target (high)** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7 | 18 | 38.10% | 45.00% | 55.00% | 38.89% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Michigan is below the target, however, there was an increase from the previous year by almost one percentage point. There was a decrease in the total number of cases filed from 53 in 2019-2020 to 36 in 2020-2021. The COVID-19 pandemic impacted the ability to coordinate resolution session meetings including cases that were settled outside of the fiscal year. Additionally, other cases were withdrawn or dismissed without a settlement agreement, which impacted the overall performance.

## 15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 15 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 15 - Required Actions

# Indicator 16: Mediation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Results indicator:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1) times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 16 - Indicator Data

**Select yes to use target ranges**

Target Range is used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1 Mediations held | 119 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 6 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 84 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms including virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys and the use of discussion virtual rooms. The primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC). Information about the SEAC can be found at https://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-6598\_88192---,00.html. In addition to the agendas and minutes of meetings, presentations used in seeking stakeholder input are on this website. The location of these presentations was also shared with the ISD Directors’ at a regularly scheduled meeting. Other stakeholders include the MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board, ISD Directors, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD directors of special education, member district directors of special education, and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP in Michigan.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2017 | 81.15% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 75.00% | 75.00% | 75.00% - 85.00% | 75.00% - 85.00% | 75.00%-85.00% |
| Data | 81.69% | 78.35% | 81.15% | 82.47% | 77.16% |

**Targets**

| **FFY** | **2020 (low)** | **2020 (high)** | **2021 (low)** | **2021 (high)** | **2022 (low)** | **2022 (high)** | **2023 (low)** | **2023 (high)** | **2024 (low)** | **2024 (high)** | **2025 (low)** | **2025 (high)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target >= | 75.00% | 85.00% | 75.00% | 85.00% | 75.00% | 85.00% | 75.00% | 85.00% | 75.00% | 85.00% | 75.00% | 85.00% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints** | **2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints** | **2.1 Number of mediations held** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target (low)** | **FFY 2020 Target (high)** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6 | 84 | 119 | 77.16% | 75.00% | 85.00% | 75.63% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Michigan requests to reset baseline data to FFY 2017 based on a change in data collection methodology from a multisource reporting system to a verifiable, centralized electronic database.

Michigan is extending the 75.00-85.00% target range for FFY 2020 – FFY 2025. Michigan’s target remains above national average, as the national agreement rate reported by CADRE is 68.70%.

## 16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 16 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2017, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 16 - Required Actions

# Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

The State’s SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

**Measurement**

The State’s SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

**Instructions**

**Baseline Data*:*** The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

**Targets*:*** In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State’s FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State’s baseline data.

**Updated Data:** In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2, 2022, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State’s targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

*Phase I: Analysis:*

- Data Analysis;

- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;

- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;

- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and

- Theory of Action.

*Phase II: Plan* (which, is in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;

- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and

- Evaluation.

*Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation* (which, is in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

**Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP**

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

***Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation***

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State’s last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2021). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

## 17 - Indicator Data

**Section A: Data Analysis**

**What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?**

The State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) area is literacy progress for students with the most significant and persistent reading needs (below the 20th percentile on screening measures), including students with disabilities. The SiMR is currently measured using Acadience Reading K-6 universal screening and progress monitoring scores matched to students' grade and skill level (e.g., phoneme segmentation fluency, nonsense word fluency-- correct letter sounds and whole words read, oral reading fluency--words correct and accuracy). In future years, the SiMR may be measured using a variety of screening and progress monitoring measures based on what Michigan districts are using. The SiMR is represented in a long-term outcome in the evaluation plan logic model and goal 1.

**Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (*e.g.*, a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)**

YES

**Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.**

The SiMR currently represents reading data from schools participating in the DBI model demonstration and supported through the SPDG. Professional learning and implementation support from the MiMTSS TA Center began in August 2021, and target students were identified in September 2021. Target students include first- and second-grade students with the most significant and persistent reading needs (below the 20th percentile on screening measures), including students with disabilities.

As of September 2021, the target group of students for the SiMR includes 62 first (53%) and second grade (47%) students from 3 elementary schools in one rural district. The students are 69% male (31% female), 85% white (15% Hispanic/Latino or multi-racial), and 21% have an individualized education plan. This initial group of target students does not represent the full diversity of Michigan's students, which is why recruitment efforts are currently underway to support at least two additional districts with greater racial diversity, representing different geographic areas of the state. Both potential new districts have also been previously identified as needing support based on an analysis of ESSA and IDEA outcome indicators. These two districts currently have staff engaged in professional learning to help teachers understand scientifically based reading instruction, which will create a foundation for implementing DBI for reading within an MTSS framework in the future.

Data from the selected first- and second-grade target students (3 elementary schools) was analyzed for the previous school year (FY2020) to establish a new baseline. The same progress criteria were applied to students' screening and progress monitoring data during FY2020. It was determined that none of the current target students met at least 2 of the 3 criteria for progress during FY2020, establishing FY2020 baseline results as 0%.

**Is the State’s theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Please provide a link to the current theory of action.**

https://www.michigan.gov/mde/-/media/Project/Websites/mde/specialeducation/data-reporting/SSIP\_TheoryofAction.pdf?rev=cf67ac0d308e4d489c0e06fd341fbe55&hash=0AC307ED86BE5B15FB31E7E6F328A9DF

**Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)**

NO

**If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or** **justification for the changes.**

Although the SSIP evidence-based practice (Data-Based Individualization), activities, strategies, and timelines have not changed from the FFY 2019 report, this is the first year Acadience universal screening assessment data are represented in the SiMR for baseline and targets. The measure change from NWEA to Acadience was noted in FFY 2019; however, due to COVID, a model demonstration district could not be mutually selected to begin reviewing baseline Acadience data, establishing targets, and implementing the Data-Based Individualization specific activities and strategies. The impact of not having a mutually selected model demonstration district meant the previous FFY 2018 SIMR NWEA data was carried over to the FFY 2019 report. In June 2021, a model demonstration that encompasses three elementary schools in one district was secured. Accordingly, the baseline for the SiMR changed, and the SiMR targets represent an improvement over the baseline.

**Progress toward the SiMR**

**Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages)*.***

**Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)**

YES

**Historical Data**

| **Part** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| A | 2020 | 0.00% |
| B | 2020 | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 0.00% | 20.00% | 22.00% | 24.00% | 26.00% | 28.00% |
| Target B >= | 0.00% | 20.00% | 22.00% | 24.00% | 26.00% | 28.00% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | Number of target students who make above or well above typical progress from fall to spring per the Acadience Reading Pathways of Progress for the Composite score / Number of target students who make progress toward their individual goal per weekly Acadience Reading progress monitoring scores (at least 2 of the last 3 data points at or above the aimline) | Number of students scoring well below benchmark and at or below the district 20th percentile on the Fall Acadience Reading Composite score / Number of students scoring well below benchmark and at or below the district 20th percentile on the Fall Acadience Reading Composite score  | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| A | 0 | 62 |  | 0.00% | 0.00% | N/A | N/A |
| B | 0 | 62 |  | 0.00% | 0.00% | N/A | N/A |

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.**

Acadience Reading K-6 universal screening composite scores and weekly progress monitoring scores.

**Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR**.

The SiMR data collection and analysis plans are outlined in the SSIP Evaluation Plan (Data Analysis Plan and Data Collection Plan). This evaluation plan was developed in October 2021. Progress toward data collection and analysis will be reported in the FFY 2022 report.

Part A
Acadience Reading K-6 screening data will be collected for ALL students using paper/pencil methods by an assessment team that includes classroom teachers, interventionists, and other school staff who have been trained to collect the data with fidelity each September, January, and May. Scores will be entered into Acadience Data Management.

Part B
Acadience Reading K-6 progress monitoring data will be collected weekly for all students participating in reading intervention. Specific measures are selected based on the student's grade level and skills needing development (e.g., phoneme segmentation fluency, nonsense word fluency--correct letter sounds and whole words read, oral reading fluency--words correct and accuracy). Progress monitoring scores, goals, and intervention adaptations all will be entered into the Acadience Data Management System.

**Optional: Has the State collected additional data *(i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey)* that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)**

NO

**Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe any data quality issues, unrelated to COVID-19, specific to the SiMR data and include actions taken to address data quality concerns.**

The modified SSIP described in the FFY 2019 report began to be implemented in May/June 2021. A State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) district was selected to participate in the DBI model demonstration project. The MiMTSS TA Center staff assigned to support the DBI model demonstration analyzed the district's 2020-2021 elementary Acadience data to establish the SiMR baseline. They discovered the district had not consistently collected universal screening data for all students with disabilities. The rostered students in the Acadience Data Management System who did not have 2019-2020 spring screening assessment data recorded included students with a disability. The MiMTSS TA Center staff met with school and district leaders to determine whether the Acadience screening data had not been collected or if it had been collected but was not entered into the data system. The district reported the decision to administer universal screening assessments to students with disabilities was determined by the special education teacher of record. Most of the students who were not screened with the Acadience assessment measures qualified to have alternate assessments administered and received support in a self-contained classroom. Their teacher of record described the students' functional skills as being too low for the Acadience assessments. Other students with disabilities who were not assessed were chronically absent from school due to the pandemic.

Efforts were made to ensure all students were screened starting in 2021-22, including procedures for systematically monitoring students' progress in reading intervention. These efforts were combined with the strategies described in the next section to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

**Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

YES

**If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State’s ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.**

The FFY 20 SSIP/SiMR reporting timeline is July 1, 2020, to June 30, 2021. The impact on data completeness, validity, and reliability for the indicator was impacted by COVID-19 because recruited SPDG districts were unwilling to participate in the Data-Based Individualization (DBI) model demonstration until May/June 2021. The delay in a district agreeing to participate in the DBI model demonstration also impacted the state’s ability to develop its comprehensive SSIP evaluation plan. District leaders respectfully declined to participate when first approached because the teachers needed to invest time to provide a combination of virtual and in-person instruction using new technology and different instructional delivery methods than what they had been accustomed to providing. The MiMTSS Technical Assistance (TA) Center continued to connect with the district recruited to participate in the DBI model demonstration. The district was already receiving support from the TA Center as a SPDG-supported district. One of the TA Center's supports to the district was specific to virtual administration and scoring for universal screening assessments. In May/June 2021, the state requested district leaders reconsider participating in the DBI model demonstration. Once participation was confirmed, the state could begin analyzing the district's Acadience data for their three elementary schools to establish a new SiMR baseline.

COVID-19 also impacted the state's ability to ensure the FFY 2020 SiMR baseline data for the indicator represented all students receiving a reading intervention, including students with disabilities. When the district agreed to participate in the DBI model demonstration, it was after the district's spring universal screening assessment data had been collected. As a result, the MiMTSS TA Center did not know until after the school year that some students with disabilities were not being assessed with the Acadience assessment measures due to either the special education teacher's discretion or chronic absenteeism.

Steps were taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection with the district chosen to participate in the DBI model demonstration because they are also a SPDG-supported district. The MiMTSS Technical Assistance (TA) Center assigned staff to support district and school leaders in mitigating Acadience data quality issues. The mitigation strategies included helping the district develop a shared understanding amongst staff, families, and caregivers that the purpose of collecting fall assessment data is to determine individual learner instructional needs, including providing options for in-person or remote assessment possibilities. The MiMTSS TA Center offered additional support to district and school staff responsible for administering Acadience assessments. The support included conducting remote assessments and maximizing assessment fidelity and validity. One of the ways to optimize assessment fidelity included defining the roles of school personnel assessors, parents/caregivers, and the child. The MiMTSS TA Center also supported district and school staff in accessing professional learning to administer the assessments and using the Acadience assessment accuracy checklist. The district/schools used the mitigation strategies throughout the 2020-2021 school year, since a combination of hybrid or virtual instruction was accessible to students. MiMTSS TA Center staff worked with district and elementary school leaders to ensure all students (including those receiving services in the self-contained classroom) were screened and are progress monitored. The only exceptions are for nonverbal students. It would not be appropriate to administer the Acadience assessment measures with the nonverbal students.

**Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**

**Please provide a link to the State’s current evaluation plan.**

https://www.dropbox.com/s/fh8o1qg6exrlupw/MI\_SSIP%20Evaluation%20Plan\_FY2021\_Report.docx?dl=0

**Is the State’s evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, provide a description of the changes and updates to the evaluation plan.**

A simple evaluation plan that represented a series of guiding questions was included with the FFY18 report. The simple plan was submitted in anticipation of changing the evidence-based practice (EBP) and SiMR in FFY 2019. The modified SSIP described in the FFY 2019 report began to be implemented in May/June 2021. Once model demonstration work was underway related to the SSIP modifications, a complete evaluation plan was developed in October 2021. The full evaluation plan now includes these detailed components: 1) Logic model, 2) Goals, 3) Data Analysis Plan, 4) Data Collection Plan, and 5) Evaluation questions.

**If yes, describe a rationale or justification for the changes to the SSIP evaluation plan.**

The previous FFY18 simple evaluation plan was only designed to present some initial ideas. As the programming side of the SSIP was further conceptualized, it was necessary to develop an evaluation plan with more details. For example, the current evaluation plan specifies the inputs, outputs, and outcomes in a logic model. The previously submitted evaluation questions and data sources represented broad ideas about what data would be collected before the state had finished conceptualizing the model demonstration project for data-based individualization within an MTSS framework. The October 2021 evaluation questions are now tightly aligned to the programming aspects of the SSIP, including the infrastructure improvement strategies and proposed outcomes, and the SiMR. In addition, the evaluation plan now includes a detailed plan for which teams will analyze data, for what purpose/decisions, and when. The analysis plan is supported by a detailed data collection plan that specifies who will collect each data source, when, and where the data will be entered. While minor changes to this comprehensive evaluation plan may be needed in future years, it is unlikely to change substantially again before 2025.

**Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:**

The FFY 20 infrastructure and improvement strategies reporting timeline is July 1, 2020, to October 31, 2021. The ToA focuses on developing capacity within the MDE, Intermediate School Districts (ISDs), and local districts to fulfill their respective roles in the selection, coordination, support, and implementation of Data-Based Individualization (DBI) and other evidence-based practices, within a multi-tiered framework to improve outcomes for all learners, including students with disabilities. The emphasis on developing an internal infrastructure encompasses the MDE offices, aligning cross-office priorities through effective teaming structures by establishing clear governance and expanding stakeholder communication.

Way of Work: The MDE Way of Work encompasses individuals responsible for developing templates for standard meeting agendas, team governance guidance, communication, and action planning. As a part of the application and use of the templates, respective state teams supporting Coordinated Supports (described below) and MiMTSS (described below) provided feedback to inform their iterative development. Cross-office meetings were held to provide an overview of the tools and guidance documents. The MDE offices discussed a priority area to use the templates described above following the overview.

Coordinated Supports: Collectively, the MDE Senior Leadership, the Coordinated Supports Leadership Team, the Coordinated Supports Development Team, and respective committees are responsible for developing the processes and tools necessary to increase the state's ability to effectively coordinate supports that are being provided to districts by or on behalf of the MDE. The MDE approved a proposal to align TA provided by the state through the MiMTSS Technical Assistance Center (funded by the Office of Special Education), Statewide Field Team (Statewide Technical Assistance Grant funded by ESSA), and Michigan Integrated Continuous Improvement Process (MICIP). The TA provided is collectively defined as systemic supports. Previous reports referenced the Coherence Team. That teaming structure has been redefined as the Systemic Support Team. The Systemic Support Team has been established to coordinate and oversee the MDE's efforts to support capacity development within ISDs, LEAs, and schools to apply implementation and continuous improvement sciences. Implementation and continuous improvement sciences are used to effectively implement and sustain a multi-tiered framework that includes Data-Based Individualization (DBI) with fidelity to improve literacy outcomes for learners across Michigan, including students with disabilities.

MiMTSS: MDE's MTSS Practice Profile defines standards and expectations for what MTSS looks like in practice and provides guidance for the implementation of MTSS, as indicated in Michigan's state law. The MDE MTSS Practice Profile specifically describes educators' and leaders' actions when using an MTSS framework as intended. The Practice Profile also provides educational settings with a framework to organize the instructional strategies used to support tiers 2 and 3 using the steps outlined in Data-Based Individualization to support successful learner outcomes. The MDE ensures high-quality professional learning and TA is available to support the implementation of MTSS through the state's MTSS supports (MiMTSS). MiMTSS is governed by the MDE's MiMTSS Leadership Team, with TA provided by the MiMTSS Technical Assistance (TA) Center, and supported using statewide data to inform improvements using the MiMTSS Data System.

General Supervision: Since 2016, when OSEP informed the MDE that ISDs as sub-recipients of IDEA grant funds are functionally the local education agencies (LEAs), OSE has worked to broaden and enhance the system of general supervision. The OSE has engaged regularly since 2018 with a group of ISD and member district stakeholders, along with stakeholders representing other constituencies. The OSE supports the ISD work through grants – General Supervision System Grants – with required applications for funds and semi-annual and annual reporting of progress. Also, the OSE has been engaging with ISD Directors through a series of iterative documents that began with reviewing OSEP's Critical Elements (CrAIG), which evolved into a Conversation Guide and further evolved into an ISD self-assessment of the general supervision development work. The activities described above are part of the larger effort to build infrastructure and capacity within the MDE, OSE, and ISDs. The OSE annually engages in activities to increase awareness and capacity, such as the SPP/APR presentation of indicator progress and trends to the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), OSE staff, and ISD Directors. The OSE has engaged and embraced a Data Use and Action Process to increase the OSE capacity to report, analyze, and use data to improve both results and compliance. The OSE is building two teams for this capacity-building work. The Data Use and Action Process Team provides TA to ISD data action teams. The Quadrant Data Use Team is charged with building the capacity within the OSE. There is some overlap in the membership of these teams to ensure coordination.

**Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.**

The FFY 20 infrastructure and improvement strategies reporting timeline is July 1, 2020, to October 31, 2021. Since the SSIP evaluation plan was not finalized until October 2021, the evaluation questions submitted in FFY18, and resubmitted in the FFY19 report, will be used to describe the outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy. The FFY18 evaluation questions were not categorized by short-term or intermediate outcomes. Report reviewers may note an imperfect alignment of these previous questions with reported activities. This will be addressed in the FFY 2022 reporting period, which will align the October 2021 evaluation plan with a full reporting cycle of improvement strategy data.

Way of Work (WOW): Related evaluation question: To what extent is the MDE maintaining an infrastructure to support ISDs, districts, and schools in fulfilling their respective roles in implementing evidence-based practices (Data-Based Individualization) within a multi-tiered framework? The WOW support team evaluated progress on infrastructure by monitoring the number of tools and guidance documents that were developed (e.g., team governance templates, agenda template, action planning tools), which increased from 22 to 36. Nine of 17 MDE offices used the tools and guidance documents to support implementation. The WOW support team also established targeted and intensive categories of WOW supports to assist offices in using the tools and guidance documents. The number of implementation efforts that received those WOW supports increased from eight to 16.

Coordinated Supports (CS): Related evaluation question: To what extent is the MDE maintaining an infrastructure to support ISDs, districts, and schools in fulfilling their respective roles in implementing evidence-based practices (Data-Based Individualization) within a multi-tiered framework? In the Fall of 2020, a CS State Action Plan was developed, and team governance was established for the CS Leadership Team. The Catalog of Supports design committee completed a prototype for the MDE catalog in November 2020. The Customer Relations design committee completed a District Profile prototype in December 2020. In March 2021, the MDE Senior Leadership agreed on governance and oversight of the MDE's ESSA Plan implementation. It was decided that CS should be held by the same teaming structure and asked that 2021-22 efforts focus on supporting Michigan's lowest-performing schools to use data-based individualization to improve literacy outcomes in preparation for the next round of ESSA identification (via the School Index) in the Fall of 2022.

MiMTSS: The MiMTSS infrastructure activities are organized into five categories: governance, quality standards, finance, professional learning and technical assistance (PL/TA), and communication. A description of outcomes achieved for each category is provided.

Governance: Related evaluation question: To what extent is the MDE maintaining an infrastructure to support ISDs, districts, and schools in fulfilling their respective roles in implementing evidence-based practices (Data-Based Individualization) within a multi-tiered framework? In Fall 2020, the MiMTSS LT, with the support of the MiMTSS Communications Committee, Resource Committee, and PL/TA Committee, developed a collective MiMTSS State Action plan including goals and objectives identified using State Capacity Assessment (SCA) data. MiMTSS demonstrated improved capacity to provide MTSS implementation support to the field, as indicated by a total score increase of 13 percentage points (35% to 48%).

Quality Standards: Related evaluation question: To what extent are ISDs and districts maintaining an infrastructure to support the implementation of a schoolwide reading model (the reading components of an MTSS framework) and data-based individualization? In September 2020, the MDE released version 5.0 of the MDE MTSS Practice Profile. The updated version has embedded the five steps of DBI. The practice profile establishes standards for district-level MTSS implementation.

Finance: Related evaluation question: To what extent are schools implementing a schoolwide reading with fidelity across tiers one through three? To accomplish successful MTSS implementation requires districts to allocate ongoing fiscal support. In May 2021, the MDE released Fiscal Guidance for Implementing an MTSS framework, which provides districts with guidance on coordinating state and federal funds to support the implementation of evidence-based practices, including data-based individualization, within an MTSS framework.

PL & TA: Related evaluation questions: (1) To what extent are individuals receiving professional learning demonstrating high levels of knowledge/skills at the conclusion of all learning sessions? (2) To what extent are schools implementing a schoolwide reading with fidelity across tiers one through three? In summer 2020, the MiMTSS TA Center established goals to operationalize a 3- to 5-year strategic plan encompassing the MiMTSS TA Center's overall work. The plan addresses three goals: Goal 1, Reach: Increase the number and percent of ISDs and member districts that access a continuum of MTSS technical assistance. Goal 2, Statewide Capacity and Impact: Continuously improve the impact of the MiMTSS TA Center's work on educator skills and knowledge related to MTSS, district and ISD capacity, school-level fidelity, and learner outcomes, including students with an IEP. Goal 3, Model Demonstration: Establish model demonstration projects to systematically learn more about specific MTSS data, practices, and systems to integrate that learning into the continuum of MTSS supports offered by the MiMTSS TA Center. The DBI model demonstration efforts are outlined in Goal 3. During 2020-21, 217 MTSS training sessions were held. These sessions reached educators in 52 ISDs and 299 districts. In addition, the TA Center produced over two hundred online, on-demand resources available through the MiMTSS TA Center Website, EduPaths learning platform, and MiMTSS TA Center YouTube channel.

Communication: MiMTSS communication efforts increased in 2020-21 with the redesign of the MDE MTSS website, MiMTSS Frequently Asked Questions, and the introduction of a bi-monthly MiMTSS eNewsletter. The communication activities include disseminating information about professional learning opportunities available to educators that support evidence-based practices, such as data-based individualization, that can be implemented within an MTSS framework.

General Supervision (GS): Related evaluation question: To what extent is the MDE maintaining an infrastructure to support ISDs in fulfilling their respective roles in the implementation of evidence-based practices (Data-Based Individualization) within a multi-tiered framework? 56 ISDs participated in GS learning. 12 of 56 ISDs completed a self-assessment tool to determine the level of implementation of the eight components. The process and outcomes have increased the understanding of the sub-recipient role of the ISD and the shared obligation of ensuring FAPE within their jurisdiction. The OSE is increasingly integrating monitoring activities across the office's fiscal, programmatic, and dispute resolution units to broaden and strengthen the individual components of GS – policies, procedures, and effective evidence-based practices; TA and professional learning and development; fiscal accountability and management; and effective dispute resolution. One method has been the Differentiated Framework of Support. This framework begins with analyses of the ISD Determinations data for the current and previous years, examines what TA or other supports have been provided to each ISD, and reviews data and information more inclusively in dispute resolution and fiscal areas to identify differentiated supports.

**Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

The next steps for the infrastructure improvement strategies reported in FFY 21 will reflect work that is anticipated to occur between November 1, 2021, and October 31, 2022.

Way of Work: The MDE recommends that WOW no longer be reported on as an improvement strategy as it is the foundation for implementing Coordinated Supports, MiMTSS using the tools and guidance documents that were developed to assist the teaming structures supporting each of those infrastructure improvement strategies (e.g., team governance template, agenda template). The recommendation for not reporting on WOW should not require the ToA to be updated to reflect this change. WOW, Coordinated Supports, and MiMTSS are all encompassed in the first part of the ToA: "if capacity is established within the MDE,…to fulfill their respective roles in the selection, coordination, support and/or implementation of Evidence-Based Practices (EBPs) within a multi-tiered framework…."

Coordinated Supports: Progress will be reported for goal 13 (By January 2023, and annually thereafter, each district receiving literacy-based MTSS supports, including DBI, will have a plan that outlines how state-level supports from the MDE are coordinated and aligned, as measured by product review [district plans] and/or a state-level teaming structure available to support each district.) and goal 15 (By June 2023, districts and ISDs of varying size and demographics, including sites that have been identified for support through state and federal accountability measures, will access a continuum of TA to help improve literacy outcomes for all students, including students with disabilities, as measured by universal, targeted, and intensive TA participation and training records housed in the MiMTSS Data System.). In FFY21, Coordinated Supports Development Team membership will be reviewed in relation to ESSA plan implementation, and relevant managers and consultants will be added. Visioning for the System of Coordinated Supports will be revisited with input from across the teaming structure to identify what system improvements are needed to support districts/schools identified for CSI, ATS, and TSI support prior to the Fall of 2022, which will inform updates to the 2021-22 Coordinated Supports State Action Plan. The Coordinated Supports Leadership Team will review current School Index data at aggregate (ISD, District, and Schools) and disaggregate levels (components, student subgroups) to further explore needs and supports. Resources (fiscal and personnel) will be identified to support the structural changes (e.g., roles, processes) needed as a result of Coordinated Supports improvements in 2021-22. Initial development of the the MDE Catalog of Supports will start with the supports indicated in the MDE's ESSA plan and those related to ESSA result indicators. Meanwhile, implementation of the Systemic Support plan will continue in FFY21 with targeted TA being provided to Michigan's Continuous Improvement Facilitators Network on implementation science, and mutual selection of ISDs and districts to participate in intensive TA with the Statewide Field Team will begin in late fall, 2021.

MiMTSS: Progress will be reported for goal 11 (Annually, the MiMTSS TA Center will demonstrate learning from the DBI and MTSS model demonstration project and demonstrate how the learning is infused into other universal, targeted, and intensive TA, as measured by annual summaries from data-driven continuous improvement planning sessions and descriptions of each TA offering that integrates DBI data, systems, and practices.) and goal 12 (Annually, the state's capacity to support MTSS will improve or remain above 80%, as measured by the State Capacity Assessment total score.). In FFY 21, the MiMTSS State Action Plan will be updated to illustrate the collective work and impact across the MiMTSS LT, committees, and MiMTSS TA Center. The MiMTSS LT will continue to expand its use of data (reach, capacity, fidelity, and impact) and establish a MiMTSS Evaluation Committee to assist the MiMTSS LT in using relevant data, including disaggregated data, when planning and evaluating support for effective implementation of MTSS. The MiMTSS TA Center will continue developing and expanding its TA Catalog offerings. Technical assistance to districts on coordinating the use of state and federal funds to support the implementation of MTSS will be developed. Learning from the model demonstrations for Data-Based Individualization, Interconnected Systems Framework, and Early Childhood MTSS will continue to inform the development of a MiMTSS Resource Plan for statewide scale-up. Communication data will be collected and analyzed for the MiMTSS LT to understand better the reach of collective communication strategies used between the MDE and the MiMTSS TA Center. Some of the FFY 2021 activities involving the MiMTSS TA Center will deepen knowledge of the MDE MiMTSS Leadership Team to understand how the DBI model demonstration’s focus on intensifying literacy instruction is connected to several state and federal priorities to accelerate literacy outcomes. The MDE MiMTSS Leadership Team will review data related to learning from the DBI model demonstration and discuss opportunities for promoting and disseminating information about universal, targeted, and intensive DBI-related TA accessible to stakeholders.

General Supervision: Progress will be reported for goal 10 (Annually, the number of districts and ISDs with the capacity to support schools with DBI and MTSS will increase, as measured by the number of district and ISD staff trained, pre-post DBI knowledge tests, and post-training installation and practice activities.). FFY 2021 activities are part of the larger effort to build infrastructure and capacity within the MDE, OSE, and ISDs to increase the ISDs' ability to apply DBI to accelerate literacy outcomes within an MTSS framework. The MiMTSS TA Center will begin this effort by developing a plan to leverage resources to work with approximately 15 ISDs to engage in ongoing professional learning. The learning will incorporate readings, online learning, live training sessions, and application exercises to develop knowledge, skills, and reading and social-emotional abilities and behavior expertise within an MTSS framework. Since many ISDs employ staff assigned to provide ancillary services for LEAs to support students with disabilities (e.g., school psychologists, speech and language pathologists, teacher consultants), it is critical the MDE's OSE ensures the ISD staff working with LEAs have access to quality professional learning in DBI, scientifically valid reading research, and effective implementation of an MTSS framework.

**List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:**

DBI implementation and the district-selected reading intervention curriculum resource (Enhanced Core Reading Instruction) chosen for DBI step 1 started in September and October 2021. The FFY 2021 report will detail the implementation of both DBI and ECRI.

**Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.**

DBI is a research-based process used by a multidisciplinary team for individualizing and intensifying interventions. DBI is accomplished by systematically using assessment data, using research-validated interventions, and adapting the intervention instruction using research-based strategies. The adaptations to the intervention instruction are categorized by the Dimensions of Intervention Intensity (dosage, alignment, comprehensiveness, or elements of explicit instruction, behavioral supports, and attention to transfer). The multidisciplinary team includes individuals with a variety of expertise who will attend to students' access to quality Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention supports (e.g., assessment, reading specialist, behavior specialists, speech and language). They ensure that the intervention supports being accessed by students effectively meet their needs.

There are five steps in DBI that can be categorized by Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports within an MTSS framework. The first step of DBI begins by selecting a research-validated intervention to deliver intervention instruction. The schools participating in the DBI model demonstration already decided to use the Enhanced Core Reading Instruction (ECRI) as the validated intervention program to teach the foundational word-reading skills in grades K-2. ECRI uses explicit instructional routines to teach phonemic awareness, decoding, and developing reading fluency that includes teacher modeling, guided practices, and opportunities for learners to apply and extend their learning. The DBI model demonstration does not require a specific intervention curriculum resource to be used. Instead, the TA Center works with district and school leaders to review the evidence of the intervention curriculum resources to confirm the intervention has quality evidence to improve literacy-related outcomes and is aligned with scientifically based reading research. District leaders and the MiMTSS TA Center mutually agree on the intervention curriculum resources used in the first DBI step. Step 2 in DBI is progress monitoring. The progress monitoring data are analyzed to determine whether students respond to the intervention instruction. Suppose students are responding to the validated intervention. In that case, it continues until it is determined they can exit intervention and maintain their foundational word-reading skill progress during class-wide, Tier 1 reading instruction. The first two DBI steps can be classified as Tier 2 intervention supports within an MTSS framework. Students who are not responding to the intervention instruction as anticipated would progress to DBI steps 3-5 for individualized, intensive Tier 3 intervention supports. Step 3 analyzes assessment data in a diagnostic way and, when needed, administers additional diagnostic assessments to develop a hypothesis about why a student is not responding as expected to the intervention instruction. Based on the hypothesis generated, DBI step 4 is initiated by determining adaptations to the intervention instruction. The adaptations are documented in an Individualized Intensive Intervention Plan. The interventionists implement the contents of the Individualized Intensive Intervention Plan with fidelity, and the student's progress is monitored. Progress monitoring is the last step of DBI, with the provision for analyzing the data to determine each student's response to the intensive, Tier 3 intervention supports.

Professional learning in scientifically based reading research instructional methods is provided to educators and leaders participating in the DBI model demonstration using the Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS) Suite. The LETRS Suite is a blended professional learning model using a combination of readings, online modules, and live learning sessions with a certified LETRS Facilitator. LETRS teaches general educators and special educators the skills needed to master the fundamentals of reading instruction: phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, writing, and language. The LETRS Suite is not a curriculum resource used in the DBI process. It develops background knowledge in reading science necessary for educators and leaders who are members of the Multidisciplinary Team, interventionists, and some general education and special education teachers.

**Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.**

DBI has just started to be implemented across the schools participating in the model demonstration. It is anticipated information about the impact of DBI on district policies and procedures and the impact on teacher practice will be learned throughout the FFY 2021 reporting period. This information is also available in the Evaluation Plan Logic Model, specifically the intermediate and long-term outcomes. The DBI professional learning for the model demonstration is provided to two teaming structures that are expected to impact the SiMR by changing policies, procedures, and teacher practices: a District Implementation Team and Multidisciplinary Teams. The District Implementation Team (DIT) is responsible for developing the district's implementation infrastructure by developing policies, processes, and procedures to support the effective use, scale-up, and sustainability of educational innovations. This would include the implementation of DBI to support the advanced tiers (Tiers 2 and 3) of an MTSS framework to accelerate literacy outcomes for all learners, including students with disabilities. DIT membership typically includes a district executive leader, principal representation, teacher representation, and at specific times, additional stakeholders like a board member and family/caregiver representation. The district selected to participate in the model demonstration has developed its implementation infrastructure to support an integrated behavior and reading MTSS framework in the SPDG partnership.

Intended impact on teacher/provider practices:
As a result of participating in professional learning, teachers, schools, districts, and ISD leadership will increase their understanding of the core components of data-based individualization to improve reading outcomes, applied within an MTSS framework. Schools will also implement the reading components of an MTSS framework and DBI with fidelity. The three elementary school Multidisciplinary Teams are the second teaming structure receiving DBI professional learning. Sessions include introducing DBI, identifying students who need intensive (Tier 3) intervention supports, using data to inform intervention instruction, intensifying intervention instruction, behavioral supports to increase student motivation and engagement, and finally, evaluating DBI implementation efforts. These sessions impact the district/school policies, procedures, and teacher practices needed to impact the SiMR.

Intended impact on district policies, procedures, and/or practices:
Districts and ISDs will increase their capacity to support schools with DBI and MTSS through implementation infrastructures, including local training and coaching capacity. The implementation infrastructure the district has been developing and using to support an integrated behavior and reading MTSS framework through the SPDG partnership is being expanded to include DBI to support the advanced tiers of an MTSS framework (Tiers 2 and 3). The DIT professional learning sessions encompass two sessions. The first session focuses on expanding the district infrastructure to support DBI implementation. The second session is focused on district decisions for successful DBI implementation. Some of the decisions districts make after participating in the professional learning impacting policies, procedures, and teacher practices involve the recruitment and selection procedures for elementary multidisciplinary teams to ensure individuals with the proper skillsets are chosen. They also approve a DBI professional learning plan for intensifying literacy intervention instruction and ensure the appropriate resources are allocated to support efforts (e.g., personnel, time, fiscal). The DIT also analyzes Acadience data to inform how students access Tier 2 intervention supports (DBI steps 1 and 2) and, when the data warrants, access the most intensive (Tier 3) individualized intervention supports (DBI steps 3-5). Districts ensure it is documented that Tier 3 intervention supports also include students with disabilities to ensure reading outcomes are accelerated. Finally, the district reviews its existing process and procedures for reviewing, evaluating, and selecting intervention curriculum resources to ensure it encompasses ways to evaluate interventions using the Dimensions of Intervention Intensity represented in steps 1 and 4 of the DBI process.

Intended impact on parent/caregiver and child outcomes:
Students with disabilities and their families will experience the following types of benefits resulting from data-based individualization and MTSS: 1) Improved access to evidence-based reading intervention, with intensification as needed, 2) improved reading outcomes, and 3) positive attitudes about reading and school supports. The professional learning sessions for the multidisciplinary teams include learning in how to meaningfully engage parent/caregiver and student voice in the intervention goals, as well as in developing an Individualized Intensive Intervention Plan and corresponding intervention supports to accelerate reading outcomes.

**Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.**

The following three measures of fidelity will be used to assess practice change from November 1, 2021, thru October 31, 2022, and results will be reported in the FFY2022 report:

Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory (R-TFI) 2.0: The R-TFI was developed to measure the reading components of an MTSS framework. There are two subscales: Tier 1 and the Advanced Tiers, which represent Tiers 2 and 3. The Advanced Tier items align with DBI and the dimensions of intensifying intervention that need to occur within the DBI process (steps 3 through 5). The R-TFI is the only measure available to assess scientifically based reading research, assessment measures, and systems needed for the reading components of an MTSS framework. The R-TFI will be used to measure progress toward Goal 8: Annually, the number of schools that implement the reading components of an MTSS framework (including DBI) with fidelity will increase, as measured by the Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory 2.0.

Tier 2 reading intervention fidelity: Step 1 of DBI uses a validated intervention program, and it is the foundation for intensifying instruction. The interventions used in the three elementary schools have a fidelity measure that the intervention program authors have developed. The intervention program fidelity rubrics will be used to measure Goal 9: Annually, the number of schools demonstrating DBI implementation fidelity and intervention implementation fidelity will increase, as measured by a random sampling of 10% of school products (intervention adaptations documented in individual student intensive intervention plans) and intervention fidelity observations.

Individualized Intensive Intervention Plan (IIIP) fidelity: Students who are not responding as expected to the Tier 2, validated reading intervention, enter into steps 3-5 of the DBI process. A Multidisciplinary Team, which includes the student's educator (special educator and general educator), develop an IIIP. It provides for monitoring the fidelity of the adaptations to specific components of the intervention. Data are collected to ensure the intensive intervention instruction is delivered as documented in the IIIP weekly. IIIP product reviews will be used to measure Goal 9: Annually, the number of schools demonstrating DBI implementation fidelity and intervention implementation fidelity will increase, as measured by a random sampling of 10% of school products (intervention adaptations documented in individual student intensive intervention plans) and intervention fidelity observations.

**Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.**

N/A

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

The DBI model demonstration is underway, and it is anticipated progress will be made related to the short-term and intermediate outcomes outlined in our SSIP Evaluation Plan. Specifically, by the end of this reporting period (June 2022), 20 percent of students accessing reading intervention supports will demonstrate within-year reading progress as measured by Acadience Reading K-6 universal screening and progress monitoring scores matched to students’ grade and skill level. Educator and leader knowledge will also increase in DBI due to participating in professional learning sessions and receiving coaching support from MiMTSS TA Center staff. The MiMTSS TA Center is working closely with the district and their elementary schools to teach them how to use DBI and develop their capacity to coach DBI implementation for sustainability. This formal partnership is designed to last two years. Knowledge will be measured using training evaluation data (e.g., pre-post tests, completion of in-session activities, and post-training installation and practice activities).

The DBI model demonstration will expand to 1 to 2 additional districts that have been a SPDG ¬¬partner and/or are recipients of the state’s federally funded Comprehensive Literacy State Development (CLSD) grant. Initial conversations with the executive leaders in the two districts will occur during winter 2022 and will be facilitated by MiMTSS TA Center leadership and staff supporting the DBI model demonstration. The readiness conversations with executive leaders will last approximately 2 hours. The discussion will outline the purpose of the DBI model demonstration and its connection to the SiMR and SSIP. An overview of DBI will also be provided and will include a summary of the professional learning sessions designed for a district implementation team (DIT) and multidisciplinary teams. Finally, a description of the personnel needed to coordinate the DBI model demonstration and the assessment data will be provided to leaders. If district executive leaders agree to participate in the model demonstration, readiness activities will begin with school principals and teachers to prepare them for the DBI professional learning and implementation supports provided by the MiMTSS TA Center. The readiness conversations will be similar to what was discussed with district executive leaders; however, additional emphasis will be placed on how the DBI model demonstration will extend the schools’ MTSS and literacy efforts. This is to help school leaders and teachers understand that the DBI model demonstration should not be viewed as something different and separate from what the schools have been focusing efforts upon. It is anticipated the readiness conversations with school staff will take approximately 1 hour, and they will be led by MiMTSS TA Center staff.

Once commitment to participate in the DBI model demonstration is secured, a reading intervention curriculum audit will occur to determine if the interventions align with scientifically based reading research. Depending on the results of the intervention audit, the MiMTSS TA Center staff will support the district and school leaders in reviewing and evaluating additional interventions to select for use in the elementary grades. District leaders will purchase the reading interventions, and professional learning can be secured for individuals who deliver the intervention instruction. Scheduling for district team professional learning sessions, school-level multidisciplinary team sessions, and a review of curriculum-based reading assessment data will happen before the end of the school year.

In the two districts that will be recruited to participate, the teachers, leaders, and interventionists are currently accessing professional learning in the LETRS Suite, a blended professional learning model using a combination of readings, online modules, and live learning sessions. LETRS teaches general educators and special educators the skills needed to master the fundamentals of reading instruction: phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, writing, and language. It is not an intervention curriculum resource used in the DBI process. Knowledge in the fundamentals of reading instruction will help teachers, interventionists, leaders, and members of the multidisciplinary teams better understand how to implement the five steps of DBI, since it is foundational knowledge needed to inform accurate intervention placement (DBI step 1), reading assessment data analysis (DBI steps 2-3), instructional adaptations to intensify reading intervention supports (DBI step 4), and ongoing data analysis (DBI step 5).

**Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

Description of Stakeholder Input

The MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms including virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys and the use of discussion virtual rooms. The primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC). Information about the SEAC can be found at https://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-6598\_88192---,00.html. In addition to the agendas and minutes of meetings, presentations used in seeking stakeholder input are on this website. The location of these presentations was also shared with the ISD Directors’ at a regularly scheduled meeting. Other stakeholders include the MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board, ISD Directors, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD directors of special education, member district directors of special education, and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP in Michigan.

 **Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.**

The primary stakeholder group providing feedback about the SSIP is the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC), which meets monthly throughout the year. SEAC serves as Michigan’s Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) mandated State Advisory Panel. The SEAC advises the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) Office of Special Education and the State Board of Education (SBE). The SEAC has a broad diversity of stakeholders—administrators, providers, advocates, parents, and consumers—concerned with the education of all children, including students with disabilities. The IDEA requires at least 51 percent of SEAC’s membership to be “defined” members: persons with a disability or parents of a child with a disability (a child less than 26 years of age who receives special education services). The State Board of Education appoints SEAC members. There are up to 33 members of the SEAC.

SEAC has been engaged with the MDE to support the implementation of the SSIP since the initial requirement in 2014. Strategies to engage with SEAC include status updates, professional learning about assessment types, the eight components of general supervision, and target-setting activities. Before COVID-19, SEAC meetings were full-day and held in person. Currently, the monthly meetings are virtual, using a variety of ways to engage members in the discussions. SEAC has a shared meeting folder for meeting minutes, materials referenced during the meetings, and guidelines for reviewing materials before and after the regularly scheduled meetings. For example, meeting materials must be submitted approximately one week before the scheduled meeting to allow members time to complete pre-meeting assignments. The SEAC Facilitator works with presenters to submit any follow-up materials or responses to questions members generated during the previous meeting. The things submitted are included in the next month’s meeting folder and assigned to review as pre-work for the meeting.

For the FFY 20 SiMR target setting, SEAC members were asked to view an online, interactive, self-paced Data-Based Individualization course before the meeting. The course would be a starting point for building some common language and understanding of DBI amongst SEAC members before the MDE provided a formal presentation and overview of the proposed SIMR targets and SSIP efforts. During the October 2021 meeting, the MDE OSE Director and MiMTSS TA Center Assistant Director reviewed the SSIP ToA since it had been a while since members saw it. They also defined a “model demonstration” and provided a rationale, so members understood why this SSIP reported on a DBI model demonstration. Members received information about the scope and sequence of DBI professional learning that already happened in summer 2021 with the district’s Implementation Team and elementary multidisciplinary teams. They previewed the professional learning topics scheduled to occur during the FFY21 reporting period.

The information provided about DBI and the definition of a model demonstration better-prepared members to give feedback on the SIMR. Members were asked if the SIMR targets for 2021-2022 and 2022-2023 represented a meaningful change for learners. They were asked to assume the DBI model demonstration yielded sufficient DBI learning, substantial levels of DBI implementation, and robust student progress. Then, members reflected on how DBI should be scaled up across the state. They were asked to consider student characteristics, district demographics, and areas of the state and how MiMTSS TA Center capacity-building efforts and implementation supports would be differentiated. Members were also asked to consider how many students and districts needed to implement DBI to be considered a “tipping point” for scaling up. Finally, they were also asked how the vision for scaling up DBI impacts the SIMR targets for 2023-2024, 2025, 2026. Member feedback was provided in small, facilitated breakout room conversations or by completing an anonymous survey. The survey option was done to give people time to process the presented information and then provide as much feedback as possible. The state will continue to engage SEAC throughout the year by providing updated data from the DBI model demonstration and student reading outcomes. Throughout the process, SEAC and the state will determine when and if SiMR targets need to be revised or if new improvement strategies need to be developed.

**Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.**

Concern: The small number of students with disabilities that the DBI model demonstration could positively impact.
Recruitment efforts are underway to expand the DBI model demonstration to at least two additional districts within the next school year. The expansion efforts would continue in subsequent years. Increasing the number of schools/districts means DBI will impact more students with disabilities, and there will also be greater racial diversity, representing different geographic areas of the state.

Concern: How to develop enough capacity for districts to implement DBI to intensify literacy instruction successfully.
The capacity concerns expressed by SEAC members were also validated since DBI implementation connected to intensifying literacy instruction requires a level of expertise many educators and leaders have not acquired through professional learning. The efforts underway during the FFY 2021 reporting period to develop a plan to increase Intermediate School District (ISD) and district capacity will help mitigate this concern. Increasing ISD and district capacity requires learning from the model demonstration to inform areas that will require more teaching, coaching, and resources to support DBI implementation. The MiMTSS TA Center is developing professional learning materials for teams, educators, leaders, and ISD consultants that will respond to the observed needs in the model demonstration, since those needs will likely exist in subsequent DBI replications.

Concern: Ensure the intervention curriculum materials and instructional methods align with scientifically based reading research.
The DBI model demonstration includes a readiness component to determine if the intervention curriculum resources are aligned with scientifically based reading research. Although the state does not require a specific intervention to be used to begin applying the DBI process, MiMTSS TA Center staff meet with leaders to determine what intervention curriculum resources will be used in DBI step 1. If a district does not have quality intervention curriculum resources aligned with reading science, the MiMTSS TA Center will help the district apply a review and selection process before the DBI model demonstration professional learning begins with multidisciplinary teams.

Another way the state addresses this concern is to develop educators’ and leaders’ foundational knowledge in reading acquisition. Professional learning in scientifically based reading research instructional methods is provided to educators and leaders participating in the DBI model demonstration using the Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS) Suite. The LETRS Suite is a blended professional learning model using a combination of readings, online modules, and live learning sessions with a certified LETRS Facilitator. LETRS teaches general educators and special educators the skills needed to master the fundamentals of reading instruction: phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, writing, and language. The LETRS Suite is not a curriculum resource used in the DBI process. It develops background knowledge in reading science necessary for educators and leaders of the Multidisciplinary Team, interventionists, and some general education and special education teachers. Additionally, FY21 state aid funds have been allocated for PreK-3rd grade teachers to receive the LETRS materials and professional learning. This will help increase educator and leader access to professional learning in scientifically based reading research.

**Additional Implementation Activities**

**List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.**

N/A

**Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.**

The SSIP Evaluation Plan outlines timelines, data collection methods, measures, and expected outcomes for SSIP implementation activities. To access the SSIP Evaluation Plan click on the following link: https://www.dropbox.com/s/fh8o1qg6exrlupw/MI\_SSIP%20Evaluation%20Plan\_FY2021\_Report.docx?dl=0

**Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.**

The state has not identified any new barriers.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).**

## 17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 17 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 17 - Required Actions

# Certification

**Instructions**

**Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.**

**Certify**

**I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.**

**Select the certifier’s role:**

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

**Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.**

**Name:**

Julie Trevino

**Title:**

SPP/APR Coordinator

**Email:**

trevinoj1@michigan.gov

**Phone:**

15172410497

**Submitted on:**

04/28/22 8:58:58 AM

# ED Attachments



1. Prior to the FFY 2020 submission, the State used a different data source to report data under this indicator. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)