

# **STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B**

**for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education  
Act**

**For reporting on  
FFY 2021**

**Michigan**



**PART B DUE February 1, 2023**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

# Table of Contents

Introduction.....	5
Intro - Indicator Data .....	5
Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions .....	13
Intro - OSEP Response.....	15
Intro - Required Actions .....	15
Indicator 1: Graduation .....	16
1 - Indicator Data .....	16
1 - Prior FFY Required Actions.....	19
1 - OSEP Response.....	19
1 - Required Actions.....	19
Indicator 2: Drop Out .....	20
2 - Indicator Data .....	20
2 - Prior FFY Required Actions.....	23
2 - OSEP Response.....	23
2 - Required Actions.....	23
Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs .....	24
3A - Indicator Data .....	24
3A - Prior FFY Required Actions .....	29
3A - OSEP Response .....	29
3A - Required Actions .....	29
Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards).....	30
3B - Indicator Data .....	30
3B - Prior FFY Required Actions .....	36
3B - OSEP Response .....	36
3B - Required Actions .....	36
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards).....	37
3C - Indicator Data .....	37
3C - Prior FFY Required Actions .....	43
3C - OSEP Response .....	43
3C - Required Actions .....	43
Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards).....	44
3D - Indicator Data .....	44
3D - Prior FFY Required Actions .....	48
3D - OSEP Response .....	48
3D - Required Actions .....	48
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion.....	49
4A - Indicator Data .....	50
4A - Prior FFY Required Actions .....	53
4A - OSEP Response .....	53
4A - Required Actions .....	53
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion.....	54
4B - Indicator Data .....	55
4B - Prior FFY Required Actions .....	58
4B - OSEP Response .....	58
4B- Required Actions .....	58

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21) .....	59
5 - Indicator Data .....	59
5 - Prior FFY Required Actions.....	62
5 - OSEP Response.....	62
5 - Required Actions.....	62
Indicator 6: Preschool Environments .....	63
6 - Indicator Data .....	64
6 - Prior FFY Required Actions.....	67
6 - OSEP Response.....	67
6 - Required Actions.....	67
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes.....	68
7 - Indicator Data .....	69
7 - Prior FFY Required Actions.....	75
7 - OSEP Response.....	75
7 - Required Actions.....	75
Indicator 8: Parent involvement .....	76
8 - Indicator Data .....	77
8 - Prior FFY Required Actions.....	82
8 - OSEP Response.....	82
8 - Required Actions.....	82
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation.....	84
9 - Indicator Data .....	85
9 - Prior FFY Required Actions.....	87
9 - OSEP Response.....	87
9 - Required Actions.....	87
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories.....	88
10 - Indicator Data.....	89
10 - Prior FFY Required Actions.....	92
10 - OSEP Response.....	92
10 - Required Actions.....	92
Indicator 11: Child Find.....	93
11 - Indicator Data.....	94
11 - Prior FFY Required Actions.....	98
11 - OSEP Response.....	99
11 - Required Actions.....	99
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition .....	100
12 - Indicator Data.....	101
12 - Prior FFY Required Actions.....	105
12 - OSEP Response.....	106
12 - Required Actions.....	106
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition .....	107
13 - Indicator Data.....	108
13 - Prior FFY Required Actions.....	110
13 - OSEP Response.....	110
13 - Required Actions.....	110
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes.....	112
14 - Indicator Data.....	115

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions.....	121
14 - OSEP Response.....	121
14 - Required Actions.....	121
Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions.....	122
15 - Indicator Data.....	122
15 - Prior FFY Required Actions.....	124
15 - OSEP Response.....	124
15 - Required Actions.....	124
Indicator 16: Mediation .....	125
16 - Indicator Data.....	125
16 - Prior FFY Required Actions.....	127
16 - OSEP Response.....	127
16 - Required Actions.....	127
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan .....	128
17 - Indicator Data.....	130
17 - Prior FFY Required Actions.....	146
17 - OSEP Response.....	146
17 - Required Actions.....	146
Certification .....	147

## **Introduction**

### **Instructions**

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

### **Intro - Indicator Data**

#### **Executive Summary**

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

Since 2016, MDE OSE has been developing an increased awareness and understanding of the role of intermediate school districts (ISDs) as sub-recipients of the IDEA grant funds. This has led MDE OSE to continue to broaden and refine the general supervision system. This work has been ongoing in coordination and with cooperation of ISDs through regularly scheduled meetings of MDE OSE and ISD directors of special education and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup representing ISDs, member districts, and other stakeholders.

OSEP supports states increasing the focus on improving student outcomes through the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). This multi-year plan requires states to focus resources and collaborative efforts to address a data-based area of state concern regarding the performance of students with an IEP. The SSIP includes baseline data, targets, and a comprehensive plan for improving the outcomes of students as well as an evaluation plan. As outlined in the SSIP, MDE has used this opportunity to take a comprehensive approach to system change by strategically expanding the SSIP work as an MDE cross-office effort. In partnership with internal and external stakeholders, MDE identified guiding principles in organizing this effort. This strategic effort is a department-wide plan, titled Michigan's Top 10 Strategic Education Plan.

In February 2021, Governor Whitmer signed Executive Order 2021-02, to create the Student Recovery Advisory Council of Michigan. The task of the advisory council is to create guidance to help local school leaders and educators build comprehensive, evidence-based, and equity-driven local recovery plans to emerge from the COVID-19 pandemic. The Student Recovery Advisory Council of Michigan's report and [MI Blueprint for Comprehensive Student Recovery](#), provide key strategies for school districts and policymakers to help Michigan's children rebound after the challenges to their education during the COVID-19 pandemic. Four of the report's recommendations directly tie to three goals of the state's Top 10 Strategic Education Plan— expand early childhood learning opportunities, increase the number of certified teachers in areas of shortage, and provide adequate and equitable school funding. In addition, the governor and the legislature worked together on a budget to support the state's Top 10 Strategic Education Plan goals. The fiscal year 2023 school aid

budget negotiated by Governor Whitmer and the state legislature will help Michigan students and schools improve.

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

The combination of COVID and the increased challenge staff shortages have presented, the MDE OSE did recognize educational effects from this continuing pandemic. MDE OSE is committed to continuing to better understand challenges to effective implementation and to work to support districts in complying with the requirements of the IDEA, while improving educational results and functional outcomes.

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

The MDE OSE with broad stakeholder input sets targets for results indicators. Stakeholders include the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) which is Michigan's state advisory panel to the State Board of Education and MDE, a statewide data advisory committee, the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup, and other school administrators and parents. Compliance indicator targets, set by the OSEP, are either zero or 100% depending on the indicators.

#### **Data on Processes & Results**

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

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

Michigan has 56 local educational agencies (LEAs) known as ISDs as well as the State of Michigan operated programs. State agencies are included in some SPP/APR indicators. The instances where state agencies are included will be noted in the specific indicator.

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

56

#### **General Supervision System:**

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

MDE OSE is working to more fully develop, implement & refine the 8 components of the MDE OSE General Supervision System as described below. The components of the SPP/APR, including the SSIP & Data on Results & Processes were described above. MDE OSE has developed a definition of monitoring to include both the improvement of results & compliance with IDEA. In this context, monitoring includes examinations of

educational results & functional outcomes, as well as compliance activities. Monitoring begins with examinations of data from various sources & across the programmatic, policy & fiscal areas.

### Integrated Monitoring

MDE OSE integrates monitoring activities across all components of the general supervision system. Multiple data sources & methods are used to monitor ISDs & member districts. Monitoring is seen as a proactive, preventive & corrective approach to improve results and compliance. The monitoring activities ensure continuous examinations of performance for results & compliance. Monitoring protocols focus on specific priority areas selected based on state performance & improvement needs.

### Policies, Procedures & Effective Implementation

Michigan & MDE OSE have policies, procedures & implementation strategies which align with & support the implementation of the IDEA & Michigan Administrative Rules for Special Education (MARSE). MDE OSE has been engaging in an ongoing process to ensure ISDs & member districts' procedures are in alignment with state policies & procedures to ensure a FAPE in the LRE. Interagency agreements or memoranda of understandings are used to facilitate efforts to coordinate across state & local agencies. Through the development of the SPP/APR, SSIP, MDE OSE continues to work to ensure alignment of policies, procedures & implementation strategies.

### Professional Learning & Development & TA

MDE OSE uses data, as well as input from stakeholders, to identify areas of universal need for TA & professional learning & development (PLD). MDE OSE uses several means of providing these services, including the MDE OSE website & Catamaran system. Catamaran is a system to support ISDs & districts analyze & interpret data & keep track of monitoring activities in a single location.

Catamaran reflects the priorities of the IDEA, the SPP & is aligned with the School Improvement Framework. MDE OSE also uses meetings with ISD directors of special education, professional organization meetings & conferences to provide universal TA. In addition to universal TA, specific TA is provided based on identified needs through compliance monitoring, dispute resolution & fiscal management activities. MDE OSE has also developed a Differentiated Framework of Supports to identify ISDs' needs in 4 specific categories 1. universal, 2. directed (low in compliance indicators), 3. targeted (low in select results indicators), or 4. intensive (low in both compliance & results indicators). Through the framework, the MDE offers ISDs support in data analysis through a data use & action process and one on one TA in areas of low compliance. MDE OSE also uses the framework to direct ISDs to accept TA when more intensive TA is warranted.

### Fiscal Accountability & Management

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

## Effective Dispute Resolution & Implementation of Evidence-based Practices

MDE OSE provides training & support for the timely resolution of complaints, mediations & due process actions. Information for all interested parties is provided through the [MDE OSE website](#), toll-free phone lines, email, electronic & paper versions of documents, coaching, mentoring, local, regional, & statewide learning opportunities, & training sessions. Several of MDE OSE IDEA grant-funded initiatives are directly informed dispute resolution activities. Providing mediation, facilitation & training services for working through disputes between districts & parents/guardians of students with an IEP, designed to ensure students with an IEP promptly receive the services needed to develop & succeed in school. Issues of concern are entered into & tracked through a state data system. Data are used to determine whether patterns or trends exist, identify districts for monitoring activities & ensure related corrective actions have been implemented & noncompliance has been corrected, consistent with OSEP memo 09-02.

## Improvement, Correction, Incentives & Sanctions

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

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

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

## Technical Assistance System:

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

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



needs are emerging. MDE OSE continues to develop resources and TA to specifically address these needs, as well as needs identified as universal across the state.

TA is available through multiple means. A universal method is Catamaran, a repository system where resources, such as written guidance, video webinars, links, and micro-TA presentations can be accessed by all ISDs and member districts. Universal TA is also available through Michigan Virtual University, the MDE website, and the MDE OSE specific section of the website. Also, information is provided about resources available at OSEP funded TA centers' websites. For additional information, reference the PLD/TA description in the General Supervision section, as well as Professional Development System section below.

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

### **Professional Development System:**

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

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

- [MDE, Low Incidence Outreach](#) (MDE-LIO) supports the needs of ISDs and member districts in improving the quality of education for students who have visual impairments and for students who are either deaf or hard of hearing.
- [Michigan's Multi-Tiered System of Supports](#) (MiMTSS) TA center previously Michigan's Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative (MIBLSI), an OSEP Part D State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG), works on behalf of the MDE to provide a continuum of TA to ISDs, member districts, and schools in a MTSS framework.
- [The Statewide Autism Resources and Training Project](#) (START) works with schools, community partners and families to support students with autism spectrum disorder to become active, engaged members of their schools and local communities.
- [The Michigan Alliance for Families](#) (MAF), an OSEP funded Parent Training and Information Center, provides information, support, and education to parents whose children receive special education services, from birth to age 26.
- [The Special Education Mediation Services](#) (SEMS) is the federally funded mediation center which provides mediation and facilitation services at no cost for parents, ISDs and member districts.
- [The Alt+Shift](#) provides professional learning opportunities, resources, tiered TA, and implementation support.

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

## **Broad Stakeholder Input:**

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

MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms including in-person and virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys, and the use of virtual discussion rooms. MDE OSE conducted presentations for Indicator 2 Dropout and allowed stakeholders to breakout into groups to have a deeper discussion about the data and targets so that attendees could provide informed feedback on targets.

MDE OSE developed a schedule to systematically present the stakeholders with performance and progress data on indicators with the intent of ensuring everyone had a context for discussion. Content experts were available to answer questions and provide additional detail. Using this base of understanding, MDE OSE went through each indicator reviewing previous targets, rationales, and possible ways to approach target setting. For in-depth discussion, breakout rooms were used when holding virtual meetings. Each breakout room had MDE OSE staff and content experts to facilitate the discussion.

MDE OSE used [Special Education Advisory Committee \(SEAC\)](#) as the primary stakeholder group. In addition to the agendas and minutes of meetings, presentations used in seeking stakeholder input are on this website. The location of these presentations was also shared with the ISD Directors of Special Education at a regularly scheduled meeting providing additional geographic representation. Other stakeholders groups include MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board, ISD Directors of Special Education, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD Directors of Special Education, member district directors of special education, attendees of the ISD Collaborative Conference, and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP.

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

YES

## **Number of Parent Members:**

129

## **Parent Members Engagement:**

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

MDE OSE developed and implemented plans to engage stakeholders in target setting for the FFY 2020–2025 SPP/APR. As noted above, time has been spent on planning for and facilitating monthly meetings with the SEAC, where stakeholders, including parents of students with disabilities, were guided through intentional conversations designed to develop a greater understanding of each indicator and the trends over time, to enable stakeholders to provide informed feedback and input including improvement strategies.

The SEAC is a diverse group made up of at least 51% parents of children with disabilities representing several ISDs across the state. The SEAC's membership consists of approximately 68 representatives with a race/ethnicity breakdown of 78%--White, 12%--African American, 5%--Native American, 3%--Asian and 3%--Hispanic. The MDE OSE team continues the work of planning and developing processes to share information and obtain meaningful input from stakeholders across the state, seeking input representative of the

racial/ethnic populations, various geographic locations of Michigan including gender, age and educational backgrounds. In fact, SEAC has identified action steps the group can implement to achieve greater diversity. These steps include marketing representation when reaching out to organizations for new delegates/member at-large, actively recruiting parents who work in school districts and/or have children with various disabilities, targeting specific regions with low representation through a marketing campaign and encouraging liaisons to intentionally connect with other groups throughout Michigan to bring diversity to the table without requiring membership. These steps are designed to build capacity to gather diverse perspectives from Michigan's parents on not only target setting but improvement strategies as well. The MDE OSE plans on meeting with SEAC and Michigan Alliance for Families (MAF) throughout the year bringing data and sharing information to determine whether targets are reasonable yet rigorous.

Additionally, MDE OSE provided attendees of the ISD Collaborative Conference with information on the SPP/APR with a focus on Indicators 1 and 2. MDE OSE elicited input and feedback from the group. MDE OSE presented a historical overview of the SPP/APR as well as current requirements for the FFY 2020–2025 submission. MDE OSE provided analyzed data to show trends, projections, and the rationale for projections. MDE OSE provided detailed information to stakeholders including definitions from the OSEP indicator measurement table and other relevant state-level data ahead of monthly meetings as homework for participants to attend meetings as informed participants. Surveys were provided to gather feedback and recommendations on the proposed indicator targets.

MDE OSE also presented to the Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education (MAASE), the Michigan Intermediate Special Education Directors and the Michigan Alliance for Families (MAF) is Michigan's Parent Training Information Center. MDE OSE and MAF are planning for continued and expanded parent involvement in stakeholder activities. PowerPoints are available publicly on the Michigan Department of Education's [SEAC Function 3 webpage](#) along with a summary document with all Results targets set through FFY 2025 based on stakeholder input gathered. MDE OSE also provided updates to these groups on the historical trends in the SPP/APR data, as well as activities the MDE OSE, grant funded initiatives, and MDE are undertaking to improve results for students with an IEP and increase compliance with IDEA and MARSE. Input was provided by these stakeholder groups using a variety of methods, most commonly in the form of discussions and surveys including interactive polls at regularly scheduled meetings. This is a continuous process. The tasks requested of these groups were related to the reviewing of baselines and targets, assisting in determining an appropriate State-identified Measurable Result for the SSIP, and providing input regarding strategic improvement activities to improve outcomes for students with an IEP. Individuals were engaged in asking questions about the data and trends, target setting, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

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

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

MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms including in-person and virtual meetings. MDE OSE created summary information documents which included user friendly data displays, definitions of the indicators, and historical context ahead of meetings as homework to prepare for rich discussions. In Spring 2022, MDE OSE conducted presentations for Indicator 2 Dropout and allowed stakeholders to breakout into groups to have a deeper discussion about the data and targets so that attendees could provide informed feedback on targets. The impact of attendees including parents being able to review information ahead of the meeting led to meaningful input of resetting targets for Indicator 2 Dropout.

MDE OSE developed a schedule to systematically present the stakeholders with performance and progress data on indicators with the intent of ensuring everyone had a context for discussion. Content experts were available to answer questions and provide additional detail. Using this base of understanding, MDE OSE went

through each indicator reviewing previous targets, rationales, and possible ways to approach target setting. For in-depth discussion, breakout rooms were used when holding virtual meetings. Each breakout room had MDE OSE staff and content experts to facilitate the discussion.

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

### **Soliciting Public Input:**

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

As has been noted, MDE OSE sought stakeholder input through multiple means and mechanisms. MDE OSE engaged stakeholders in target setting for the FFY 2020–2025 SPP/APR. As part of the ongoing process for continuous target review, MDE OSE engaged stakeholders specifically for Indicator 2 Dropout in FFY 2021. Time was spent planning and facilitating monthly meetings with the SEAC, where stakeholders, including parents of students with disabilities, were guided through intentional conversations to develop a greater understanding of the indicators and the trends over time. Each meeting provided opportunities for feedback and input. Additionally, the MDE OSE will continue to engage SEAC throughout the year by providing updated data and gathering input on ways to continue to improve student outcomes on both results and compliance indicators. Throughout the process, SEAC and MDE OSE will determine when and if SPP targets need to be revised and if existing improvement activities need to be revised or new improvement activities need to be developed. As noted above, the MDE OSE will also work more closely with MAF to broaden and extend the outreach to parents of children with disabilities and seek public input. Also as noted above, public input was sought through presentations to MAASE, DAC, MAF, and ISD Directors.

### **Making Results Available to the Public:**

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

Additional information is publicly available by June 1 of each year through the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) Target Setting section [SEAC Function 3 webpage](#). SEAC meeting agendas and minutes are publicly posted on this site. Historical meeting minutes which include details on the review of the results indicators along with the input provided by attendees. In addition, a summary document with all Results targets set through FFY 2025 based on stakeholder input gathered is available at the [MDE OSE SEAC website](#).

## Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2020 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2020 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2020 APR in 2022, is available.

MDE OSE 2022 IDEA public reporting on the performance of ISDs and member districts can be found on the [MI School Data portal for Special Education Public Reporting Selected Indicator Reports](#) and the [MDE OSE website](#). MDE OSE posted these data the last week of May 2022. MDE OSE also posts the current SPP/APR, including the SSIP, on the Annual Performance Report section of the [MDE OSE SPP/APR website](#).

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

### Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

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

### Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

Michigan Department of Education's Determination Response

Summary:

MDE received the federal determination of "needs assistance" for its annual performance rating on meeting the requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, or IDEA, Part B for the FFY 2020. The MDE's score increased from 70.00% to 75.00%. This is the highest score Michigan has received since 2014, when the federal government moved to results-driven accountability. Overall, the five-year growth rate for Michigan is 15.83 percentage points. Work continues to improve the results elements, such as graduation rate, dropout rate, time students spend in the general education setting, and implementation of evidence-based practices, as well as for compliance.

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

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

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

MDE OSE staff searched the [OSEP Ideas That Work website](#) and the [IDEA Data center website](#) for TA documents addressing the identified areas. In addition, Michigan attended multiple webinar and professional



learning opportunities provided by the IDC and other national TA centers. The MDE OSE works with identified ISDs to improve dropout rates and look at promising practices.

#### MDE OSE Response to the Elements (Graduation and Dropout)

Graduation and dropout are of educational concern for all students, not just for students with an IEP. Therefore, MDE is addressing this concern in conjunction with the work of the MDE OSE.

MDE OSE accessed tools and resources for Part B SPP Indicator 1 Graduation from the [National TA Center on Transition for Graduation & Dropout](#). Michigan provided TA to ISDs on the use of personal curriculums as a way to meet the Michigan Merit Curriculum requirements. This allows students to meet graduation requirements in a multitude of ways and thus receive a regular high school diploma. MDE OSE has some preliminary evidence that implementing personal curriculum has a positive effect on the likelihood of students with an IEP graduating with a regular diploma.

MDE OSE also accessed tools and resources for Part B SPP Indicator 2 Dropout from the NTACT website.

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

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

Actions taken by the MDE as a result of the TA include:

- The MDE OSE created multiple TA resources to address graduation, dropout and statewide assessment. MDE OSE created guidance documents on personal curriculum, including providing data to ISDs on the use of personal curriculum use in individual districts to ensure proper use and increase graduation rate and decrease dropout rate. MDE OSE created webinars on exit codes to ensure districts are properly entering student exit data in data systems to accurately reflect students exit status. MDE OSE also created guidance documents on the appropriate use of alternate assessments.
- The Deputy Superintendent for P-20 System and Student Transitions is leading work being done with the ISDs and member districts across the state and at the MDE to improve results and compliance.
- A steering committee and four work groups have worked to generate and implement recommendations designed to lead to continued improvements in graduation and dropout rates, participation in Michigan's general education state-wide assessment, named the M-STEP, and national NAEP test results and participation. The MDE OSE also participates monthly in the National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO) calls where alternate assessments are discussed along with activities for ensuring higher expectations. Michigan has raised expectations for over 3,000 students with an IEP over the last 4 years who now may be on track to graduate with a diploma.

MDE OSE continued to focus TA efforts by utilizing the MDE OSE Data Use and Action Process with selected ISDs to determine root causes and develop strategies to improve dropout and graduation rates among the lowest performing ISDs in the state. Similarly, MDE OSE used the data use process to analyze discipline data to target low performing ISDs and conduct root cause analysis and develop improvement activities to decrease exclusionary discipline and improve student outcomes. MDE also provides TA to ISDs using a Michigan

designed discipline toolkit. The discipline toolkit is a comprehensive tool which uses data analysis to drive root cause analysis and change adult behavior to decrease suspension and expulsion. The Discipline Toolkit along with other resources can be found at the [Catamaran Discipline Resource page](#). Additionally, MDE OSE provides opportunities for ISDs to share exemplars of model practices to one another to increase performance in Results and Compliance areas.

#### **Intro - OSEP Response**

The State's determinations for both 2021 and 2022 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 24, 2022, determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

#### **Intro - Required Actions**

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2022 and 2023 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2023 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2024, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

## Indicator 1: Graduation

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

### Data Source

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

### Measurement

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

### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

### 1 - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data<sup>1</sup>

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	70.78%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	70.78%
Data	64.15%	65.34%	63.53%	64.26%	70.78%

<sup>1</sup> Prior to the FFY 2020 submission, the State used a different data source to report data under this indicator.



## Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	70.78%	70.78%	70.78%	72.30%	73.50%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms including in-person and virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys, and the use of virtual discussion rooms. MDE OSE conducted presentations for Indicator 2 Dropout and allowed stakeholders to breakout into groups to have a deeper discussion about the data and targets so that attendees could provide informed feedback on targets.

MDE OSE developed a schedule to systematically present the stakeholders with performance and progress data on indicators with the intent of ensuring everyone had a context for discussion. Content experts were available to answer questions and provide additional detail. Using this base of understanding, MDE OSE went through each indicator reviewing previous targets, rationales, and possible ways to approach target setting. For in-depth discussion, breakout rooms were used when holding virtual meetings. Each breakout room had MDE OSE staff and content experts to facilitate the discussion.

MDE OSE used Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) as the primary stakeholder group. Information about the SEAC can be found at [SEAC website](#). In addition to the agendas and minutes of meetings, presentations used in seeking stakeholder input are on this website. The location of these presentations was also shared with the ISD Directors of Special Education at a regularly scheduled meeting providing additional geographic representation. Other stakeholders groups include MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board, ISD Directors of Special Education, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD Directors of Special Education, member district directors of special education, attendees of the ISD Collaborative Conference, and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	8,375
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	979
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	23

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	2,783

#### FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
8,375	12,160	70.78%	70.78%	68.87%	Did not meet target	Slippage

#### Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

MDE OSE reviewed the methodology and procedures used to create the data and found no anomalies. Additional analysis of the data did not identify any discernable pattern that would explain the slippage occurred other than the continued potential impact of the Covid-19 pandemic. During the 2020- 21 school year, some districts continued remote instruction which may have impacted enrollment. There were over 400 fewer students in the denominator of this indicator calculation compared to the prior year. Even as there were no specific changes to legislation, the May 2020 Executive Order from the Governor, included a recommendation for students not be held back due to closures, which could have inflated the graduation rate.

Additionally, students may be continuing education for another year after returning to school post pandemic.

#### Graduation Conditions

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

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

The 18 required credits are based on proficiency in state content standards for content areas:

- 4 credits English language arts
- 4 credits math
- 3 credits science
- 3 credits social studies
- 1 credit physical education and health
- 1 credit visual, performing, and applied arts
- 2 credits world languages (or equivalent learning experience in grades K-12 (1 credit)
- Online learning experience course, learning or integrated learning experience

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

NO

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

The COVID-19 pandemic has had an impact on statewide graduation rates. During the 2020-21 school year, some districts continued remote instruction which may have impacted overall enrollment.

**1 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**1 - OSEP Response**

**1 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 2: Drop Out

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

### Data Source

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

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

### Measurement

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

### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a

state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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

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

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

## 2 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2021	22.89%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target <=	8.75%	8.50%	8.25%	8.25%	8.25%
Data	7.06%	6.76%	6.86%	6.66%	5.46%

## Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	22.89%	22.89%	22.89%	21.89%	19.89%

## Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms including in-person and virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys, and the use of virtual discussion rooms. MDE OSE conducted presentations for Indicator 2 Dropout and allowed stakeholders to breakout into groups to have a deeper discussion about the data and targets so that attendees could provide informed feedback on targets.

MDE OSE developed a schedule to systematically present the stakeholders with performance and progress data on indicators with the intent of ensuring everyone had a context for discussion. Content experts were available to answer questions and provide additional detail. Using this base of understanding, MDE OSE went through each indicator reviewing previous targets, rationales, and possible ways to approach target setting. For in-depth discussion, breakout rooms were used when holding virtual meetings. Each breakout room had MDE OSE staff and content experts to facilitate the discussion.

MDE OSE used Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) as the primary stakeholder group. Information about the SEAC can be found at [SEAC website](#). In addition to the agendas and minutes of meetings, presentations used in seeking stakeholder input are on this website. The location of these presentations was also shared with the ISD Directors of Special Education at a regularly scheduled meeting providing additional geographic representation. Other stakeholders groups include MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board, ISD Directors of Special Education, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD Directors of Special Education, member district directors of special education, attendees of the ISD Collaborative Conference, and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP.

Additional stakeholder input for Indicator 2 Dropout targets was sought during the MAASE ISD Collaborative meeting which included gathering survey feedback.

## Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	8,375
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	979
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	23
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	2,783

## FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
2,783	12,160	5.46%	22.89%	22.89%	N/A	N/A

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

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

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

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

NO

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

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

Michigan requests to reset baseline and targets through FFY 2025 based on a change to the data source for reporting dropout rates. Per OSEP, all states must report using Option 1, EDFacts FS009 file.

## **2 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

## **2 - OSEP Response**

The State revised the baseline for this indicator using data from FFY 2021 and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State revised its FFY 2021 through FFY 2025 targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## **2 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

### Data Source

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

### Measurement

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

### Instructions

- Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.
- Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported. Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

### 3A - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	70.89%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	62.81%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	60.59%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	69.78%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	62.42%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	60.56%



## Targets

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

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms including in-person and virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys, and the use of virtual discussion rooms. MDE OSE conducted presentations for Indicator 2 Dropout and allowed stakeholders to breakout into groups to have a deeper discussion about the data and targets so that attendees could provide informed feedback on targets.

MDE OSE developed a schedule to systematically present the stakeholders with performance and progress data on indicators with the intent of ensuring everyone had a context for discussion. Content experts were available to answer questions and provide additional detail. Using this base of understanding, MDE OSE went through each indicator reviewing previous targets, rationales, and possible ways to approach target setting. For in-depth discussion, breakout rooms were used when holding virtual meetings. Each breakout room had MDE OSE staff and content experts to facilitate the discussion.

MDE OSE used Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) as the primary stakeholder group. Information about the SEAC can be found at [SEAC website](#). In addition to the agendas and minutes of meetings, presentations used in seeking stakeholder input are on this website. The location of these presentations was also shared with the ISD Directors of Special Education at a regularly scheduled meeting providing additional geographic representation. Other stakeholder groups include MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board, ISD Directors of Special Education, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD Directors of Special Education, member district directors of special education, attendees of the ISD Collaborative Conference, and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP.

All targets for participation rates are set at 95% for all students and subgroups and grade levels, consistent with stipulations under ESSA regarding required assessment rates.

## FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

### Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

### Date:

04/05/2023

### Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	14,458	13,971	11,929
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	12,013	5,710	1,296
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	289	5,380	7,415
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1,706	1,633	1,711

### Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

### Date:

04/05/2023

### Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	14,467	14,007	11,959
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	10,302	5,595	1,195
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	1,979	5,503	7,516
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1,755	1,700	1,837

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

## FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	14,008	14,458	70.89%	95.00%	96.89%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	12,723	13,971	62.81%	95.00%	91.07%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	10,422	11,929	60.59%	95.00%	87.37%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

## FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	14,036	14,467	69.78%	95.00%	97.02%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	12,798	14,007	62.42%	95.00%	91.37%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	10,548	11,959	60.56%	95.00%	88.20%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

## Regulatory Information

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

## Public Reporting Information

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

For more information about Michigan's Student Test of Educational Progress (M-STEP) and historical assessment data numbers of students with disabilities and without who take the general assessments use the following URL link at the [K-12<sup>th</sup> Grade Landing Page on MI School Data](#). A specific grade is needed to request sub-group demographic results for the regular assessments. After selecting a specific grade, then results on M-Step, PSAT, and SAT allow for selection of students with an IEP among other subgroups, and this information can be tallied up at the school building, district, ISD, or state level. The following is a direct link to an example of state data [Grades 3-8 State Testing Data Performance](#).

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

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

Annual Special Education public reporting can be found within the [MI School Data portal Summary](#). There are two choices for viewing data on the public reporting website:

1. Downloadable Special Education (Part B) Public Reporting Excel Spreadsheets are available for ISDs and member districts on the Special Education Summary tab. This Excel spreadsheet contains data for all required indicators for all ISDs and member districts (data are masked).
2. Run Indicator Reports
  - a. On the Indicator Report Summary tab, select an ISD
  - b. Select either All Districts for data on the entire ISD or select any member district within the ISD from dropdown menu
  - c. Select the Report Year
  - d. Click on the “View Results” button at the bottom of the page

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

This is a direct link to an example of a school district for Indicator 3 on [MI School Data Selected Indicator Reports](#). To select a different district, select Edit Report at top left. Use drop down menu for Member District or use blue Location Search. FFY 2020 Public reporting was made available in May 2022. New FFY 2021 data will be publicly posted by June 1, 2023.

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

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

Michigan continues to see a return to pre-pandemic levels participation rates. While overall across all grades, around 95% of students participated in assessments last year, participation levels have not quite bounced back fully in our middle and high school grades. Additionally, chronic absenteeism for all students was much greater last year than in previous years, and this is especially true for upper grade levels, and this is likely contributing to suppressed participation rates for students with an IEP. Michigan expects that participation rates will continue to improve over the next couple of years, as the residual impact of the pandemic continues to ebb.

### **3A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

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

### **Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

Michigan has provided links in the Public Reporting Information section with details to access Michigan's publicly posted FFY 2020 SPP/APR data.

### **3A - OSEP Response**

### **3A - Required Actions**

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

### **Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

### **Data Source**

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

### **Measurement**

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

### **Instructions**

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

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

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

### **3B - Indicator Data**

#### **Historical Data:**

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Group</b>	<b>Group Name</b>	<b>Baseline Year</b>	<b>Baseline Data</b>
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	15.69%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	23.00%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	13.97%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	13.53%

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	8.02%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	5.09%

## Targets

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

## Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms including in-person and virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys, and the use of virtual discussion rooms. MDE OSE conducted presentations for Indicator 2 Dropout and allowed stakeholders to breakout into groups to have a deeper discussion about the data and targets so that attendees could provide informed feedback on targets.

MDE OSE developed a schedule to systematically present the stakeholders with performance and progress data on indicators with the intent of ensuring everyone had a context for discussion. Content experts were available to answer questions and provide additional detail. Using this base of understanding, MDE OSE went through each indicator reviewing previous targets, rationales, and possible ways to approach target setting. For in-depth discussion, breakout rooms were used when holding virtual meetings. Each breakout room had MDE OSE staff and content experts to facilitate the discussion.

MDE OSE used Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) as the primary stakeholder group. Information about the SEAC can be found at [SEAC website](#). In addition to the agendas and minutes of meetings, presentations used in seeking stakeholder input are on this website. The location of these presentations was also shared with the ISD Directors of Special Education at a regularly scheduled meeting providing additional geographic representation. Other stakeholder groups include MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board, ISD Directors of Special Education, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD Directors of Special Education, member district directors of special education, attendees of the ISD Collaborative Conference, and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP.

Stakeholders were provided with a range of possible targets over time, based on typical performance and annual change for five other states most demographically similar to Michigan, and based on typical annual change observed within Michigan over the past 15 years. These data were used to gauge several data-informed, plausible ranges of improvement that might be possible, given historical trends and baselines.

## FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

### Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

### Date:

04/05/2023

### Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	12,302	11,090	8,711
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,074	1,286	202
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	40	973	887

### Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

### Date:

04/05/2023

### Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	12,281	11,098	8,711
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,762	599	68
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	48	378	267



## FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	2,114	12,302	15.69%	15.70%	17.18%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	2,259	11,090	23.00%	23.00%	20.37%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	1,089	8,711	13.97%	14.00%	12.50%	Did not meet target	Slippage

### Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

Results from the spring 2022 Michigan Student Test of Educational Progress (M-STEP) assessments showed scores increased at the 4th grade level and declined at the middle and high school levels in Reading. For the most part, the results showed a leveling-off after the declines in spring 2021 scores relative to pre-pandemic levels. What Michigan is experiencing at this point in the pandemic is similar to what is transpiring in many other states. Educators, parents, students, and other family members have worked together to reduce the effects on students of the COVID pandemic this past school year, However, despite the great efforts of students, educators, and community members, our schools have not yet returned to pre-pandemic achievement levels. Michigan is still struggling with profound staffing shortages which existed prior to, and were exacerbated by, the pandemic—shortages.

### Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

Results from the spring 2022 Michigan Student Test of Educational Progress (M-STEP) assessments showed scores increased at the 4th grade level and declined at the middle and high school levels in Reading. For the most part, the results showed a leveling-off after the declines in spring 2021 scores relative to pre-pandemic levels. What Michigan is experiencing at this point in the pandemic is similar to what is transpiring in many other states. Educators, parents, students, and other family members have worked together to reduce the effects on students of the COVID pandemic this past school year, However, despite the great efforts of students, educators, and community members, our schools have not yet returned to pre-pandemic achievement levels. Michigan is still struggling with profound staffing shortages which existed prior to, and were exacerbated by, the pandemic—shortages.

## FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,810	12,281	13.53%	13.80%	14.74%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	977	11,098	8.02%	8.02%	8.80%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	335	8,711	5.09%	5.50%	3.85%	Did not meet target	Slippage

### Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

Results from the spring 2022 Michigan Student Test of Educational Progress (M-STEP) assessments showed scores increased at both the 4th and 8th grade levels and declined at the high school level in Math. The baseline school year for 2021 was missing roughly one quarter of all students, and proficiency rates are only now beginning to reflect results for all districts. As a result, Michigan expects that this year would be somewhat different from the baseline year, which we believe may have been skewed. For the most part, the results showed a leveling-off after the declines in spring 2021 scores relative to pre-pandemic levels. What Michigan is experiencing at this point in the pandemic is similar to what is transpiring in many other states. Educators, parents, students, and other family members have worked together to reduce the effects on students of the COVID pandemic this past school year. However, despite the great efforts of students, educators, and community members, our schools have not yet returned to pre-pandemic achievement levels. Michigan is still struggling with profound staffing shortages which existed prior to, and were exacerbated by, the pandemic-shortages.

### Regulatory Information

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

### Public Reporting Information

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

For more information about Michigan's Student Test of Educational Progress (M-STEP) and historical assessment data numbers of students with disabilities and without who take the general assessments use the

following URL link at the [K-12<sup>th</sup> Grade Landing Page on MI School Data](#). A specific grade is needed to request sub-group demographic results for the regular assessments. After selecting a specific grade, then results on M-Step, PSAT, and SAT allow for selection of students with an IEP among other subgroups, and this information can be tallied up at the school building, district, ISD, or state level. The following is a direct link to an example of state data [Grades 3-8 State Testing Data Performance](#).

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

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

Annual Special Education public reporting can be found within the [MI School Data portal Summary](#). There are two choices for viewing data on the public reporting website:

- Downloadable Special Education (Part B) Public Reporting Excel Spreadsheets are available for ISDs and member districts on the Special Education Summary tab. This Excel spreadsheet contains data for all required indicators for all ISDs and member districts (data are masked).
- Run Indicator Reports
  - On the Indicator Report Summary tab, select an ISD
  - Select either All Districts for data on the entire ISD or select any member district within the ISD from dropdown menu
  - Select the Report Year
  - Click on the “View Results” button at the bottom of the page

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

This is a direct link to an example of a school district for Indicator 3 on [MI School Data Selected Indicator Reports](#). To select a different district, select Edit Report at top left. Use drop down menu for Member District or use blue Location Search.

FFY 2020 Public reporting was made available in May 2022. New FFY 2021 data will be publicly posted by June 1, 2023.

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

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

### **3B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

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

### **Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

Michigan has provided links in the Public Reporting Information section with details to access Michigan's publicly posted FFY 2020 SPP/APR data.

### **3B - OSEP Response**

### **3B - Required Actions**

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

#### **Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

#### **Data Source**

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

#### **Measurement**

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

#### **Instructions**

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

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

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

#### **3C - Indicator Data**

##### **Historical Data:**

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Group</b>	<b>Group Name</b>	<b>Baseline Year</b>	<b>Baseline Data</b>
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	59.35%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	71.95%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	72.47%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	50.29%

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	52.80%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	61.19%

## Targets

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

## Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms including in-person and virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys, and the use of virtual discussion rooms. MDE OSE conducted presentations for Indicator 2 Dropout and allowed stakeholders to breakout into groups to have a deeper discussion about the data and targets so that attendees could provide informed feedback on targets.

MDE OSE developed a schedule to systematically present the stakeholders with performance and progress data on indicators with the intent of ensuring everyone had a context for discussion. Content experts were available to answer questions and provide additional detail. Using this base of understanding, MDE OSE went through each indicator reviewing previous targets, rationales, and possible ways to approach target setting. For in-depth discussion, breakout rooms were used when holding virtual meetings. Each breakout room had MDE OSE staff and content experts to facilitate the discussion.

MDE OSE used Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) as the primary stakeholder group. Information about the SEAC can be found at [SEAC website](#). In addition to the agendas and minutes of meetings, presentations used in seeking stakeholder input are on this website. The location of these presentations was also shared with the ISD Directors of Special Education at a regularly scheduled meeting providing additional geographic representation. Other stakeholder groups include MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board, ISD Directors of Special Education, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD Directors of Special Education, member district directors of special education, attendees of the ISD Collaborative Conference, and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP.

Stakeholders were provided with a range of possible targets over time based on similar states and the level of change in proficiency rates observed, to gauge several data-informed, plausible ranges of improvement that might be possible, given historical baseline trends.

## FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

### Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

### Date:

04/05/2023

### Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	1,706	1,633	1,711
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	1,064	1,086	1,162

### Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

### Date:

04/05/2023

### Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	1,755	1,700	1,837
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	831	811	1,122

## FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,064	1,706	59.35%	59.35%	62.37%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	1,086	1,633	71.95%	71.95%	66.50%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	1,162	1,711	72.47%	72.50%	67.91%	Did not meet target	Slippage

### Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

Results from the spring 2022 Michigan Student Test of Educational Progress (M-STEP) assessments showed scores increased at 4th and declined at both the 8th grade and high school levels in Reading. Several factors contribute to this trend; First older students missed out on more years of in-person instruction during the pandemic and this negatively impacts Math more than ELA; Second, the high proficiency rates for alternate achievement standards observed in past years should continue to trend downward as the overall volume of higher achieving students continues to trend downward, due to the ESSA 1% cap requirements for alternate assessments. These high alternate standard achieving students are now getting more opportunities to work towards grade level content, which should double their odds of going on to earn a diploma and improve their long-term college, career, and economic life outcomes. For the most part, the results showed a leveling-off after the declines in spring 2021 scores relative to pre-pandemic levels. What Michigan is experiencing at this point in the pandemic is similar to what is transpiring in many other states. Educators, parents, students, and other family members have worked together to reduce the effects on students of the COVID pandemic this past school year. However, despite the great efforts of students, educators, and community members, our schools have not yet returned to pre-pandemic achievement levels. Michigan is still struggling with profound staffing shortages which existed prior to, and were exacerbated by, the pandemic—shortages.

### Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

Results from the spring 2022 Michigan Student Test of Educational Progress (M-STEP) assessments showed scores increased at 4th and declined at both the 8th grade and high school levels in Reading. Several factors contribute to this trend; First older students missed out on more years of in-person instruction during the pandemic and this negatively impacts Math more than ELA; Second, the high proficiency rates for alternate achievement standards observed in past years should continue to trend downward as the overall volume of higher achieving students continues to trend downward, due to the ESSA 1% cap requirements for alternate assessments. These high alternate standard achieving students are now getting more opportunities to work towards grade level content, which should double their odds of going on to earn a diploma and improve their



long-term college, career, and economic life outcomes. For the most part, the results showed a leveling-off after the declines in spring 2021 scores relative to pre-pandemic levels. What Michigan is experiencing at this point in the pandemic is similar to what is transpiring in many other states. Educators, parents, students, and other family members have worked together to reduce the effects on students of the COVID pandemic this past school year. However, despite the great efforts of students, educators, and community members, our schools have not yet returned to pre-pandemic achievement levels. Michigan is still struggling with profound staffing shortages which existed prior to, and were exacerbated by, the pandemic—shortages.

#### FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	831	1,755	50.29%	50.30%	47.35%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	811	1,700	52.80%	52.80%	47.71%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	1,122	1,837	61.19%	61.19%	61.08%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

#### Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

Results from the spring 2022 Michigan Student Test of Educational Progress (M-STEP) assessments showed scores decreased at all levels in Math. Several factors contribute to this trend; First older students missed out on more years of in-person instruction during the pandemic and this negatively impacts Math more than ELA; Second, the high proficiency rates for alternate achievement standards observed in past years should continue to trend downward as the overall volume of higher achieving students continues to trend downward, due to the ESSA 1% cap requirements for alternate assessments. These high alternate standard achieving students are now getting more opportunities to work towards grade level content, which should double their odds of going on to earn a diploma and improve their long-term college, career, and economic life outcomes. For the most part, the results showed a leveling-off after the declines in spring 2021 scores relative to pre-pandemic levels. What Michigan is experiencing at this point in the pandemic is similar to what is transpiring in many other states. Educators, parents, students, and other family members have worked together to reduce the effects on students of the COVID pandemic this past school year. However, despite the great efforts of students, educators, and community members, our schools have not yet returned to pre-pandemic achievement levels. Michigan is still struggling with profound staffing shortages which existed prior to, and were exacerbated by, the pandemic—shortages.

## Regulatory Information

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

## Public Reporting Information

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

For more information about Michigan's Student Test of Educational Progress (M-STEP) and historical assessment data numbers of students with disabilities and without who take the general assessments use the following URL link at the [K-12<sup>th</sup> Grade Landing Page on MI School Data](#). A specific grade is needed to request sub-group demographic results for the regular assessments. After selecting a specific grade, then results on M-Step, PSAT, and SAT allow for selection of students with an IEP among other subgroups, and this information can be tallied up at the school building, district, ISD, or state level. The following is a direct link to an example of state data [Grades 3-8 State Testing Data Performance](#).

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

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

Annual Special Education public reporting can be found within the [MI School Data portal Summary](#). There are two choices for viewing data on the public reporting website:

1. Downloadable Special Education (Part B) Public Reporting Excel Spreadsheets are available for ISDs and member districts on the Special Education Summary tab. This Excel spreadsheet contains data for all required indicators for all ISDs and member districts (data are masked).
2. Run Indicator Reports
  - a. On the Indicator Report Summary tab, select an ISD
  - b. Select either All Districts for data on the entire ISD or select any member district within the ISD from dropdown menu
  - c. Select the Report Year
  - d. Click on the "View Results" button at the bottom of the page

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

This is a direct link to an example of a school district for Indicator 3 on [MI School Data Selected Indicator Reports](#). To select a different district, select Edit Report at top left. Use drop down menu for Member District or use blue Location Search. FFY 2020 Public reporting was made available in May 2022. New FFY 2021 data will be publicly posted by June 1, 2023.

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

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

#### **3C - Prior FFY Required Actions**

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

#### **Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

Michigan has provided links in the Public Reporting Information section with details to access Michigan's publicly posted FFY 2020 SPP/APR data.

#### **3C - OSEP Response**

#### **3C - Required Actions**

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

#### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

#### Instructions

- Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.
- Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.
- Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

#### 3D - Indicator Data

##### Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	28.60
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	40.66
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	42.34

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	23.04
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	28.00
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	29.18

## Targets

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

## Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms including in-person and virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys, and the use of virtual discussion rooms. MDE OSE conducted presentations for Indicator 2 Dropout and allowed stakeholders to breakout into groups to have a deeper discussion about the data and targets so that attendees could provide informed feedback on targets.

MDE OSE developed a schedule to systematically present the stakeholders with performance and progress data on indicators with the intent of ensuring everyone had a context for discussion. Content experts were available to answer questions and provide additional detail. Using this base of understanding, MDE OSE went through each indicator reviewing previous targets, rationales, and possible ways to approach target setting. For in-depth discussion, breakout rooms were used when holding virtual meetings. Each breakout room had MDE OSE staff and content experts to facilitate the discussion.

MDE OSE used Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) as the primary stakeholder group. Information about the SEAC can be found at [SEAC website](#). In addition to the agendas and minutes of meetings, presentations used in seeking stakeholder input are on this website. The location of these presentations was also shared with the ISD Directors of Special Education at a regularly scheduled meeting providing additional geographic representation. Other stakeholder groups include MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board, ISD Directors of Special Education, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD Directors of Special Education, member district directors of special education, attendees of the ISD Collaborative Conference, and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP.

Stakeholders were provided with a range of possible targets over time based on similar states and the level of change in proficiency rates observed, to gauge several data-informed, plausible ranges of improvement that might be possible, given historical baseline trends.

## FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

### Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

### Date:

04/05/2023

### Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	96,679	100,178	94,827
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	12,302	11,090	8,711
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	41,971	58,118	46,552
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	45	1,801	2,623
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,074	1,286	202
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	40	973	887

### Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

### Date:

04/05/2023

## Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	96,785	100,227	94,831
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	12,281	11,098	8,711
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	35,494	35,510	27,373
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	55	829	1,208
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,762	599	68
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	48	378	267

## FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
<b>A</b>	Grade 4	17.18%	43.46%	28.60	25.00	26.28	Did not meet target	No Slippage
<b>B</b>	Grade 8	20.37%	59.81%	40.66	34.30	39.44	Did not meet target	No Slippage
<b>C</b>	Grade HS	12.50%	51.86%	42.34	42.00	39.36	Met target	No Slippage

## FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	14.74%	36.73%	23.04	21.60	21.99	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	8.80%	36.26%	28.00	23.30	27.45	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	3.85%	30.14%	29.18	26.10	26.29	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

Michigan is making progress on reducing the gap in proficiency rates on regular assessments for students with an IEP. Furthermore, the proficiency rates for students with an IEP in 4th grade have consistently improved as well as the rates for Math in 8th grade; however, given the lower participation rates from the 2021 school year due to the covid 19 pandemic, this current year represents a more reliable starting point for comparison from which to use gap rates as an equity metric for achievement outcomes for students with an IEP.

### 3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

### 3D - OSEP Response

### 3D - Required Actions



## **Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion**

### **Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

### **Data Source**

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

### **Measurement**

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

### **Instructions**

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR introduction).

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

#### 4A - Indicator Data Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	0.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target <=	3.90%	3.70%	3.50%	1.45%	0.00%
Data	1.48%	2.05%	2.41%	0.00%	0.00%

## Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms including in-person and virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys, and the use of virtual discussion rooms. MDE OSE conducted presentations for Indicator 2 Dropout and allowed stakeholders to breakout into groups to have a deeper discussion about the data and targets so that attendees could provide informed feedback on targets.

MDE OSE developed a schedule to systematically present the stakeholders with performance and progress data on indicators with the intent of ensuring everyone had a context for discussion. Content experts were available to answer questions and provide additional detail. Using this base of understanding, MDE OSE went through each indicator reviewing previous targets, rationales, and possible ways to approach target setting. For in-depth discussion, breakout rooms were used when holding virtual meetings. Each breakout room had MDE OSE staff and content experts to facilitate the discussion.

MDE OSE used Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) as the primary stakeholder group. Information about the SEAC can be found at [SEAC website](#). In addition to the agendas and minutes of meetings, presentations used in seeking stakeholder input are on this website. The location of these presentations was also shared with the ISD Directors of Special Education at a regularly scheduled meeting providing additional geographic representation. Other stakeholders groups include MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board, ISD Directors of Special Education, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD Directors of Special Education, member district directors of special education, attendees of the ISD Collaborative Conference, and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP.

### FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

0

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
0	57	0.00%	0.00%	NVR	Met target	No Slippage

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

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

**State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology**

Michigan compares rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with an IEP among the ISD/LEA's in the State. An ISD/LEA is identified as having a significant discrepancy in rates of suspensions and/or expulsions when more than five percent of students with an IEP received out-of-school suspensions/expulsions for greater than 10 days cumulatively during the school year within the ISD's population of students with an IEP. ISDs exceeding the five percent threshold with fewer than five students with an IEP suspended/expelled for more than 10 days, were not identified as having a significant discrepancy. MDE OSE, in collaboration with ISDs, monitors member districts exceeding the 5% threshold to ensure policies, practices and procedures are compliant with IDEA.

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

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

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 data)**

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

Not applicable

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

<b>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</b>	<b>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</b>
0	0	N/A	0

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

<b>Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected</b>	<b>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</b>
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**4A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**4A - OSEP Response**

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2021. The State reported, "Michigan compares rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with an IEP among the ISD/LEA's in the State. An ISD/LEA is identified as having a significant discrepancy in rates of suspensions and/or expulsions when more than five percent of students with an IEP received out-of-school suspensions/expulsions for greater than 10 days cumulatively during the school year within the ISD's population of students with an IEP." OSEP is unable to determine whether the State's chosen methodology meets one of the two comparison methods as required in 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(a) and the Measurement Table. Specifically, it is unclear how the State's chosen threshold of a five percent suspension and expulsion rate bar relates to the State-level, State mean or some other measure of the distribution of suspension and expulsion rates throughout the State. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

**4A - Required Actions**

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2021. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2022 in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR using a methodology that meets one of the two comparison methods as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(a) and the Measurement Table.

## **Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion**

### **Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

### **Data Source**

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

### **Measurement**

Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{\# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards}}{\text{\# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups}} \right] \times 100$ .

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

### **Instructions**

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2020-2021 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

#### **4B - Indicator Data**

**Not Applicable**

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

NO

#### **Historical Data**

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	0.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	1.84%	5.07%	3.86%	0.00%	0.00%

#### Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

#### FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

0

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	57	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

#### State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Michigan compares rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with an IEP among the ISD/LEA's in the State by race/ethnicity. An ISD is identified as having a significant discrepancy in rates of suspensions and/or expulsions when more than five percent of students with an IEP received out-of-school suspensions/expulsions for greater than 10 days cumulatively during the school year within the ISD's population of students with an IEP. ISDs exceeding the five percent threshold for each race/ethnicity with fewer than five students with an IEP



suspended/expelled for more than 10 days, were not identified as having a significant discrepancy. MDE OSE, in collaboration with ISDs, monitors member districts exceeding the 5% by race/ethnicity threshold to ensure policies, practices and procedures are compliant with IDEA.

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

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

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 data)**

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

Not applicable

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

<b>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</b>	<b>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</b>
0	0	N/A	0

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

<b>Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected</b>	<b>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</b>
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**4B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**4B - OSEP Response**

The State reported, "Michigan compares rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with an IEP among the ISD/LEA's in the State by race/ethnicity. An ISD is identified as having a significant discrepancy in rates of suspensions and/or expulsions when more than five percent of students with an IEP received out-of-school suspensions/expulsions for greater than 10 days cumulatively during the school year within the ISD's population of students with an IEP." Specifically, it is unclear how the State's chosen threshold of a five percent suspension and expulsion rate bar relates to the State-level, State mean or some other measure of the distribution of suspension and expulsion rates among LEAs in the State. Therefore, OSEP is unable to determine whether the State's chosen methodology meets one of the two comparison methods as required in 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(a) and the Measurement Table.

**4B- Required Actions**

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must provide data for this indicator for FFY 2022 using a methodology that meets one of the two comparison methods as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(a) and the Measurement Table.

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

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

### Data Source

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

### Measurement

- A. A. Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80\% or more of the day)}}{\text{(total \# of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$ .
- B. B. Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40\% of the day)}}{\text{(total \# of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$ .
- C. C. Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements)}}{\text{(total \# of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$ .

### Instructions

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

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

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

### 5 - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	2020	Target >=	63.75%	64.00%	64.25%	64.25%	69.92%
A	69.92%	Data	66.89%	67.19%	67.66%	68.58%	69.92%
B	2020	Target <=	11.60%	11.50%	11.40%	11.40%	9.93%
B	9.93%	Data	10.90%	11.10%	10.97%	10.55%	9.93%

Part	Baseline	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
C	2020	Target <=	5.28%	5.24%	5.15%	5.15%	4.98%
C	4.98%	Data	4.96%	4.83%	4.79%	4.71%	4.98%

## Targets

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

## Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms including in-person and virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys, and the use of virtual discussion rooms. MDE OSE conducted presentations for Indicator 2 Dropout and allowed stakeholders to breakout into groups to have a deeper discussion about the data and targets so that attendees could provide informed feedback on targets.

MDE OSE developed a schedule to systematically present the stakeholders with performance and progress data on indicators with the intent of ensuring everyone had a context for discussion. Content experts were available to answer questions and provide additional detail. Using this base of understanding, MDE OSE went through each indicator reviewing previous targets, rationales, and possible ways to approach target setting. For in-depth discussion, breakout rooms were used when holding virtual meetings. Each breakout room had MDE OSE staff and content experts to facilitate the discussion.

MDE OSE used Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) as the primary stakeholder group. Information about the SEAC can be found at [SEAC website](#). In addition to the agendas and minutes of meetings, presentations used in seeking stakeholder input are on this website. The location of these presentations was also shared with the ISD Directors of Special Education at a regularly scheduled meeting providing additional geographic representation. Other stakeholders groups include MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board, ISD Directors of Special Education, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD Directors of Special Education, member district directors of special education, attendees of the ISD Collaborative Conference, and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP.

## Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	182,743
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	131,047
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	18,315
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	7,354
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	138
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	440

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

NO

## FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	131,047	182,743	69.92%	69.92%	71.71%	Met target	No slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	18,315	182,743	9.93%	9.93%	10.02%	Did not meet target	No slippage

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/ hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	7,932	182,743	4.98%	4.98%	4.34%	Met target	No slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For Indicator 5B Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day, the pre-pandemic five-year (2015-2019) average is 10.88%. Therefore, the measure change baseline reported in the FFY 2020 is likely an anomaly.

#### 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

#### 5 - OSEP Response

#### 5 - Required Actions

## **Indicator 6: Preschool Environments**

### **Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

### **Data Source**

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

### **Measurement**

- A. A. Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program)}}{\text{(total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)}} \times 100 \right]$
- B. B. Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility)}}{\text{(total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)}} \times 100 \right]$
- C. C. Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home)}}{\text{(total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)}} \times 100 \right]$

### **Instructions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**6 - Indicator Data**  
**Not Applicable**

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

**Historical Data – 6A, 6B**

Part	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
<b>A</b>	Target >=	28.30%	28.50%	28.80%	28.80%	19.46%
<b>A</b>	Data	29.89%	28.68%	30.24%	28.24%	19.46%
<b>B</b>	Target <=	42.00%	41.50%	41.00%	41.00%	46.03%
<b>B</b>	Data	38.72%	38.51%	36.08%	37.31%	46.03%

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms including in-person and virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys, and the use of virtual discussion rooms. MDE OSE conducted presentations for Indicator 2 Dropout and allowed stakeholders to breakout into groups to have a deeper discussion about the data and targets so that attendees could provide informed feedback on targets.

MDE OSE developed a schedule to systematically present the stakeholders with performance and progress data on indicators with the intent of ensuring everyone had a context for discussion. Content experts were available to answer questions and provide additional detail. Using this base of understanding, MDE OSE went through each indicator reviewing previous targets, rationales, and possible ways to approach target setting. For in-depth discussion, breakout rooms were used when holding virtual meetings. Each breakout room had MDE OSE staff and content experts to facilitate the discussion.

MDE OSE used Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) as the primary stakeholder group. Information about the SEAC can be found at [SEAC website](#). In addition to the agendas and minutes of meetings, presentations used in seeking stakeholder input are on this website. The location of these presentations was also shared with the ISD Directors of Special Education at a regularly scheduled meeting providing additional geographic representation. Other stakeholders groups include MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board, ISD Directors of Special Education, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD Directors of Special Education, member district directors of special education, attendees of the ISD Collaborative Conference, and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP.

**Targets**

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

Inclusive Targets

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



Target Range not used

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

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

**Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B**

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	19.50%	19.50%	20.25%	21.00%	21.75%
Target B <=	46.00%	46.00%	45.75%	45.50%	45.25%

**Inclusive Targets – 6C**

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	2.82%	2.82%	2.82%	2.82%	2.80%

**Prepopulated Data**

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

**Date:**

07/06/2022

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	4,636	5,738	938	11,312
a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	610	1,327	158	2,095
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	2,303	2,357	516	5,176
b2. Number of children attending separate school	74	86	35	195
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	1	0	1

<b>Description</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3 through 5 - Total</b>
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	174	132	18	324

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

NO

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5**

<b>Preschool Environments</b>	<b>Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served</b>	<b>Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5</b>	<b>FFY 2020 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2021 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2021 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	2,095	11,312	19.46%	19.50%	18.52%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	5,372	11,312	46.03%	46.00%	47.49%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C. Home	324	11,312	2.82%	2.82%	2.86%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group B aged 3 through 5, if applicable**

The Office of Great Start within the Michigan Department of Education has two statewide inclusion initiatives in place. First, MDE awarded Preschool Development Grant Birth to Five (PDGB-5) monies to seven ISDs through a request for proposals process to support the intentional and targeted efforts around preschool inclusion, which involves intensive training, support for practice-based coaching, and data analysis. The seven ISDs are reviewing the district and local preschool inclusion data to determine the quality of what is being reported. In addition, ensuring staff are appropriately trained on Indicator 6 and reporting requirements. The second initiative is a statewide stakeholder group which has developed a Preschool Inclusion Collective Action Plan. Within this body of work, intentional focus has been placed on high-quality inclusive practices and exploring local level preschool inclusion data. The two projects described, collectively discussed reasons for slippage especially in the area where more children were being placed in segregated settings.

Although there is a decrease of 7.9% in our overall numbers of preschool children, ages 3, 4, and 5 with an IEP from the 2020 to the 2021 school year, Michigan identified an increase in the placement of three-year-old children in segregated settings. Further exploration indicated, of the three-year-old children whose eligibility is cognitive impairment, all were placed in separate special education classes or separate schools. This is an increase of 30 percentage points, from the previous year, of children placed in segregated settings. Additional data analysis, again focused within the three-year-old population, highlighted there was a slight increase of children identified and found eligible with autism spectrum disorder, there was a noticeable increase in placements in a separate special education classroom as well, over 7%. Lastly, traumatic brain Injury (TBI), within the three-year-old population, had an increase of children from the 2020 school year found eligible, and all but one of the children was placed in a separate special education classroom. In the past year, children were among their peers in a regular early childhood classroom receiving embedded services, yet this year, this population is in a segregated setting. The two stakeholder initiatives determined the slippage may be due to these children having more severe needs than in previous years. Michigan will continue to watch trends in each of the eligibility categories for all preschool ages.

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

**6 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**6 - OSEP Response**

**6 - Required Actions**

## **Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes**

### **Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

### **Data Source**

State selected data source.

### **Measurement**

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

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

**Summary Statement 1:** Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:** Percent =  $[(\# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in category (d)}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children reported in$

progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d)]] times 100.

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

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

## Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 7 - Indicator Data Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

## Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A1	2011	Target >=	87.00%	87.50%	88.00%	88.00%	88.00%
A1	81.10%	Data	88.36%	88.31%	88.39%	88.61%	87.47%
A2	2011	Target >=	55.10%	55.20%	55.30%	55.30%	57.00%
A2	54.00%	Data	57.82%	58.08%	60.61%	54.02%	56.72%

Part	Baseline	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
B1	2011	Target >=	88.00%	88.50%	89.00%	89.00%	86.00%
B1	82.20%	Data	90.17%	89.94%	88.23%	89.62%	89.78%
B2	2011	Target >=	56.30%	56.40%	56.50%	56.50%	56.00%
B2	53.70%	Data	57.13%	57.41%	57.65%	53.49%	55.11%
C1	2011	Target >=	87.25%	87.75%	88.25%	88.25%	86.00%
C1	81.30%	Data	88.66%	89.14%	87.71%	88.39%	88.33%
C2	2011	Target >=	59.30%	59.40%	59.50%	59.50%	59.00%
C2	58.70%	Data	60.89%	61.67%	61.55%	57.29%	58.58%

## Targets

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

## Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms including in-person and virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys, and the use of virtual discussion rooms. MDE OSE conducted presentations for Indicator 2 Dropout and allowed stakeholders to breakout into groups to have a deeper discussion about the data and targets so that attendees could provide informed feedback on targets.

MDE OSE developed a schedule to systematically present the stakeholders with performance and progress data on indicators with the intent of ensuring everyone had a context for discussion. Content experts were available to answer questions and provide additional detail. Using this base of understanding, MDE OSE went through each indicator reviewing previous targets, rationales, and possible ways to approach target setting. For in-depth discussion, breakout rooms were used when holding virtual meetings. Each breakout room had MDE OSE staff and content experts to facilitate the discussion.

MDE OSE used Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) as the primary stakeholder group. Information about the SEAC can be found at [SEAC website](#). In addition to the agendas and minutes of meetings, presentations used in seeking stakeholder input are on this website. The location of these presentations was also shared with the ISD Directors of Special Education at a regularly scheduled meeting providing additional geographic representation. Other stakeholders groups include MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board, ISD Directors of Special Education, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD Directors of Special Education, member district directors of special education, attendees of the ISD Collaborative Conference, and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP.

## FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

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

2,934

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	24	0.82%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	293	9.99%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	989	33.71%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	963	32.82%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	665	22.67%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: <math>(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</math></i>	1,952	2,269	87.47%	88.00%	86.03%	Did not meet target	Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: <math>(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</math></i>	1,628	2,934	56.72%	57.00%	55.49%	Did not meet target	Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	18	0.61%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	285	9.71%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,049	35.75%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,159	39.50%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	423	14.42%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2,208	2,511	89.78%	86.00%	87.93%	Met target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1,582	2,934	55.11%	56.00%	53.92%	Did not meet target	Slippage

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

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	24	0.82%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	246	8.38%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	977	33.30%



Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,068	36.40%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	619	21.10%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	2,045	2,315	88.33%	86.00%	88.34%	Met target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,687	2,934	58.58%	59.00%	57.50%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	<p>Michigan met two of the targets set for preschool outcomes. For the remaining four targets which were not met, there was slippage for each of them. Upon review of the 2021 Part B FFY 2019 SPP/APR Indicator Analysis, it is noted there has been a steady decline nationally over the past few years with mean scores dropping significantly in summary statement 1 percentages. For Outcome A, there has been a decline of 24%. A decline of 23% was noted for Outcome B, and a slippage of 36% for Outcome C. Similarly, summary statement 2 percentages also declined for Outcome A by 2%, and by 6% for Outcome C. Slippage for Michigan ranged from 1.08% in summary statement 2 for Outcome C to our highest slippage of 1.44% in summary statement 1 in Outcome A. However, even though measurement scores have decreased, Michigan is employing better measurement techniques which are indicative of a more accurate picture of child outcomes across the state.</p> <p>Upon further analysis, in comparison to the average percentages for summary statements one and two for each outcome, from Table 13: Part B preschool, states with high-quality data, weighted by child count: percentages for OSEP progress categories (N=41) in the 2020 Methods for computing the national estimates report, the average for Outcome A summary statement 1 is 78%. Although Michigan did not meet the target for this outcome and experienced slippage from FFY 2020, Michigan's percentage exceeds the national average by more than 8%. Continuing with summary statement 1 percentages, slippage was experienced for Outcome B, however even with the slippage, this is one target that was met. Moving to summary statement 2 percentages, Michigan experienced slippage of 1.23% in Outcome A, from last year to this year and did not meet the target, Michigan's data is consistent with the national average. Outcome B, amount of slippage was 1.19%, however, even with the slippage, Michigan's percentage is 1.92% above the national average.</p> <p>The last piece of analysis that was conducted from last year to this year was the eligibility of children. From last year to this year, Michigan experienced an increase in children who meet Autism Spectrum Disorder eligibility requirements with a noticeable decrease in children found eligible with a speech and language delay. Within the 2020-21 school year, Michigan noticed an increase in the eligibility category for children shift between the entry and exit timeframes in autism, cognitive impairment, and severe multiple impairment. Children within these eligibility categories have more significant needs and did not reach age expected skills when exiting preschool special education.</p> <p>Michigan has provided additional training on outcomes, birth through age 5, encompassing Part C and 619. Teachers and specialists are improving their Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process and providing more accurate data because of the outcomes training. MDE OSE will continue to monitor these data and continue to provide training on the outcomes COS process, with the goal of meeting targets for FFY 2022.</p>
A2	See A1 Comment
B2	See A1 Comment
C2	See A1 Comment

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

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

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

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

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

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

**7 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**7 - OSEP Response**

**7 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 8: Parent involvement Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

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

### Data Source

State selected data source.

### Measurement

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

### Instructions

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

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023**, include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must consider race/ethnicity. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process. States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

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

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

## 8 - Indicator Data

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

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms including in-person and virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys, and the use of virtual discussion rooms. MDE OSE conducted presentations for Indicator 2 Dropout and allowed stakeholders to breakout into groups to have a deeper discussion about the data and targets so that attendees could provide informed feedback on targets.

MDE OSE developed a schedule to systematically present the stakeholders with performance and progress data on indicators with the intent of ensuring everyone had a context for discussion. Content experts were available to answer questions and provide additional detail. Using this base of understanding, MDE OSE went through each indicator reviewing previous targets, rationales, and possible ways to approach target setting. For in-depth discussion, breakout rooms were used when holding virtual meetings. Each breakout room had MDE OSE staff and content experts to facilitate the discussion.

MDE OSE used Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) as the primary stakeholder group. Information about the SEAC can be found at [SEAC website](#). In addition to the agendas and minutes of meetings, presentations used in seeking stakeholder input are on this website. The location of these presentations was also shared with the ISD Directors of Special Education at a regularly scheduled meeting providing additional geographic representation. Other stakeholders groups include MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board, ISD Directors of Special Education, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD Directors of Special Education, member district directors of special education, attendees of the ISD Collaborative Conference, and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP.

## Historical Data

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

## Targets

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

## FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Preschool Children Reported Separately

Group	Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
Preschool	1,706	2,278	78.44%	78.44%	74.89%	Did not meet target	Slippage
School age	4,760	7,623	62.15%	62.15%	62.44%	Met target	No Slippage

## Provide reasons for Preschool slippage, if applicable

Several assessments were conducted to evaluate possible reasons for the slight decline in the FFY 2021 data for Preschool.

First, the average scores of each of the 37 survey items that comprise the overall partnership effort score for FFY 2021 were compared to the corresponding scores for FFY 2020. This comparison revealed a decrease for 35 of the 37 items. One of the items was the statement, 'I have been asked for my opinion about how well preschool special education services are meeting my child's needs.'

Second, the average partnership effort score was broken out by ISD peer group (a proxy of geographic group) and compared to the average partnership effort score by ISD peer group in FFY 2020. This analysis revealed a decline in the average partnership effort score of respondents in the largest ISD peer group from FFY 2020 to FFY 2021. This finding may suggest that respondents in larger, more populated areas were more reluctant to agree, on average, with the survey's partnership effort items, compared to last year.

Third, an assessment of historical data was conducted by extending the state’s current method of analyzing the survey data to the three years prior to the FFY 2020 baseline (FFY 2017 – FFY 2019). This assessment revealed that the percentage of respondents who met the state’s current standard for the baseline year of FFY 2020 was higher than each of the last five years (FFY 2017 through FFY 2021 inclusive), with the exception of FFY 2019.

While this may suggest that the state’s baseline was set during a peak year, it should also be noted that external factors such as adaptations to the COVID-19 pandemic may have fostered respondents’ perceptions of additional services and efforts of providers to accommodate their needs during the unique challenges of COVID-19. If this explanation contributed to higher results in FFY 2019 and FFY 2020 (which correspond to survey years 2020 and 2021), it may also explain the slight decrease observed in FFY 2021.

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

73,004

**Percentage of respondent parents**

13.56%

**Response Rate**

FFY	2020	2021
Response Rate	19.09%	13.56%

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

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

To further achieve representativeness, the response rates from historically underrepresented groups are closely monitored throughout the survey process. The monitoring process guides the use of targeted telephone follow-up calls, post-card reminders, and additional mailings. Even with the additional attempts, along with efforts to secure accurate contact information, some groups continue to be underrepresented. Michigan is using the Michigan Alliance for Families (MAF), the OSEP funded Parent Training and Information Center, and other strategies such as working with specific ISDs which have a high proportion of underrepresented groups to boost the response rate for these groups.

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

When comparing the survey sample to the eligible population, WSU examines parent characteristics as well as child characteristics. Specifically, WSU assesses five demographic categories to evaluate possible nonresponse bias. The categories are child/student gender, child/student race/ethnicity, respondent race/ethnicity, disability category, and a geographic measure called ISD peer group. WSU constructs tables of these attributes as they pertain to the survey-eligible population and calculates the proportion of the eligible

survey population who are in the various demographic groups. These proportions are then compared to the corresponding proportions for survey respondents. That comparison results in a difference of proportions test, in which the differences between the population and respondent groups are assessed for statistical significance. For FFY 2021, this procedure indicated that the respondent group was representative of the population in terms of child/student gender but revealed at least one statistically significant difference with respect to child/student race/ethnicity, parent race/ethnicity, disability category, and ISD peer group.

To further test for possible effects of nonresponse bias, WSU conducts an additional assessment to determine if the results would be meaningfully impacted by statistical weighting. For each of the demographic categories in which the respondents were not fully representative of the population, the overall results are weighted and recalculated to assess how those weighted results might differ from the unweighted results. This procedure provides an estimate of the results that would be found if the distribution of a particular characteristic in the sample was identical to the distribution in the overall population. Once the weights are applied in this way, the analyses can be performed again to obtain weighted results. With the FFY 2021 data, no statistically significant differences were found between the proportions of respondents who met the state standard of 60%. This suggests that, to the extent nonresponse bias has been found, the overall results were not meaningfully affected.

Michigan will use the following strategies to address the issue of nonresponse bias of the sample:

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

**Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.**

Comparisons between the demographics of the children for whom parents responded and the demographics of children receiving special education services reveal some statistically significant differences. For example, in comparison to the eligible statewide population, the preschool survey sample had an underrepresentation of African American children. The school age survey sample had an underrepresentation of African American students and an overrepresentation of Asian American students.

In terms of disability category, children with speech and language impairment were underrepresented in the preschool sample. Students with cognitive impairment, hearing impairment, physical impairment, severe multiple impairment, autism, or other health impairment were overrepresented in the school age sample, and



students with speech and language impairment, early childhood developmental delay, or specific learning disability were underrepresented in the school age sample.

With respect to ISD peer group, students in 'medium small' ISDs or 'medium large' ISDs were underrepresented in the school age sample, while students in the largest ISDs were overrepresented in both the preschool sample and the school age sample.

For each of the demographic categories in which the respondents were not fully representative of the population, the overall results were weighted and recalculated to assess how those weighted results might differ from the unweighted results. No statistically significant differences were found between the proportions of respondents who met the state standard of 60%. Therefore, even though the respondents were not entirely representative across the demographic categories considered, the Indicator 8 results were not meaningfully affected, and unweighted results are reported. WSU has prepared a full technical report summarizing the data and findings from the survey results.

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

NO

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

Michigan's strategies to ensure that future response data are representative of these demographics closely align with the strategies mentioned above for increasing the survey response rate. Michigan with WSU will continue the efforts to ensure representativeness, including those listed above.

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

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

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

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

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

There were two versions of the survey for parents of children and students receiving special education services:

- One for parents of children who are at least age 3 in preschool (the “preschool survey”); and
- One for parents of students in kindergarten through age 21 (the “school age survey”).

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

There were 2,279 respondents to the preschool survey (18.54% response rate) and 7,623 respondents to the school age survey (12.56% response rate) for a total of 9,902 responses from 73,004 viable respondents (13.56% total response rate).

An overall standard of 60% (“agree”) was used to determine whether respondents reported that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with an IEP. Of the 2,279 completed preschool surveys, 2,278 respondents provided sufficient data to calculate an average score, and 1,706 respondents (74.89%) had scores that met or exceeded the state standard. Of the completed school age surveys, all 7,623 respondents provided sufficient data to calculate an average score, and 4,760 respondents (62.44%) had scores that met or exceeded this standard.

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

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

The COVID-19 pandemic continues to impact Michigan’s data as indicated in the continued decline for response rates.

#### **8 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

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

#### **Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

See Michigan's response above.

#### **8 - OSEP Response**

OSEP’s response to the State’s FFY 2020 SPP/APR required the State to submit a revised sampling plan for this indicator. The State submitted its revised sampling plan, and OSEP’s evaluation of the sampling plan indicated that it is approvable.

#### **8 - Required Actions**

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the

State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

## **Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation**

### **Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

### **Data Source**

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

### **Measurement**

Percent =  $\left[ \left( \frac{\text{\# of districts, that meet the State-established } n \text{ and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification}}{\text{\# of districts in the State that meet the State-established } n \text{ and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups}} \right) \times 100 \right]$

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

### **Instructions**

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 9 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.29%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

### Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

### FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

1

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	56	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

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

Step 1: Identify ISDs with disproportionate representation data. For the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the two school years examined were school year (2020-2021) and school year (2021-2022). A risk ratio greater than 2.5 for two consecutive years in the same racial/ethnic group in all eligibility categories was used to identify ISDs for monitoring activities.

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

Step 2: Analyze policies, practices and procedures. When an ISD has a risk ratio greater than 2.5 for both years, MDE OSE conducts monitoring activities to determine whether the disproportionate representation was a result of inappropriate identification policies, practices and/or procedures. When inappropriate policies, practices, and/or procedures are found, MDE OSE issues findings of noncompliance.

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

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

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

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

<b>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</b>	<b>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</b>
0	0	N/A	0

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

<b>Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected</b>	<b>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</b>
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**9 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**9 - OSEP Response**

**9 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

### Data Source

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

### Measurement

Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of districts, that meet the State-established } n \text{ and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification)}}{\text{(\# of districts in the State that meet the State-established } n \text{ and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)}} \right] \times 100$ .

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

### Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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



result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

#### 10 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	2.00%	1.17%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

#### Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

#### FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

1

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
5	0	56	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

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

Step 1: Identify ISDs with disproportionate representation data. For the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the two school years considered were school year (2020-2021) and school year (2021-2022). A risk ratio (RR) greater than 2.5 for two consecutive years in the same racial/ethnic group in one of six eligibility categories was used to identify ISDs for focused monitoring activities.

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

Step 2: Analyze policies, practices and procedures. As a result of an ISD having a risk ratio greater than 2.5 for both years, MDE OSE conducted monitoring activities to determine whether the disproportionate representation was a result of inappropriate identification policies, practices and/or procedures. When inappropriate policies, practices and/or procedures are found, MDE OSE issues findings of noncompliance.

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

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

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

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

<b>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</b>	<b>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</b>
0	0	N/A	0

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

<b>Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected</b>	<b>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</b>
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**10 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**10 - OSEP Response****10 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 11: Child Find

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

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

### Data Source

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

### Measurement

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline). Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

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

### Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

**11 - Indicator Data**  
**Historical Data**

<b>Baseline Year</b>	<b>Baseline Data</b>
2005	80.51%

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2020</b>
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.86%	99.77%	99.55%	99.35%	99.61%

**Targets**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>2022</b>	<b>2023</b>	<b>2024</b>	<b>2025</b>
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

## FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
34,245	34,142	99.61%	100%	99.70%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

103

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

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

#### Reason for Late Evaluation for Eligible Children with a Late Evaluation:

External reports not available - 14 (15.38%)  
 Personnel not available for evaluation - 19 (20.88%)  
 Personnel not available for IEP - 58 (63.74%)  
 Total - 91 (88.35%)

#### Reason for Late Evaluation for Ineligible Children with a Late Evaluation:

External reports not available - 0 (0.00%)  
 Personnel not available for evaluation - 4 (33.33%)  
 Personnel not available for IEP - 8 (66.67%)  
 Total - 12 (11.65%)

The following information presents the number and percent of late evaluations by the range of calendar days beyond the state's 30-School-Day timeline:

1-5 days 44 (42.72%)  
 6-10 days 15 (14.56%)  
 11-15 days 9 (8.74%)  
 16-20 days 6 (5.83%)  
 21-25 days 2 (1.94%)  
 26-30 days 5 (4.85%)  
 > 30 days 22 (21.36%)

May not equal 100% due to rounding.

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used:**

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

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

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

- Code 12: The evaluation was completed within the agreed-upon written timeline extension.
- Code 22: The IEP from the previous state was implemented while conducting a review of the existing evaluation or convening an IEP team meeting within 30 school days.

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)****Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
36	35	0	1

**FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected****Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

The state conducted reviews of policies and procedures for all entities with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 to ensure these were in compliance and updated as needed. The state also reviewed data, using the statewide database to determine whether the entities were evaluating students within the required state timeline. Thirty-five of the thirty-six entities were found to have compliant policies and procedures and were evaluating students with IEPs within the state established timelines. The individual students have all been evaluated although late. The one entity with findings that has not been verified as corrected is being provided additional training and a continuing review of subsequent student records.



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

MDE OSE ensured each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 is correctly implementing regulatory requirements (100% compliance) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through student record reviews verified by ISDs and the MDE OSE.

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

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

## **FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

### **Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

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

## **Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

<b>Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected</b>	<b>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</b>
FFY 2019	1	1	0
FFY 2018	1	1	0

## **FFY 2019**

### **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

For the member district with ongoing noncompliance, MDE OSE provided a technical assistant who reviewed the cause of the ongoing noncompliance and mandated the use of TA, training and other enforcement actions to ensure prompt compliance and is working with the member district and the ISD. MDE OSE developed a plan to bring the district into compliance which included support from the ISD to conduct overdue and tracked initial evaluations. Weekly meetings were held with the district and ISD to review the progress of the district in completing evaluations and achieving compliance. Work with the district continued until the district met the

regulatory requirements and achieved 100 percent compliance, as verified by MDE OSE. The finding of noncompliance was verified and closed.

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

The state reviewed individual student files, using the statewide database to determine whether the entities were evaluating students within the required state timeline, subsequent to the findings of noncompliance for all entities to ensure compliant practices. The individual students have all been evaluated although late.

**FFY 2018**

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

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

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

The state reviewed individual student files, using the statewide database to determine whether the entities were evaluating students within the required state timeline, subsequent to the findings of noncompliance for all entities to ensure compliant practices. The individual students have all been evaluated although late.

**11 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

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

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 and FFY 2018 (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

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

## **Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

See above

### **11 - OSEP Response**

#### **11 - Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the remaining one uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 was corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and the LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

## **Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition**

### **Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

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

### **Data Source**

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

### **Measurement**

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

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

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

### **Instructions**

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

**12 - Indicator Data**  
**Not Applicable**

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

**Historical Data**

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	92.10%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	93.09%	93.52%	93.04%	86.89%	97.35%

**Targets**

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

Category	Number
a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	3,145
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	160
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,892
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	53
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	10
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	N/A

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,892	2,922	97.35%	100%	98.97%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

30

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

Reason for late IEPs of Eligible Children with Late IEPs:

Late notification from Part C to Part B LEA (less than 90 days before third birthday) – 0

Timeline began in previous district - 0

Personnel not available for evaluation – 2

Personnel not available for IEP – 7

External reports not available - 1

Unknown – 15

Total – 25

Reason for late IEPs of Ineligible Children with Late IEPs:

Late notification from Part C to Part B LEA (less than 90 days before third birthday) - 0

Timeline began in previous district - 0

Personnel not available for evaluation – 0

Personnel not available for IEP - 0

External reports not available - 0

Unknown – 5

Total – 5

Number of Late IEPs: 1 – 3 ISDs

Number of Late IEPs: 2-3 – 8 ISDs

Number of Late IEPs: 4+ - 2 ISDs

Range of Days beyond third birthday, number and percent of late IEPs:

1-10 days - 8 late IEPs (26.67%)

11-50 days - 12 (40.00%)

51-100 days – 2 (6.67%)

>100 days – 3 (10.00%)

Unknown days – 5 (16.67%)

IEP took place too early (prior to age 2 years 6 months) but member district indicated through data the child was late - 0 late IEPs (0.00%)

### **Attach PDF table (optional)**

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

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

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

Additionally, Michigan looked at Indicator B-12 data from two perspectives. First was to identify noncompliance that was B-12 specific meaning the IEP did not take place by the child's third birthday. Districts whose data indicated one or more children did not have an IEP in place by the child's third birthday were issued a B-12 corrective action plan (CAP). The other perspective was a data review which identified noncompliance related to data entry but the B-12 activity was compliant. This began in FFY 2019 when districts who demonstrated noncompliance due to data accuracy and entry were given written letters of warning for Valid and Reliable data. This year, any district who demonstrated issues with valid and reliable data, who were already given a letter of warning last year was issued a data CAP. Districts whose data indicated valid and reliable data issues for a first year were given a letter of warning. This process enables districts to be aware of a potential data submission problem before it is issued a data CAP. In some instances, data indicated both B-12 noncompliance and data noncompliance, those districts were issued both a B-12 CAP and a Valid and Reliable data CAP.

The decision to provide the activities as described above is based on past offering of training and targeted TA to the districts where we were focused on B12, however files were B12 compliant, and the children did have an IEP in place before their third birthday. However, because data entry and accuracy was not explored or corrected, these errors continued into the next year. MDE OSE has been very intentional about the support and training provided around data accuracy and entry. With a Valid and Reliable Data CAP, districts are now more focused on the data. It is anticipated, the Valid and Reliable Data CAPs will enhance districts' data policies of entry and accuracy.

## Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
41	38	1	2

### FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

MDE OSE ensured each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 is correctly implementing regulatory requirements (100% compliance) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through student record reviews verified by ISDs and MDE OSE.

Each individual case of noncompliance was corrected, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, except for at those entities whose findings are not yet verified as corrected.

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

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

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

The state conducted reviews of policies and procedures for all entities with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 to ensure these were in compliance and updated as needed. The state also reviewed data, using the statewide database. Thirty-nine (39) of the 41 entities were found to have compliant policies and procedures and were implementing compliant practices. The 2 entities with findings that have not been verified as corrected were provided additional training and a continuing review of subsequent student records.

### FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

#### **Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

For the 2 member districts with ongoing noncompliance, MDE OSE is providing technical assistants and reviewing the cause of the ongoing noncompliance and mandated the use of TA, training and other enforcement actions to ensure prompt compliance. MDE OSE is developing individual plans with each district to bring the district into compliance which includes support from the ISD to conduct overdue evaluations. Monthly meetings are being held with the district and the ISD to review the progress of the district in completing evaluations and achieving 100% compliance as required by OSEP memo 09-02. Data are analyzed by the MDE OSE and ISD to provide TA to the member districts to correct noncompliance. Compliance will be verified by MDE OSE.



## Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2019	4	4	0

### FFY 2019

#### Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

MDE OSE ensured each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 is correctly implementing regulatory requirements (100% compliance) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through student record reviews verified by ISDs and MDE OSE. Each individual case of noncompliance was corrected, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, except for at those entities whose findings are not yet verified as corrected.

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

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

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

The state conducted reviews of policies and procedures for all entities with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 and provided additional training to ensure these were in compliance and updated as needed. The state also reviewed data, using the statewide database.

### **12 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the remaining four uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2019: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

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

### **Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

See above

## **12 - OSEP Response**

### **12 - Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the remaining two uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2020: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

## **Indicator 13: Secondary Transition**

### **Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

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

### **Data Source**

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

### **Measurement**

Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority)}}{\text{(\# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)}} \right] \times 100$ .

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

### **Instructions**

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance,

improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

### 13 - Indicator Data Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	92.34%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	81.23%	81.00%	92.34%	92.94%	90.66%

### Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

### FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
4,481	4,777	90.66%	100%	93.80%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

State monitoring

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

The MDE OSE used the fall Michigan Student Data System (MSDS) count of students in all member districts. To be included in measurement for this indicator, the member district had to have served at least one student

aged 16 and older with an IEP. Using this criterion, a total of 637 member districts were monitored. Students meeting the criterion were selected from each ISD district. A 9-item checklist originally based on the NTACT B-13 checklist was used.

The MDE OSE used the MSDS fall collection of students with an IEP, ages 16 and over as our sample frame. Michigan uses a stratified-random sample of students from each ISD. Additionally, any member districts with a total population over 50,000 students, was sampled separately at a margin of error of +/- 5%. Michigan had one member district that met this criterion. Students who graduated or exited school during the transition review period, were removed from the sample frame. As a result, there was a statewide total sample of 4777 students ages 16 to 21 (the federal age cut-off).

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

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

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
160	158	2	0

#### FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

MDE OSE ensured all LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 are correctly implementing regulatory requirements (100% compliance) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through student record reviews verified by ISDs and MDE OSE.

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

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

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

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

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

The State reviewed data subsequent to the initial finding to determine that noncompliance has been corrected. Verification activities included: (1) a review of updated policies, procedures, and/or practices and (2) a review of new data submitted through state data systems. If the data submitted demonstrated continued noncompliance there was additional training and a review of more recent student records. Based on this review, the State established the identified noncompliance has been corrected and the LEA is correctly implementing the specific statutory or regulatory requirement(s) except for at those entities whose findings are not yet verified as corrected.

For those districts whose finding of noncompliance were not initially corrected the MDE OSE provided increased technical assistance. A contractor was assigned to the district. The contractor worked with the district to determine the cause of ongoing noncompliance. This includes a review of policy and procedures as well as file reviews. When the cause of noncompliance was understood, additional corrective actions were assigned which included revising policies and procedures and/or providing staff training. Findings of noncompliance have subsequently been corrected.

#### **Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

<b>Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected</b>	<b>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</b>
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

#### **13 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

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

#### **Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

See above

#### **13 - OSEP Response**

##### **13 - Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of

noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

## Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

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

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

### Data Source

State selected data source.

### Measurement

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

### Instructions

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

Collect data by September 2022 on students who left school during 2020-2021, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2020-2021 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.



## **I. Definitions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **II. Data Reporting**

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

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

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

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

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

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

### III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

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

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

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

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

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, include the State's analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process. If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

#### 14 - Indicator Data

##### Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	2018	Target >=	33.40%	33.60%	33.90%	33.90%	28.21%
A	28.21%	Data	32.56%	29.18%	28.21%	27.10%	23.02%
B	2018	Target >=	60.50%	61.00%	61.50%	61.50%	42.82%
B	42.82%	Data	62.96%	64.85%	42.82%	40.72%	39.88%
C	2018	Target >=	73.00%	73.50%	74.00%	75.25%	75.19%
C	75.19%	Data	76.93%	77.43%	75.19%	78.09%	74.80%

##### FFY 2020 Targets

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

## Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms including in-person and virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys, and the use of virtual discussion rooms. MDE OSE conducted presentations for Indicator 2 Dropout and allowed stakeholders to breakout into groups to have a deeper discussion about the data and targets so that attendees could provide informed feedback on targets.

MDE OSE developed a schedule to systematically present the stakeholders with performance and progress data on indicators with the intent of ensuring everyone had a context for discussion. Content experts were available to answer questions and provide additional detail. Using this base of understanding, MDE OSE went through each indicator reviewing previous targets, rationales, and possible ways to approach target setting. For in-depth discussion, breakout rooms were used when holding virtual meetings. Each breakout room had MDE OSE staff and content experts to facilitate the discussion.

MDE OSE used Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) as the primary stakeholder group. Information about the SEAC can be found at [SEAC website](#). In addition to the agendas and minutes of meetings, presentations used in seeking stakeholder input are on this website. The location of these presentations was also shared with the ISD Directors of Special Education at a regularly scheduled meeting providing additional geographic representation. Other stakeholder groups include MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board, ISD Directors of Special Education, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD Directors of Special Education, member district directors of special education, attendees of the ISD Collaborative Conference, and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP.

### FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Category	Number
Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	3,354
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	609
Response Rate	18.16%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	171
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	93
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	54
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	151

<b>Measure</b>	<b>Number of respondent youth</b>	<b>Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school</b>	<b>FFY 2020 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2021 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2021 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	171	609	23.02%	28.21%	28.08%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1+2)	264	609	39.88%	42.82%	43.35%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	469	609	74.80%	75.19%	77.01%	Met target	No Slippage

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

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

## Response Rate

FFY	2020	2021
Response Rate	15.13%	18.16%

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

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

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

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

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

Michigan will use the following strategies to address the issue of nonresponse bias and the non-representativeness of the sample:

- A) Offering the survey in three modes (online, paper, and telephone); mailing follow-up postcards, conducting follow-up telephone calls and interviews, mailing additional copies of the survey to non-respondents, making additional calls to low-responding areas and underrepresented groups; and making in-person visits in selected low-response areas (if public health circumstances, due to COVID-19, allow it);
- B) Encouraging and supporting former students to participate in the survey, using a variety of techniques, including:
  - a. Sending multiple letters to inform former students or their guardians (for minors or students with cognitive development impairments) about the survey and providing guidance for ISD transition coordinators to do likewise;
  - b. Providing potential respondents an opportunity to ask questions;

- c. Indicating that the survey is voluntary and confidential;
- d. Providing a toll-free number for questions about the survey and/or to take the survey over the phone if desired; and
- e. Offering the survey in Arabic and Spanish.

**Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.**

To test the representativeness of the respondent group (or survey sample) to the population, a test of proportions was used to compare the respondent group to the population in terms of gender, race/ethnicity, exit status, disability, and peer group. For gender and peer group, the respondent group was found to be representative of the population, whereas race/ethnicity, exit status, and disability group were found to be statistically significantly different. WSU has prepared a full technical report summarizing the data and findings from the survey sample.

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

For Indicator 14, weights were calculated by dividing the proportion of each of the subgroups in the population by the corresponding proportion in the sample. For example, in the Indicator 14 population, the proportion of former students who graduated was 0.8023 and the proportion in the respondent group was 0.8768. Dividing 0.8023 by 0.8768 yields 0.9150. Therefore, the weight assigned to graduating former students was 0.9150.

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

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

NO

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

The response data is representative in terms of former students' gender and peer group; but not representative in terms of race/ethnicity, exit status, and disability group. Michigan will use the following strategies to address the issue of nonresponse bias and the non-representativeness of the sample:

- A) Offering the survey in three modes (online, paper, and telephone); mailing follow-up postcards, conducting follow-up telephone calls and interviews, mailing additional copies of the survey to non-respondents, making additional calls to low-responding areas and underrepresented groups; and

making in-person visits in selected low-response areas (if public health circumstances, due to COVID-19, allow it);

- B) Encouraging and supporting former students to participate in the survey, using a variety of techniques, including:
- Sending multiple letters to inform former students or their guardians (for minors or students with cognitive development impairments) about the survey and providing guidance for ISD transition coordinators to do likewise;
  - Providing potential respondents an opportunity to ask questions;
  - Indicating that the survey is voluntary and confidential;
  - Providing a toll-free number for questions about the survey and/or to take the survey over the phone if desired; and
  - Offering the survey in Arabic and Spanish.

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

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

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

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

The sampling frame was former students who had an IEP and exited high school across the 56 Intermediate School Districts in the State of Michigan. Students included are those who graduated, dropped out, or received a certificate. Further, only those students who were in Grade 9 through, and including, age 21 were included. Students were identified using Michigan's Student Data System (MSDS). A sample of roughly one-third of member districts within each of the Intermediate School Districts (ISDs) in Michigan was chosen based on balanced demographic characteristics of the former student population. These selected member districts comprise a cohort. Member districts surveyed within this round of data collection comprise cohort 3. The nature of the approved sampling plan, as well as the representativeness of each cohort's survey sample, suggests that each of the three cohorts are demographically similar.

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

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

The response rate for FFY 2021 (18.16%) is statistically significantly higher than FFY 2020 (15.13%). The higher response rate was likely associated with a lower COVID-19 pandemic impact in FFY 2021 than in FFY 2020. Also, telephone follow-up yielded higher completion rates in FFY 2021 than in FFY 2020. The State will continue to use the strategies listed in previous sections to boost response rates and improve data quality.



**14 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2021 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

See above

**14 - OSEP Response**

OSEP's response to the State's FFY 2020 SPP/APR required the State to submit a revised sampling plan for this indicator. The State submitted its revised sampling plan, and OSEP's evaluation of the sampling plan indicated that it is approvable.

**14 - Required Actions**

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

## Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

### Instructions and Measurement

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

**Results Indicator:** Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

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

### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

### Measurement

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

### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

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

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

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

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

### 15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/02/2022	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	33
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/02/2022	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	24

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

NO

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms including in-person and virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys, and the use of virtual discussion rooms. MDE OSE conducted presentations for Indicator 2 Dropout and allowed stakeholders to breakout into groups to have a deeper discussion about the data and targets so that attendees could provide informed feedback on targets.

MDE OSE developed a schedule to systematically present the stakeholders with performance and progress data on indicators with the intent of ensuring everyone had a context for discussion. Content experts were available to answer questions and provide additional detail. Using this base of understanding, MDE OSE went through each indicator reviewing previous targets, rationales, and possible ways to approach target setting. For in-depth discussion, breakout rooms were used when holding virtual meetings. Each breakout room had MDE OSE staff and content experts to facilitate the discussion.

MDE OSE used Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) as the primary stakeholder group. Information about the SEAC can be found at [SEAC website](#). In addition to the agendas and minutes of meetings, presentations used in seeking stakeholder input are on this website. The location of these presentations was also shared with the ISD Directors of Special Education at a regularly scheduled meeting providing additional geographic representation. Other stakeholders groups include MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board, ISD Directors of Special Education, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD Directors of Special Education, member district directors of special education, attendees of the ISD Collaborative Conference, and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP.

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	36.40%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	48.00%	50.00%	52.00%	52.00%	45.00%-55.00%
Data	42.86%	46.88%	54.55%	38.10%	38.89%

### Targets

FFY	2021 (low)	2021 (high)	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=	45.00 %	55.00 %	45.00 %	55.00 %	45.00 %	55.00 %	45.00 %	55.00 %	45.00 %	55.00 %

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

<b>3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements</b>	<b>3.1 Number of resolutions sessions</b>	<b>FFY 2020 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2021 Target (low)</b>	<b>FFY 2021 Target (high)</b>	<b>FFY 2021 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
24	33	38.89%	45.00%	55.00%	72.73%	Met target	No Slippage

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

Michigan has an increase in overall due process complaints filed from 37 in 2020 to 93 in 2021. With more districts returning to in person after Covid closures, the ability to coordinate resolution session meetings has contributed to the increase. The MDE OSE created guidance, How to Complete the Resolution Session Summary Guide, and has distributed it to intermediate school districts. The How To Complete the Resolution Session Summary guide is also posted on the Catamaran Training website and is sent to districts with a reminder at 15, 30, and 45 days after a due process complaint has been filed.

**15 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**15 - OSEP Response****15 - Required Actions**

**Indicator 16: Mediation**  
**Instructions and Measurement**

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

**Results indicator:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

**Measurement**

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1) times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

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

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

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

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

**16 - Indicator Data**

**Select yes to use target ranges**

Target Range is used

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1 Mediations held	182
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	35
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	101

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

NO

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms including in-person and virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys, and the use of virtual discussion rooms. MDE OSE conducted presentations for Indicator 2 Dropout and allowed stakeholders to breakout into groups to have a deeper discussion about the data and targets so that attendees could provide informed feedback on targets.

MDE OSE developed a schedule to systematically present the stakeholders with performance and progress data on indicators with the intent of ensuring everyone had a context for discussion. Content experts were available to answer questions and provide additional detail. Using this base of understanding, MDE OSE went through each indicator reviewing previous targets, rationales, and possible ways to approach target setting. For in-depth discussion, breakout rooms were used when holding virtual meetings. Each breakout room had MDE OSE staff and content experts to facilitate the discussion.

MDE OSE used Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) as the primary stakeholder group. Information about the SEAC can be found at [SEAC website](#). In addition to the agendas and minutes of meetings, presentations used in seeking stakeholder input are on this website. The location of these presentations was also shared with the ISD Directors of Special Education at a regularly scheduled meeting providing additional geographic representation. Other stakeholders groups include MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board, ISD Directors of Special Education, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD Directors of Special Education, member district directors of special education, attendees of the ISD Collaborative Conference, and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP.

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2017	81.15%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	75.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00%-85.00%	75.00%-85.00%
Data	78.35%	81.15%	82.47%	77.16%	75.63%

### Targets

FFY	2021 (low)	2021 (high)	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=	75.00 %	85.00 %	75.00 %	85.00 %	75.00 %	85.00 %	75.00 %	85.00 %	75.00 %	85.00 %

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

<b>2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints</b>	<b>2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints</b>	<b>2.1 Number of mediations held</b>	<b>FFY 2020 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2021 Target (low)</b>	<b>FFY 2021 Target (high)</b>	<b>FFY 2021 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
35	101	182	75.63%	75.00%	85.00%	74.73%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

The slight decrease may be attributed to the increased number of mediations overall and transitioning from virtual mediations to in-person mediations following the Covid-19 Pandemic.

**16 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**16 - OSEP Response****16 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

### Instructions and Measurement

#### Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

#### Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

#### Instructions

**Baseline Data:** The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

**Targets:** In its FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2021 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

**Updated Data:** In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

#### Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

##### ***Phase I: Analysis:***

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

***Phase II: Plan*** (which, is in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

***Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation*** (which, is in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:



- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

## **Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP**

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

### ***Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation***

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

#### **A. Data Analysis**

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2021 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

#### **B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2022). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023 for the FFY 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023).).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based

practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

### C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

### Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023 for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023)) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

## 17 - Indicator Data

### Section A: Data Analysis

#### What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

The focus of the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) is on literacy progress for students with the most significant and persistent reading needs (below the 20th percentile on screening measures), including students with disabilities. The SiMR is currently measured using Acadience Reading K- 6 universal screening and progress monitoring scores matched to students' grade and skill level (e.g., phoneme segmentation fluency, nonsense word fluency-- correct letter sounds and whole words read, oral reading fluency--words correct and accuracy). In future years, the SiMR may be measured using a variety of screening and progress monitoring measures based on what Michigan districts are using. The SiMR is represented as a long-term outcome in the evaluation plan logic model and goal 2.

#### Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

#### Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

YES

#### Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

The SiMR currently represents reading data from three elementary schools that participated in the data-based individualization (DBI) model demonstration during 2021-2022. Professional learning and implementation support from the MiMTSS TA Center began in August 2021, and a first group of 56 target students was identified in September 2021. The 56 target students included first (31) and second grade (25) students with the most significant and persistent reading needs (scored Well Below Benchmark on the fall Acadience Reading screening and below the 21st percentile). In the three elementary schools, the district's first-grade 20th percentile was equivalent to the national 4th percentile. The district's second-grade 20th percentile was equivalent to the national 5th percentile. The SSIP target student group includes 21 (38%) students with an individualized education plan (IEP) but are not exclusively students with an IEP. Of the 21 students with an

IEP, the majority were eligible based on a Speech and Language Impairment (7). Four students had a Developmental Delay, three had an autism spectrum disorder, three had a Specific Learning Disability, two had a Cognitive Impairment, one with a Physical Impairment, and one with Other Health impairments. The SSIP target student group is 38% female and 64%, male. The racial/ethnic composition of the SSIP target student group is 94% White, 6% Hispanic/Latino, and 6% Multi-racial.

Two additional schools within a different district, began participating in the DBI model demonstration in September 2022, and 52 students were identified to be part of a second group of SSIP target students. These are 1st and 2nd-grade students who scored Well Below Benchmark on the fall Acadience Reading screening and below the 21st percentile from the two new schools. SiMR data from this second group of target students will be reflected in the FFY 2022 report.

These first two groups of target students represent schools within rural Michigan school districts, but the subset does not yet represent the full diversity of Michigan's students. Recruitment efforts are currently underway to support additional districts with greater racial and economic diversity, representing different geographic areas of the state. One potential new district has been previously identified as needing support based on an analysis of ESSA and IDEA outcome indicators. This district currently has their staff engaged in professional learning to help teachers understand scientifically based reading instruction, which will create a foundation for implementing DBI for reading within an MTSS framework in the future.

**Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Please provide a link to the current theory of action.**

[State Systemic Improvement Theory of Action](#)

**Progress toward the SiMR**

**Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).**

**Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)**

YES

**Historical Data**

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2020	0.00%
B	2020	0.00%

**Targets**

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	20.00%	22.00%	24.00%	26.00%	28.00%
Target B >=	20.00%	22.00%	24.00%	26.00%	28.00%

## FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Part	Number of target students who make above or well above typical progress from fall to spring per the Acadience Reading Pathways of Progress for the Composite score / Number of target students whose progress monitoring scores improve after an intervention intensification (3 of 5 of most recent post-intensification data points are higher than pre-intensification data points)	Number of students scoring well below benchmark and at or below the district 21st percentile on the Fall Acadience Reading Composite score / Number of target students whose data show a lack of progress and need for intervention intensification	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	36	56	0.00%	20.00%	64.29%	Met target	No Slippage
B	0	56	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

### Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.

Acadience Reading K-6 universal screening fall and spring composite scores, fall to spring pathways of progress based on the composite scores, and weekly progress monitoring scores.

### Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

The SiMR data collection and analysis plans are outlined in the SSIP Evaluation Plan (Data Analysis Plan and Data Collection Plan). This evaluation plan was developed in October 2021, with modifications proposed in October 2022. The SiMR is represented in the evaluation plan as a long-term outcome (improved reading outcomes) and Goal 2 (By the end of each school year, SSIP target students will demonstrate within-year reading progress in two ways: A) make above or well above typical progress from fall to spring per the Acadience Reading Pathways of Progress for the Composite score; B) improve progress monitoring scores after a documented intervention intensification, as measured by Acadience Reading K-6 universal screening

and progress monitoring scores matched to students' grade and skill level). Data collection and analysis have been ongoing since Fall of 2021. Data are primarily collected by school staff and analyzed by multiple teams: school multi-disciplinary team, school leadership team, district implementation team, MiMTSS TA Center intensifying literacy instruction implementation team, and the SSIP leadership team.

#### SIMR Part A

Acadience Reading K-6 screening data are collected for ALL students using paper/pencil methods by an assessment team that includes classroom teachers, interventionists, and other school staff who have been trained to collect the data with fidelity each September, January, and May. Scores are entered into Acadience Data Management. To measure progress toward the SiMR targets, students' fall and spring composite scores are compared, including their fall to spring Pathway of Progress. Pathways of Progress provides a norm-referenced comparison of each student's progress throughout the school year, compared to other students who started the school year with the same composite score. We strive to have SSIP target students make above or well-above-typical progress compared to their same-grade peers who started the school year with similar skills.

#### SIMR Part B

Acadience Reading K-6 progress monitoring data are collected weekly for all target students participating in reading intervention. Specific measures are selected based on the student's grade level and skills needing development (e.g., Phoneme Segmentation Fluency, Nonsense Word Fluency--Correct Letter Sounds and Whole Words Read, and Oral Reading Fluency-- words correct and accuracy measures). Progress monitoring goals, scores, and intervention adaptations are entered into the Acadience Data Management system. First-grade students are typically monitored in Phoneme Segmentation Fluency until they've met the benchmark goal, Nonsense Word Fluency all year, and Oral Reading Fluency once they have met the first grade Nonsense Word Fluency benchmark goal. Second-grade students are typically monitored in Nonsense Word Fluency until they have met the benchmark goal and Oral Reading Fluency all year. These specific measures allow educators to closely examine student progress on the skills that reading intervention is (most likely) targeting. Progress monitoring data are analyzed weekly, starting after the first 5 weeks of intervention. During 2021-2022, the participating elementary schools were focused on establishing their Tier 2 reading intervention system to support 73% of their first and second-grade students and collecting progress monitoring data for those students (DBI Steps 1 and 2). The school multidisciplinary team still needed more skill building and practice analyzing student progress data to determine when and how to intensify intervention for students who were not responding to intervention instruction (DBI Steps 3-5). None of the schools made and clearly documented intervention intensifications during the desired time frame (using 5 data points initially and then again post an intensification), yielding 0% for the SiMR Part B FFY21 data. New schools are starting the 2022-2023 school year with clearer guidance on individual goal setting for student progress monitoring and data-based decision-making rules.

**Optional: Has the State collected additional data (*i.e.*, *benchmark, CQI, survey*) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.**

Three SSIP target students met the end-of-year benchmark goal. These students and teachers worked very hard to dramatically change their reading performance from below the 16th percentile to above the 55th percentile within a single school year. An additional six students moved from well below benchmark at the beginning of the year to just below benchmark by the end of the year.

Goal 3: Annually, students within schools participating in the intensifying literacy instruction model demonstration and receiving intensive technical assistance will report more positive attitudes about reading and school compared to baseline, as measured by student interviews (sampling of elementary students) or surveys (secondary method for measure student attitudes about reading). The majority of students felt positive about school (69%), reading (64%), and intervention time (59%) at the end of the school year. Most students thought they were great readers or getting better at reading (92%) at the end of the school year. During 2022-2023, this information will be gathered at the beginning and end of the school year to determine if learners' perceptions change while their schools implement data-based individualization (DBI).

Goal 4: Annually, parents, families, and caregivers will report more opportunities to be involved in planning about their children's learning and more positive attitudes about the school's reading support, as measured by parent, family, and caregiver surveys or interviews and measured by Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory items. Most parents agreed (59-69%) that the school listens and involves them in planning supports for their child. During 2022-2023, this information will be gathered at the beginning and end of the school year to determine if parent or caregiver perceptions change while their school implements data-based individualization (DBI). We will also examine whether those who disagree are parents or caregivers for children with disabilities or other marginalized groups. One of the three schools only sent the survey to parents who were also teachers at the school in 2021- 2022.

**Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe any data quality issues, unrelated to COVID-19, specific to the SiMR data and include actions taken to address data quality concerns.**

During the 2021-2022 school year, the MiMTSS TA Center worked with the multidisciplinary teams in the three schools to develop progress monitoring data collection plans, including consistent people to collect the data, using specific measures and decision rules for when to add or drop assessments based on students' progress. Late in the fall, the MiMTSS TA Center coach realized that each school had assigned just one person to collect the progress monitoring data for all students receiving intervention supports (approximately 74 first and second-grade students per school). This unfeasible workload, combined with a lack of clarity about which measures to administer, resulted in limited progress monitoring data being collected across all students, and for some students, too many unnecessary measures were being administered. By mid-winter, progress monitoring data collection had improved. Schools had switched to using first-grade oral reading fluency measures with their second-grade students per the MiMTSS TA Center's recommendation. However, when data showed that using first-grade assessment probes did not improve sensitivity to detecting student progress, the staff at one of the three schools did not want to switch back to using second-grade measures. They believed students would lose confidence when monitored using more difficult assessment probes even though the data did not show that students were performing any better on the first-grade measures. Schools in the second cohort of the DBI Model Demonstration project are starting 2022-2023 with clearer guidance on what measures to collect for students at each grade level. They also have a plan for collecting data for one student each day (taking approximately 2- 3 minutes) to ensure all data are being collected with minimal disruption to instructional time.

Student progress data (SiMR Part B) were also impacted by schools' adherence to decision rules for when to make changes to intervention. In the same school described above that did not want to switch back to using second-grade oral reading fluency measures, staff were eager to respond to any data points below the aimline. Rather than waiting for an accumulation of at least three data points and first looking at attendance and intervention fidelity, staff regularly regrouped students and changed the intervention without documenting intervention changes in the Acadience Data Management platform. For many students, it was not possible to

determine when intervention changes were made, what those changes were, and how impactful those changes were.

**Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

YES

**If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.**

COVID-19 continued to impact student attendance during the 2021-2022 school year. As students were exposed to and diagnosed with COVID-19, district policies required students to stay home and, in some cases, whole classrooms were required to stay home and transition to remote instruction for days at a time. The first grade SSIP Target Students in one school missed an average of 26 school days (range: 6-63 days). The reduced attendance very likely weakened the potential impact of Tier 1, class-wide instruction and intervention instruction during 2021-2022. With more students and adults vaccinated and less strict quarantine policies, absences due to COVID-19 are likely to decrease during 2022-2023. However, attendance data will continue to be monitored.

## **Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**

**Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.**

[Updated Evaluation Plan](#)

**Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, provide a description of the changes and updates to the evaluation plan.**

The SSIP Leadership Team is proposing two modifications to the evaluation plan that was developed in October 2021. The first modification is related to the Coordinated Supports infrastructure improvement strategy (Short-term outcome: Documented process for matching school, district, and ISD literacy needs to a continuum of literacy based MTSS supports). This corresponds with Goal 5 (By Fall 2023, a reduced number of previously identified schools will be reidentified as needing improved literacy outcomes for students with disabilities, as measured by MDE's determinations using IDEA result indicators (OSE "targeted" group) and ESSA TSI indicators (CSI and ATS as available) for students with disabilities) and Goal 13 (By September 2023, and annually thereafter, each district receiving state-level literacy-based MTSS supports including DBI will have a plan that outlines how state-level supports from MDE are coordinated and aligned, as measured by product review (district plans) completed by the state-level coordinated supports team for each district). It will be early December 2022 before ESSA indicators are applied to identify schools and districts needing additional state-level supports and monitoring. Then, it will take further time to co-construct a formal plan with each district. Given the time still needed to analyze accountability data and plan, we would like to remove the related short-term outcome, Goal 5 and Goal 13 from the evaluation plan at this time. Given this change, coordinated supports will not be described in the remaining sections of this report that are related to infrastructure improvement activities. The connection to coordinated supports will be added back when the system has had the opportunity to receive and act upon relevant ESSA data. In the meantime, work is underway to ensure there is a plan for scaling up DBI implementation in Michigan through the newly awarded State Personnel

Development Grant and connecting with intermediate school districts through general supervision and local MTSS scale-up efforts.

The second proposed change to the evaluation plan is to consolidate two nearly identical goals (14 and 15) that are focused on who is participating in SSIP technical assistance (intensifying literacy instruction model demonstration). We propose keeping the more comprehensive Goal 15 (By June 2023 districts and ISDs of varying size and demographics, including sites that have been identified for support through state and federal accountability measures, will access a continuum of TA to help improve literacy outcomes for all students, including students with disabilities, as measured by universal, targeted, and intensive technical assistance participation and training records housed in the MiMTSS Data System) and removing Goal 14 that was just focused on model demonstration sites.

**If yes, describe a rationale or justification for the changes to the SSIP evaluation plan.**

The rationale for changes to the SSIP evaluation plan are included in the previous response field, alongside a description of each proposed change.

**Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:**

The FFY 21 infrastructure and improvement strategies reporting timeline is July 1, 2021, to October 31, 2022. The Theory of Action (ToA) focuses on developing capacity within MDE, Intermediate School Districts (ISDs), and local districts to fulfill their respective roles in the selection, coordination, support, and implementation of Data-Based Individualization (DBI) and other evidence-based practices, within a multi-tiered framework to improve outcomes for all learners, including students with disabilities. The emphasis on developing an internal infrastructure encompasses the MDE offices, aligning cross-office priorities through effective teaming structures by establishing clear governance and expanding stakeholder communication.

MiMTSS: MDE's MTSS Practice Profile defines standards and expectations for what MTSS looks like in practice and provides guidance for the implementation of MTSS, as indicated in Michigan's state law. The MDE MTSS Practice Profile specifically describes educators' and leaders' actions when using an MTSS framework as intended. The Practice Profile also provides educational settings with a framework to organize the instructional strategies used to support tiers 2 and 3 using the steps outlined in data-based individualization (DBI) to support successful learner outcomes. The MDE ensures high-quality professional learning and TA is available to support the implementation of MTSS through the state's MTSS supports (MiMTSS). MiMTSS is governed by the MDE's MiMTSS Leadership Team, with the TA provided to educators and leaders by the MiMTSS Technical Assistance (TA) Center, and supported using statewide data to inform improvements using the MiMTSS Data System.

General Supervision: Since 2016, when OSEP informed MDE that ISDs as sub-recipients of IDEA grant funds are functionally the local education agencies (LEAs), OSE has worked to broaden and enhance the system of general supervision. The OSE has engaged regularly since 2018 with a group of ISD and member district stakeholders, along with stakeholders representing other constituencies. The OSE supports the ISD work through grants – General Supervision System Grants – with required applications for funds and semi-annual and annual reporting of progress. Also, the OSE has been engaging with ISD Directors through a series of iterative documents that began with reviewing OSEP's Critical Elements (CrAIG), which evolved into a Conversation Guide and further evolved into an ISD self-assessment of the general supervision development work. These activities are part of the larger effort to build infrastructure and capacity within MDE, OSE, and ISDs. The OSE annually engages in activities to increase awareness and capacity, such as the SPP/APR presentation of indicator progress and trends to the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), OSE staff, and ISD Directors. The OSE has engaged and embraced a Data Use and Action Process to increase the OSE capacity to report, analyze, and use data to improve both results and compliance. The OSE is building two teams for this capacity-building work. The Data Use and Action Process Team has provided TA to three ISD



data action teams since 2018. It is anticipated TA will be provided to three additional ISDs and up to five districts. Each of the ISDs will identify approximately two constituent districts for a total of five additional districts being supported. The Quadrant Data Use Team is charged with building the capacity within the OSE. There is some overlap in the membership of these teams to ensure coordination. ISDs will be encouraged to identify staff to also participate in the DBI State-Trainer Network and a DBI community of practice to develop the knowledge and abilities of ISD staff who have been identified by leadership to facilitate DBI professional learning to school multidisciplinary teams. This will help connect the Data Use and Action Process with efforts to analyze the impact of intensifying literacy instruction using DBI to accelerate reading outcomes for students with disabilities.

**Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.**

MDE Office of Special Education: Professional learning and network for ISD directors and staff on how to develop regional infrastructures to support the literacy outcomes for students with disabilities. The OSE is beginning to consider strategic opportunities to connect and leverage the General Supervision and Data Use and Action Process with data-based individualization (DBI) technical assistance. For example, upcoming meetings with OSE staff and ISD Directors will include space for learning about how DBI and MTSS can be used to support growth for students with disabilities. Directors will access information about DBI and a summary of learning from the model demonstration project, including SiMR results. They will receive information about how they can partner with local districts to access a continuum of DBI technical assistance from the MiMTSS TA Center. As the OSE Data Use and Action Process Team provides TA to the field, ISD and district data action teams may identify a need to strengthen their Tier 2 intervention systems and Tier 3 systems for intensifying intervention. These teams could then be connected to the MiMTSS TA Center for DBI professional learning and implementation support that can be integrated into their strategic activities and plan.

MDE will apply implementation science to support alignment of MTSS supports from the capital to the classroom.

The MiMTSS Leadership Team completes the State Capacity Assessment (SCA) annually to self-assess progress toward developing the necessary state-level infrastructure to support MTSS across the educational cascade. The most recent administration was in April 2022, and yielded a Total score of 54%, an improvement of six percentage points since February 2021. Upon reviewing the results, the Leadership Team decided to prioritize improvements around using data to drive state-level decisions related to MTSS. The team has started looking at MTSS implementation fidelity data to understand the scope of MTSS implementation in Michigan.

The MiMTSS TA Center will demonstrate learning from the DBI and MTSS model demonstration project and demonstrate how the learning is infused into other universal, targeted, and intensive technical assistance. The following lessons were documented from the first year of the DBI Model Demonstration work with three elementary schools: 1) Schools need coaching support for multidisciplinary teams (systems coaching) and instructional coaching for interventionists, 2) Local assessment expertise needs to be developed, and tools that allow data to be easily summarized are needed, 3) MDTs are needing a lot of time to meet (at least weekly) to ensure their solid systems to support intervention access, ensure intervention effectiveness, and to provide ongoing individual student decision-making, 4) More intervention program adaptation examples are needed to demonstrate how to intensify the instruction. These lessons learned have all been used to design improvements to the data-based individualization (DBI) training materials and resources. In addition, efforts are underway to provide greater statewide access to data-based individualization (DBI) professional learning

through the newly awarded State Personnel Development Grant, universal TA sessions at the annual MTSS conference, webinars and videos, and a targeted TA professional learning series for school and district teams who need small doses of professional learning in a shorter-duration to improve their intervention systems.

Intermediate Outcomes in the evaluation plan are conceptualized as “Improved Knowledge and Skills, Fidelity & Capacity.”

As a result of participating in professional learning, teachers, schools, districts, and ISD leadership will increase their understanding and knowledge of the core components of data-based individualization to improve reading outcomes, applied within an MTSS framework.

School staff demonstrated a 7-percentage points improvement in data-based individualization (DBI) knowledge and skills based on a 39- item assessment that was given before training the multidisciplinary teams (pre) and again at the end of the school year (post). During the summer of 2022, this assessment was revised for the second and third usability cycles based on an analysis of the results from 2021-22 and alignment with the concepts and language used in the updated training materials. At the end of the school year, staff were also asked about the impact of participating in the DBI model demonstration project. 93% agreed that they were glad their school participated in the project. 98% of staff said they were able to implement all components of the intervention instruction effectively and 95% said they improved as a reading teacher. 95% of staff believed their school implementation of MTSS improved during the year and 100% of staff agreed that student reading outcomes improved.

Schools will implement the reading components of an MTSS framework and DBI with fidelity.

The Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory (R-TFI) was used to measure the implementation of the reading components of an MTSS framework. Tier 1 scores on the R-TFI improved for some schools, and stayed above 70% for all three schools, despite switching to the more rigorous version 2.0 in the spring of 2022. Advanced Tiers scores on the R-TFI improved for some schools, and were above 70% for all three schools, despite switching to the more rigorous version 2.0 in the spring of 2022. Observation data from the Enhanced Core Reading Instruction (ECRI) intervention lessons showed that while many interventionists technically used the lesson routines, they still needed support with implementation fidelity. The intervention was new to teachers during 2021-2022. It is therefore expected that teachers will be able to more consistently demonstrate intervention implementation fidelity during 2022-2023. Related to the steps of data-based individualization (DBI) that require intensifying intervention for students who do not initially make progress, approximately 67% of target students had data showing that they could benefit from intervention intensification. Only 19% of those students had an individualized intensive intervention plan developed. This is consistent with the lack of data available for SiMR Part B reporting.

Districts and ISDs will increase their capacity to support schools with DBI and MTSS through implementation infrastructures, including local training and coaching capacity.

The District Capacity Assessment (DCA) was used to measure the district-level infrastructure available to support schools to implement MTSS and DBI with fidelity. The first model demonstration district has been sustaining their district implementation infrastructure above 80% since September 2019.

**Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

The next steps for the infrastructure improvement strategies reported in FFY 22 will reflect work that is anticipated to occur between November 1, 2022, and October 31, 2023.

MiMTSS: Progress will continue to be reported for goal 11 (Annually, the MiMTSS TA Center will demonstrate learning from the data-based individualization (DBI) and MTSS model demonstration project and demonstrate how the learning is infused into other universal, targeted, and intensive TA, as measured by annual summaries from data-driven continuous improvement planning sessions and descriptions of each TA offering that integrates DBI data, systems, and practices.) and goal 12 (Annually, the state's capacity to support MTSS will improve or remain above 80%, as measured by the State Capacity Assessment total score.). In FFY 21, the MiMTSS State Action Plan was updated to illustrate the collective work and impact across the MiMTSS Leadership Team (LT), MTSS sub-committees, and the MiMTSS TA Center. The MiMTSS LT will continue to expand its use of data (reach, capacity, fidelity, and impact). The MiMTSS Evaluation Committee was formed to assist the MiMTSS LT in using relevant data, including disaggregated data, when planning and evaluating support for the effective implementation of MTSS. The MiMTSS TA Center will continue developing and expanding its TA Catalog offerings for DBI. The MTSS Resource Committee developed fiscal guidance to support districts in using state and federal funds to support the implementation of MTSS. ISDs are requesting comparable fiscal guidance since they are working to allocate consultants and other ancillary staff (e.g., school psychologists and teacher consultants) to provide DBI professional learning and coaching support. Learning from the model demonstrations for DBI, Interconnected Systems Framework (integrating Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support with social-emotional learning and school-wide mental health supports), and Early Childhood MTSS will continue to inform the development of a MiMTSS Resource Plan for statewide scale-up. Some of the FFY 2021 activities involving the MiMTSS TA Center will deepen knowledge of the MDE MiMTSS Leadership Team to understand how the DBI model demonstration's focus on intensifying literacy instruction is connected to several state and federal priorities to accelerate literacy outcomes. The MDE MiMTSS Leadership Team will review data related to learning from the DBI model demonstration and discuss opportunities for promoting and disseminating information about universal, targeted, and intensive DBI-related TA accessible to stakeholders.

General Supervision: Progress will be reported for goal 10 (Annually, the number of districts and ISDs with the capacity to support schools with DBI and MTSS will increase, as measured by the number of district and ISD staff trained, pre-post DBI knowledge tests, and post-training installation and practice activities.). FFY 2021 activities are part of the larger effort to build infrastructure and capacity within MDE, OSE, and ISDs to increase the ISDs' ability to apply DBI to accelerate literacy outcomes within an MTSS framework. The MiMTSS TA Center is formally collaborating with 13 ISDs who are working to scale up MTSS implementation across their counties/regions. Each of the 13 ISDs will have an ISD Scale-Up Plan that is approved by their executive leaders. The ISDs will have the opportunity to include capacity-building activities focused on DBI as they continue their efforts to scale MTSS. The TA Center will support the ISD capacity-building effort by having a DBI State-Trainer Network and a DBI community of practice to develop the knowledge and abilities of ISD staff who have been identified by ISD leadership to facilitate DBI professional learning to school multidisciplinary teams. There are also opportunities through state aid for ISDs to have their own Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS) Facilitators to develop educator and leader knowledge in scientifically based reading instructional methods. LETRS is a part of the intensifying literacy instruction model demonstration that is focused on DBI because it establishes foundational knowledge in reading acquisition that is necessary to know how to intensify reading instruction using the five DBI steps. LETRS professional learning is already available to Michigan pre-kindergarten through fifth-grade educators for free through state aid. Adding ISD LETRS Facilitators will not only increase the number of teachers and leaders who have access to professional learning in scientifically based instructional methods, but it will also help address teacher and leader turnover to ensure new staff has the necessary knowledge in reading acquisition.

**List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:**

DBI implementation and the district-selected reading intervention curriculum resource (Enhanced Core Reading Instruction) chosen for DBI step 1 started in September-October 2021. Next year's FFY22 report will include data from additional model demonstration partners that are using Reading Mastery as their intervention curriculum resource.

**Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.**

DBI is a research-based process used by a multidisciplinary team for individualizing and intensifying interventions. DBI is accomplished by systematically using assessment data, using research-validated interventions, and adapting the intervention instruction using research-based strategies. The adaptations to the intervention instruction are categorized by the Dimensions of Intervention Intensity (dosage, alignment, comprehensiveness, or elements of explicit instruction, behavioral supports, and attention to transfer). The multidisciplinary team includes individuals with a variety of expertise who will attend to students' access to quality Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention supports (e.g., assessment, reading specialist, behavior specialists, speech and language). They ensure that the intervention supports being accessed by students effectively meet their needs.

There are five steps in DBI that can be categorized by Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports within an MTSS framework. The first step of DBI begins by selecting a research-validated intervention to deliver intervention instruction. Four of the five schools participating in the DBI model demonstration (three schools' data are reported in the FFY 2021 report and the two schools' data to be reported in the FFY 2022 report) already decided to use the Enhanced Core Reading Instruction (ECRI) as the validated intervention program to teach foundational word-reading skills in grades K-2. ECRI uses explicit instructional routines to teach phonemic awareness, decoding skills and develops reading fluency including teacher modeling, guided practices, and opportunities for learners to apply and extend their learning. The additional schools that are starting DBI professional learning have decided to use Reading Mastery as the evidence-based, standard protocol intervention representing DBI step 1. Like ECRI, Reading Mastery explicit instructional routines to teach phonemic awareness, decoding skills and develops reading fluency. The model demonstration does not require a specific intervention curriculum resource to be used. The TA Center works with district and school leaders to review the evidence of the intervention curriculum resources to confirm the intervention has quality evidence to improve literacy-related outcomes and is aligned with scientifically based reading research. District leaders and the MiMTSS TA Center mutually agree on the evidence-based standard protocol intervention curriculum resources used in the first DBI step. Step 2 in DBI is progress monitoring. The progress monitoring data are analyzed to determine whether students respond to the intervention instruction. When students are responding to the validated intervention. In that case, it continues until it is determined they can exit intervention and maintain their foundational word-reading skill progress during class-wide, Tier 1 reading instruction. The first two DBI steps can be classified as Tier 2 intervention supports within an MTSS framework. Students who are not responding to the intervention instruction as anticipated would progress to DBI steps 3-5 for individualized, intensive Tier 3 intervention supports. Step 3 analyzes assessment data in a diagnostic way and, when needed, administers additional diagnostic assessments to develop a hypothesis about why a student is not responding as expected to the intervention instruction. Based on the hypothesis generated, DBI step 4 is initiated by determining adaptations to the intervention instruction. The adaptations are documented in an Individualized Intensive Intervention Plan. The interventionists implement the contents of the Individualized Intensive Intervention Plan with fidelity, and the student's progress is monitored. Progress monitoring is the last step of DBI, with the provision for analyzing the data to determine each student's response to the intensive, Tier 3 intervention supports.

Professional learning in scientifically based reading instructional methods is provided to educators and leaders participating in the DBI model demonstration using the Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS) Suite. The LETRS Suite is a blended professional learning model using a combination of readings, online modules, and live learning sessions with a certified LETRS Facilitator. LETRS teaches general

educators and special educators the skills needed to master the fundamentals of reading instruction: phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, writing, and language. It develops background knowledge in reading science necessary for educators and leaders who are members of the Multidisciplinary Team, interventionists, and some general education and special education teachers.

**Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.**

DBI is in the second year of implementation across the three schools with data reported in this report. The FFY 2022 report will include additional schools participating in the model demonstration. It is anticipated that information about the impact of DBI on district policies and procedures and the impact on teacher practice will continue to be learned throughout the FFY 2022 reporting period. This information is also available in the Evaluation Plan Logic Model, specifically the intermediate and long-term outcomes. The DBI professional learning for the model demonstration is provided to two teaming structures that are expected to impact the SiMR by changing policies, procedures, and teacher practices: District Implementation Team and Multidisciplinary Teams. The District Implementation Team (DIT) is responsible for developing the district's implementation infrastructure by developing policies, processes, and procedures to support the effective use, scale-up, and sustainability of educational innovations. This would include the implementation of DBI to support the advanced tiers (Tiers 2 and 3) of an MTSS framework to accelerate literacy outcomes for all learners, including students with disabilities. DIT membership typically includes a district executive leader, principal representation, teacher representation, and at specific times, additional stakeholders like a board member and family/caregiver representation. The newly awarded State Personnel Development Grant has the DBI professional learning for the district implementation team and elementary multidisciplinary teams happening in the first year of partnership. Future SPDG-supported district data will be included in future reports.

Intended impact on teacher/provider practices:

As a result of participating in professional learning, teachers, schools, districts, and ISD leadership will increase their understanding of the core components of data-based individualization (DBI) to improve reading outcomes, applied within an MTSS framework. Schools will also implement the reading components of an MTSS framework and DBI with fidelity. The three elementary school multidisciplinary teams are the second teaming structure receiving DBI professional learning. Sessions include introducing DBI, identifying students who need intensive (Tier 3) intervention supports, using data to inform intervention instruction, intensifying intervention instruction, behavioral supports to increase student motivation and engagement, and finally, evaluating DBI implementation efforts. These sessions impact the district/school policies, procedures, and teacher practices needed to impact the SiMR.

Intended impact on district policies, procedures, and/or practices:

Districts and ISDs will increase their capacity to support schools with DBI and MTSS through implementation infrastructures, including local training and coaching capacity. The implementation infrastructure the district has been developing and using to support an integrated behavior and reading MTSS framework through the SPDG partnership has been expanded to include DBI to support the advanced tiers of an MTSS framework (Tiers 2 and 3). The DIT professional learning sessions encompass two sessions. The first session focuses on expanding the district infrastructure to support DBI implementation. The second session is focused on district decisions for successful DBI implementation. Some of the decisions districts make after participating in the professional learning impacting policies, procedures, and teacher practices involve the recruitment and selection procedures for elementary multidisciplinary teams to ensure individuals with the proper skillsets are chosen. They also approve a DBI professional learning plan for intensifying literacy intervention instruction and

ensure the appropriate resources are allocated to support efforts (e.g., personnel, time, fiscal). The DIT also analyzes Acadience data to inform how students access Tier 2 intervention supports (DBI steps 1 and 2) and, when the data warrants, access the most intensive (Tier 3) individualized intervention supports (DBI steps 3-5). Districts ensure it is documented that Tier 3 intervention supports also include students with disabilities to ensure reading outcomes are accelerated. Finally, the district reviews its existing process and procedures for reviewing, evaluating, and selecting intervention curriculum resources to ensure it encompasses ways to evaluate interventions using the Dimensions of Intervention Intensity represented in steps 1 and 4 of the DBI process.

Intended impact on parent/caregiver and child outcomes:

Students with disabilities and their families will experience the following benefits resulting from data-based individualization and MTSS: 1) Improved access to evidence-based reading intervention, with intensification as needed, 2) improved reading outcomes, and 3) positive attitudes about reading and school supports. The professional learning sessions for the multidisciplinary teams include learning in how to meaningfully engage parent/caregiver and student voice in the intervention goals, as well as in developing an Individualized Intensive Intervention Plan and corresponding intervention supports to accelerate reading outcomes.

### **Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.**

The following three measures of fidelity were used to assess practice change from July 2021, thru June 2022:

Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory (R-TFI) 2.0: The R-TFI was developed to measure the reading components of an MTSS framework. There are two subscales: Tier 1 and the Advanced Tiers, which represent Tiers 2 and 3. The Advanced Tier items align with DBI and the dimensions of intensifying intervention that need to occur within the DBI process (steps 3 through 5). The R-TFI is the only measure available to assess scientifically based reading research, assessment measures, and systems needed for the reading components of an MTSS framework. Tier 1 scores on the R-TFI improved for some schools, and stayed above 70% for all three schools, despite switching to the more rigorous version 2.0 in the spring of 2022.

Advanced Tiers scores on the R-TFI improved for some schools, and were above 70% for all three schools, despite switching to the more rigorous version 2.0 in the spring of 2022.

Tier 2 reading intervention fidelity: Step 1 of DBI uses a validated intervention program, and it is the foundation for intensifying instruction. The interventions used in the three elementary schools have a fidelity measure that the intervention program authors have developed. The intervention program fidelity rubrics will be used to measure Goal 9: Annually, the number of schools demonstrating DBI implementation fidelity and intervention implementation fidelity will increase, as measured by a random sampling of 10% of school products (intervention adaptations documented in individual student intensive intervention plans) and intervention fidelity observations. Observation data from the Enhanced Core Reading Instruction (ECRI) intervention lessons showed that while many interventionists technically used the lesson routines, they still needed support with implementation fidelity. The intervention was new to teachers during 2021-2022. It is therefore expected that teachers will be able to more consistently demonstrate intervention implementation fidelity during 2022-2023.

Individualized Intensive Intervention Plan (IIIP) fidelity: Students who are not responding as expected to the Tier 2, validated reading intervention, enter into steps 3-5 of the DBI process. A multidisciplinary team, which includes the student's educator (special educator and general educator), and parents/caregivers develop an IIIP. It provides for monitoring the fidelity of the adaptations to specific components of the intervention. Data are collected to ensure the intensive intervention instruction is delivered as documented in the IIIP weekly. IIIP product reviews will be used to measure Goal 9: Annually, the number of schools demonstrating DBI implementation fidelity and intervention implementation fidelity will increase, as measured by a random sampling of 10% of school products (intervention adaptations documented in individual student intensive

intervention plans) and intervention fidelity observations. Related to the steps of DBI that require intensifying intervention for students who do not initially make progress, approximately 67% of target students had data showing that they could benefit from intervention intensification. Only 19% of those students had an intensive intervention plan developed. This is consistent with the lack of data available for SiMR Part B reporting.

**Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.**

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

The DBI model demonstration continues to be underway, and it is anticipated that progress will be made related to the short-term and intermediate outcomes outlined in our SSIP Evaluation Plan. Specifically, by the end of this reporting period (June 2023), the SiMR target (goal 2) will continue to be met for students accessing reading intervention supports and will demonstrate within-year reading progress as measured by Acadience Reading K-6 universal screening and progress monitoring scores matched to students' grade and skill level. Educator and leader knowledge will also increase in DBI due to participating in professional learning sessions and receiving coaching support from MiMTSS TA Center staff. It is also anticipated that progress will continue to be made on school and district capacity to support the advanced tiers (tiers 2 and 3) of an MTSS framework by implementing DBI (goals 7 and 9). Intervention and DBI fidelity goals are also expected to meet (goal 8), setting the stage for sustainability. The MiMTSS TA Center continues to work closely with the district and their elementary school(s) to teach them how to use DBI and develop their capacity to coach DBI implementation for sustainability. The formal partnership between the MiMTSS TA Center and schools participating in the DBI model demonstration is designed to last two years.

The DBI model demonstration will expand in FFY 2022 to include two additional districts and their elementary schools. One of the districts has been the recipient of the state's federally funded Comprehensive Literacy State Development (CLSD) grant. Initial conversations with the executive leaders in the two districts happened during the summer of 2022 and were facilitated by the MiMTSS TA Center director and staff supporting DBI. The readiness conversations with executive leaders outlined the purpose of the DBI model demonstration and its connection to the SiMR and SSIP. An overview of DBI was provided and included a summary of the professional learning sessions designed for a district implementation team (DIT) and multidisciplinary teams. Both districts needed to identify an evidence-based, standard protocol intervention before participation in the model demonstration could be confirmed. Each district chose Reading Mastery. Finally, the readiness conversation outlined the personnel needed to coordinate the DBI model demonstration and the assessment data that would need to be collected by staff. One of the two districts chose Acadience to use as the screening and progress monitoring curriculum-based assessment measures. The other district has been using Aimsweb and will provide the MiMTSS TA Center access to the Aimsweb data system so the professional learning and coaching support to the district can be appropriately contextualized for Aimsweb. Readiness conversations with elementary school staff have already occurred for one of the two schools. MiMTSS TA Center staff had a chance to meet the teachers (interventionists, special educators, classroom teachers) and provide an overview of DBI, the work that will happen across the 2022-2023 school year, and the professional learning and coaching support they will receive. The second readiness conversation should occur during late fall or early winter of 2022.

In one of two districts that have been recruited to participate, the teachers, leaders, and interventionists are currently accessing MiMTSS TA Center facilitated professional learning in the LETRS Suite, a blended professional learning model using a combination of readings, online modules, and live learning sessions. LETRS teaches general educators and special educators the skills needed to master the fundamentals of reading instruction: phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, writing, and language. It is not an intervention curriculum resource used in the DBI process. Knowledge in the fundamentals of reading instruction will help teachers, interventionists, leaders, and members of the

multidisciplinary teams better understand how to implement the five steps of DBI, since it is foundational knowledge needed to inform accurate intervention placement (DBI step 1), reading assessment data analysis (DBI steps 2-3), instructional adaptations to intensify reading intervention supports (DBI step 4), and ongoing data analysis (DBI step 5). The second district is working on having teachers enrolled in state-aid-funded LETRS professional learning. The MiMTSS TA Center LETRS Facilitators will also provide professional learning to the teachers in the second school.

**Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.**

While we will continue to use data to drive improvements to the implementation of Michigan's SSIP, we are not currently planning major modifications to the SSIP. Our evidence-based practice continues to be Data-Based Individualization (DBI), the SiMR remains focused on reading, and the major components of the evaluation plan remain in place. We are making progress toward our SSIP goals, and we will continue to expand the use of DBI and collection and use of data to inform decisions moving forward.

## **Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

### **Description of Stakeholder Input**

MDE OSE seeks stakeholder involvement through multiple means and mechanisms including in-person and virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys, and the use of virtual discussion rooms. MDE OSE conducted presentations for Indicator 2 Dropout and allowed stakeholders to breakout into groups to have a deeper discussion about the data and targets so that attendees could provide informed feedback on targets.

MDE OSE developed a schedule to systematically present the stakeholders with performance and progress data on indicators with the intent of ensuring everyone had a context for discussion. Content experts were available to answer questions and provide additional detail. Using this base of understanding, MDE OSE went through each indicator reviewing previous targets, rationales, and possible ways to approach target setting. For in-depth discussion, breakout rooms were used when holding virtual meetings. Each breakout room had MDE OSE staff and content experts to facilitate the discussion.

MDE OSE used Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) as the primary stakeholder group. Information about the SEAC can be found at [SEAC website](#). In addition to the agendas and minutes of meetings, presentations used in seeking stakeholder input are on this website. The location of these presentations was also shared with the ISD Directors of Special Education at a regularly scheduled meeting providing additional geographic representation. Other stakeholders groups include MDE OSE Data Advisory Committee (DAC), the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board, ISD Directors of Special Education, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD Directors of Special Education, member district directors of special education, attendees of the ISD Collaborative Conference, and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP.

**Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.**

The primary stakeholder group providing feedback about the SSIP is the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC), which meets monthly throughout the year. SEAC serves as Michigan's Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) mandated State Advisory Panel. The SEAC advises the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) Office of Special Education and the State Board of Education (SBE). The



SEAC has a broad diversity of stakeholders—administrators, providers, advocates, parents, and consumers—concerned with the education of all children, including students with disabilities. The IDEA requires at least 51 percent of SEAC’s membership to be “defined” members: persons with a disability or parents of a child with a disability (a child less than 26 years of age who receives special education services). The State Board of Education appoints SEAC members. There are up to 33 members of the SEAC with some membership turnover from year to year.

For the FFY 2020 SiMR target setting, SEAC members were asked to view an online, interactive, self-paced Data-Based Individualization course before the meeting. The course was a starting point for building some common language and understanding of DBI amongst SEAC members before the MDE provided a formal presentation and overview of the proposed SiMR targets and SSIP efforts. During the October 2021 meeting, the MDE OSE Director and MiMTSS TA Center Assistant Director reviewed the SSIP Theory of Action (ToA). They also defined a “model demonstration” and provided a rationale so members understood why this SSIP reported on a DBI model demonstration. Members received information about the scope and sequence of DBI professional learning for a District’s Implementation Team and elementary multidisciplinary teams. Three concerns were raised by SEAC members during the FFY 2021 target setting. The first was the small number of students with disabilities that could benefit from the Intensifying Literacy Instruction model demonstration. The second concern was developing sufficient state capacity for districts to implement DBI. The final concern expressed during target setting was ensuring the reading instructional methods and curriculum materials align with scientifically valid instructional practices.

During the fall of 2022, the MiMTSS TA Center Director and the MDE Director of Special Education presented the FFY 2021 SSIP data to SEAC members and outlined the lessons learned in the Intensifying Literacy Instruction model demonstration, expansion efforts with new districts, and how SEAC concerns expressed during last year’s target setting continue to be addressed. Expansion efforts were discussed with members and were presented with information about the school demographics for the additional schools included in the model demonstration. Members also learned that the Intensifying Literacy Instruction model demonstration professional learning scope and sequence is embedded into the state’s newly awarded State Personnel Development Grant in the first-year district elementary schools begin their work on implementing an integrated reading and social, emotional, behavioral MTSS framework. Information was also shared about the state’s DBI capacity building effort that will begin next fall with a state trainer network for ISD consultants and ancillary staff. Related to the second concern, SEAC learned about the resources and worked examples that have been developed from the existing DBI model demonstration sites to help new district teams and school multidisciplinary teams to apply DBI.

Since the worked examples and implementation lessons span across school sites, SEAC members were able to see how a range of district and school characteristics are represented in the learning. SEAC members were also able to see how the worked examples are used to help develop district DBI capacity. Finally, information was shared about the intervention curriculum materials being used across sites and the need for those things to meet the criteria of an evidence-based standard protocol intervention to implement the first DBI step. Since SEAC members were concerned last year about whether intervention curriculum resources were “balanced literacy based” or “aligned with a structured literacy approach,” additional information was shared during the meeting about how state aid funded professional learning in scientifically-valid reading instructional practices using the Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS) Suite is helping to increase understanding in reading acquisition and sources of reading difficulty. It is also creating shared language within the state about the elements of “structured literacy.” In subsequent SEAC meetings throughout the 2022-2023 school year, SEAC members will begin to see how DBI is represented in the state’s dyslexia handbook and how the learning from the model demonstration has set the stage for more students with disabilities to benefit from DBI.

The staff, students, and parents/caregivers are also stakeholders that are informing the SSIP. During initial model demonstration partnership conversations, staff are aware the intensifying literacy instruction work is

connected to the SSIP. The MiMTSS TA Center staff director shares relevant goals from the SSIP evaluation plan. Additionally, they see how perception data collected at the end of the school year directly informs goals within the SSIP evaluation plan. At the end of the school year, staff were also asked about the impact of participating in the DBI model demonstration project. 93% agreed that they were glad their school participated in the project. 98% of staff said they were able to implement all components of the intervention instruction effectively and 95% said they improved as a reading teacher. 95% of staff believed their school implementation of MTSS improved during the year and 100% of staff agreed that student reading outcomes improved.

SSIP target students attending participating schools were surveyed for their perspective at the end of the 2021-2022 school year. The majority of SSIP students felt positive about school (69%), reading (64%), and intervention time (59%) at the end of the school year. Most students thought they were great readers or getting better at reading (92%) at the end of the school year. During 2022-2023, this information will be gathered at the beginning and end of the school year to determine if learners' perceptions change while their schools implement data-based individualization (DBI).

Parents were also surveyed at the end of 2021-2022. Most parents agreed (59-69%) that the school listens and involves them in planning supports for their child. During 2022-2023, this information will be gathered at the beginning and end of the school year to determine if parent or caregiver perceptions change while their school implements data-based individualization (DBI). We will also examine whether those who disagree are parents or caregivers for children with disabilities or other marginalized groups. One of the three schools only sent the survey to parents who were also teachers at the school in 2021-2022.

**Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)**

NO

#### **Additional Implementation Activities**

**List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.**

N/A

**Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.**

The SSIP Evaluation Plan outlines timelines, data collection methods, measures, and expected outcomes for SSIP implementation activities. To access the SSIP Evaluation Plan click on the following link: [Evaluation Plan for Michigan's State Systemic Improvement Plan](#)

**Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.**

The state has not identified any new barriers.

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

#### **17 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

#### **17 - OSEP Response**

#### **17 - Required Actions**

## **Certification**

### **Instructions**

**Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.**

### **Certify**

**I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.**

**Select the certifier's role:**

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

**Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.**

**Name:** Julie Trevino

**Title:** SPP/APR Coordinator

**Email:** [trevinoj1@michigan.gov](mailto:trevinoj1@michigan.gov)

**Phone:** 517-241-0497

**Submitted on:** 04/25/23 1:32:44 PM