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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 increase the state's current level of compliance with the statutory and regulatory requirements of the law. The state is submitting the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), which will inform the OSEP and our Michigan constituents 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 letter and the spirit 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) ensure the rights of children with an individualized education program (IEP) are protected. MDE OSE is developing a holistic system of general supervision, which is cohesive, robust, and responsive to the data presented in the SPP/APR. The first steps toward a holistic system of general supervision includes identifying priorities.  
  
In 2016, MDE OSE’s OSEP state contact provided guidance that led to an increased understanding of the role of intermediate school districts (ISDs) as sub-recipients of the IDEA grant funds. This led MDE OSE to determine the need to develop and broaden the general supervision system. This work has been ongoing since then in coordination and with cooperation of ISDs through every other month or monthly meetings of MDE OSE and ISD directors of special education and a 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, there are state agencies that are included in some SPP/APR indicators making the denominator 57 entities. In the instances where state agencies are included it will be noted in the specific indicator.  
  
The OSEP revised the SPP for FFY 2013 to support 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 and includes 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. Michigan 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.

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

Michigan’s State Performance Plan (SPP)  
The Michigan Department of Education’s (MDE) State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), including the State Systemic Improvement Plan (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, policies, procedures, and implementation of effective evidence-based practices, professional learning and development and technical assistance, 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 Office of Special Education (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, a general supervision accountability workgroup, and other school administrators and parents. Compliance indicator targets, set by the federal government's Office of Special Education Programs (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, technical assistance and professional learning and development, monitoring, determinations, and for generating ad hoc data responses, as well as 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.**

Integrated Monitoring Activities  
The MDE integrates monitoring activities across all components of the general supervision system and the MDE OSE. Multiple data sources and methods are used to monitor ISDs and member districts. The MDE OSE takes a broad view of monitoring that includes gauging performance and progress for both results and compliance areas. Monitoring is seen as a proactive, preventive, and corrective approach. The monitoring activities ensure continuous examinations of performance for results and compliance.  
   
Monitoring begins with examinations of data from various sources and across the programmatic, policy, and fiscal areas. These activities may be off-site or on-site. Monitoring protocols focus on specific priority areas selected based on state performance and improvement needs.  
  
Policies, Procedures & Effective Implementation  
Michigan and the MDE OSE have policies, procedures, and implementation strategies which align with and support the implementation of the IDEA and Michigan Administrative Rules for Special Education (MARSE). The policies, procedures, and effective implementation of evidence-based practices guidance are intended to support the IDEA goals of improved results and functional outcomes and compliance with the requirements most closely aligned with improvement. MDE OSE has been engaging in an ongoing process to ensure ISDs and member districts’ procedures are in alignment with state policies and procedures. ISDs and member districts also have policies and procedures in place to ensure all personnel necessary to carry out the requirements of IDEA are appropriately and adequately prepared. These policies and 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 and local agencies.  
Through the development of the SSIP, the MDE OSE is working toward increased alignment of policies, procedures, and implementation strategies.  
  
Professional Learning and Development and Technical Assistance  
As was noted in the introduction to the document MDE OSE uses data, as well as input from stakeholders to identify areas of universal need for technical assistance and professional learning and development. MDE OSE uses several means of providing these services, including the MDE OSE website, the Catamaran system, meetings with ISD directors of special education, and professional organization meetings and conferences. In addition to universal technical assistance, specific TA is provided based on identified needs through the compliance monitoring, dispute resolution, and 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 and results SPP indicators).  
  
Fiscal Management  
MDE OSE has a system of fiscal management and accountability which implements processes and procedures to provide oversight for the application, receipt, distribution, use, and monitoring of IDEA funds at the state and district level.  
  
Upon receipt of Part B funds, administrative and other state level activities spending plans are developed following procedures to ensure allowable spending levels and use. Part B funds are distributed to LEAs in a timely manner implementing the federally required funding formula.  
  
ISDs, as the sub-recipients, submit applications which are reviewed for completeness and allowable use for approval. Fiscal monitoring is an ongoing process which includes program fiscal reviews conducted by fiscal experts through both on-site and desk reviews. Risk factors are taken into consideration. A-133 single audits are reviewed. Findings are resolved through corrective action and the recapture of any misspent funds.  
  
The ISD fiscal monitoring oversight and technical assistance ensures all Part B fiscal requirements are being met including maintenance of effort, coordinated early intervening services (both voluntary and required amounts when significant disproportionality is identified), proportionate share, excess cost, and funding new or significantly expanding charter schools.  
  
Effective Dispute Resolution  
The MDE OSE provides training and support for the timely resolution of complaints, mediations and due process actions. Information for all interested parties is provided through the MDE OSE websites; toll-free phone lines; email; electronic and paper versions of documents; coaching; mentoring; local, regional, and statewide learning opportunities; and training sessions. Several of the MDE OSE IDEA grant funded initiatives are directly engaged with dispute resolution activities. Providing mediation, facilitation, and training services for working through disputes between member districts and parents or guardians of students with an IEP, ensures students with an IEP promptly receive the services needed to develop and succeed in school.  
  
Issues of concern are entered into and tracked through a state data system to identify whether patterns or trends exist, identify member districts for monitoring activities, ensure all related corrective actions have been implemented and noncompliance has been corrected.  
   
Improvement, Correction, Incentives & Sanctions  
The MDE OSE’s system of general supervision includes ISDs as the sub-recipients of IDEA grant funds. There are member districts within each of the ISDs.  
  
The enforcement of regulations, policies and procedures is required by the IDEA and MARSE. The MDE OSE for Part B and the Office of Great Start (OGS)/Early Childhood Education and Family Services (ECE&FS) for Part C use the Catamaran system to input monitoring data, generate reports, and 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 which includes both the citation of the statute, rule or regulation, and a description of the data supporting the state's conclusion of noncompliance with statute or regulation. Catamaran tracks all findings of noncompliance and 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 and 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, the MDE OSE has a system in place to ensure correction occurs as soon as possible. The MDE OSE assigns a technical assistance provider to every member district and ISD who is unable to correct findings of noncompliance within one year. In the event, the MDE OSE technical assistance provider is unable to assist the member district or ISD in closing the finding of noncompliance, the MDE OSE has a procedure in place that has a variety of incentives and sanctions to accomplish closing findings.  
  
The MDE OSE uses an interactive system, Catamaran, which allows the uploading of documentation from the member district or ISD. The MDE OSE reviews the documentation provided to verify correction or further direct the ISD or member district correction efforts.  
  
The MDE OSE is in the process of broadening 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.**

MDE OSE has worked over the past few years to develop a coordinated technical assistance (TA) system that is responsive to the needs of ISDs and member districts. Part of this coordination was to use the data collected through the SPP/APR, integrated monitoring activities, fiscal management and accountability, and dispute resolution processes to identify areas of both results and compliance needs. In the last two years, MDE OSE has worked to build a sequence to identify and address technical assistance 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 quadrant of supports, a tiered identification and technical assistance response system. Within each of the quadrants 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. This is a repository system where resources, such as written guidance, video webinars, links, and micro-TA presentations can be accessed by all ISD and member districts. ISDs, member districts, and the MDE OSE can access data, both results and compliance, to analyze to identify patterns and needs. The MDE OSE also uses a differentiated framework of supports that aligns with ISD determination status. The four quadrants or levels of support are universal (meets requirements), targeted (needs assistance for results), directed (needs assistance for compliance), and intensive (needs intervention).  
  
It is difficult for the MDE OSE to separate TA from professional learning and development (PLD) activities because each informs the other. Some of the interrelated activities are - 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; training sessions from other technical assistance providers. This alignment and coordination of TA and PLD is part of the work in the SSIP to align work 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 students with disabilities.**

As noted above, 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 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 technical assistance to ISDs, member districts, and schools in a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (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/) SEMS 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 technical assistance, 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.

**Stakeholder Involvement**

**The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.**

The MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms. The primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC). Other stakeholders include the MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), 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.   
  
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 are already beginning to examine current targets to consider whether changes are warranted in the future.

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

YES

**Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY18 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 2018 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, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2018 APR in 2020, is available.**

Prior to publicly reporting data, MDE OSE offers ISDs and member districts time to preview the data. This enables ISDs and member districts to prepare communications tailored for their communities along with planning for improvement.  
  
MDE OSE 2020 IDEA public reporting on the performance of ISDs and member districts can be found on the MDE OSE website (www.michigan.gov/specialeducation) and the MI School Data portal (https://mischooldata.org/special-education-summary/). MDE OSE posted these data the last week of May 2020. 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---,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

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP’s coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State’s capacity to improve its SiMR data.  
  
The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2019 and 2020 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2020 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 2019 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2021, 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 2018 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 2018. MDE’s score increased from 65.28% to 72.50%, an increase of over seven percentage points which brings the two-year growth to 13.33 percentage points.  
  
Although this is the second year of considerable improvement, the work to improve outcomes for every Michigan student with an individualized education program (IEP) must continue. There still is much work to do around the areas of 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 received a zero score for two results elements. The elements were as follows:  
  
• Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped-Out  
• Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma  
  
The MDE OSE reports, with its FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission on (1) the technical assistance sources from which the state received assistance and (2) the actions the state has taken as a result of that technical assistance (TA).  
  
In July 2020, the MDE requested to have the U.S. Department of Education continue waiving the federal requirements that all students take statewide assessments, in addition to the waiving of school accountability measures based on those assessments, for the 2020-21 school year. The U.S. Department of Education provided such waivers to schools across the nation this past spring because of the covid-19 pandemic, when states, including Michigan, closed schools. The virus continues to adversely affect the ways in which Americans live, work and go to school. Michigan’s request included an explanation that students will have had interrupted instruction and schools needed to focus on children’s needs, not time- consuming state assessments. It is Michigan’s belief that the focus nationally should be on instruction, supports and the nurturing of students, not on state summative assessments. At the same time, MDE OSE has 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/) using the Resource Library for technical assistance 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.  
  
MDE OSE response to the Exiting Data Element - Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out:  
Michigan has a birth to age 26 mandate and has been reporting zero students who reached maximum age for services in the EDFacts C009 – Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education.  
  
Indicator 1: Graduation Resources within the National Technical Assistance on Transition website  
• Tools and Resources for Part B SPP Indicator 1 (https://transitionta.org/indicatorb)  
  
Indicator 2: Dropout Resources within the National Technical Assistance on Transition website  
• Tools and Resources for Part B SPP Indicator 2 (https://transitionta.org/indicatorb)  
  
In addition, the MDE OSE accessed technical assistance from the Office of Special Education Programs, by participating in OSEP's monthly technical assistance calls and receiving onsite technical assistance. The MDE OSE also received technical assistance 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) and reviewed TA materials.  
  
Actions taken by the MDE as a result of the technical assistance include the Deputy Superintendent for P-20 System and Student Transitions leading work being done with the intermediate school districts (ISDs) and member districts across the state and at the MDE to improve results and compliance. A steering committee and four work groups began work to generate and implement recommendations designed to lead to continued improvements in graduation and dropout rates and Michigan's general education state-wide assessment named the M-STEP test participation and national NAEP test results and participation.  
  
In addition, the MDE OSE focused technical assistance efforts on dropout rates by utilizing a data use 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 discipline and improve student outcomes.

## Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2019 and 2020 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 25, 2020 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2021, 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 April 1, 2021 and April 2, 2021 and will respond under separate cover.

## Intro - 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.

# Indicator 1: Graduation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school 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 of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

**Measurement**

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

**Instructions**

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

## 1 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2016 | 64.15% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= | 80.00% | 80.00% | 80.00% | 80.00% | 80.00% |
| Data | 55.07% | 57.12% | 64.15% | 65.34% | 63.53% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 80.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms. The primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC). Other stakeholders include the MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), 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.   
  
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 are already beginning to examine current targets to consider whether changes are warranted in the future.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696) | 07/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma | \*[[1]](#footnote-2) |
| SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696) | 07/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate | 13,541 |
| SY 2018-19 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695) | 07/27/2020 | Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table | 64.26% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs in the current year’s adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma** | **Number of youth with IEPs in the current year’s adjusted cohort eligible to graduate** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| \*1 | 13,541 | 63.53% | 80.00% | 64.26% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Graduation Conditions**

**Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:**

Extended ACGR

**If extended, provide the number of years**

6

**Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain*.***

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)**

## 1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 1 - OSEP Response

## 1 - Required Actions

# Indicator 2: Drop Out

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (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:

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 left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2:

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.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

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:

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 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target <= | 9.25% | 9.00% | 8.75% | 8.50% | 8.25% |
| Data | 7.86% | 7.35% | 7.06% | 6.76% | 6.86% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 8.25% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms. The primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC). Other stakeholders include the MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), 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.   
  
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 are already beginning to examine current targets to consider whether changes are warranted in the future.

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

Option 2

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 8,773 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b) | 1,170 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c) | 0 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d) | 3,545 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e) | 62 |

**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.  
  
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 2017 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 2019 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out | Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort | **FFY** **2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 4,308 | 64,675 | 6.86% | 8.25% | 6.66% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

**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 below.**

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

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 2 - OSEP Response

## 2 - Required Actions

# Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Indicator 3A – Reserved

B. Participation rate for children with IEPs

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate 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 FS185 and 188.

**Measurement**

B. 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. 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 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, 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.

## 3B - Indicator Data

**Reporting Group Selection**

**Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Grade 3** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 5** | **Grade 6** | **Grade 7** | **Grade 8** | **Grade 9** | **Grade 10** | **Grade 11** | **Grade 12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Elementary School | X | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **B** | Middle School |  |  |  | X | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| **C** | High School |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |

**Historical Data: Reading**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Elementary School | 2014 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| **A** | Elementary School | 97.27% | Actual | 97.27% | 97.74% | 98.03% | 98.26% | 98.49% |
| **B** | Middle School | 2014 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| **B** | Middle School | 96.58% | Actual | 96.58% | 97.20% | 97.71% | 97.53% | 97.36% |
| **C** | High School | 2014 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| **C** | High School | 90.58% | Actual | 90.58% | 92.71% | 94.11% | 92.35% | 93.26% |

**Historical Data: Math**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Elementary School | 2014 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| **A** | Elementary School | 97.90% | Actual | 97.90% | 97.19% | 98.49% | 98.83% | 98.84% |
| **B** | Middle School | 2014 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| **B** | Middle School | 97.25% | Actual | 97.25% | 97.55% | 98.01% | 98.17% | 97.83% |
| **C** | High School | 2014 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| **C** | High School | 91.18% | Actual | 91.18% | 93.39% | 94.73% | 93.23% | 93.85% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2019** |
| Reading | A >= | Elementary School | 95.00% |
| Reading | B >= | Middle School | 95.00% |
| Reading | C >= | High School | 95.00% |
| Math | A >= | Elementary School | 95.00% |
| Math | B >= | Middle School | 95.00% |
| Math | C >= | High School | 95.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms. The primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC). Other stakeholders include the MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), 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.   
  
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 are already beginning to examine current targets to consider whether changes are warranted in the future.

**FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)**

YES

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Elementary School |  |  | 98.49% | 95.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Middle School |  |  | 97.36% | 95.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | High School |  |  | 93.26% | 95.00% |  | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Elementary School |  |  | 98.84% | 95.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Middle School |  |  | 97.83% | 95.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | High School |  |  | 93.85% | 95.00% |  | 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.**

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

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Indicator 3 Assessment Reporting Waived

## 3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3B - OSEP Response

The State was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

## 3B - Required Actions

# Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Indicator 3A – Reserved

B. Participation rate for children with IEPs

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate 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 grade level and 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)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. 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 reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 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

**Reporting Group Selection**

**Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Grade 3** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 5** | **Grade 6** | **Grade 7** | **Grade 8** | **Grade 9** | **Grade 10** | **Grade 11** | **Grade 12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Elementary School | X | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **B** | Middle School |  |  |  | X | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| **C** | High School |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |

**Historical Data: Reading**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Elementary School | 2014 | Target >= | 72.00% | 74.00% | 76.00% | 77.00% | 79.00% |
| **A** | Elementary School | 27.35% | Actual | 27.35% | 28.80% | 27.79% | 26.04% | 24.90% |
| **B** | Middle School | 2014 | Target >= | 70.00% | 72.00% | 74.00% | 76.00% | 78.00% |
| **B** | Middle School | 21.62% | Actual | 21.62% | 23.51% | 23.24% | 21.65% | 24.38% |
| **C** | High School | 2014 | Target >= | 65.00% | 68.00% | 71.00% | 74.00% | 76.00% |
| **C** | High School | 26.29% | Actual | 26.29% | 27.83% | 27.72% | 26.89% | 24.15% |

**Historical Data: Math**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Elementary School | 2014 | Target >= | 53.00% | 58.00% | 62.00% | 67.00% | 71.00% |
| **A** | Elementary School | 25.98% | Actual | 25.98% | 25.38% | 24.81% | 22.34% | 21.42% |
| **B** | Middle School | 2014 | Target >= | 50.00% | 55.00% | 60.00% | 65.00% | 70.00% |
| **B** | Middle School | 18.23% | Actual | 18.23% | 18.36% | 16.86% | 15.85% | 15.89% |
| **C** | High School | 2014 | Target >= | 47.00% | 52.00% | 58.00% | 63.00% | 69.00% |
| **C** | High School | 19.74% | Actual | 19.74% | 20.30% | 17.64% | 17.64% | 15.35% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2019** |
| Reading | A >= | Elementary School | 79.00% |
| Reading | B >= | Middle School | 78.00% |
| Reading | C >= | High School | 76.00% |
| Math | A >= | Elementary School | 71.00% |
| Math | B >= | Middle School | 70.00% |
| Math | C >= | High School | 69.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms. The primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC). Other stakeholders include the MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), 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.   
  
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 are already beginning to examine current targets to consider whether changes are warranted in the future.

**FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)**

YES

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

**Reading Proficiency Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

**Math Proficiency Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned** | **Number of Children with IEPs Proficient** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Elementary School |  |  | 24.90% | 79.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Middle School |  |  | 24.38% | 78.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | High School |  |  | 24.15% | 76.00% |  | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned** | **Number of Children with IEPs Proficient** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Elementary School |  |  | 21.42% | 71.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Middle School |  |  | 15.89% | 70.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | High School |  |  | 15.35% | 69.00% |  | 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.**

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

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Indicator 3 Assessment Reporting Waived

## 3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3C - OSEP Response

The State was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

## 3C - 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 districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs

(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 districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts 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 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions 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.

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n 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 district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy 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 the Office of Special Education Programs (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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), 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** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target <= | 4.30% | 4.10% | 3.90% | 3.70% | 3.50% |
| Data | 2.48% | 1.34% | 1.48% | 2.05% | 2.41% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 1.45% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms. The primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC). Other stakeholders include the MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), 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.   
  
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 are already beginning to examine current targets to consider whether changes are warranted in the future.

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n-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 size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

0

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy** | **Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 0 | 57 | 2.41% | 1.45% | 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 was 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)**

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 not included in the Introduction section. However, State agencies are included in these indicators.  
  
The State has moved from conducting monitoring activities at the member district level to the ISD level, as subrecipients. For this indicator, the current report is at the ISD level. Therefore, the State has revised its baseline using FFY 2019 data.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 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.**

N/A

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 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7 | 5 | 1 | 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***

The MDE OSE ensured each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018:  
  
(1) Is correctly implementing regulatory requirements (100% compliance) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through student record reviews verified by ISDs and MDE OSE.  
(2) Each individual case of noncompliance was corrected, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.  
  
The MDE OSE 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). When correction of noncompliance was not completed within one year, the state mandated increased technical assistance, training or other enforcement action to promptly bring the LEA into compliance. A finding remains active until correction is verified by the MDE OSE.

**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 conducted onsite by the ISD and submitted to and reviewed by the MDE OSE.

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

For uncorrected noncompliance the MDE OSE provided a technical assistant who reviewed the cause of the ongoing noncompliance and mandated the use of technical assistance, training, and other enforcement action to ensure prompt compliance.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

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

## 4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4A - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019 and OSEP accepts that revision.

## 4A - 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.

# Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(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 districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n 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 size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts 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 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions 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.

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts 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 district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy 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 the Office of Special Education Programs (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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), 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** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 1.91% | 3.58% | 1.84% | 5.07% | 3.86% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n-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 size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

0

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity** | **Number of those districts that have policies procedure, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements** | **Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 8 | 0 | 57 | 3.86% | 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 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 not included in the Introduction section. However, State agencies are included in these indicators.  
  
The State has moved from conducting monitoring activities at the member district level to the ISD level, as subrecipients. For this indicator, the current report is at the ISD level. Therefore, the State has revised its baseline using FFY 2019 data.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 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 all 8 ISDs identified with significant discrepancy. As part of the monitoring, Michigan reviewed the ISDs’ 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, zero ISDs were 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 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 30 | 23 | 1 | 6 |

**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:  
  
(1) Is correctly implementing regulatory requirements (100% compliance) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through student record reviews verified by ISDs and MDE OSE.  
(2) Each individual case of noncompliance was corrected, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.  
  
The MDE OSE 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). When correction of noncompliance was not completed within one year, the MDE OSE mandated increased technical assistance, training or other enforcement action to promptly bring the LEA into compliance. A finding remains active until the district meets the regulatory requirements and is achieving 100 percent compliance and is verified by the MDE OSE.

**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 conducted onsite or virtual by the ISD and submitted to and reviewed by the MDE OSE.

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

For the six member districts with uncorrected noncompliance the MDE OSE provided a technical assistant who reviewed the cause of the ongoing noncompliance and mandated the use of technical assistance, training, or other enforcement action to ensure prompt compliance. The technical assistance provider will continue to work with the six member districts and determine why and what actions need to be taken until noncompliance is corrected and verified by the state. The verification ensures the member district is meeting the regulatory requirements and is achieving 100 percent compliance.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FFY 2017 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2017**

**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 used the same process described above to ensure correction of noncompliance from FFY 2018.

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

See above.

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

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

## 4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4B - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.

## 4B- 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.

# Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Education environments (children 6-21): Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

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

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

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

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

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

**Instructions**

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

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** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A | 2005 | Target >= | 63.25% | 63.50% | 63.75% | 64.00% | 64.25% |
| A | 54.01% | Data | 65.90% | 66.39% | 66.89% | 67.19% | 67.66% |
| B | 2005 | Target <= | 11.80% | 11.70% | 11.60% | 11.50% | 11.40% |
| B | 17.87% | Data | 11.08% | 10.86% | 10.90% | 11.10% | 10.97% |
| C | 2011 | Target <= | 5.36% | 5.32% | 5.28% | 5.24% | 5.15% |
| C | 5.50% | Data | 5.04% | 5.16% | 4.96% | 4.83% | 4.79% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A >= | 64.25% |
| Target B <= | 11.40% |
| Target C <= | 5.15% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms. The primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC). Other stakeholders include the MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), 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.   
  
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 are already beginning to examine current targets to consider whether changes are warranted in the future.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 | 178,553 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 122,452 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 18,837 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools | 7,819 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities | 243 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements | 352 |

**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 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Education Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 122,452 | 178,553 | 67.66% | 64.25% | 68.58% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 18,837 | 178,553 | 10.97% | 11.40% | 10.55% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3] | 8,414 | 178,553 | 4.79% | 5.15% | 4.71% | Met Target | No Slippage |

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

NO

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

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 5 - OSEP Response

## 5 - Required Actions

# Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Preschool environments: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and

B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

(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**

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 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 aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

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

**Instructions**

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

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.

## 6 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

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

NO

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A | 2011 | Target >= | 28.20% | 28.20% | 28.30% | 28.50% | 28.80% |
| A | 27.20% | Data | 28.00% | 29.72% | 29.89% | 28.68% | 30.24% |
| B | 2011 | Target <= | 43.20% | 43.20% | 42.00% | 41.50% | 41.00% |
| B | 44.20% | Data | 41.39% | 39.25% | 38.72% | 38.51% | 36.08% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A >= | 28.80% |
| Target B <= | 41.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms. The primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC). Other stakeholders include the MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), 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.   
  
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 are already beginning to examine current targets to consider whether changes are warranted in the future.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 | 20,594 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | 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 | 5,815 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | b1. Number of children attending separate special education class | 7,342 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | b2. Number of children attending separate school | 338 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | b3. Number of children attending residential facility | 3 |

**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 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Preschool Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 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 | 5,815 | 20,594 | 30.24% | 28.80% | 28.24% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 7,683 | 20,594 | 36.08% | 41.00% | 37.31% | Met Target | No Slippage |

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

NO

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **A** | Due to changes in our MSDS system, several primary educational setting codes could be entered for this age group which had not been available previously. Additionally, with our continued training and technical assistance around inclusion, we are getting higher reliability in the data from past potential coding errors. |

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

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 6 - OSEP Response

## 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** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A1 | 2011 | Target >= | 86.00% | 86.50% | 87.00% | 87.50% | 88.00% |
| A1 | 81.10% | Data | 87.73% | 87.90% | 88.36% | 88.31% | 88.39% |
| A2 | 2011 | Target >= | 54.90% | 55.00% | 55.10% | 55.20% | 55.30% |
| A2 | 54.00% | Data | 54.98% | 58.02% | 57.82% | 58.08% | 60.61% |
| B1 | 2011 | Target >= | 87.00% | 87.50% | 88.00% | 88.50% | 89.00% |
| B1 | 82.20% | Data | 89.28% | 89.11% | 90.17% | 89.94% | 88.23% |
| B2 | 2011 | Target >= | 56.00% | 56.10% | 56.30% | 56.40% | 56.50% |
| B2 | 53.70% | Data | 56.34% | 58.93% | 57.13% | 57.41% | 57.65% |
| C1 | 2011 | Target >= | 86.00% | 86.50% | 87.25% | 87.75% | 88.25% |
| C1 | 81.30% | Data | 87.85% | 88.47% | 88.66% | 89.14% | 87.71% |
| C2 | 2011 | Target >= | 59.10% | 59.20% | 59.30% | 59.40% | 59.50% |
| C2 | 58.70% | Data | 59.17% | 61.25% | 60.89% | 61.67% | 61.55% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A1 >= | 88.00% |
| Target A2 >= | 55.30% |
| Target B1 >= | 89.00% |
| Target B2 >= | 56.50% |
| Target C1 >= | 88.25% |
| Target C2 >= | 59.50% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms. The primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC). Other stakeholders include the MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), 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.   
  
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 are already beginning to examine current targets to consider whether changes are warranted in the future.

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

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

2,812

**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 | 18 | 0.64% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 237 | 8.43% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 1,038 | 36.91% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 945 | 33.61% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 574 | 20.41% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 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)* | 1,983 | 2,238 | 88.39% | 88.00% | 88.61% | Met Target | No 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)* | 1,519 | 2,812 | 60.61% | 55.30% | 54.02% | Did Not Meet Target | 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 | 0.68% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 235 | 8.36% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 1,054 | 37.48% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,140 | 40.54% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 364 | 12.94% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 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)* | 2,194 | 2,448 | 88.23% | 89.00% | 89.62% | 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)* | 1,504 | 2,812 | 57.65% | 56.50% | 53.49% | Did Not Meet Target | 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 | 18 | 0.64% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 241 | 8.57% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 942 | 33.50% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,030 | 36.63% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 581 | 20.66% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 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)* | 1,972 | 2,231 | 87.71% | 88.25% | 88.39% | 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)* | 1,611 | 2,812 | 61.55% | 59.50% | 57.29% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **A2** | The three targets not met were all in summary statement 2. Michigan closed in person learning March 13, 2020 and many member districts were not equipped nor trained on the use of other assessment tools that could be used virtually. Schools were therefore, relying on the assessment tools that required an in-person evaluation and assessment which led to incomplete and compromised data being entered. Additionally, this abrupt end to in person learning left educators struggling to gather needed data to complete the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process. Furthermore, there were times, families who did not make their child available for either virtual services or virtual assessment. In speaking with 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, in those cases the data were from mid-year assessments from January.  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 the slippage occurred other than the potential impact of the covid-19 pandemic.  Michigan has provided additional training on outcomes, birth through age 5, encompassing Part C and 619. Perhaps teachers and specialists are improving their COS process and providing more accurate data as a result of the outcomes training. The MDE OSE will continue to monitor this data and continue to provide training on the outcomes COS process, with the goal of meeting targets for FFY 2020. |
| **B2** | See explanation A2 |
| **C2** | See explanation A2 |

**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. 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)**

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, 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 technical assistance 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.

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

## 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.

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

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the 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.

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. The primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC). Other stakeholders include the MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), 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.   
  
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 are already beginning to examine current targets to consider whether changes are warranted in the future.

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Preschool | 2007 | Target >= | 45.50% | 46.00% | 46.50% | 47.00% | 47.50% |
| Preschool | 34.00% | Data | 49.90% | 49.70% | 50.38% | 50.48% | 49.25% |
| School age | 2007 | Target >= | 25.20% | 25.60% | 26.00% | 26.40% | 26.80% |
| School age | 20.50% | Data | 28.96% | 29.59% | 28.90% | 28.14% | 30.36% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A >= | 47.50% |
| Target B >= | 26.80% |

**FFY 2019 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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Preschool | 2,571 | 4,694 | 49.25% | 47.50% | 54.77% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| School age | 4,065 | 12,925 | 30.36% | 26.80% | 31.45% | Met Target | No Slippage |

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

76,391

**Percentage of respondent parents**

23.06%

| **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 between the ages of 3 and 5 years (inclusive) who received special education services in Michigan, and to approximately one third of all parents of students between the ages of 6 and 21 years (inclusive) who received such services in Michigan. Parents of students ages 6 through 21 years were selected to participate in the survey using the OSEP-approved cohort sampling plan. Approximately one third of member districts within every ISD were selected to participate in the 6-21 survey. The 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 between the ages of 3 and 5, inclusive (the “preschool survey”); and  
• One for parents of students between the ages of 6 and 21, inclusive (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 4,694 respondents to the preschool survey (23.96% response rate) and 12,925 respondents to the school age survey (22.76% response rate,) for a total of 17,619 responses from 76,391 viable respondents (23.06% total response rate). Rasch analyses were used to generate scores for each respondent, and the NCSEAM standard of 600 was used to determine whether parents reported that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with an IEP. Of the completed surveys, all 17,619 respondents provided sufficient data to calculate a rasch score. For the preschool survey, 2,571 respondents (54.77%) had scores that met or exceeded the NCSEAM standard, and for the school age survey 4,065 respondents (31.45%) had scores that met or exceeded this standard.

| **Survey Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was a survey used? | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised survey? | NO |
| The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. | 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 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 additional calls to low-responding areas.  
• Encourage and support 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 or to opt out of the survey;  
• 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 demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.**

Comparisons of the demographic characteristics of the statewide population and the respondent sample reveal that respondents are not fully representative of the Michigan Part B special education population. The demographic categories assessed were gender, respondent race/ethnicity, child/student race/ethnicity, primary disability category, and ISD peer group.  
  
There were no statistically significant differences between the survey population and the respondent sample with respect to child or student gender.  
   
Statistically significant differences were found when comparing the survey population to the respondent sample with respect to race/ethnicity. In comparison to the 3-5 year statewide population, the 3-5 year survey sample had an:  
• underrepresentation of African American children and parents of African American children;  
• underrepresentation of multiracial parents; and an  
• overrepresentation of Asian American children and parents of Asian American children.  
  
In comparison to the 6-21 year cohort 1 population, the 6-21 year survey sample had an:  
• underrepresentation of African American parents;  
• underrepresentation of parents of White students;  
• underrepresentation of multiracial students and parents of multiracial students; and an  
• overrepresentation of Hispanic/Latino students and parents of Hispanic/Latino students.  
  
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 did not reveal statistically significant differences between the unweighted and weighted results. Therefore, even though the samples were not entirely representative across the demographics included, the Indicator 8 results were not affected, and unweighted results are reported. (Additional details for comparison data are available upon request.)

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

## 8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2019 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 2018 SPP/APR**

See Indicator Data section above.

## 8 - OSEP Response

## 8 - 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.

# 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 FFY 2018, 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 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), 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** |
| --- | --- |
| 2018 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.81% | 0.00% | 0.29% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% |

**FFY 2019 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 and ethnic groups in special education and related services** | **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and 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-size** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 0 | 0 | 56 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**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).**

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 2019 SPP/APR, the two school years examined were school year (2018-2019) and school year (2019-2020). A risk ratio greater than 2.5 for two consecutive years for any racial/ethnic group in all or one of six 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 was calculated when the racial/ethnic distribution of the ISD’s student population varied significantly from the state racial distribution which was used to calculate weighted risk ratios/ARR. The risk ratio (RR) compared identification rates by race/ethnicity with the ISD’s student population.  
  
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, 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.  
  
For ISDs determined to have disproportionate representation, the MDE OSE conducted monitoring activities using IDEA regulations along with 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 policies, procedures, or practices.

**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 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 excluded for this indicator.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **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 2018**

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

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

**Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

See Indicator Data section above.

## 9 - OSEP Response

## 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 2019, 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 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 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), 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** |
| --- | --- |
| 2018 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 1.86% | 0.00% | 2.00% | 1.17% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% |

**FFY 2019 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 and ethnic groups in specific disability categories** | **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification** | **Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 9 | 0 | 56 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**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 2019 SPP/APR, the two school years considered were school year (2018-2019) and school year (2019-2020). A risk ratio (RR) greater than 2.5 for two consecutive years for any racial/ethnic group in all or 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. ARR was calculated when the racial/ethnic distribution of the ISD’s student population varied significantly from the state racial distribution which was used to calculate weighted risk ratios/ARR. The RR compared identification rates by race/ethnicity with the ISD’s student population.  
  
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.

**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 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 excluded for this indicator.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **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 2018**

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

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

**Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

See Indicator Data section above.

## 10 - OSEP Response

## 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), 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** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 99.85% | 99.80% | 99.86% | 99.77% | 99.55% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% |

**FFY 2019 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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 22,902 | 22,753 | 99.55% | 100% | 99.35% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

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

149

**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 - 8 (5.37%)  
Personnel not available for evaluation - 58 (38.93%)   
Personnel not available for IEP - 62 (41.61%)  
Total - 128 (85.91%)  
  
Reason for Late Evaluation for Ineligible Children with a Late Evaluation:   
External reports not available - 3 (2.01%)  
Personnel not available for evaluation - 7 (4.70%)   
Personnel not available for IEP - 11 (7.38%)   
Total - 21 (14.09%)  
  
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 31 (20.81%)  
6-10 days 19 (12.75%)  
11-15 days 12 (8.05%)  
16-20 days 12 (8.05%)  
21-25 days 12 (8.05%)  
26-30 days 9 (6.04%)  
> 30 days 54 (36.24%)  
Does 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 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 53 | 39 | 0 | 14 |

**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:  
  
(1) Is correctly implementing regulatory requirements (100% compliance) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through student record reviews verified by ISDs and MDE OSE.  
(2) Each individual case of noncompliance was corrected, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.  
  
The MDE OSE 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). When correction of noncompliance was not completed within one year, the state mandated increased technical assistance, training or other enforcement action to promptly bring the LEA into compliance. A finding remains active until the district meets the regulatory requirements and is achieving 100 percent compliance and is verified by the MDE OSE.

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

For each individual case of noncompliance, the ISD and the MDE OSE verified the initial evaluation was completed. Data was reported to the MDE OSE in the MSDS.

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

For the fourteen member districts with uncorrected noncompliance the MDE OSE provided a technical assistant who reviewed the cause of the ongoing noncompliance and mandated the use of technical assistance, training, or other enforcement action to ensure prompt compliance. The technical assistance provider will continue to work with the fourteen member districts and determine why and what actions need to be taken until noncompliance is corrected and verified by the state. The finding will remain open until all individual cases of noncompliance are corrected and the member district is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FFY 2017 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2017**

**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 used the same process described above to ensure correction of noncompliance from FFY 2018.

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

See above.

## 11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 11 - OSEP Response

## 11 - 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.

# 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.

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.

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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), 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** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 89.78% | 76.08% | 93.09% | 93.52% | 93.04% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination. | 2,350 |
| b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday. | 88 |
| c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. | 1,895 |
| 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. | 70 |
| e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays. | 11 |
| 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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 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. | 1,895 | 2,181 | 93.04% | 100% | 86.89% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

The Early Access and the MDE OSE are working together to ensure a seamless transition. However, due to the covid-19 pandemic, many schools were not able to perform the initial IEP evaluations by the third birthday. Michigan saw a drop in our compliance rate for B12 due to these unprecedented circumstances. Michigan closed in person learning March 13, 2020 and many member districts were not equipped and trained on the use of other assessment tools to determine eligibility for children that could be used virtually therefore relying on the assessment tools that required an in-person evaluation and assessment. This led to incomplete and compromised data being entered as well as IEPs not being held by the child’s third birthday. Additionally, this abrupt end to in person learning left educators challenged in gathering needed data to complete the referral process and determining eligibility for children coming from Part C to Part B. Furthermore, there were times, families did not make their child available for virtual assessments. The data were reviewed as well as the pool of children and an explanation for the slippage between FFY 2018 and FFY 2019 is not obvious, outside of the potential impact of the covid-19 pandemic. Michigan has developed additional training on transition from Part C to Part B for a timely IEP by age three that is available for remote training and we will continue to work with our member districts for compliance on this indicator.

**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**

286

**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 - 25   
External reports not available - 0  
Unknown - 250  
Total - 284  
  
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 - 0   
Personnel not available for IEP - 1  
External reports not available - 0   
Unknown - 1  
Total - 2  
  
Number of Late IEPs: 1 - 9 ISDs   
Number of Late IEPs: 2-3 - 4 ISDs   
Number of Late IEPs: 4+ - 5 ISDs  
  
Range of Days beyond third birthday, number and percent of late IEPs:  
1-10 days - 17 late IEPs (5.94%)  
11-50 days - 37 late IEPs (12.94%)  
51-100 days - 4 late IEPs (1.40%)  
>100 days - 0 late IEPs (0.00%)   
Unknown days - 228 late IEPs (79.72%)  
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)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 77 | 73 | 0 | 4 |

**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 and FFY 2017:  
  
(1) Is correctly implementing regulatory requirements (100% compliance) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through student record reviews verified by ISDs and MDE OSE.  
(2) Each individual case of noncompliance was corrected, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.  
  
The MDE OSE reviewed data after 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). When correction of noncompliance was not completed within one year, the state mandated increased technical assistance, training or other enforcement action to promptly bring the LEA into compliance. A finding remains active until the district meets the regulatory requirements and is achieving 100 percent compliance and is verified by the MDE OSE.

**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 conducted onsite or virtual by the ISD and submitted to and reviewed by the MDE OSE. Subsequent data submitted to the MDE OSE in the MSDS was verified at 100 percent compliance to ensure the member district is implementing the regulatory requirements.

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

For the four member districts with uncorrected noncompliance the MDE OSE provided a technical assistant who reviewed the cause of the ongoing noncompliance and mandated the use of technical assistance, training, or other enforcement action to ensure prompt compliance. The technical assistance provider will continue to work with the four member districts and determine why and what actions need to be taken until noncompliance is corrected and verified by the state. The technical assistant will ensure the member district corrects each individual case of noncompliance and the member district is implementing the regulatory requirements.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FFY 2017 | 4 | 4 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2017**

**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 used the same process described above to ensure correction of noncompliance from FFY 2018.

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

See above.

## 12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 12 - OSEP Response

## 12 - 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.

# Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

**Compliance indicator**: Secondary transition: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(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 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), 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** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 76.78% | 78.34% | 81.23% | 81.00% | 92.34% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% |

**FFY 2019 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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4,474 | 4,814 | 92.34% | 100% | 92.94% | Did Not Meet Target | No 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 4,814 students ages 16 to 21 (the federal age cut-off), for a statewide margin of error of +/- 0.79%. 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.  
  
Using these criteria, a total of 624 member districts were monitored, with 152 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. Therefore, the MDE OSE has revised the baseline for this indicator using FFY 2018 data.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 272 | 270 | 0 | 2 |

**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:  
  
1) Is correctly implementing regulatory requirements (100% compliance) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through student record reviews verified by ISDs and MDE OSE.  
2) Each individual case of noncompliance was corrected, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.  
  
The MDE OSE reviewed data after 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 MDE OSE 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 technical assistance, training or other enforcement action to promptly bring the LEA into compliance. A finding remains active until the district meets the regulatory requirements and is achieving 100 percent compliance and is verified by the MDE OSE.

**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 conducted onsite or virtual by the ISD and submitted to and reviewed by the MDE OSE.

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

For the two member districts with uncorrected noncompliance the MDE OSE provided a technical assistant who reviewed the cause of the ongoing noncompliance and mandated the use of technical assistance, training, or other enforcement action to ensure prompt compliance. The technical assistance provider will continue to work with the two member districts and determine why and what actions need to be taken until noncompliance is corrected and verified by the state. The technical assistant will ensure the member district corrects each individual case of noncompliance and the member district is implementing the regulatory requirements.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

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

## 13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 13 - OSEP Response

## 13 - 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.

# Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

**Results indicator:** Post-school outcomes: Percent 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.

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

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 2020 on students who left school during 2018-2019, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2018-2019 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” in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, due February 2021:

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, 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.

*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***

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.

**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 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. States should consider categories such as race and 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.

## 14 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A | 2018 | Target >= | 33.00% | 33.20% | 33.40% | 33.60% | 33.90% |
| A | 28.21% | Data | 34.79% | 32.36% | 32.56% | 29.18% | 28.21% |
| B | 2018 | Target >= | 59.50% | 60.00% | 60.50% | 61.00% | 61.50% |
| B | 42.82% | Data | 65.35% | 63.31% | 62.96% | 64.85% | 42.82% |
| C | 2018 | Target >= | 72.00% | 72.50% | 73.00% | 73.50% | 74.00% |
| C | 75.19% | Data | 77.09% | 76.82% | 76.93% | 77.43% | 75.19% |

**FFY 2019 Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A >= | 33.90% |
| Target B >= | 61.50% |
| Target C >= | 75.25% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms. The primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC). Other stakeholders include the MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), 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.   
  
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 are already beginning to examine current targets to consider whether changes are warranted in the future.

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school | 808 |
| 1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school | 219 |
| 2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school | 110 |
| 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) | 93 |
| 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). | 209 |

| **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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Enrolled in higher education (1) | 219 | 808 | 28.21% | 33.90% | 27.10% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2) | 329 | 808 | 42.82% | 61.50% | 40.72% | Did Not Meet Target | 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) | 631 | 808 | 75.19% | 75.25% | 78.09% | Met Target | No Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **A** | Michigan did not meet the target of 33.90% on measure A for FFY 2019. The result on measure A represent a 1.11 percentage point slippage from FFY 2018. 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: 37.3% in 2014-15; 35.4% in 2015-16; 33.0% in 2016-17; 31.2% in 2017-18; and 29.2% in 2018-19 (per MIschooldata.org). The decline in measure A in FFY 2019 is also related to the higher enrollment in some other postsecondary education or training program (i.e., group 3) over higher education when compared to FFY 2018. More specifically, in FFY 2019, 11.5% of respondents enrolled in some other education or training program within one year of leaving high school, versus 9.1% in FFY 2018. |
| **B** | Michigan did not meet the target of 61.50% on Measure B for FFY 2019. The result on Measure B represent a 2.10 percentage point slippage from FFY 2018. The decrease is not statistically significant.  Michigan’s slippage on Indicator 14 measure B is attributable to the drop in the competitive employment rate (i.e., group 2) from FFY 2018. More explicitly, the competitive employment rate in FFY 2019 is 13.6%, versus 14.6% in FFY 2018. The drop in the FFY 2019 is also related to the increase in some other employment rate (i.e., group 4). More specifically, 25.9% of respondents were in some other employment in FFY 2019, in comparison to 23.3% of respondents in FFY 2018. |

**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.

| **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 respondent group was not representative of the population in terms of race/ethnicity, exit status, and of former students with Autism Spectrum Disorder. 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 race/ethnicity, exit status, and disability group.  
Statistical weights are commonly used to adjust survey results for under- and over-representation of specific subgroups in a sample. This procedure provides an estimate of the results which would be found when 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 identified as African-American/Black was .2340 and the proportion in the respondent group was .2017. Dividing .2340 by .2017 yields 1.160. Therefore, the weight assigned to African-American/Black former students was 1.160.  
  
This computation was repeated for the remaining racial and ethnic groups as well as for exit status and disability. Differences in results between the unweighted respondent group and the weighted respondent group for the race/ethnicity, exit status, and disability categories were found not to be statistically significant. This suggests even though the respondent group is not representative in terms of students’ race/ethnicity, exit status, and disability groups, the results are not affected in a statistically significant manner. Therefore, the unweighted results are reported.

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

**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 on gender, race/ethnicity, exit status, disability, and peer group. On gender and peer group, the respondent group was found to be representative of the population, whereas race/ethnicity, exit status, and disability group were found to be statistically significantly different.  
  
Results of the analyses, indicating that African-American/Black former students were statistically significantly under-represented in the respondent group. In terms of exit status, former students who graduated high school were over-represented, while those that dropped out of high school were under-represented. Lastly, former students with Autism Spectrum Disorder were over-represented in the respondent group. (Additional details available upon request.)

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school? | 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.**

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 contact cards to transition coordinators at their request for distribution to student leavers who could return (when they choose) the postage- paid postcards to WSU; 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 African-American respondents and 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, these groups 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.

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

Michigan reset the baseline for Indicator 14 Postsecondary Outcomes, given the change in the definition of competitive employment to competitive integrated employment. Per the requirement of OSEP and recommendations from the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT), Michigan adopted the revised post-school outcomes data collection protocol in FFY 2018 SPP/APR.  
  
The new definition requires all the criteria of the old definition to be met, along with the following additional criteria: interaction with co-workers without a disability, customary pay rate, work which provides benefits, and work which provides the same opportunity for advancement for those with disabilities as for those without disabilities. As a result of these changes, four new questions were added to the FFY 2018 survey to capture the new employment criteria. FFY 2019 survey remained the same as FFY 2018. There was slippage on measure A higher education enrollment and on measure B higher education or competitive employment, but there was an increase of nearly three percentage points on measure C.

## 14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2019 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 2018 SPP/APR**

See Indicator Data section above.

## 14 - OSEP Response

## 14 - 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.

# 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, targets and improvement activities, 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 not used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/04/2020 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 21 |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/04/2020 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 8 |

**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. The primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC). Other stakeholders include the MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), 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.   
  
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 are already beginning to examine current targets to consider whether changes are warranted in the future.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 36.40% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= | 44.00% | 46.00% | 48.00% | 50.00% | 52.00% |
| Data | 37.04% | 51.22% | 42.86% | 46.88% | 54.55% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 52.00% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 8 | 21 | 54.55% | 52.00% | 38.10% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

The covid-19 quarantine postponed some of the resolution sessions beyond the reporting period. Other cases were withdrawn or dismissed without a settlement agreement which impacted the overall performance of the state on this indicator.

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

## 15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 15 - OSEP Response

## 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 resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, 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 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 2.1 Mediations held | 162 |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 13 |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 112 |

**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. The primary stakeholder group is the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC). Other stakeholders include the MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), 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.   
  
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 are already beginning to examine current targets to consider whether changes are warranted in the future.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 87.70% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= | 75.00% | 75.00% | 75.00% | 75.00% - 85.00% | 75.00% - 85.00% |
| Data | 77.63% | 81.69% | 78.35% | 81.15% | 82.47% |

**Targets**

| **FFY** | **2019 (low)** | **2019 (high)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 75.00% | 85.00% |

**FFY 2019 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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target (low)** | | **FFY 2019 Target (high)** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 13 | 112 | 162 | 82.47% | 75.00% | 85.00% | | 77.16% | Met Target | No Slippage |

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

The COVID-19 quarantine postponed some of the mediation agreements beyond the reporting period. Other cases were withdrawn or dismissed without a settlement agreement which impacted the overall performance of the State on this Indicator. There were parents who were not willing or unable to engage in virtual mediation although it was made available.

## 16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 16 - OSEP Response

## 16 - Required Actions

# Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan



# 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:**

04/28/21 11:05:52 AM

# ED Attachments

  

1. Data suppressed due to privacy protection [↑](#footnote-ref-2)