

Michigan Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) Extension

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

Submitted to the
United States Department of Education
Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)
February 3, 2014

This document includes Targets and Activities for each
SPP Indicator for FFY 2010 – FFY 2013



Office of Special Education

**Part B State Performance Plan Extension for 2011-2014
Table of Contents**

Overview of the Part B State Performance Plan Extension..... 5

Indicator 1: Graduation..... 9

Indicator 2: Dropout..... 13

Indicator 3: Statewide Assessment 17

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion 25

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion by Race/Ethnicity 29

Indicator 5: Educational Environments 33

Indicator 6: Preschool Educational Environments 37

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes 41

Indicator 8: Facilitated Parent Involvement 49

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation—Child with a Disability 53

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation—Eligibility Categories..... 57

Indicator 11: Child Find..... 61

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition 65

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition 69

Indicator 14: Postsecondary Outcomes..... 73

Indicator 15: Compliance Findings 81

Indicator 16: State Complaints..... 83

Indicator 17: Hearings Adjudicated..... 87

Indicator 18: Resolution Session Agreements..... 89

Indicator 19: Mediation Agreements 91

Indicator 20: Timely and Accurate Data..... 95

Acronym List 97

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) Extension for 2011-2014 February 2014 Overview

What are the new SPP Extension requirements?

On October 6, 2010 the United States Department of Education (USED), Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) notified states that the SPP Extension due 2/1/11 must include:

- Extended time frames for existing activities or new activities for all Part B indicators for school years 2011-2012 and 2012-2013.
- Targets for results indicators for school years 2011-2012 and 2012-2013. This affects the following indicators:
 - 1 Graduation
 - 2 Dropout
 - 3 Statewide Assessment (Adequate Yearly Progress, Participation, Performance)
 - 4A Suspension/Expulsion
 - 5 Educational Environments (gen ed >80% or <40%, or separate facilities)
 - 6 Preschool Educational Environments
 - 7 Preschool Outcomes
 - 8 Facilitated Parent Involvement (children ages 3-5 years, students ages 6-21 years)
 - 14 Postsecondary Outcomes
 - 18 Resolution Session Agreements
 - 19 Mediation Agreements

Targets for compliance indicators will continue to be zero percent (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100 percent (Indicators 11, 12, 13, 15 and 20) per the OSEP requirements. Beginning in FFY¹ 2011, Indicators 16 and 17 no longer need to be reported in the APR.

During the December 2013 OSEP Technical Assistance Call it was indicated that if a State had no changes to their SPP then they were not required to include the SPP in their FFY 2012 submission. Michigan, however, had multiple changes to their SPP Extension for FFY 2013 and has submitted a revised version in the FFY 2012 submission. The submitted SPP Extension includes dates that reflect the FFY 2013 reporting period. In addition, Michigan's SPP Extension contains information based on the requirements for the FFY 2012 submission, revised targets for Indicator 3: Statewide Assessment and Indicator 19: Mediation Agreements, and revised improvement activities.

How will Michigan meet the new requirements?

- This Extension only includes information relevant for FFY 2010 (2010-2011) through FFY 2013 (2013-2014). *Please see Michigan's comprehensive SPP for all historical information which dates back to 2005 at:*
http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_6598_31834---,00.html

¹ Federal Fiscal Year

- The Office of Special Education (OSE) Director, SPP Core Team and SPP Indicator Teams implemented a common approach to target setting and activity extension/creation across all affected indicators.
- The SPP Extension includes:
 - A description of the most recent calculation methodology and associated baseline data;
 - targets from the most recent baseline year² through FFY 2013 (2013-2014); and
 - activities/timelines/resources that will be in effect FFY 2010 (2010-2011) through FFY 2013 (2013-2014). Where appropriate, existing activities were extended. New activities were added as needed to assure a focus on improved indicator performance.
- Per the OSEP's approval and with input from the Special Education Advisory Committee³ (SEAC), Michigan's SPP maintains FFY 2010 approved targets for all results indicators except Indicator 19: Mediation Agreements which will be reporting an interval and Indicator 3: Statewide Assessments where Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) and proficiency targets must align with Michigan Department of Education (MDE) state assessment targets that changed during this period. In February 2013, Indicator 6 was reported with a new baseline and targets.

During the 2010-2014 Extension period, the OSE will continue to refine its own procedures and work with districts to continue to improve performance on each indicator. In addition, the OSE will continue to analyze disaggregated indicator data in preparation for the comprehensive indicator target setting that is anticipated with the reauthorization of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* and the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA) and the development of the proposed Statewide Systemic Improvement Plan.

Michigan's February 3, 2014 submitted SPP Extension includes dates that reflect the FFY 2013 reporting period. In addition, Michigan's SPP Extension contains information based on the requirements for the FFY 2012 submission, a revised indicator target and revised improvement activities.

Stakeholder Involvement:

The OSE continues, when necessary, to actively seek input from stakeholders. Over the past couple of years the OSE has sought input from the OSE State Data Advisory Committee, the SEAC, the Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (Michigan's birth through age five advisory council), school districts, professional organizations, universities, USED-funded educational centers and other State of Michigan agencies.

² The baseline does not go back to the beginning of the 2005 SPP for all indicators because the OSEP changed the measurement (e.g., Indicator 1) or Michigan received the OSEP approval to change the approach to measurement for some indicators (e.g., Indicator 8).

³ Michigan's IDEA mandated special education State Advisory Panel

The most recent stakeholder involvement was resetting the targets for Indicator 19: Mediation Agreements and setting the targets for Indicator 6: Early Childhood Educational Environments: Ages 3 through 5. For Indicator 19, the data were analyzed and other relevant data were reviewed, and measurable and rigorous targets were discussed and revised. For Indicator 6, the collected data were analyzed and other relevant data were reviewed. The baseline was established, measurable and rigorous targets were discussed and set, and improvement activities were developed.

For detailed historical information pertaining to the involvement of stakeholders in the SPP development process, please see Michigan's comprehensive SPP at: http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_6598_31834---,00.html

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) Extension for 2011-2014

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE⁴ / Graduation	(Results Indicator)
--	---------------------

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

Measurement: States must report using the graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the <i>Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)</i> .
--

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process and Data:

To comply with the 2001 reauthorization of the ESEA, Michigan adopted an accountability system in which a graduation rate includes only "on-time" graduates who earn regular diplomas within four years of entering high school. This calculation meets the guidelines provided by the National Governors Association (NGA) Graduation Counts Compact and the United States Department of Education (USED) for calculation of such rates.

The 2008 four-year cohort graduation rate is calculated by tracking individual students who first enrolled in ninth grade during the 2004-2005 school year (assigned to the 2008 cohort) and graduated four years later with a regular diploma. The four-year cohort graduation rate accounts for students who transfer in and out of the district, who leave school permanently, who leave school during one school year and return in another, or who are retained in a grade but stay in school and graduate later than their original classmates.

The total number of students who were identified as first-time 9th graders in fall 2004 formed the initial 2008 cohort. Non-graded students ages 14-21 are assigned to grades 9-12 based on their age. Students who transferred into one of Michigan's districts at any time during the four-year period were added to the initial cohort. For students who moved among Michigan public schools, student records were updated to reflect the correct district and building. These students were considered "transfers out" of the district/building they left and "transfers in" to the district/building they entered. Students who exited the public school system entirely (out of state, to non-public school, or home school) or died at any time during the four-year period were removed from the cohort.

To calculate the 2008 four-year cohort graduation rate (based on the NGA recommended methodology), all students were placed into one of four categories:

1. On-track graduated - completed high school with a regular diploma in four years or less
2. Other completer - earned a General Educational Development certificate, other certificate, or reached the special education maximum age⁵

⁴ Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment

⁵ Michigan serves students with disabilities through age 25. The OSEP formula reflects students through age 21; therefore, the category "Aged Out" is zero in Michigan.

3. Off-track (graduated & continuing) - completed high school with a regular diploma in more than four years, or did not complete high school in four years and are still continuing in school
4. Dropout - left high school permanently at any time during the four-year period, or whose whereabouts are unknown (missing expected records)

Per the Office of Special Education Programs' (OSEP) March 2009 revision to the timeline for this indicator, there is a one-year data lag for this indicator. The OSEP formula reflects students through age 21. Michigan serves students with an IEP through age 25. Students between the ages of 22-26 have not been included in these federal graduation rate calculations. In the category "Aged Out", the data are zero in Michigan.

In addition to providing a four-year cohort graduation rate, in May 2009 the USED approved Michigan's use of an extended five-year cohort graduation rate to meet ESEA's requirement for districts to meet Adequate Yearly Progress. The five-year cohort graduation rate is available approximately eight months after the fifth year students graduate.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets:

The OSEP March 2009 Indicator Measurement Table revision specified that graduation targets should be the same as the targets under Title I of the ESEA. Michigan set an 80 percent target for all students. This was approved by the State Board of Education in the winter of 2009, submitted to USED and approved in Michigan's Accountability Workbook. During the 2011-2012 school year, Michigan submitted a revised Accountability Workbook to USED that was subsequently approved. This revised Accountability Workbook contained a graduation target of 80 percent.

FFY	Baseline	Target
2007 (2007-2008 data)	58.0%*	80.0%
2008 (2007-2008 data)		80.0%
2009 (2008-2009 data)		80.0%
2010 (2009-2010 data)		80.0%
2011 (2010-2011 data)		80.0%
2012 (2011-2012 data)		80.0%
2013 (2012-2013 data)		80.0%
Percent = [(# of youth with an IEP who entered ninth grade in 2004-2005 and received a regular diploma within four years) divided by (Total # of youth with an IEP in the cohort)] X 100 * [9,642 on-track graduates ÷ 16,636] X 100 = 58.0%		

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

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Timelines	Activities	Resources
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2011-2013 <i>Completed/ Deleted 2/3/14</i>	1. Use graduation, dropout, secondary transition and postsecondary outcomes data to develop and implement technical assistance and personnel development to increase graduation rate.	Michigan’s Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative (MiBLSi), Reaching and Teaching Struggling Learners (RTSL), Michigan Transition Outcomes Project (MI-TOP)
2011-2014 <i>Revised 2/3/14</i>	2. Leverage community and state level resources to provide districts with targeted assistance and professional development to increase graduation rates of students with an IEP.	MiBLSi, RTSL, MAPS projects, ISDs, MDE, Superintendent’s Dropout Challenge, state and community human service agencies
2011-2014	3. Provide policy and data guidance to support a long-term, outcomes-based approach to student-centered planning.	MI-TOP
2013-2014 <i>New Activity 2/3/14</i>	4. Develop and test a model using state level student data that can reliably identify students at risk of dropping out and students likely to graduate.	MDE; Department of Technology, Management and Budget; National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD)
2013-2014 <i>New Activity 2/3/14</i>	5. Disseminate the risk and protective factors associated with students with an IEP that emerged as a result of the data model described in the new activity above so that districts can assist students to matriculate through secondary school with their classmates toward graduation.	MDE, Department of Technology, DTMB, Management & Budget

Please see Michigan’s comprehensive SPP for all historical information which dates back to 2005:
http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_6598_31834---,00.html

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) Extension for 2011-2014

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE⁶ / Dropout

(Results Indicator)

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

Measurement: States must report using the dropout data used in the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (ESEA) graduation rate calculation and follow the timeline established by the Department under the ESEA.

Definition:

The event dropout rate, as reported through the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR), defines a dropout as an individual who met the following conditions:

1. was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and
2. was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and
3. has not graduated from high school or completed a district- or state-approved educational program; and
4. does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions—
 - a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs);
 - b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or
 - c) death.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process and Data:

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) use of the event dropout rate provides a measure of the percentage of high school students who drop out of high school over the course of a given school year. This measurement is in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Common Core Data reporting requirements. Michigan received permission from the United States Department of Education NCES contact to use the fall 2007 general collection as the measure of students being enrolled during the 2007-2008 school year. The event dropout rate for these Michigan students and for student subgroups, including students with disabilities, is submitted annually in Michigan's CSPR for Title I of the ESEA.

Because the CSPR event dropout rate is no longer collected, the OSEP provided guidance that states could report using either the revised methodology as documented in the Part B SPP and Annual Performance Report (APR), Part B Indicator Measurement Table or the methodology used for reporting in the

⁶ Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment

FFY 2010 APR. To provide data comparability, Michigan has elected to continue reporting using the methodology documented in the current SPP.

The event dropout rate is calculated by summing the number of dropouts in grades 9-12 in a given school year and dividing this sum by the number of students enrolled in grades 9-12 at the beginning of that school year. Students who indicate they plan to attend school the following year, but do not return for the subsequent school year are counted as dropouts in the school year they last attended. Non-graded students are assigned to grades 9-12 based on their chronological age (chronological age – 6 = grade).

The OSEP calculation reflects students through age 21. Michigan serves students with an IEP through age 25. Students ages 22-26 have not been included in the federal dropout rate calculation, which serves as the basis for this report.

A new baseline was established for the FFY 2007 (2007-2008) report reflecting the required Event Dropout Rate calculation described above.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets:

FFY	Baseline	Target
2007 (2007-2008 data)	7.6%*	<10.0%
2008 (2007-2008 data)		<10.0%
2009 (2008-2009 data)		<9.5%
2010 (2009-2010 data)		<9.0%
2011 (2010-2011 data)		<8.0%
2012 (2011-2012 data)		<8.0%
2013 (2012-2013 data)		<8.0%
Percent = [(# of youth with an IEP who dropped out of high school in one year) divided by (# of youth with an IEP who are enrolled in grades 9-12 in the same year)] X 100. This includes students ages 14-21 who were in ungraded programs and matched by age to grades 9-12. *[5,521 dropouts ÷ 72,936] X 100 = 7.6%		

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

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Timelines	Activities	Resources
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2011-2013 <i>Revised</i> 2/1/12 <i>Completed</i> /Deleted 2/3/14	1. Use graduation, dropout, secondary transition and postsecondary outcomes data to develop and implement technical assistance and personnel development to increase graduation rates and decrease dropout rates.	Reaching and Teaching Struggling Learners (RTSL), Michigan's Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative (MiBLSi), National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD)
2011-2014 <i>Revised</i> 2/1/12 <i>Revised</i> 2/3/14	2. Leverage community and state level resources to provide districts with targeted assistance and professional development to increase graduation rates of students with an IEP.	RTSL, MiBLSi, NDPC-SD; MAPs projects, ISDs, MDE, Superintendent's Dropout Challenge, state and community human service agencies
2011-2014	3. Provide policy and data guidance to support a long-term, outcomes-based approach to student-centered planning.	National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center, RTSL, Michigan Transition Outcomes Project
EVALUATION		
2012-2014 <i>New Activity</i> 2/1/13 <i>Revised</i> 2/3/14	4. Develop and test a model using state level student data that can reliably identify students at risk of dropping out and students likely to graduate.	MiBLSi; RTSL; MI-TOP; MDE; Department of Technology, Management and Budget; National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD)
2013-2014 <i>New Activity</i> 2/3/14	5. Disseminate the risk and protective factors associated with students with an IEP that emerged as a result of the data model described in activity four so that districts can assist students to matriculate through secondary school with their classmates toward graduation.	MDE, Department of Technology, Management & Budget

Please see Michigan's comprehensive SPP for all historical information which dates back to 2005: http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_6598_31834---,00.html

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) Extension for 2011-2014

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE⁷ / Statewide Assessment

(Results Indicator)

Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with an individualized education program (IEP) on statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) targets for the disability subgroup. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))
- B. Participation rate for children with an IEP.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with an IEP against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

- A. AYP percent = $[(\# \text{ of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size})] \times 100$.
- B. Participation rate percent = $[(\# \text{ of children with an IEP participating in the assessment}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children with an IEP enrolled during the testing window, calculated separately for reading and math})]$. The participation rate is based on all children with an IEP, including both children with an IEP enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.
- C. Proficiency rate percent = $[(\# \text{ of children with an IEP enrolled for a full academic year scoring at or above proficient}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children with an IEP enrolled for a full academic year, calculated separately for reading and math})]$.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process and Data:

Michigan's Educational Assessment System is comprised of the following state assessments: the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) for students in grades 3-8, the Michigan Merit Examination (MME) for students in grade 11, Michigan's alternate assessment program based on alternate achievement standards (MI-Access), Michigan's alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards (MEAP-Access), and the English Language Proficiency Assessment. Michigan's English language arts and mathematics assessments have received approval through the United States Department of Education (USED) peer review process. MEAP-Access was revised during the 2010-2011 school year. The collaboration of Michigan Department of Education (MDE) offices and teams of Michigan educators and stakeholders familiar with the population of students with an IEP and content being assessed culminated in the MEAP-Access assessment

⁷ Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment

being implemented in 2011.

The MME is the state's general education assessment used to assess grade 11 and eligible grade 12 students on Michigan's high school content expectations. The MME has three distinct components: (1) the ACT Plus Writing college entrance examination, (2) WorkKeys[®] job skills assessments in Reading for Information, Applied Mathematics, and Locating Information; and (3) Michigan-specific assessments in mathematics, science, and social studies. Each MME component is comprised of several sections, which together, enable students to fully demonstrate their knowledge in relation to state standards.

MI-Access is Michigan's Alternate Assessment based on Alternate Achievement Standards. MI-Access is designed for students whose IEP Teams have determined that participation in the state's general education assessments (the MEAP or the MME) was not appropriate or the state's alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards (MEAP-Access). It is designed for students with cognitive disabilities whose IEP Teams have determined that it is not appropriate for them to participate in the state's general education assessments. MI-Access assessments are available for students in grades 3-8 and grade 11.

Beginning with the 2005-2006 calculations, a district made AYP if it met the proficiency targets at one of the three grade ranges (elementary, middle, or high school) in both content areas - English language arts (ELA) and mathematics. Based on changes in the approved accountability workbook, beginning in 2011-2012, the district will be treated as if it were a large school containing grades 3-11. A single overall AYP determination will be made, instead of making a separate determination at the elementary, middle and high school spans as was previously calculated.

This change was made because schools, districts, the public, and even department staffers were confused when comparing district AYP status with building statuses. Valid subgroup size also became an issue when doing three separate AYP determinations. Districts may have enough students to compose a valid subgroup using grades 3-8, and 11, but not when those grades are broken into the three current spans (3-5, 6-8, and 11).

Michigan is using the same proficiency index methodology as was previously used for schools to determine an AYP status for a district's entire grade span.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets – AYP/AMO:

The FFY 2004 baseline data was set at 88 percent and was used for setting the annual targets. The criteria used for district AYP determinations were revised for 2005-2006. All districts met the revised criterion for 2005-2006 thus making the baseline, based on the revised criteria, 100 percent.

The Michigan Department of Education submitted an Amended ESEA Flexibility Waiver and received approval in July of 2013. The MDE developed Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) for the state as a whole and for the next ten years

based on where the state is starting out (in the 2011-2012) school year for each subject area (mathematics, reading, science, social studies, and writing) and school level (elementary, middle, and high school). Each of the AMOs follows a linear increase from the starting point in the 2011-2012 school year to 85% proficient in the 2021-2022 school year.

FFY	Baseline	Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100%*	88.0%
2006 (2006-2007)		88.0%
2007 (2007-2008)		91.0%
2008 (2008-2009)		94.0%
2009 (2009-2010)		97.0%
2010 (2010-2011)		98.0%
2011 (2011-2012)		98.0%
2012 (2012-2013)		98.0%
Percent = [(# of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the state's minimum "n" size that meet the state's AYP targets for the disability subgroup) divided by (Total # of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the state's minimum "n" size)] X 100 *[539 districts ÷ 539] X 100 = 100%		
Revised AMO Mathematics Targets* for 2013-2014		
FFY 2013	Baseline	Target
Elementary School	40%	44%
Middle School	36%	41%
High School	30%	36%
Revised AMO Reading Targets* for 2013-2014		
FFY 2013	Baseline	Target
Elementary School	66%	68%
Middle School	63%	65%
High School	57%	59%
*Per the Amended ESEA Flexibility Waiver (July 24, 2013), the MDE developed Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) for the state as a whole. The 2012 baseline AMOs were created by taking the 2011-2012 percent proficient across all assessments (MEAP or MME, MEAP-Access, and MI-Access), and creating a weighted average across the elementary grades (3-5), middle school grades (6-8), and high school (grade 11).		

Source: MDE, Bureau of Assessment and Accountability (BAA)

Measurable and Rigorous Targets – Participation:

The *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (ESEA) requires that a minimum of **95 percent** of all students participate in state assessment (general and alternate). Therefore, Michigan set the same participation targets for students with an IEP. Beginning in 2005-2006 MEAP and MI-Access assessed ELA and mathematics in grades 3-8. The range of participation rates for ELA over the seven grades tested was 93 percent to 98.5 percent and the range for math was 92 percent to 98.7 percent.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets – Proficiency:

Under the ESEA and Michigan's accountability system, the State Board of Education set proficiency targets for all students including those with an IEP. For the 2011-2012 school year, Michigan revised the tests and cut scores to reflect the need to prepare students for a higher level of college readiness. The targets reflected in the reading and mathematics proficiency targets tables below reflect these revised cut scores. New baselines were also established based on the revised tests.

School Year	ELA/Reading ⁸ Proficiency Targets						
	Grade						
	3	4	5	6	7	8	11
2005-06	50.0%	48.0%	46.0%	45.0%	43.0%	41.0%	52.0%
2006-07	50.0%	48.0%	46.0%	45.0%	43.0%	41.0%	52.0%
2007-08	60.0%	59.0%	57.0%	56.0%	54.0%	53.0%	61.0%
2008-09	60.0%	59.0%	57.0%	56.0%	54.0%	53.0%	61.0%
2009-10	70.0%	69.0%	68.0%	67.0%	66.0%	65.0%	71.0%
2010-11	78.0%	77.0%	76.0%	75.0%	74.0%	73.0%	79.0%
Revised 2011-12	86.0%	85.0%	84.0%	83.0%	82.0%	82.0%	86.0%
Revised 2012-13	93.0%	92.0%	92.0%	91.0%	91.0%	91.0%	93.0%
Revised Targets (Cut Scores) Beginning in 2011-2012							
2011-12	47.0%	48.0%	50.0%	43.0%	34.0%	39.0%	33.0%
2012-13	74.0%	74.0%	75.0%	72.0%	67.0%	70.0%	67.0%
2013-14	74.0%	74.0%	75.0%	72.0%	67.0%	70.0%	67.0%

School Year	Mathematics Proficiency Targets						
	Grade						
	3	4	5	6	7	8	11
2005-06	59.0%	56.0%	53.0%	50.0%	46.0%	43.0%	44.0%
2006-07	59.0%	56.0%	53.0%	50.0%	46.0%	43.0%	44.0%
2007-08	67.0%	65.0%	62.0%	60.0%	57.0%	54.0%	55.0%
2008-09	67.0%	65.0%	62.0%	60.0%	57.0%	54.0%	55.0%
2009-10	67.0%	65.0%	62.0%	60.0%	57.0%	54.0%	55.0%
2010-11	75.0%	74.0%	71.0%	70.0%	67.0%	66.0%	67.0%
Revised 2011-12	83.0%	82.0%	81.0%	80.0%	78.0%	77.0%	78.0%
Revised 2012-13	91.0%	91.0%	90.0%	90.0%	89.0%	89.0%	89.0%
Revised Targets (Cut Scores) Beginning in 2011-2012							
2011-12	17.0%	20.0%	18.0%	14.0%	14.0%	10.0%	8.0%
2012-13	58.0%	60.0%	59.0%	57.0%	57.0%	55.0%	54.0%
2013-14	58.0%	60.0%	59.0%	57.0%	57.0%	55.0%	54.0%

Source: MDE/BAA

⁸ Michigan reported ELA from 2005-2006 to 2008-2009; beginning in 2009-2010, Michigan reports reading.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Timelines	Activities	Resources
PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
2011-2014 <i>Revised</i> 2/3/14	<p><i>Revision of Activity #1:</i> The Assessment Selection Guidelines document will be revised for the 2014-2015 school year to provide instructions and training scenarios that include students who had previously taken the AA-MAS and future options, based on the grade level content.</p> <p>Transition activities with instructions for IEP teams to transition students back to the general assessment will be conducted during statewide conferences in August and September 2013.</p>	BAA – Test Composition Unit and Test Development Unit
2011-2014	2. Continue to collaborate with the Office of Special Education (OSE) in monitoring implementation of accommodations and disseminate information on the appropriate use of assessment accommodations, using conference sessions, joint presentations with accommodations/assistive technology groups and newsletter articles.	BAA, OSE, Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT		
2011-2013 <i>Completed /Deleted</i> 2/3/14	3. Use the resources from the USED General Supervision Enhancement Grants to develop and implement an Alternate Assessment based on Modified Achievement Standards, as well as a comprehensive online learning program designed to ensure appropriate student participation and support instruction.	BAA – Test Development Unit, OSE
EVALUATION		
2013-2014 <i>New Activity</i> 2/3/14	4. The Michigan Department of Education will compare the participation rates for grade 11 over the past five years with other subgroups and overall 11 th grade participation to determine if the current trend is related specifically to students with an IEP, or if the participation rates are attributed to other factors. This comparison will be done collaboratively between members from the Bureau of Assessment and Accountability and the Office of Special Education. A	BAA – Office of Standards and Assessment; the OSE.

Timelines	Activities	Resources
	recommendation will be made to the participating offices from this collaboration regarding potential improvement activities based on the results.	

Please see Michigan's comprehensive SPP for all historical information which dates back to 2005 at http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_6598_31834---,00.html.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) Extension for 2011-2014

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE⁹/Suspension/Expulsion

(Results Indicator)

Indicator 4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with an individualized education program (IEP). (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Measurement:

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Definition of Significant Discrepancy:

The Office of Special Education (OSE) identifies a district as having a significant discrepancy if more than five percent of its students with an IEP are suspended/expelled for greater than ten days, cumulatively during the school year. Districts with fewer than five students with an IEP suspended or expelled for greater than ten days are exempt from significant discrepancy calculations. This definition went into effect for the 2008-2009 school year, and a new baseline was established to align with this new, more rigorous definition.

Michigan does not collect universal suspension/expulsion data on general education students; therefore, a comparison with that population is not possible.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process and Data:

School districts report disciplinary actions for students with an IEP through the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS). Districts are expected to report, for every student with an IEP, the number, duration, and type of each disciplinary incident across the school year. For this indicator, the calculation is based on out-of-school suspensions or expulsions greater than ten days, either in one incident or an accumulation.

⁹ Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment

Measurable and Rigorous Targets:

FFY	Baseline	Target
2009 (2008-2009 data)	5.1%*	<5.5%
2010 (2009-2010 data)		<5.0%
2011 (2010-2011 data)		<4.5%
2012 (2011-2012 data)		<4.5%
2013 (2012-2013 data)		<4.5%

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

* [42 districts ÷ 821 districts with students with an IEP] X 100 = 5.1%

Source: MSDS

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Timelines	Activities	Resources
IMPROVE COLLABORATION/COORDINATION		
2011-2014 <i>Revised 2/1/13</i>	1. The OSE will work with Michigan’s Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative (MiBLSi) personnel to identify districts with high rates of suspension and expulsion. This information will identify districts in need of support and gives them priority for selection in MiBLSi participation.	MiBLSi, OSE Performance Reporting (PR) Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System (CIMS) Team.
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2011-2014 <i>Revised 2/1/13 Revised 2/3/14</i>	2. MiBLSi will provide training, coaching and TA to participating districts to implement an MTSS with fidelity in order to reduce the number or duration of out-of-school suspensions/ expulsions and increase students' academic achievement.	OSE PR and Program Accountability (PA) Units
2011-2013 <i>Completed/ Deleted 2/1/13</i>	3. Provide all districts with a rubric and guidance to conduct a self-examination of policies, procedures and practices related to discipline.	OSE PA Unit

Timelines	Activities	Resources
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2012-2014 <i>New Activity</i> 2/1/13	4. Review and analyze the results of local corrective action plans to identify districts with continued or multiple noncompliance issues and to improve TA to locals and monitors.	OSE, OSE PR CIMS Team
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT		
2012-2014 <i>New Activity</i> 2/1/13	5. Develop, implement and refine a multi-tiered system of support scalable model to address suspension/expulsion statewide.	MiBLSi
PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
2012-2014 <i>New Activity</i> 2/1/13	6. MiBLSi will provide training, coaching and TA to participating districts to reduce the number or duration of out-of-school suspensions/expulsions.	MiBLSi

Please see Michigan's comprehensive SPP for all historical information which dates back to 2005 at http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_6598_31834---,00.html.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) Extension for 2011-2014

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE¹⁰ / Suspension/Expulsion

(Compliance Indicator)

Indicator 4B: Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with an individualized education program (IEP); and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and support, and procedural safeguards. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year of children with an IEP; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and support, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (#of districts in the state) times 100].

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Definition of Significant Discrepancy:

Indicator 4B measures the number of districts with a significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions/expulsions out of school greater than ten days and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with related requirements relating to the development and use of IEPs, use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

For this indicator Michigan defined "significant discrepancy" as a district suspension/expulsion rate by race or ethnicity for students with an IEP that was equal to or greater than 3.6 percent.

Michigan does not collect universal suspension/expulsion data on general education students; therefore, a comparison with that population is not possible.

¹⁰ Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process and Data:

In August 2011, the Office of Special Education Programs informed Michigan that the Indicator 4B methodology was not acceptable. Based on federal guidance, a revised methodology and definition of significant discrepancy were developed and applied to the 2009-2010 data.

The revised methodology consists of a state threshold based on the statewide percentage of students with an IEP that were suspended/expelled greater than ten days out of school (1.8 percent during the 2009-2010 school year) times two (3.6 percent). In order for a district to be included in the analyses, there needed to be at least 30 students with an IEP enrolled in the district. For the selected districts, the data are analyzed for each race/ethnicity with ten or more students with an IEP enrolled.

Monitoring districts identified as having a significant discrepancy in their rate of suspensions/expulsions is an integral part of this indicator's measurement. Districts meeting the minimum n size with a ratio greater than or equal to 3.6 percent and ten or more students with an IEP for any racial/ethnic group enrolled will be identified for focused monitoring. The Office of Special Education (OSE) reviews districts' policies, procedures and practices to determine whether they contributed 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.

Discussion of Baseline Data for FFY 2010 using 2009-2010 data

For FFY 2010, 829 districts had students with an IEP enrolled. One hundred thirty-one of these districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension/expulsion of greater than ten days for at least one racial/ethnic group. One hundred seventeen districts were excluded from the calculation because they had fewer than 30 students with an IEP enrolled.

Based on the Monitoring Selection Criteria, the OSE conducted on-site reviews, desk audits and state verified self reviews of these districts' policies, procedures and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*.

After monitoring, 27 districts were found to have inappropriate policies, procedures and/or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy. Seven of these districts had a significant discrepancy in more than one racial/ethnic group. Each of the 27 districts was issued findings of noncompliance in April or December 2011. Upon notification of findings of noncompliance, these districts were required to develop and implement a corrective action plan (CAP) to come into compliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year including verification. Displayed in the following table are the number(s) of districts with findings of noncompliance by the racial/ethnic group(s) which had a significant discrepancy.

Racial/Ethnic Group with Significant Discrepancy	Number of Districts with Significant Discrepancy
American Indian	1
Black	18
Hispanic	9
White	11

Source: Michigan Student Data System (MSDS), verification review, Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System (CIMS)

Measurable and Rigorous Targets:

FFY	Baseline	Target
2010 (2009-2010 data) through 2013 (2012-2013 data)	3.3%	0%
Percent = [(# of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year of children with an IEP; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and support, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (#of districts in the state X 100)] *(27 districts ÷ 829 districts with students with an IEP) X 100 = 3.3%		

Source: MSDS, verification review, monitoring data from the CIMS

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Timelines	Activities	Resources
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2010-2014 <i>Revised</i> 2/1/13	1. Provide training and technical assistance (TA) to locals, TA providers and monitors for locals with high suspension/expulsion rates.	OSE Performance Reporting (PR) CIMS Team, Mandated Activities Projects ¹¹
2010-2013 <i>Completed/ Deleted</i> 2/1/13	2. Provide tools for districts to access and review their racial/ethnic patterns of discipline data.	OSE PR Unit, Wayne State University, the Center for Educational Performance and Information MSDS Team (Discipline Report)

¹¹ Michigan's state improvement and compliance initiatives, funded with *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* administrative set-aside funds

Timelines	Activities	Resources
IMPROVE COLLABORATION/COORDINATION		
2010-2014 <i>Revised</i> 2/1/13	3. The OSE will work with Michigan's Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative (MiBLSi) personnel to identify and encourage MiBLSi participation by districts with high rates of suspension and expulsion.	OSE, MiBLSi
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2012-2014 <i>New Activity</i> 2/1/13	4. Review and analyze the results of local CAPs to identify districts with continued or multiple noncompliance issues and to improve TA to locals and monitors.	OSE, OSE PR CIMS Team
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT		
2012-2014 <i>New Activity</i> 2/1/13	5. Develop, implement and refine a multi-tiered system of support (MTSS) scalable model to address suspension/expulsion statewide.	MiBLSi
PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
2012-2014 <i>New Activity</i> 2/1/13 <i>Revised</i> 2/3/14	6. MiBLSi will provide training, coaching and TA to participating districts to implement a MTSS with fidelity in order to reduce the number or duration of out-of-school suspensions/expulsions and increase students' academic achievement in reading.	MiBLSi

Please see Michigan's comprehensive SPP for all historical information which dates back to 2005 at http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_6598_31834---,00.html.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) Extension for 2011-2014

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE¹² / Educational Environments

(Results Indicator)

Indicator 5: Percent of children with an individualized education program (IEP) aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80 percent or more of the day
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40 percent of the day
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

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

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

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process and Data:

The data for this indicator come from the annual Special Education Child Count that every district submits to the Michigan Department of Education. In 2010, this electronic count occurred on the third Wednesday in November and was incorporated into the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS), the system that stores data for all Michigan students. Beginning in 2011, new state legislation facilitated a combined count of general membership, supplemental food and nutrition, and special education count to occur on the first Wednesday in October.

¹² Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment

Measurable and Rigorous Targets:

- A. Percent of children with an IEP aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class **80 percent or more** of the day.

FFY	Baseline	Target
2005 (2005-2006)	54.0%*	
2006 (2006-2007)		≥55.0%
2007 (2007-2008)		≥57.0%
2008 (2008-2009)		≥59.0%
2009 (2009-2010)		≥61.0%
2010 (2010-2011)		≥63.0%
2011 (2011-2012)		≥63.0%
2012 (2012-2013)		≥63.0%
2013 (2013-2014)		≥63.0%
Percent = [(# of children with an IEP served in the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by (Total # of students aged 6 through 21 with an IEP)] X 100 *(118,455 children ÷ 219,317) X 100 = 54.0%		

Source: MSDS

- B. Percent of children with an IEP aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class **less than 40 percent** of the day.

FFY	Baseline	Target
2005 (2005-2006)	17.9%*	
2006 (2006-2007)		≤16.9%
2007 (2007-2008)		≤15.4%
2008 (2008-2009)		≤13.9%
2009 (2009-2010)		≤12.4%
2010 (2010-2011)		≤11.9%
2011 (2011-2012)		≤11.9%
2012 (2012-2013)		≤11.9%
2013 (2013-2014)		≤11.9%
Percent = [(# of children with an IEP served in the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by (Total # of students aged 6 through 21 with an IEP)] X 100 *(39,182 children ÷ 219,317) X 100 = 17.9%		

Source: MSDS

C. Percent of children with an IEP aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

FFY	Baseline	Target
2005 (2005-2006)	5.2%*	
2006 (2006-2007)		≤5.1%
2007 (2007-2008)		≤5.1%
2008 (2008-2009)		≤5.0%
2009 (2009-2010)		≤4.9%
2010 (2010-2011)		≤4.8%
2011 (2011-2012)		≤4.8%
2012 (2012-2013)		≤4.8%
2013 (2013-2014)		≤4.8%
Percent = [(# of children with an IEP served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements) divided by (Total # of students aged 6 through 21 with an IEP)] X 100 *(11,346 children ÷ 219,317) X 100 = 5.2%		

Source: MSDS

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Timelines	Activities	Resources
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2011-2014 <i>Revised</i> 2/1/12 <i>Revised</i> 2/3/14	1. Review data for the districts whose percentage of students with an IEP in general education greater than or equal to 80 percent of the day and for those districts whose students with an IEP in separate facilities did not meet the state targets. Apply selection criteria to determine level of monitoring activity needed to help districts review policies, procedures and practices related to educational environment data and require them, as needed, to develop and implement improvement activities.	MSDS, Office of Special Education (OSE) Performance Reporting (PR) Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System (CIMS) Team.
2011-2013 <i>Completed</i> <i>/Deleted</i> 2/3/14	2. Districts which fail to correct instances of noncompliance within one year will be required to revise their corrective action plans (CAPs) to achieve compliance. The districts will receive increased OSE on-site technical assistance (TA) including close supervision of the implementation of the revised CAP.	OSE PR CIMS Team and Program Accountability Unit

Timelines	Activities	Resources
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2011-2014 <i>Revised 2/3/14</i>	3. For 100 percent of districts whose monitoring activity has led to the issuance of a finding of noncompliance, assign a TA provider and provide professional development to the district team to assist them with identifying resources, including programs available through the OSE Mandated Activities Projects (MAPs) which may align with their improvement activities.	OSE PR Unit, Center for Educational Networking

Please see Michigan's comprehensive SPP for all historical information which dates back to 2005 at http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_6598_31834---,00.html.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) Extension for 2011-2014

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE¹³/Early Childhood Educational Environments: Ages 3 through 5 (Results Indicator)

Indicator 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with an individualized education program (IEP) attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

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

Measurement:

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process and Data:

On May 3, 2010, the United States Office of Management and Budget issued a revised special education data collection and reporting requirement effective immediately. The requirement affects preschool educational environment data that is reported by all districts in the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS) for the special education annual child count the third Wednesday in November. Because of the late federal notification, and because full 2010 implementation would require amended analysis and reporting of more than 10,600 preschool IEPs that occurred beginning November 2009, Michigan prepared an estimated data crosswalk report for the 2010 special education annual child count. The United States Department of Education (USED), Office of Special Education Programs has advocated on behalf of states and approved use of this crosswalk methodology for the data collected during the 2010-2011 school year.¹⁴

The Center for Educational Performance and Information completed all necessary changes to data collection fields, definitions, and technical manuals to enable

¹³ Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment

¹⁴ Per the OSEP's Part B SPP and Annual Performance Report Instruction Sheet: *"States are not required to report on Indicator 6 in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011" and in USED, Education Data Exchange Network, N089 – Children With Disabilities (IDEA) Early Childhood File Specifications, Version 7.0, SY 2010-11, November 2010, "For states that, despite their best efforts, are unable to report the setting where the child receives the majority of hours of special education and related services, the state may for SY 2010-11 only, report these children using the following permitted value to indicate type of program where the child spends time during the week: Children attending a Regular Early Childhood (REC) program."*

districts to report the data per new requirements in the MSDS 2011 special education collection.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets:

- A. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with an IEP attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program.

FFY	Baseline	Target
2011 (2011-2012)	27.2%	
2012 (2012-2013)		28.2%
2013 (2013-2014)		28.2%
Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with an IEP attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with an IEP)] X 100 $*((4,884 + 859) \div 21,086) \times 100 = 27.2\%$		

Source: MSDS

- B. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with an IEP attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

FFY	Baseline	Target
2011 (2011-2012)	44.2%	
2012 (2012-2013)		43.2%
2013 (2013-2014)		43.2%
Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with an IEP attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with an IEP)] X 100 $*((8,985 + 339 + 1) \div 21,086) \times 100 = 44.2\%$		

Source: MSDS

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Timelines	Activities	Resources
PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
2012-2014 <i>Revised 2/3/14</i>	1. Increase access to professional development on the benefits of educating preschool children in inclusive settings with typically developing peers. These professional development opportunities will include: conference presentations, online training and webinars.	Office of Great Start, Early Childhood Education & Family Services (OGS/ECE&FS),

Timelines	Activities	Resources
		Clinton County Regional Education Service Area (CCRESA)
<p>2012-2014</p> <p><i>Revised</i> 2/3/14</p>	<p>2. Provide targeted TA to participating ISDs pertaining to 1) options for settings for preschool aged children with IEPs, and 2) assisting in the identification of appropriate placements for preschool aged children with IEPs based on the individual needs of the child for the LRE.</p> <p>Targeted TA will occur in the following phases:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Phase I: Indicator 6 and Indicator 7 data will be reviewed and shared with all ISDs in the state. •Phase II: Of the interested ISDs, 4 will be selected for individualized intensive TA based on Indicator 6 and 7 data to be provided over the next two years. Effectiveness of the TA will be measured over 2 years. 	<p>OGS/ECE&FS, OSE, CCRESA, Center for Educational Performance and Information, Statewide Autism Resources and Training</p>
<p>2012-2013</p> <p><i>Completed /deleted</i> 2/3/14</p>	<p>3. Identify intermediate school districts (ISDs) that have established successful working relationships between Early Childhood Special Education personnel, general preschool education and childcare. These ISDs will then share successful practices with key Section 619 contacts through a forum that will allow questions and answers and follow-up communication on the topic of Least Restrictive Environment.</p>	<p>OGS/ECE&FS, OSE, CCRESA</p>
<p>2013-2014</p> <p><i>New Activity</i> 2/3/14</p>	<p>4. Development of tiered workgroups to focus on state level and local level challenges to inclusion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Phase I - Recruit and convene a workgroup of decision makers at the state level who are in charge of and responsible for Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE), Great Start Readiness Program (GSRP), Office of Special Education (OSE), Head Start, Great Start Regional Resource Centers, Great Start to Quality team, State Aid, Pupil Accounting to initiate an open dialogue and discussion to identify and address barriers, including funding logistics, to include preschool aged children with IEPs in these general education programs/settings. •Phase II – Upon completion of Phase I, develop and convene a separate workgroup that represents the district and local levels to focus 	<p>OGS/ECE&FS, CCRESA, Center for Educational Performance and Information, Statewide Autism Resources and Training</p>

Timelines	Activities	Resources
	<p>on identification of strategies for including children with IEPs in state and federally funded preschool programs as well as in other general education preschool settings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Phase III – Upon completion of Phase I and Phase II Collaboration of the two workgroups outlined above in the two phases to focus on identifying solutions for overcoming additional barriers, sharing of inclusionary practices and funding logistics. Statewide distribution of best practice documents garnered from Phase I and Phase II. 	

Please see Michigan’s comprehensive SPP for all historical information which dates back to 2005 at http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_6598_31834---,00.html.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) Extension for 2011-2014

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE¹⁵ / Preschool Outcomes

(Results Indicator)

Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with an individualized education program (IEP) who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with an IEP assessed})] \times 100$.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with an IEP assessed})] \times 100$.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with an IEP assessed})] \times 100$.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with an IEP assessed})] \times 100$.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with an IEP assessed})] \times 100$.

¹⁵ Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment

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 six 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 six 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.

Definition - Comparable to Same Age Peers:

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) staff developed a general score translation guide using the seven-point Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Center scale and supporting documents that came from each tool to align ECO rating scales with the amount of delay and approximate functional age. The MDE, the Early Childhood Redesign team members and HighScope combined rating levels 6 and 7, as defined by ECO, to identify typically developing peers as follows:

Age	Amount of Delay	Approximate Functional Age	Status
3 year olds	0-6 months	30-36 months	Typical
4 year olds	0-9 months	39-48 months	Typical
5 year olds	0-9 months	51-60 months	Typical

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process and Data:

In preparation for this data collection, the MDE completed the following efforts:

- Michigan’s sampling plan was approved by the Office of Special Education Programs and implemented. The 57 intermediate school districts (ISDs) were divided into three cohorts for the data collection. The first cohort was identified via a representative sample of all ISDs in the state. Michigan has instituted a tiered implementation process by sampling two-thirds (cohorts 1 and 2) in the second year and transitioning to capturing data on the universe (cohorts 1, 2 and 3) of participating children by the third year. The one district with more than 50,000 students is required to report annually on all 3 through 5 year olds served in Early Childhood Special Education programs due to district size.

- Seven preschool assessment tools were selected as approved instruments by the Office of Special Education and the Office of Great Start, Early Childhood Education & Family Services (OGS/ECE&FS), classroom teachers, related service providers, school psychologists, and other trained school personnel.
- An advisory group assisted the MDE in creating the Michigan Child Outcome Summary Form which was based on the ECO's seven-point scale. This scannable form was used to summarize the data for each child.

The exiting cohort included a higher proportion of children that had been in programs for longer periods of time with more intensive needs. As a result, targets were set slightly below baseline to reflect that anticipated age shift, reflective of child need.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets:

Outcome A: Positive Social-Emotional Skills (including social relationships)

Summary Statement 1: Of those children who entered the program below expectation in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.

FFY	Baseline	Target
2008 (2008-2009)	86.8%*	
2009 (2009-2010)		86.0%
2010 (2010-2011)		87.0%
2011 (2011-2012)		87.0%
2012 (2012-2013)		87.0%
2013 (2013-2014)		87.0%

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

$$* [761 + 1,003] \div [63 + 205 + 761 + 1,003] \times 100 = 86.8\%$$

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

FFY	Baseline	Target
2008 (2008-2009)	60.7%*	
2009 (2009-2010)		60.0%
2010 (2010-2011)		61.0%
2011 (2011-2012)		61.0%
2012 (2012-2013)		61.0%
2013 (2013-2014)		61.0%

Percent = [# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) + # of preschool children

Summary Statement 1: Of those children who entered the program below expectation in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.

FFY	Baseline	Target
reported in progress category (e)] divided by [Total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] X 100		
*[1,003 + 586] ÷ [63 + 205 + 761 + 1,003 + 586] X 100 = 60.7%		

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

Outcome B: Acquiring and Using Knowledge and Skills

Summary Statement 1: Of those children who entered the program below expectation in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.

FFY	Baseline	Target
2008 (2008-2009)	86.5%*	
2009 (2009-2010)		86.0%
2010 (2010-2011)		87.0%
2011 (2011-2012)		87.0%
2012 (2012-2013)		87.0%
2013 (2013-2014)		87.0%

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

*[814 + 1,026] ÷ [51 + 235 + 814 + 1,026] X 100 = 86.5%

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

FFY	Baseline	Target
2008 (2008-2009)	58.0%*	
2009 (2009-2010)		58.0%
2010 (2010-2011)		59.0%
2011 (2011-2012)		59.0%
2012 (2012-2013)		59.0%
2013 (2013-2014)		59.0%

Percent = [# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) + # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)] divided by [Total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] X 100

*[1,026 + 490] ÷ [51 + 235 + 814 + 1,026 + 490] X 100 = 58.0%

Source: HighScope Education Research Foundation, MSDS

Outcome C: Use of Appropriate Behaviors to Meet their Needs

Summary Statement 1: Of those children who entered the program below expectation in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.		
FFY	Baseline	Target
2008 (2008-2009)	88.2%*	
2009 (2009-2010)		88.0%
2010 (2010-2011)		89.0%
2011 (2011-2012)		89.0%
2012 (2012-2013)		89.0%
2013 (2013-2014)		89.0%
Percent = [# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) + # of preschool children reported in category (d)] divided by [# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) + # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) + # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) + # of preschool children reported in progress category (d)] X 100		
*[507 + 1,130] ÷ [49 + 171 + 507 + 1,130] X 100 = 88.2%		
Summary Statement 2: The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.		
FFY	Baseline	Target
2008 (2008-2009)	72.3%*	
2009 (2009-2010)		72.0%
2010 (2010-2011)		73.0%
2011 (2011-2012)		73.0%
2012 (2012-2013)		73.0%
2013 (2013-2014)		73.0%
Percent = [# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) + # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)] divided by [Total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] X 100		
*[1,130 + 763] ÷ [49 + 171 + 507 + 1,130 + 763] X 100 = 72.3%		

Source: HighScope Education Research Foundation, MSDS

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Timelines	Activities	Resources
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2011-2014	1. Implement technical assistance and professional development for all service areas to improve early childhood outcomes, targeting service areas not meeting targets.	OGS/ECE&FS, <i>Early On</i> [®] Training and Technical Assistance, HighScope Educational Research Foundation
2013-2014 <i>New Activity</i> <i>2/3/14</i>	2. Development of tiered workgroups to focus on state level and local level challenges to inclusion. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Phase I - Recruit and convene a workgroup of decision makers at the state level who are in charge of and responsible for Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE), Great Start Readiness Program (GSRP), Office of Special Education (OSE), Head Start, Great Start Regional Resource Centers, Great Start to Quality team, State Aid, Pupil Accounting to initiate an open dialogue and discussion to identify and address barriers, including funding logistics, to include preschool aged children with IEPs in these general education programs/settings. •Phase II – Upon completion of Phase I, develop and convene a separate workgroup that represents the district and local levels to focus on identification of strategies for including children with IEPs in state and federally funded preschool programs as well as in other general education preschool settings. •Phase III – Upon completion of Phase I and Phase II Collaboration of the two workgroups outlined above in the two phases to focus on identifying solutions for overcoming additional barriers, sharing of inclusionary practices 	OGS/ECE&FS, CCRESA, Center for Educational Performance and Information, Statewide Autism Resources and Training

Timelines	Activities	Resources
	and funding logistics. Statewide distribution of best practice documents garnered from Phase I and Phase II.	

Please see Michigan's comprehensive SPP for all historical information which dates back to 2005 at http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_6598_31834---,00.html.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) Extension for 2011-2014

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE¹⁶ / Facilitated Parent Involvement

(Results Indicator)

Indicator 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process and Data:

Data collected for this indicator are in accordance with an Office of Special Education Programs approved sampling plan. Parent surveys are disseminated to all parents of children ages 3 through 5 years who receive special education services (approximately 24,000 families) and to one-third of all parents of students ages 6-21 who receive special education services (approximately 86,000 families). About one-third of local districts within every intermediate school district are selected annually for participation in the students ages 6-21 survey. The exception is the one district with a student population greater than 50,000 that participates every year. The parent survey of children ages 3 through 5 includes [50 items developed by the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM)] and the school-age parent survey (25 NCSEAM items). The NCSEAM set a national standard score of 600.

The scale items can be thought of as a ruler with the items arranged in order of the probability of agreement. As a result, the scores can be used to "measure" parents' perception of partnership with schools. Lower-level items address issues such as whether accommodations are discussed at individualized education program (IEP) team meeting. Higher-level items address issues such as whether parents are offered special assistance to make it possible for them to participate in IEP meetings.

According to the NCSEAM, "The standard is not about agreement with a single item." The standard score of 600 can be interpreted as a 95 percent likelihood of a response of "agree," "strongly agree" or "very strongly agree" with the item: "*The school explains what options parents have if they disagree with a decision of the*

¹⁶ Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment

school. "Given the consistent pattern in families' responses to the items, a high likelihood of agreement with the threshold item implies the same or greater likelihood of agreement with items located 'below' this one on the scale."¹⁷

State-level performance is based on the percentage of respondents from each of the children ages 3 through 5 and the students ages 6-21 samples with scores that meet or exceed this 600 standard.

The surveys are available in English, Spanish and Arabic. Families also are given the option to complete the survey online, by mail or via a telephone interview using Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing technology. In FFY 2007 the analysis began to be differentiated according to families of children ages 3 through 5 versus students ages 6-21. The new baselines for this indicator are:

- Children ages 3-5 years (Section 619) - 34.0 percent of respondents had measures at or above the standard of 600.
- Students ages 6-21 years - 20.5 percent of respondents had measures at or above the standard of 600.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets:

Children Ages 3-5 Years

FFY	Baseline	Target
2007 (2007-2008)	34.0%*	
2008 (2008-2009)		34.5%
2009 (2009-2010)		35.0%
2010 (2010-2011)		35.5%
2011 (2011-2012)		35.5%
2012 (2012-2013)		35.5%
2013 (2013-2014)		35.5%

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by (Total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] X 100

* [2,004 respondents \geq 600 \div 5,894] X 100 = 34.0%

Source: The NCSEAM Parent Survey, Wayne State University (WSU) Center for Urban Studies, Avatar International, Inc.

¹⁷ NCSEAM (2006). Use of the *NCSEAM Family Survey to Address the SPP/APR Indicator on Family Outcomes* Available at: <http://www.accountabilitydata.org/ParentFamily%20Involvement%20Measures/June%2006.pdf>.

Students Ages 6-21 Years

FFY	Baseline	Target
2007 (2007-2008)	20.5%*	
2008 (2008-2009)		21.0%
2009 (2009-2010)		21.5%
2010 (2010-2011)		22.0%
2011 (2011-2012)		22.0%
2012 (2012-2013)		22.0%
2013 (2013-2014)		22.0%
Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by (Total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] X 100 * [3,688 respondents \geq 600 \div 17,988] X 100 = 20.5%		

Source: The NCSEAM Parent Survey, WSU Center for Urban Studies, Avatar International, Inc.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Timelines	Activities	Resources
IMPROVE COLLABORATION/COORDINATION		
2011-2013 <i>Completed /Deleted 2/3/14</i>	1. Coordinate parent involvement activities with the state Parent Training and Information Center and other parent initiatives.	Office of Special Education (OSE), Mandated Activities Projects ¹⁸ (MAPs), WSU
EVALUATION		
2011-2013 <i>Completed/ Deleted 2/3/14</i>	2. Evaluate progress on activities and resources needed to affect systems change on this indicator.	OSE
2011-2013 <i>Completed /Deleted 2/3/14</i>	3. Provide evidence-based resource materials to districts regarding strategies to facilitate parent involvement and a supportive school climate.	OSE, Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System, Parent Training and Information Center, MAPs, WSU
2013-2014	4. MDE staff and ISD monitors will develop tools to support LEAs that decide to hold	Michigan Alliance for Families and the OSE

¹⁸ Michigan's state improvement and compliance initiatives, funded with *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* administrative set-aside funds

Timelines	Activities	Resources
<p><i>New Activity</i> 2/3/14</p>	<p>consistent and regular (monthly or quarterly, including online) joint trainings for educators and parents using "a cooperative team approach". Key parent organizations, PACs, and other stakeholders will be included in the development of the training.</p>	
<p>2013-2014 <i>New Activity</i> 2/3/14</p>	<p>5. By January 2015, ISD monitors will provide quarterly training sessions to improve communication and the dissemination of materials for parents in order to increase parental understanding of student progress toward achieving quality goals. Activities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to provide professional development for teachers on how to write quality goals, where progress monitoring accurate and meaningful. • Continue to provide professional development for teachers on how to monitor student goals using audience friendly graphic displays of data. • Begin to provide accessible professional development for parents on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o How to request up-to-date progress monitoring data. o How to read basic information provided in graph form. o The parents' role in students' progress toward goals. o How parents and educators can work together to help each student achieve his/her goals. 	<p>Michigan Alliance for Families and the OSE</p>

Please see Michigan's comprehensive SPP for details of the sampling process and all historical information which dates back to 2005 at http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_6598_31834---,00.html.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) Extension for 2011-2014

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation—Child with a Disability
(Compliance Indicator)

Indicator 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Measurement:

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

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

Definitions:

Disproportionate representation in special education occurs when:

- (a) The number of students ages 6 to 21 in a particular racial/ethnic group identified for special education is disproportionate to the representation of that group in the state and district population, AND
- (b) There are data that support that membership in a given group affects the probability of being placed in a specific special education category.

Disproportionate representation includes:

- **Over-Representation:** A verified operating or resident district ratio¹⁹ >2.5 for two consecutive years for race/ethnicity groups is calculated.
- **Under-Representation:** A verified operating or resident district ratio <0.40 in two consecutive years for race/ethnicity groups is calculated. Per the FFY 2011 Office of Special Education Programs Part B Indicator Measurement Table, states are to only report Over-Representation.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process and Data:

The Office of Special Education (OSE) utilizes data from the Michigan Compliance Information System (MI-CIS), the Single Record Student Database (SRSD) through

¹⁹ The OSE uses a weighted risk ratio (WRR) to calculate disproportionate representation when a district's population reflects the same racial/ethnic distribution as that of the state. A risk ratio is used instead of a WRR when the racial/ethnic distribution of the district's student population varies significantly from the state racial/ethnic distribution. This ratio is more appropriate because it compares identification rates by race/ethnicity with the district's student population. An alternate risk ratio is used when there are fewer than ten students with disabilities in all other racial/ethnic subgroups in the district.

June 2009, and the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS) beginning September 2009 to determine disproportionate representation. These results are used to identify districts that will participate in a focused monitoring activity including a review of policies, procedures and practices regarding identification. This culminates in a decision about inappropriate identification.

Baseline Data:

Category	American Indian	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White
Baseline	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Target	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Measurable and Rigorous Targets:

FFY	Baseline	Target
2008 (2008-2009)	0.1%*	0%
2009 (2009-2010) through 2013 (2013-2014)		0%
Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the state)] X 100 *[1 district with findings ÷ 755] X 100 = 0.1%		

Source: MI-CIS, SRSD, MSDS, Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Timelines	Activities	Resources
IMPROVE DATA COLLECTION		
2011-2014 <i>Revised 2/3/14</i>	1. Review and update as necessary the procedures for extracting and analyzing data in the determination of disproportionate representation.	OSE Performance Reporting (PR) Unit, Wayne State University Center for Urban Studies
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT		
2011-2014	2. Ensure involvement of districts in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of the data that resulted in their identification for disproportionate representation; Review of their policies, procedures and practices used to identify whether these are determinants of the disproportionate data; and Development of any necessary corrective action plan (CAP). 	OSE PR Unit, intermediate school district (ISD) monitors

Timelines	Activities	Resources
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2011-2014	3. Provide technical assistance in the development and implementation of a CAP to districts whose identification policies, procedures and practices are a determinant for the disproportionate representation of students from racial/ethnic groups.	OSE PR Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System Team, ISD monitors

Please see Michigan's comprehensive SPP for all historical information which dates back to 2005 at http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_6598_31834---,00.html.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) Extension for 2011-2014

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation—Eligibility Categories
(Compliance Indicator)

Indicator 10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

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

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

Definitions:

Disproportionate representation in special education occurs when:

- (a) The number of students ages 6 to 21 in a particular racial/ethnic group identified for special education in specific disabilities is disproportionate to the representation of that group in the state and district population, AND
- (b) There are data that support that membership in a given group affects the probability of being placed in a specific special education category.

Disproportionate representation includes:

- **Over-Representation:** A verified operating or resident district ratio²⁰ >2.5 for two consecutive years for race/ethnicity groups is calculated.
- **Under-Representation:** A verified operating or resident district ratio <0.40 in two consecutive years for race/ethnicity groups is calculated Per the FFY 2011 Office of Special Education Programs Part B Indicator Measurement Table, states are to only report Over-Representation.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process and Data:

The Office of Special Education (OSE) utilizes data from the Michigan Compliance Information System (MI-CIS), the Single Record Student Database (SRSD) through

²⁰ The OSE uses a weighted risk ratio (WRR) to calculate disproportionate representation when a district's population reflects the same racial/ethnic distribution as that of the state. A risk ratio is used instead of a WRR when the racial/ethnic distribution of the district's student population varies significantly from the state racial/ethnic distribution. This ratio is more appropriate because it compares identification rates by race/ethnicity with the district's student population. An alternate risk ratio is used when there are fewer than ten students with disabilities in all other racial/ethnic subgroups in the district.

June 2009, and the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS) beginning September 2009 to determine disproportionate representation.

These results are used to identify districts that will participate in a focused monitoring activity including a review of policies, procedures and practices regarding identification. This culminates in a decision about inappropriate identification.

FFY 2008 Michigan Disproportionate Representation Analysis:

Number and percent of districts by disability category and racial/ethnic group used to establish Baseline.²¹

	American Indian		Asian		Black		Hispanic		White	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Cognitive Impairment	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.27%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Emotional Impairment	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Specific Learning Disability	1	0.13%	0	0.0%	1	0.13%	0	0.0%	1	0.13%
Speech and Language Impairment	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.27%
Other Health Impairment	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.27%
Autism Spectrum Disorder	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	0.40%

²¹ There were 12 findings of noncompliance for 11 districts.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets:

FFY	Baseline	Target
2008 (2008-2009)	1.5%*	0%
2009 (2009-2010) through 2013 (2013-2014)		0%
Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the state)] X 100 *(11 ÷ 755) X 100 = 1.5%		

Source: MI-CIS, SRSD, MSDS, Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Timelines	Activities	Resources
IMPROVE DATA COLLECTION		
2011-2014 <i>Revised 2/3/14</i>	1. Review and update as necessary the procedures for extracting and analyzing data in the determination of disproportionate representation.	OSE Performance Reporting (PR) Unit, Wayne State University
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT		
2011-2014	2. Ensure involvement of districts in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • review of the data that resulted in their identification for disproportionate representation; • review of their policies, procedures and practices used to identify whether these are determinants of the disproportionate data; and • development of any necessary corrective action plan (CAP). 	OSE PR Unit, intermediate school district (ISD) monitors
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2011-2014	3. Provide technical assistance in the development and implementation of a CAP to districts whose identification policies, procedures and practices are a determinant for the disproportionate representation of students from racial/ethnic groups in specific disabilities.	OSE PR Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System Team, ISD monitors

Please see Michigan's comprehensive SPP for all historical information which dates back to 2005 at http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_6598_31834---,00.html.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) Extension for 2011-2014

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision/Child Find

(Compliance Indicator)

Indicator 11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

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

Measurement:

a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline²²).

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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process and Data:

Michigan Rule establishes a 30 school day timeline to evaluate and complete an individualized education program (IEP) for a child suspected of having a disability who may need special education programs and/or services (*Michigan Administrative Rules for Special Education* R 340.1721c(2)). The timeline begins when the district obtains written, signed parental consent for the initial evaluation.

The Office of Special Education (OSE) works with Project Find (a Mandated Activities Project (MAP)²³ administered by *Early On*[®] Training and Technical Assistance) to provide a statewide system that effectively coordinates Michigan's Child Find process. The Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System and the Program Accountability Unit within the OSE work to disseminate accurate information and provide technical assistance to all stakeholders regarding the Child Find process and the timely completion of the initial evaluation and IEP.

The data for this indicator, collected through the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS), are used to identify children found eligible whose evaluations were completed within 30 school days or an agreed upon extension and those whose evaluations were not completed within 30 school days or an agreed upon extension, counted from the date of receipt of parental consent to evaluate.

²² Children with parental consent to evaluate, will be evaluated and eligibility determined within 30 school days or a mutually agreed upon extension (state established timeline).

²³ Michigan's state improvement and compliance initiatives, funded with *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* administrative set-aside funds.

Data used for the FFY 2005 baseline was obtained by survey using a representative sampling methodology in one-third of the districts. Michigan could not generate the required new fields in the statewide student data system in time for the FFY 2005 collection. In FFY 2006, the required data items were included in the student collection system, and a new baseline was calculated from this population data.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets:

FFY	Baseline	Target
2005 (2005-2006)	80.5%	100%
2006 (2006-2007)	96.2%*	100%
2007 (2007-2008) through 2013 (2013-2014)		100%
Percent = [(# of children whose evaluations were completed within 30 school days or agreed upon extension) divided by (# of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received)] X 100		
*(14,627 timely initial IEPs ÷ 15,205) X 100 = 96.2%		

Source: Single Record Student Database, MSDS

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Timelines	Activities	Resources
IMPROVE COLLABORATION/COORDINATION		
2011-2013 <i>Deleted</i> 2/3/14	1. Continue to collaborate with targeted stakeholders to review and update, as necessary, Michigan’s Child Find policies, procedures and practices.	Michigan Alliance for Families, Project Find, Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education ²⁴ , Monitoring Advisory Team
CLARIFY/EXAMINE/DEVELOP POLICIES AND PROCEDURES		
2011-2013 <i>Deleted</i> 2/3/14	2. Review and refine an integrated set of general supervision activities across the general supervision indicators, MAPs and Michigan’s monitoring system in order to improve compliance.	MAPs, Monitoring Advisory Team, Office of Great Start, Early Childhood Education & Family Services (OGS/ECE&FS)
2013-2014 <i>New Activity</i> 2/3/14	3. The OSE will collaborate with targeted stakeholders to develop and continuously review an internal system of communication, data collection and follow-up to ensure the implementation	The OSE, ISDs, and appropriate LEA Grantees

²⁴ Michigan’s state affiliate of the Council of Exceptional Children, Council of Administrators of Special Education

Timelines	Activities	Resources
	of Michigan's Child Find policies, procedures and practices.	

Please see Michigan's comprehensive SPP for all historical information which dates back to 2005 at http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_6598_31834---,00.html.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) Extension for 2011-2014

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision/Early Childhood Transition

(Compliance Indicator)

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

Measurement:

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

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

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process and Data:

Michigan is a birth mandate state providing special education services from birth through age 25. The state provides programs and services under Michigan's special education mandate to children from birth who have identified disabilities and are determined eligible for services. In addition, those infants and toddlers who are developmentally delayed or have established conditions, and their families, are served under Part C of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*.

All birth through age two children eligible for special education services, and their families, are eligible under Part C, if the parents choose to receive services. Not all Part C eligible children and their families, however, are eligible for Michigan's Mandatory Special Education programs and services.

Referrals of infants and toddlers for special education services can and do occur anytime between birth and age three. This affects measurement component (a), which counts the number of Part C children referred to special education.

In Michigan, all referrals to special education require parental consent to evaluate. This is true for all children being referred from Part C to special education, even though Part C has previously secured parental consent. In both situations, consent is secured as part of the referral and generally occurs on the same date.

Until the 2011-2012 school year, Michigan documented, through the Michigan Compliance Information System (MI-CIS) data verification process, reasons why children referred by Part C to special education may not have an IEP implemented by his/her third birthday. If a referral has been received by a district, the district maintains and monitors these data, while tracking the evaluation through the 30 school day evaluation period set by the state.

The Office of Special Education (OSE) developed a long-range plan to ensure that the collection of data for Indicators 11 and 12 were integrated in the existing data collection systems. The data will be submitted by districts to the state through the fall, spring and end-of-year Michigan Student Data System collections.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets:

FFY	Baseline	Target
2006 (2006-2007)	91.5% ²⁵ *	100%
2007 (2007-2008) through 2013 (2013-2014)		100%
Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e)] X 100		
* [2,610 ÷ (3,487 - 624 - 9)] X 100 = 91.5%		

Source: MI-CIS, and data verification survey

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Timelines	Activities	Resources
PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
2011-2014 <i>Revised 2/3/14</i>	1. Provide targeted TA to ISDs and LEAs pertaining to 1) transition timeline guidance and documentation, and 2) assisting in the identification of potentially eligible children to ensure the timelines for Part C, Transition Conference, and Part B, IEP by age three, are met.	The OGS/ECE&FS and TA Grantee, Clinton County Regional Educational Service Agency (CCRESA).

²⁵ Using the OSEP formula Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d)] times 100 from FFY 2006 Measurement Table. This was the first year of the statewide electronic data collection. The new calculation went into effect in FFY 2008.

Timelines	Activities	Resources
2012-2014 <i>New Activity</i> 2/1/2013 <i>Revised</i> 2/3/14	2. Provide professional development on transition timeline guidelines and procedures in various formats including: conference presentations, online training, and webinars.	The OSE/PR/MTAT, the CIMS Team and the OGS/ECE&FS.
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2011-2014	3. Target local educational agencies determined to be out of compliance for TA and take appropriate corrective action.	OGS/ECE&FS, OSE PR CIMS Team
IMPROVE DATA COLLECTION		
2013-2014 <i>New Activity</i> 2/3/14	4. Develop and implement data quality checks within the MSDS.	The OSE/PR/MTAT, the CIMS Team, the OGS/ECE&FS, and the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI).

Please see Michigan's comprehensive SPP for all historical information which dates back to 2005 at http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_6598_31834---,00.html.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) Extension for 2011-2014

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision/Secondary Transition

(Compliance Indicator)

Indicator 13: Percent of youth with individualized education program (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))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of youth with an IEP aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process and Data:

In March 2009 the Office of Special Education Programs designated Indicator 13 as a new indicator, revising the indicator language and measurement. This required states to establish a new baseline in the FFY 2009 SPP. The previous SPP section for this indicator is included in an Appendix of the comprehensive SPP as a historical reference.

Sample

Michigan's IEP sample is drawn from the annual Special Education Child Count. Any student with an IEP age 16-21 in this count is included in the eligible population for sampling.

- Any district with fewer than 50,000 enrolled students is sampled annually to achieve a margin of error within plus or minus 10 percent at the 95 percent confidence level.
- Any district with 50,000 or more enrolled students is sampled annually to achieve a margin of error within plus or minus 5 percent at the 95 percent confidence level.

Data Collection

The intermediate school district (ISD) transition coordinators, with their local district counterparts, are trained to collect and analyze these data, complete data report-out sessions, and develop and implement corrective action plans (CAPs). IEP reviews are completed by district and ISD staff, and data are entered through a secure Web-based system.

An IEP review must determine that each of the following six elements are included in the IEP to comply with Indicator 13 requirements (see the Appendix in the comprehensive SPP for a sample of the Compliance Checklist for Secondary Transition):

1. The student was invited to the IEP Team meeting.
2. The student's postsecondary vision (postsecondary goals) is identified, including:
 - a. Development/update of the postsecondary vision (postsecondary goals) was based upon evidence of current transition assessment information;
 - b. Evidence the postsecondary vision (postsecondary goals) was updated annually; and
 - c. The postsecondary vision (postsecondary goals) is measurable.
3. The IEP identifies current student:
 - a. Academic achievement;
 - b. Functional performance; and
 - c. Transition related needs.
4. The IEP identifies transition services (including courses of study) that align with the postsecondary vision (postsecondary goals).
5. If any agency is likely to provide/pay for specified transition services, there must be evidence that:
 - a. Prior consent to invite any agency(s) was obtained from parent (or student if s/he has reached age of majority).
 - b. A representative from identified agency(s) was invited to the IEP Team meeting.
6. The IEP identifies at least one measurable annual IEP goal aligned with the postsecondary vision (postsecondary goals).

Analysis

Because there is a gap between the Special Education Child Count date and the date that the IEP is audited for compliance with Indicator 13 requirements, students that have moved from the school district, dropped out of school, or exited special education are removed from the sample. The sample is checked for representativeness against the known population of students with an IEP eligible for Indicator 13 review (including age, race/ethnicity, gender, and primary disability). For any demographic categories where a significant difference ($p < .05$) is identified, post-stratification weights are applied for comparison of results.

Correction of noncompliance

Districts with IEPs that are not compliant with the Indicator 13 requirements as of June 30 (previously October 1²⁶) are issued findings of noncompliance on August 15 (previously December 15). Districts are required to convene a Review and Analysis Process Team that include a sufficient number of individuals with program expertise to answer questions about data, policies, procedures and practices. The teams identify the root cause of the noncompliance, and develop and submit a CAP by October 1 (previously February 15). All CAPs are reviewed for approval by the Office of Special Education (OSE). A progress report is due on February 15 (previously June 1), and evidence of correction is due by April 1 (previously September 15). Once the OSE verifies completion of the CAP activities and correction of the student-level noncompliance, the CAP will be closed and an acknowledgment will be issued on August 15 (previously December 15).

Baseline Data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):

Using the sampling frame described above, an initial sample of 11,839 IEPs were randomly selected for review. Of these, 3,118 were removed from the sample because students were no longer receiving special education services in the sampled district; this resulted in a final sample of 8,721 IEPs.

The initial review of IEPs found that 6,483 IEPs were compliant with Indicator 13, for an FFY 2009 baseline of 74.3 percent $[(6,483 \div 8,721) \times 100 = 74.3\%]$.

Representativeness of sample

The final sample of 8,721 IEPs was checked for representativeness (for age, race/ethnicity, gender and disability) against the population of eligible students from the annual Special Education Child Count. There were significant differences between the population of eligible students and the final Indicator 13 sample for certain ages, racial/ethnic groups, and disabilities at the state level. The significant variation in the sample percent compared to the population percent for these demographic categories can be partially explained by the data collection protocol that removes students who are no longer receiving services in their sampled district, e.g., the number of graduating students removed from the sample.

Weighting

Weights are commonly used to adjust survey results for under- and over-representation of specific subgroups in a sample population. Weighting provides an estimate of the results that would be found if the distribution of a particular characteristic in the sample were identical to the distribution in the overall population. For any demographic category that varied significantly, post-stratification weighting was used to compute a weighted compliance rate. Although the representativeness of the sample varied for these demographic categories, weighted results were not significantly different than unweighted results.

²⁶ Data were available earlier and all timelines were moved forward.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets:

FFY	Baseline	Target
2010 (2010-2011)	74.3%*	100%
2011 (2011-2012)		100%
2012 (2012-2013)		100%
2013 (2013-2014)		100%
<p>Percent = [(# of youth with an IEP aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] X 100.</p> <p>* (6,483 compliant records ÷ 8,721) X 100 = 74.3%</p>		

Source: Secondary Transition Checklist

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Timelines	Activities	Resources
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2011-2014	1. Use graduation, dropout, secondary transition and postsecondary outcomes data to develop and implement technical assistance and personnel development for district staff to enhance transition IEP compliance and quality.	Michigan Transition Outcomes Project (MI-TOP), OSE Program Accountability (PA) Unit, Reaching and Teaching Struggling Learners (RTSL), National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC)
2011-2014 <i>Revised 2/3/14</i>	2. Provide professional development to ISD Transition Coordinators to enhance transition IEP compliance and quality.	MI-TOP, OSE PA Unit, RTSL, NSTTAC
2011-2014	3. Provide policy and data guidance to support a long-term, outcomes-based approach to student-centered planning.	MI-TOP, OSE PA Unit, RTSL, NSTTAC

Please see Michigan’s comprehensive SPP for details of the sampling process and all historical information which dates back to 2005 at http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_6598_31834---,00.html.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) Extension for 2011-2014

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision / Postsecondary Outcomes

(Results Indicator)

Indicator 14: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had individualized education programs (IEPs) in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement

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

Definitions:

The Office of Special Education (OSE) adopted the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) measurement table definitions for enrollment in higher education, competitive employment, enrollment in other postsecondary education or training, and some other employment.

Enrolled in higher education: enrollment 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 anytime in the year since leaving high school.

Competitive employment: work 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.

Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training: enrollment on a full- or part-time basis for at least one 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: work for pay or in a self-employment setting 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 or catering services.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process and Data:

In 2009, the OSEP designated Indicator 14 as a new indicator, revising the indicator language and measurement. This required states to establish a new baseline in the FFY 2009 SPP. The previous SPP section for this indicator is included in an Appendix of the comprehensive SPP as a historical reference.

The OSE used the National Post-School Outcomes Center revised Stage 1: Post-School Data Collection Protocol approved by the OSEP in May 2010.

Approved Research Protocol

The OSE collaborated with the Wayne State University (WSU) Center for Urban Studies to collect the data. The Human Investigation Committee of the WSU Institutional Review Board approved the survey data collection procedures and protocols which address informed consent, confidentiality, and data security.

The OSEP approved a three-year cohort sampling cycle for Michigan. Former students from every intermediate school district are included in each cohort. Each district is surveyed once in a three-year period, except for the one district with a student population greater than 50,000 where the survey is annual. Each former student was placed only in the first category where he or she met the category definition.

Once each former student was categorized using the above criteria, each was reported under the appropriate measure(s).

Baseline Data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):Response Rate

A total of 4,725 cohort 3 leavers were reported for the 2008-2009 school year. Of the 4,725 leavers, 4,065 were eligible to complete the survey; 660 leavers did not have accurate contact information, had returned to school, or were deceased. A total of 1,268 unduplicated responses were received for the FFY 2009 data collection, for a response rate of 31.2 percent.

During 2008-2009, 214 cohort 3 districts reported having eligible leavers. There were valid responses in 178 of these districts (83.2 percent). No valid responses were received relative to former students from 36 of these districts (16.8 percent).

Missing data

Analysis was conducted to identify patterns of missing data; however, no specific pattern was identified. Also, during 2009-2010 the Michigan Student Data System incorporated an optional phone number field to help increase the ability of the WSU survey team to contact non-responders and offer Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing support in survey completion.

Representativeness of respondents

The final sample of 8,721 IEPs was checked for representativeness (for gender, race/ethnicity, exit status, and disability) against the population of eligible leavers. White youth were over-represented in the respondent group, while Black youth were under-represented. In terms of exit status, youth who graduated from high school with a diploma were over-represented in the respondent group while those youth who dropped out of high school were under-represented. Lastly, those youth with autism spectrum disorder and other health impairments were over-represented in the respondent group.

To determine if the difference in the distribution between the respondent group and cohort 3 population significantly impacted the findings related to this indicator, weights were applied to adjust the sample sizes for each subgroup. Weights are commonly used to adjust survey results for under- and over-representation of specific subgroups in a sample population. Weighting provides an estimate of the results that would be found if the distribution of a particular characteristic in the sample were identical to the distribution in the overall population. The sample is not representative in terms of students' exit status and therefore, the state weighted results by exit status and is reporting weighted baseline data for FFY 2009.

Weighted baseline results by data reporting category

Category		Number	Percentage
1	Enrolled in higher education within one-year of leaving high school	414	32.6%
2	Competitively employed within one-year of leaving high school	290	22.9%
3	Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one-year of leaving high school	98	7.7%
4	In some other employment within one-year of leaving high school	60	4.7%
Categories 1 through 4 - TOTAL		862	68.0%
Leavers not captured by categories 1 through 4		406	32.0%
TOTAL		1,268	100.0%

Source: National Post-School Outcomes Center Survey

Weighted baseline measures

Measure	Number	Percentage
A = Category 1	414	32.6%
B = Categories 1 + 2	704	55.5%
C = Categories 1 + 2 + 3 + 4	862	68.0%

Source: National Post-School Outcomes Center Survey

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Compilation and analysis of the survey data yielded Michigan’s weighted baseline data for the three measures A, B and C as follows:

- **32.6 percent** of respondent leavers were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
- **55.5 percent** of respondent leavers were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school; and
- **68.0 percent** of respondent leavers were 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.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets:

Target Setting Methodology

The targets identified were developed by the OSE with input from a workgroup comprised of diverse community stakeholders and the Special Education Advisory Committee.²⁷

²⁷ Michigan’s *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* mandated special education State Advisory Panel

The targets are 105 percent (baseline percent X 1.05 = target) of the FFY 2009 baseline data in each performance category. The resulting targets communicate that outcomes are important and will drive continued examination of factors that impact outcomes.

A. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.

FFY	Baseline	Target
2009 (2009-2010)	32.6%*	
2010 (2010-2011)		34.3%
2011 (2011-2012)		34.3%
2012 (2012-2013)		34.3%
2013 (2013-2014)		34.3%

Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had an IEP 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 an IEP in effect at the time they left school)] X 100

*414 ÷ 1,268 X 100 = 32.6%

Source: National Post-School Outcomes Center Survey

B. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

FFY	Baseline	Target
2009 (2009-2010)	55.5%*	
2010 (2010-2011)		58.4%
2011 (2011-2012)		58.4%
2012 (2012-2013)		58.4%
2013 (2013-2014)		58.4%

Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had an IEP 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 an IEP in effect at the time they left school)] X 100

*704 ÷ 1,268 X 100 = 55.5%

Source: National Post-School Outcomes Center Survey

C. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had an IEP 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 within one year of leaving high school.

FFY	Baseline	Target
2009 (2009-2010)	68.0%*	
2010 (2010-2011)		71.4%
2011 (2011-2012)		71.4%
2012 (2012-2013)		71.4%
2013 (2013-2014)		71.4%

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 an IEP 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 within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had an IEP in effect at the time they left school)] X 100

*862 ÷ 1,268 X 100 = 68.0%

Source: National Post-School Outcomes Center Survey

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Timelines	Activities	Resources
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2011-2013 <i>Revised</i> 2/1/12 <i>Completed/ Deleted</i> 2/3/14	1. Use graduation, dropout, secondary transition and postsecondary outcomes data to develop and implement technical assistance and personnel development to increase graduation rates and decrease dropout rates.	Transition Coordination Grant, Michigan Transition Outcomes Project (MI-TOP) Core Team, Public Sector Consultants (PSC), WSU
2011-2013 <i>Revised</i> 2/1/12 <i>Completed/ Deleted</i> 2/3/14	2. Provide sustained building level personnel development using available district/building level data to increase graduation rates and decrease dropout rates.	Transition Coordination Grant, MI-TOP Core Team
2011-2014	3. Provide policy and data guidance to support a long-term, outcomes-based approach to student-centered planning.	Transition Coordination Grant, MI-TOP Core Team, PSC

Timelines	Activities	Resources
2013-2014 <i>New Activity</i> 2/3/14	4. Review existing data collection methodologies and explore alternate data collection strategies to increase survey response rates.	Transition Coordination Grant, Michigan Transition Outcomes Project (MI-TOP) Core Team, Public Sector Consultants (PSC), Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System Team, WSU

Please see Michigan's comprehensive SPP for details of the sampling process and all historical information which dates back to 2005 at http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_6598_31834---,00.html.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) Extension for 2011-2014

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision/Compliance Findings

(Compliance Indicator)

Indicator 15: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

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

States are required to use the "Indicator 15 Worksheet" to report data for this indicator.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process and Data:

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

The CIMS was designed to help the state and its districts analyze and interpret data as well as record all monitoring activities in a single location. The CIMS reflects the priorities of the IDEA and the SPP, and aligns with the Michigan School Improvement Framework.

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

- Focused monitoring activities (on-site, desk audit or self review)
- Complaints
- Data reviews
- Due process hearings
- Local performance plans
- Other activities

Michigan evaluates the performance of each local relative to the SPP indicator targets. If areas of noncompliance with the IDEA or state regulations are identified,

the state must issue a finding of noncompliance to the district. The finding is a written notification, which explains the area of noncompliance and includes the citation of the statute, rule or regulation related to the noncompliance and a description of the data supporting the state’s conclusion. All identified noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year, and verified by the state within that year. The CIMS *Workbooks* are launched three times each year.

Measurable & Rigorous Targets:

FFY	Baseline	Target
2004 (2004-2005)	100%*	
2005 (2005-2006) through 2013 (2013-2014)		100%
Percent = [(# of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification) divided by (# of findings of noncompliance)] X 100 *(5,508 ÷ 5,508) X 100 = 100%		

Source: Michigan Hearings Database, Michigan Due Process Database, CIMS, and required data from other SPP indicators as referenced in the Indicator B-15 Worksheet

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Timelines	Activities	Resources
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2011-2014	1. Analyze the factors affecting the lack of correction of noncompliance within one year and identify effective strategies, incentives and enforcement activities.	OSE Performance Reporting (PR) CIMS Team, Public Sector Consultants (PSC)
2011-2014	2. Enhance the electronic function of the OSE PR CIMS that includes focused monitoring activities, technical assistance activities and the tracking of noncompliance.	OSE PR CIMS Team, PSC

Please see Michigan’s comprehensive SPP for all historical information which dates back to 2005 at http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_6598_31834---,00.html.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) Extension for 2011-2014

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision/State Complaints

(Compliance Indicator)

Indicator 16: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within the 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.

Definition:

"Complaint" means a written and signed allegation that includes the facts, on which the allegation is based, by an individual or an organization, that there is a violation of any of the following:

1. Any current provision of the *Michigan Administrative Rules for Special Education*.
2. 1976 PA 451, MCL 380.1 et seq., as it pertains to special education programs and services.
3. The *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA) of 2004, 20 U.S.C., §1400 et seq., and the regulations implementing the act.
4. An intermediate school district (ISD) plan.
5. An individualized education program team report, hearing officer decision, administrative law judge decision or court decision regarding special education programs or services.
6. The state application for federal funds under the IDEA.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process and Data:

The Michigan Department of Education, Office of Special Education (OSE) implemented a single-tier complaint system in April 2009, replacing the two-tier system that had been in effect for over 30 years. FFY 2009 was the first year that all state complaints were completed using the single-tier system.

This single-tier system allows the ISDs and the OSE to jointly investigate complaints resulting in a more timely resolution of complaints and a reduction in the number of complaint investigations.

Revisions to the state complaint procedures were identified as being necessary to enhance the implementation of the single-tier system. State Complaint Procedures, and changes to *Michigan Administrative Rules for Special Education* were promulgated with input from stakeholders to reflect the single-tier state complaint system and the IDEA regulations. In addition, the OSE took preliminary steps to

develop a new database that will track state complaints and integrate data more efficiently from state complaints, due process complaints and mediation.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Complaints Processed During 2004-2005

- (1) Signed, written complaints total = 239
- (1.1) Complaints with reports issued = 216
 - (a) Reports with findings = 216
 - (b) Reports within timelines = 129
 - (c) Reports with extended timelines = 87
- (1.2) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed = 15
- (1.3) Complaints pending = 41
 - (a) Complaints pending a due process hearing = 8

Percent: $129 + 87 = 216 \div 216 = 1 \times 100 = 100\%$

Source: The OSE Complaint Database

Discussion of FFY 2004 (2004-2005) Baseline Data:

A review of data indicates that all reports were completed with findings and all reports were completed within timelines or timelines with extensions.

Complaints withdrawn or dismissed (n=15), plus complaints pending due process (n=8), plus complaints with reports issued (n=216) equals 239 (100 percent).

Measurable and Rigorous Targets:

FFY	Baseline	Target
2004 (2004-2005)	100%*	
2005 (2005-2006) through 2010 (2012-2013)		100%
2011 (2011-2012) through 2012 (2012-2013)		NA ²⁸
Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] X 100		
*[(129 + 87) ÷ 216] X 100 = 100%		

Source: Michigan Due Process Database, Michigan Hearings Database

²⁸ Per the OSEP guidance, beginning in FFY 2011 states are no longer required to report Indicator 16 (State Complaints) in the Annual Performance Report.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Timelines	Activities	Resources
PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
2011-2013	1. Provide training to all stakeholders regarding new rules and procedures relative to the single-tier complaint system.	OSE Program Accountability (PA) Unit
IMPROVE DATA COLLECTION		
2011-2013	2. Develop and implement a database to integrate information across due process, monitoring, mediation and state complaint data sets.	Department of Technology, Management and Budget, OSE PA Unit Contractors
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2011-2013	3. Review state complaints, rules and procedures biannually and make changes as needed.	OSE PA Unit

Please see Michigan's comprehensive SPP for all historical information which dates back to 2005 at http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_6598_31834---,00.html.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) Extension for 2011-2014

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision/Hearings Adjudicated
(Compliance Indicator)

Indicator 17: Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process and Data:

Pursuant to an Interdepartmental Agreement (IA) with the Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS), hearings are conducted by administrative law judges (ALJs) who are hired and supervised by the MAHS. The Michigan Department of Education and the MAHS meet regularly to review and revise procedures to ensure compliance with timeline requirements.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Due Process Hearings Processed During FFY 2004		
(3)	Total Hearing Requests (local)	110
(3.1)	Resolution Sessions (new indicator)	0
(3.2)	Hearings Fully Adjudicated	8
(3.2.a)	Adjudicated within 45 days	1
(3.2.b)	Adjudicated within extended timeline	7
(3.3)	Resolved without hearing	70
(4)	Expedited Hearing Requests	0
	Pending cases as of 8-29-05	32

Percent: $1 + 7 = 8 \div 8 = 1 \times 100 = 100\%$

Source: Michigan Due Process Database, Michigan Hearings Database

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The baseline data of 100 percent represents a significant improvement over previous year's data. This increase was due to new sanction-based requirements for hearing officers to maintain documentation of extensions current on all cases pending before them.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets:

FFY	Baseline	Target
2004 (2004-2005)	100%*	
2005 (2005-2006) through 2010 (2012-2013)		100%
2011 (2011-2012) through 2012 (2012-2013)		NA ²⁹
Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] X 100		
*[(1 + 7) ÷ 8] X 100 = 100%		

Source: Michigan Due Process Database, Michigan Hearings Database

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Timelines	Activities	Resources
PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
2011-2013	1. Provide ongoing training and evaluation of ALJs to assure continuing compliance with timeline requirements in collaboration with the MAHS.	Office of Special Education (OSE) Program Accountability (PA) Unit, MAHS, Contractors
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2011-2013	2. Annually review the IA between the MAHS and the OSE; revise roles and responsibilities of the parties as needed.	OSE, MAHS
CLARIFY/EXAMINE/DEVELOP POLICIES AND PROCEDURES		
2011-2013	3. Review biannually and change, as needed, due process complaint rules and procedures.	OSE PA Unit, MAHS

Please see Michigan’s comprehensive SPP for all historical information which dates back to 2005 at http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_6598_31834---,00.html.

²⁹ Per the OSEP guidance, beginning in FFY 2011 states are no longer required to report Indicator 17 (Hearings Adjudicated) in the Annual Performance Report.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) Extension for 2011-2014

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

Indicator 18: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B)))

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process and Data:

Pursuant to an Interdepartmental Agreement with the Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS) hearings are conducted by administrative law judges (ALJs) who are hired and supervised by the MAHS. During FFY 2009, there were ALJ changes at the MAHS requiring new staff training regarding reporting of known resolution sessions and settlement agreements. Tracking of resolution sessions and settlement agreements improved through the ALJs' use of case summary reports. Also, in June 2010, procedures were approved through the public hearing process requiring districts to submit a resolution session summary form to report completion and outcome of resolution sessions.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

Resolution Sessions/Written Settlement Agreements during FFY 2005

(3) Total Hearing Requests (local)	116
(3.1) Resolution Sessions	77
a. Settlement Agreements	28
(3.2) Hearings Fully Adjudicated	9
(3.3) Resolved without hearing	83
(4) Expedited Hearing Requests	5
- Resolution Sessions	5
- Settlement Agreements	2
Pending cases as of July 1, 2006	24

Source: Michigan Due Process Database, Michigan Hearings Database

Measurable and Rigorous Targets:

FFY	Baseline	Target
2005 (2005-2006)	36.4%*	
2006 (2006-2007)		36.0%
2007 (2007-2008)		37.0%
2008 (2008-2009)		38.0%
2009 (2009-2010)		40.0%
2010 (2010-2011)		42.0%
2011 (2011-2012)		42.0%
2012 (2012-2013)		42.0%
2013 (2013-2014)		42.0%
Percent = [3.1(a) divided by 3.1] X 100 ³⁰		
*[28 resolution settlement agreements ÷ 77] x 100 = 36.4%		

Source: Michigan Due Process Database, Michigan Hearings Database

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Timelines	Activities	Resources
PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
2011-2014 <i>Revised 2/3/14</i>	1. Provide ongoing training of all stakeholders regarding new rules and procedures relative to resolution session requirements.	Office of Special Education (OSE) Program Accountability (PA) Unit
IMPROVE DATA COLLECTION		
2011-2014 <i>Deleted 2/3/14</i>	2. Develop and implement a database to integrate information across due process, monitoring, mediation and state complaint data sets.	Department of Technology, Management and Budget, OSE PA Unit
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2011-2014	3. Review biannually and change, as needed, due process complaint rules and procedures.	OSE PA Unit

Please see Michigan's comprehensive SPP for all historical information which dates back to 2005 at http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_6598_31834---,00.html.

³⁰ See the *Resolution Sessions/Written Settlement Agreements* table on the previous page.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) Extension for 2011-2014

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

Indicator 19: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.
 (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process and Data:

The Michigan Special Education Mediation Program (MSEMP) provides mediation services at no cost to parents and educators across the state through a network of local dispute resolution centers. The program provides training for mediators with the assistance of trainers who specialize in early intervention and special education law and mediation. The MSEMP maintains a roster of more than 100 mediators statewide.

Mediation is a voluntary process in which a neutral third party helps the disputing parties reach their own resolution. The neutral third party has no authority to decide the case, and the parties have no obligation to reach an agreement. If an agreement is reached, the parties sign a written document expressing the terms of the agreement, and each party receives a copy. The written agreement is enforceable in court.

Analysis of Mediation Data for FFY 2004

	FFY 2004
(2.1) Mediated with agreement	24
(2.1) Mediated without agreement	9
(2.2) Mediations not held	17
(2.0) Total requests for mediation	50

Source: Michigan Mediation Database

Measurable and Rigorous Targets:

FFY	Baseline	Target
2004 (2004-2005)	72.7%*	
2005 (2005-2006)		74.0%
2006 (2006-2007)		75.0%
2007 (2007-2008)		76.0%
2008 (2008-2009)		77.0%
2009 (2009-2010)		78.5%
2010 (2010-2011)		80.0%
2011 (2011-2012)		80.0%
2012 (2012-2013)		80.0%
Michigan Reset Target		
2013 (2013-2014)		75.0-85.0%
Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1 X 100 ³¹		
*[24 ÷ 33] X 100 = 72.7%		

Source: Michigan Mediation Database

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Timelines	Activities	Resources
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT		
2011-2014 <i>Revised 2/3/14</i>	1. Increase the mediation agreement rate by reconfiguring training based on the redesign of the training curriculum that uses the following steps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Analyze issue trends in disputes •Determine what parts of IDEA/MARSE are necessary to trainees •Conduct focus groups with mediators to identify mediation challenges, obstacles to agreement and techniques for overcoming both •Survey best training practices in Michigan and from other states •Compile and analyze internal and 	Office of Special Education (OSE) Program Accountability (PA) Unit, Michigan Alliance for Families, Consortium for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE)

³¹ See the *Analysis of Mediation Data for FFY 2004* table on the previous page.

Timelines	Activities	Resources
	external evaluation data and trends.	
2011-2014	2. Research and introduce strategies and collaborative problem-solving techniques for use in mediation.	CADRE, Harvard Program on Negotiation, Search for Common Ground
CLARIFY/EXAMINE/DEVELOP POLICIES AND PROCEDURES		
2011-2014	3. Review biannually and change, as needed, dispute resolution rules and procedures.	OSE PA Unit
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2013-2014 <i>New Activity</i> <i>2/3/14</i>	4. Provide materials to potential participants (e.g., MSEMP and Dispute Resolution Centers' website) to increase skill development and retention regarding the mediation and IEP facilitation processes utilizing multiple formats, e.g. webinars, short videos, print materials and new research on collaborative communication and dispute resolution. An evaluation plan will be developed and implemented to determine the impact of these additional learning supports.	Office of Special Education (OSE) Program Accountability (PA) Unit, Michigan Alliance for Families, Consortium for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE)

Please see Michigan's comprehensive SPP for all historical information which dates back to 2005 at http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_6598_31834---,00.html.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) Extension for 2011-2014

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision/Timely and Accurate Data

(Compliance Indicator)

Indicator 20: State reported data (Section 618 and SPP and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

State reported data, including 618 data, SPP, and Annual Performance Reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity; placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel and dispute resolution; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports and assessment); and
- b. Accurate, including covering the correct year and following the correct measurement.

States are required to use the "Indicator 20 Scoring Rubric" for reporting data for this indicator.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process and Data:

The Office of Special Education (OSE) Performance Reporting (PR) Unit, grantees from Wayne State University, Public Sector Consultants, and the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) review data submitted for each SPP indicator and the data for Section 618/*EDFacts* tables submitted in February and November each year to determine the extent to which all reported data are timely, complete and pass edit checks.

The OSE also:

- Provides explanations of year-to-year changes requested by the Data Accountability Center (DAC) on behalf of the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP).
- Reviews all formulas and instructions provided by the OSEP to assure that they are followed.

In order to comply with new and/or changes to data reporting requirements as soon as possible, the OSE representatives routinely participate in the OSEP and North Central Regional Resource Center technical assistance (TA) calls, the DAC/OSEP Data Managers' communications, the OSEP Leadership Conferences and the Educational Information Management Advisory Consortium.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets:

a. Reports and data are submitted on or before due dates.		
FFY	Baseline	Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100%	
2006 (2006-2007) through 2013 (2013-2014)		100%

b. Reports and data are accurate.		
FFY	Baseline	Target
2005 (2005-2006)	90.0%	
2006 (2006-2007) through 2013 (2013-2014)		100%

Source: Michigan Due Process Database, Michigan Hearings Database, Michigan Mediation Database, Single Record Student Database, Michigan Student Data System (MSDS), Michigan Compliance Information System (MI-CIS), Registry of Educational Personnel, Michigan Educational Assessment System, the OSE Financial Databases

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Timelines	Activities	Resources
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2011-2014 <i>Revised 2/1/12</i>	1. Follow and enforce submission deadlines.	OSE PR and Administration Units, OSE Determinations Team
2011-2014 <i>Revised 2/1/13</i>	2. Continue to distribute widely, teach about and use the MI School Data portal and District Data Portraits to help districts understand/improve their data.	OSE PR Unit, CEPI
CLARIFY/EXAMINE/DEVELOP POLICIES AND PROCEDURES		
2011-2014 <i>Revised 2/1/12</i>	3. Implement internal processes and revise business rules to ensure timely and accurate data reporting.	OSE PR Unit, CEPI, OSE Determinations Team
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2011-2014 <i>Revised 2/1/13</i>	4. Continue providing TA to districts' data personnel to improve accuracy and timeliness of reporting.	OSE PR Unit, CEPI

Please see Michigan's comprehensive SPP for all historical information which dates back to 2005 at http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_6598_31834---,00.html.

Acronyms Used in the SPP Extension

ALJ	Administrative Law Judge
AMO	Annual Measurable Objectives
APR	Annual Performance Report
AYP	Adequate Yearly Progress
BAA	Bureau of Assessment and Accountability
CADRE	Consortium for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education
CAP	Corrective Action Plan
CEPI	Center for Educational Performance and Information
CIMS	Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System Team
CCRESA	Clinton County Regional Education Service Area
CSPR	Consolidated State Performance Report
DAC	Data Accountability Center (through 9/30/12)
ECSE	Early Childhood Special Education
ECE&FS	Early Childhood Education & Family Services
ECO	Early Childhood Outcomes
ELA	English Language Arts
ESEA	<i>Elementary and Secondary Education Act</i>
FAPE	Free Appropriate Public Education
FFY	Federal Fiscal Year
GSRP	Great Start Readiness Program
IA	Interdepartmental Agreement
IDEA	<i>Individuals with Disabilities Education Act</i>
IEP	Individualized Education Program
ISD	Intermediate School District
LRE	Least Restrictive Environment
MAHS	Michigan Administrative Hearing System
MAP	Mandated Activities Project
MARSE	Michigan Administrative Rules for Special Education
MDE	Michigan Department of Education
MEAP	Michigan Educational Assessment Program
MiBLSi	Michigan's Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative
MI-CIS	Michigan Compliance Information System
MI-TOP	Michigan Transition Outcomes Project
MME	Michigan Merit Examination
MSDS	Michigan Student Data System
MSEMP	Michigan Special Education Mediation Program
MTSS	Multi-tiered System of Support
NCES	National Center for Education Statistics
NCSEAM	National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring
NDPC-SD	National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities
NGA	National Governors Association
NSTTAC	National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center
OGS	Office of Great Start
OSE	Office of Special Education
OSEP	Office of Special Education Programs
PA	Program Accountability
PR	Performance Reporting
PSC	Public Sector Consultants
REC	Regular Early Childhood
RTSL	Reaching and Teaching Struggling Learners
SEAC	Special Education Advisory Committee

SPP Extension - Part B

Michigan

SPP	State Performance Plan
SRSD	Single Record Student Database
TA	Technical Assistance
USED	United States Department of Education
WRR	Weighted Risk Ratio
WSU	Wayne State University