STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

For reporting on
FFY 2022

Michigan

PART B DUE February 1, 2024

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

WASHINGTON, DC 20202

Table of Contents

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 FFY 2022 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), which informs 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 incorporating the SPP/APR process and 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 prepare them for further education, employment, and independent living; and 3) protect the civil rights of children with an individualized education program (IEP). MDE OSE continues to develop a holistic system of general supervision, which is cohesive and robust.

Since 2016, MDE OSE has developed an increased awareness and understanding of the role of intermediate school districts (ISDs) as subrecipients of the IDEA grant funds. This has led MDE OSE to continue to broaden and refine the general supervision system. As subrecipients of IDEA grant funds, OSEP instructed MDE that ISDs are to be considered local educational agencies (LEA). With this understanding and awareness, the ongoing work is a coordinated and cooperative effort with ISDs. Scheduled monthly meetings occur with the MDE OSE, 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). The 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. The strategic effort is a department-wide plan, titled Michigan's Top 10 Strategic Education Plan Michigan's Top 10 Strategic Education Plan.

In June of 2023, Governor Whitmer and the Michigan Legislature passed Michigan's largest education budget in an effort to support students reaching the goals of Michigan's Top 10 Strategic Education Plan. This was the second consecutive year of increased educational funding. Notable bolstered efforts in the FFY 2023-24 school aid budget include per pupil funding, early childhood programs, universal meals, early literacy, school staff recruitment and retention, transportation, and the creation of MI Kids Back on Track MI Kids Back on Track, a program designed to address learning loss due to the pandemic. Additionally, MDE OSE recognizes the significance of back-to-back years of historic budgets regarding funding for students receiving special education services. Prior to FFY 2022-23, Michigan's foundation allowance reimbursed districts either 28% of

the cost of special education services or the full per pupil funding allowance, whichever was greater. With the current budget, special education students receive 100% of the per pupil amount plus 28% of special education costs absorbed by LEAs. This change is significant in the advancement of funding equity for the special education population. Michigan's FFY 2022-23 and FFY 2023-24 school aid budget sends the message that all students are important investments and provides the means to advance Michigan's Top 10 Strategic Education Plan.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

MDE OSE recognizes the continual effect COVID and the increased staff shortages has on educational outcomes. MDE OSE analyzed data from a variety of sources to identify lingering effects of the COVID-19 pandemic. MDE OSE examined and determined indicator data are impacted due to chronic absenteeism, a category monitored through the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS). The summarized analysis is provided in the following format:

1. Impact on validity and reliability
2. Explanation on potential impact on result/compliance indicator(s)
3. Action steps MDE OSE took, or is in the process of taking, to mitigate further impact on the indicator.

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: 1) SPP/APR, including the SSIP; 2) data on results and processes; 3) integrated compliance monitoring activities; 4) policies, procedures, and implementation of effective evidence-based practices; 5) professional learning and development (PLD) and technical assistance (TA); 6) fiscal accountability and management; 7) effective dispute resolution; and 8) improvement and correction of compliance through the use of incentives and sanctions.

MDE OSE with broad stakeholder input sets targets for results indicators and seeks input on methodologies and procedures. Stakeholders include the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) which is Michigan's state advisory panel to the State Board of Education and MDE, the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup, Michigan Alliance for Families (MAF), ISD directors of special education 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 ISD determinations. MDE also uses the data to generate ad hoc data responses, as well as deciding how and where to allocate resources.

Michigan has 56 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 are noted in the specific indicator. MDE OSE monitors the subrecipients of IDEA funds, which include ISDs and programs operated by other State agencies, such as correctional agencies according to 34 C.F.R. § 300.149(d). The subrecipients, in turn, are responsible for the general supervision of schools or programs within their jurisdiction. Monitoring and all reporting occur at the ISD level as member district data is aggregated to the ISD level. However, MDE OSE continues to support ISDs with monitoring and improvement activities at the

member district level. MDE OSE issues findings to the member districts based on the MDE OSE directed monitoring for Indicators 4, 9 and 10. These data are not reported in the SPP/APR as the data are reported at the subrecipient level.

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

56

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that the IDEA Part B requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions).

MDE OSE continues to implement & refine the 8 General Supervision System components. Supports in place include the General Supervision Grant, General Supervision System Design Self-Assessment, Data Use & Action Process, Quadrant Data Use, Differentiated Framework of Supports, & General Supervision System Accountability Workgroup. MDE OSE has developed a definition of monitoring to include improvement of results & compliance with IDEA going beyond SPP/APR data reporting.

Integrated Monitoring

MDE OSE monitoring examines educational results, outcomes & compliance. Multiple methods are used to ensure FAPE in the least restrictive environment (LRE). Methods include monitoring that occur through SPP/APR indicators, dispute resolution system, fiscal risk assessment & ISD Determinations' process. Member district data are aggregated & reported to ISD, reinforcing collaboration between MDE OSE, ISDs, & member districts, each with well-defined roles. Data are compiled from MSDS, Catamaran & a review of prior monitoring activities. Data are analyzed & criteria is set to identify member districts for differentiated monitoring activities. When data are analyzed & criteria assigned, MDE OSE works with ISDs to schedule/prepare/participate in training for monitoring teams, issue a Findings/No Findings report, ensure evidence of Corrective Action Plans (CAPs) & ensure timeliness from all parties. An ISD functions as team lead during monitoring activities, obtains further detailed member district data, develops a district level team, performs procedure & student record reviews, completes report, & works alongside member districts to address CAPs. A member district actively participates in all monitoring activities & ensures essential personnel are accessing targeted TA offered by MDE OSE as needed. This monitoring structure builds capacity to ensure eligible students are afforded FAPE, with collaborative efforts focused on compliance & educational results.

Policies, Procedures & Effective Implementation

Michigan & MDE OSE have policies, procedures & implementation strategies which align & support implementation of the IDEA & Michigan Administrative Rules for Special Education (MARSE). MDE OSE has been engaging in an ongoing process to ensure ISDs & 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. With development of the SPP/APR, SSIP & integrated monitoring activities, the work continues to ensure alignment of policies, procedures & implementation strategies.

PLD & TA

MDE OSE uses data & stakeholder input to identify areas of universal need for TA & PLD. The State website & Catamaran, a system that supports ISDs & districts analyze/interpret data & keep track of monitoring activities in a single location are used. MDE OSE also uses meetings with ISD directors of special education,

professional organization meetings & conferences to provide universal TA. TA is provided based on identified needs through compliance monitoring, dispute resolution & fiscal management activities & at the request of ISD directors of special education. MDE OSE has a Differentiated Framework of Supports to identify ISDs' needs in 4 categories: 1) universal 2) directed (low in compliance) 3) targeted (low in results) or 4) intensive (low in compliance & results). Through the framework, MDE offers ISD support in data analysis through a data use & action process and 1:1 TA in areas of low compliance. Framework is also used to direct ISDs to accept TA when more intensive TA is warranted.

Fiscal Accountability

The MDE OSE's system of fiscal management & accountability implements processes & procedures to provide oversight for the application, receipt, distribution & monitoring use of IDEA funds at the State & ISD 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 timely using the federally required funding formula. ISDs, as subrecipients, submit applications which are reviewed for completeness & allowable use. Fiscal monitoring is an ongoing process which includes program fiscal reviews through on-site & desk reviews. Risk factors are taken into consideration. A-133 single audits are reviewed & findings are resolved through corrective action & the recapture of any misspent funds. ISD fiscal monitoring oversight & TA ensures all Part B fiscal requirements are being met, including maintenance of effort, coordinated early intervening services (voluntary & required amounts with significant disproportionality), 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 timely resolution of complaints, mediations & due process actions. Information for all interested parties is provided through the [MDE OSE website](#) including translated documents in Spanish & Arabic. Toll-free phone lines, email, electronic & paper documents, coaching, mentoring, local, regional, & statewide learning opportunities & training sessions are also available. IDEA grant-funded initiatives provide information on dispute resolution for families & others. Highlights of initiatives include: providing mediation, facilitation, training services & support for districts & parents to resolve disputes. Issues of concern are entered & tracked through a state data system. Data are used to determine whether patterns/trends exist, identify districts for further monitoring activities & ensure related corrective actions have been implemented & noncompliance corrected.

Improvement, Correction, Incentives & Sanctions

Enforcement of regulations, policies & procedures is required by the IDEA & MARSE. MDE OSE administers for Part B & the Office of Great Start/Early Childhood Education & Family Services (OGS/ECE&FS) administers for Part C. Both offices use Catamaran to input monitoring data, generate reports, & assure correction of noncompliance. When noncompliance is identified, the State issues a finding of noncompliance to the 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. All findings of noncompliance & time it takes for correction of the finding of noncompliance are tracked in Catamaran.

ISDs & districts are required 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. If the district or ISD is unable to correct the finding of noncompliance, a TA provider is assigned to correct systemic findings of noncompliance. If TA provider is unable to assist the district or ISD in closing the finding of noncompliance, MDE OSE uses a variety of incentives & sanctions to accomplish improvement and correction. Catamaran is used to review documentation provided to verify correction or further direct correction efforts.

An incentive & in response to ongoing & substantial need for appropriately certified & endorsed teachers, MDE OSE offers an expanded Special Education Teacher Tuition Reimbursement Grant. The grant funds are

intended to incentivize certified Michigan teachers to earn an endorsement in special education for employment in a program for which currently not qualified.

As a sanction, ISDs with Determinations as needs intervention for 3 or more years are directed to participate in the OSE Data Use & Action process at the ISD's expense.

Technical Assistance System:

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

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 developed 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 (low in compliance indicators), targeted (low in select results indicators) or intensive (low in both compliance & results indicators). The data are further examined to determine areas where support is still necessary and areas where needs are emerging. MDE OSE continues to develop resources and TA to specifically address individual as well as universal needs identified 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 sections above and below.

MDE OSE's TA and PLD activities are correlative because each informs the other. Some of the interrelated activities include - documents and videos on the State's website; 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 coordinated alignment of TA and PLD are part of the SSIP work to align efforts 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, an OSEP Part D State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG), works on behalf of MDE to provide a continuum of TA to ISDs, member districts, and schools in an 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.

Stakeholder Engagement:

The mechanisms for broad stakeholder engagement, including activities carried out to obtain input from, and build the capacity of, a diverse group of parents to support the implementation activities designed to improve outcomes, including target setting and any subsequent revisions to targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

MDE OSE seeks stakeholder input through multiple means and mechanisms including in-person and virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys, and the use of virtual discussion rooms. MDE OSE uses 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.

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 78 representatives with a race/ethnicity breakdown of 78%--White, 8%--African American, 3%--Native American,4%--Asian and 5%--Hispanic and 3%--Middle Eastern. 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 be more inclusive of diverse perspectives. 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. MDE OSE meets with SEAC and Michigan Alliance for Families (MAF) throughout the year bringing data and sharing information to determine whether targets are reasonable yet rigorous.

MDE OSE conducted presentations for input on Indicator methodologies and provided for stakeholders to breakout into groups to have a deeper discussion about the data and targets so attendees could provide informed feedback on proposed changes. Each breakout room had MDE OSE staff and content experts to facilitate the discussion. MDE OSE developed a schedule to systematically present 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 Indicator teams went through each indicator analyzing data, reviewing targets,

improvement strategies and evaluated progress. The results of these analyses were presented to stakeholders.

Other stakeholder groups include the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board of Education, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD directors of special education, member district special education representatives, attendees of the ISD Collaborative Conference (special education personnel), and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP.

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

YES

Number of Parent Members:

78

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.

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 proposed indicator targets and or changes to methodologies.

MDE OSE also presented to the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education (MAASE), the Michigan Intermediate Special Education Directors and the Michigan Alliance for Families (MAF), 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](#), 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. 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.

Additionally, MDE OSE tracks information and questions received from the MDE OSE Information line [About OSE](#). The information gathered is from a broad range of stakeholders, including parents. The MDE OSE

Information line is accessible through email and/or phone, which is toll free and available with interpreter services and in multiple languages. Anyone who contacts the information line can expect a response within 48 hours. Data gathered from this process are documented, reviewed, and analyzed in order to determine trends and possible actions needed by MDE OSE.

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 monthly 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 Fall 2023, MDE OSE conducted presentations for Indicator 4 Suspension/Expulsion and moved stakeholders into breakout groups to have a deeper discussion about the data and targets. Each breakout room had MDE OSE staff and content experts to facilitate the discussion. Attendees then provided informed feedback on proposed changes to the methodology. Giving attendees, including parents, information to review ahead of the meeting led to meaningful input of changes to the definition of significant discrepancy for Indicator 4A and 4B.

Translation and closed captioning services were provided during SEAC stakeholder monthly meetings. In addition, materials were provided electronically on a public website which included an overview and historical information on the indicators. 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. MDE OSE continues to identify ways to present information to various stakeholder groups and receive input and feedback.

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 4 Suspension/Expulsion in FFY 2022. Time was spent planning and facilitating monthly meetings with 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, MDE OSE continues 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, MDE OSE has worked more closely with MAF to broaden and extend the outreach to parents of children with disabilities and seek public input.

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 on 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 Function 3 webpage.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2021 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 2021 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 revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2021 APR in 2023, is available.

MDE OSE 2023 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 2023. MDE OSE also posts the current SPP/APR, including the SSIP, on the Annual Performance Report section of the MDE OSE 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 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 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 2021. The MDE's score decreased from 75.00% to 70.83%. Overall, the five-year growth rate for Michigan is 11.66 percentage points. Work continues to improve the results elements, such as graduation rate, dropout rate, participation in statewide assessments, 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 received a zero score for five results elements.

- Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments for Reading
- Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress for Reading
- Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments for Math

- 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 national sources of TA and taken the actions described below.

MDE OSE Response to the Elements (Assessment)

Technical Assistance Sources:

Michigan received guidance on assessment practices through calls hosted by the National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO). Three MDE OSE staff attended the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE) School Support and Accountability 2023 State Assessment Conference and brought back to Michigan essential concepts and direction related toward assessment practices. This information was disseminated to ISDs through a statewide TA call, as well as presented to the Michigan Alliance for Families (MAF), an MDE OSE stakeholder group. Additionally, Michigan worked with the OSEP State contact to verify Michigan's assessment information related to the state's request for a waiver on the 1% cap for participation.

Action Taken:

As a result of above TA sources and MDE OSE's collaborative efforts to address State determinations, MDE OSE created guidance documents, presented to ISD directors of special education, and provided TA on the appropriate use of alternate assessments in an effort to increase participation and strive to meet the 1% cap. MDE OSE presented to MAF with a focus on educating stakeholders on the importance of the 95% participation requirement and the unintended consequences when 95% participation is not met. Additionally, MDE OSE updated the Family Matters State Assessments document to include a section about why participation is important, an explanation of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) requirement, and the consequences for not meeting participation requirements.

MDE OSE Response to the Elements (Graduation and Dropout)

Technical Assistance Sources:

MDE OSE accessed tools and resources for Part B SPP Indicator 1 Graduation from the National TA Center on Transition. MDE OSE also accessed tools and resources for Part B SPP Indicator 2 Dropout from the NTACT website.

Action Taken:

As a result of above TA sources and MDE OSE's collaborative efforts to address State determinations, Michigan provided TA to ISDs on the use of personal curriculums as an option for meeting 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 demonstrating that the use of personal curriculum has a positive effect on the likelihood of students with an IEP graduating with a regular diploma. MDE OSE created guidance documents on personal curriculum, including providing data to ISDs on the use of personal curriculum 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. Graduation and dropout are of educational concern for all students, not only for students with an IEP. Therefore, the MDE Superintendent of Public Instruction issued a statewide memo regarding the use of personal curriculums. MDE is addressing this concern in conjunction with the work of MDE OSE.

MDE OSE Response to General Supervision

Technical Assistance Sources:

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 regularly provided by the IDC and other national TA centers. 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.

Action Taken:

As a result of above TA sources and MDE OSE's collaborative efforts to address State determinations, MDE OSE works with identified ISDs to improve data and look at promising practices. MDE OSE continues 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 outcomes for students with an IEP. 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 OSE 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 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 2022 and 2023 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to Section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 23, 2023 determination letter informed the State that it 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. The State provided the required information.

Intro - Required Actions

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 ED*Facts* 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 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), 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.

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

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	70.78%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	70.78%	70.78%
Data	65.34%	63.53%	64.26%	70.78%	68.87%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MDE OSE seeks stakeholder input through multiple means and mechanisms including in-person and virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys, and the use of virtual discussion rooms. MDE OSE uses Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) as the primary stakeholder group. Information about the SEAC can be found at the 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.

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 78 representatives with a race/ethnicity breakdown of 78%--White, 8%--African American, 3%--Native American,4%--Asian and 5%--Hispanic and 3%--Middle Eastern. 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 be more inclusive of diverse perspectives. 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. MDE OSE meets with SEAC and Michigan Alliance for Families (MAF) throughout the year bringing data and sharing information to determine whether targets are reasonable yet rigorous.

MDE OSE conducted presentations for input on Indicator methodologies and provided for stakeholders to breakout into groups to have a deeper discussion about the data and targets so attendees could provide informed feedback on proposed changes. Each breakout room had MDE OSE staff and content experts to facilitate the discussion. MDE OSE developed a schedule to systematically present 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 Indicator teams went through each indicator analyzing data, reviewing targets, improvement strategies and evaluated progress. The results of these analyses were presented to stakeholders.

Other stakeholder groups include the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board of Education, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD directors of special education, member district special education representatives, attendees of the ISD Collaborative Conference (special education personnel), and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	8,803
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	N/A
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	1,046
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	17
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	3,682

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
8,803	13,548	68.87%	70.78%	64.98%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

MDE OSE examined data to assess the quality of the data validity and reliability. MDE OSE compared data from previous years and categories and determined data to be accurate. MDE OSE determined reliability in methodology by verifying consistency in the process LEAs use to report students who dropout. With data being verified as valid and reliable, MDE OSE conducted data analysis and discovered an alarming trend in chronic absenteeism (missing 10% or more of school). There has been a noticeable increase in chronic absenteeism, reaching a historic high of 38.5% for all students K-12 in 2021-22, negatively impacting students with an IEP to a greater degree. Prior to the COVID pandemic, the percentage of chronically absent students with an IEP hovered around 28%. Michigan's 2021-22 data reports chronically absent students with disabilities at 47.8%, a dramatic increase.

In exploring correlation between attendance and dropout rates, MDE OSE found research compiled by the US Department of Education updated in 2019 (Chronic Absenteeism in the Nation's Schools (ed.gov)) which states, "Irregular attendance can be a better predictor of whether students will drop out before graduation than test scores." From reading this report as well as studies referenced in this report, MDE OSE contributes slippage in graduation rates to the drastic increase in chronic absences for students with disabilities during the 2021-22 school year.

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)

To address chronic absenteeism, MDE publicly released a statement in September of 2022 with an urgent request for districts and families to work together to increase student attendance. Michigan's Multi-Tiered System of Supports TA Center, MI Kids Back on Track program, and increased financial supports for transportation are some of the bolstered efforts MDE and Michigan's Legislature are utilizing to increase student engagement and attendance. This is done in coordinated effort with MDE OSE's General Supervision System, guidance surrounding LRE, and supported TA. Attendance data reported for the 2022-23 school year show students with IEPs who were chronically absent dropped from 47.8% to 39.5%. While there are ongoing efforts to return to pre-pandemic levels or below, the 8.3 percentage point drop in chronic absenteeism for students with disabilities is encouraging, and MDE OSE anticipates improvement with graduation rates in years to come as a result.

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 ED*Facts* 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 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 section 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), 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.

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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	8.50%	8.25%	8.25%	8.25%	22.89%
Data	6.76%	6.86%	6.66%	5.46%	22.89%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MDE OSE seeks stakeholder input through multiple means and mechanisms including in-person and virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys, and the use of virtual discussion rooms. MDE OSE uses Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) as the primary stakeholder group. Information about the SEAC can be found at the [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.

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 78 representatives with a race/ethnicity breakdown of 78%--White, 8%--African American, 3%--Native American,4%--Asian and 5%--Hispanic and 3%--Middle Eastern. 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 be more inclusive of diverse perspectives. 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. MDE OSE meets with SEAC and Michigan Alliance for Families (MAF) throughout the year bringing data and sharing information to determine whether targets are reasonable yet rigorous.

MDE OSE conducted presentations for input on Indicator methodologies and provided for stakeholders to breakout into groups to have a deeper discussion about the data and targets so attendees could provide informed feedback on proposed changes. Each breakout room had MDE OSE staff and content experts to facilitate the discussion. MDE OSE developed a schedule to systematically present 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 Indicator teams went through each indicator analyzing data, reviewing targets, improvement strategies and evaluated progress. The results of these analyses were presented to stakeholders.

Other stakeholder groups include the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board of Education, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD directors of special education, member district special education representatives, attendees of the ISD Collaborative Conference (special education personnel), and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	8,803
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	N/A
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	1,046
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	17
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	3,682

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
3,682	13,548	22.89%	22.89%	27.18%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

MDE OSE examined data to assess the quality of the data validity and reliability. MDE OSE compared data from previous years and categories and determined data to be accurate. MDE OSE determined reliability in methodology by verifying consistency in the process LEAs use to report students who dropout. With data being verified as valid and reliable, MDE OSE conducted data analysis and discovered an alarming trend in chronic absenteeism (missing 10% or more of school). There has been a noticeable increase in chronic absenteeism, reaching a historic high of 38.5% for all students K-12 in 2021-22, negatively impacting students with an IEP to a greater degree. Prior to the COVID pandemic, the percentage of chronically absent students with an IEP hovered around 28%. Michigan's 2021-22 data reports chronically absent students with disabilities at 47.8%, a dramatic increase.

In exploring correlation between attendance and dropout rates, MDE OSE found research compiled by the US Department of Education updated in 2019 (Chronic Absenteeism in the Nation's Schools (ed.gov)) which states, "Irregular attendance can be a better predictor of whether students will drop out before graduation than

test scores." From reading this report as well as studies referenced in this report, MDE OSE contributes slippage in dropout rates to the drastic increase in chronic absences for students with disabilities during the 2021-22 school year.

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

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

- 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
- Completed general education with an equivalency certificate—GED or HSE examination.
- 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)

To address chronic absenteeism, MDE publicly released a statement in September of 2022 with an urgent request for districts and families to work together to increase student attendance. Michigan's Multi-Tiered System of Supports TA Center, MI Kids Back on Track program, and increased financial supports for transportation are some of the bolstered efforts MDE and Michigan's Legislature are utilizing to increase student engagement and attendance. This is done in coordinated effort with MDE OSE's General Supervision System, guidance surrounding LRE, and supported TA. Attendance data reported for the 2022-23 school year show students with IEPs who were chronically absent dropped from 47.8% to 39.5%. While there are ongoing efforts to return to pre-pandemic levels or below, the 8.3 percentage point drop in chronic absenteeism for students with disabilities is encouraging, and MDE OSE anticipates improvement with dropout rates in years to come as a result.

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions
None

2 - OSEP Response

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 ED*Facts* 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	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MDE OSE seeks stakeholder input through multiple means and mechanisms including in-person and virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys, and the use of virtual discussion rooms. MDE OSE uses Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) as the primary stakeholder group. Information about the SEAC can be found at the 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.

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 78 representatives with a race/ethnicity breakdown of 78%--White, 8%--African American, 3%--Native American,4%--Asian and 5%--Hispanic and 3%--Middle Eastern. 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 be more inclusive of diverse perspectives. 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. MDE OSE meets with SEAC and Michigan Alliance for Families (MAF) throughout the year bringing data and sharing information to determine whether targets are reasonable yet rigorous.

MDE OSE conducted presentations for input on Indicator methodologies and provided for stakeholders to breakout into groups to have a deeper discussion about the data and targets so attendees could provide informed feedback on proposed changes. Each breakout room had MDE OSE staff and content experts to facilitate the discussion. MDE OSE developed a schedule to systematically present 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 Indicator teams went through each indicator analyzing data, reviewing targets, improvement strategies and evaluated progress. The results of these analyses were presented to stakeholders.

Other stakeholder groups include the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board of Education, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD directors of special education, member district special education representatives, attendees of the ISD Collaborative Conference (special education personnel), and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts*

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	15,447	13,579	12,431
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	13,039	5,498	1,645
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	346	5,352	7,453
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1,752	1,672	1,710

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	15,460	13,605	12,458
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	10,983	5,374	1,497
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	2,396	5,479	7,601
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1,800	1,755	1,808

(1) The children with IEPs who are English learners and took the ELP in lieu of the regular reading/language arts assessment are not included in the prefilled data in this indicator.

(2) 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.

(3) The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments, as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	15,137	15,447	96.89%	95.00%	97.99%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	12,522	13,579	91.07%	95.00%	92.22%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	10,808	12,431	87.37%	95.00%	86.94%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	15,179	15,460	97.02%	95.00%	98.18%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	12,608	13,605	91.37%	95.00%	92.67%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	10,906	12,458	88.20%	95.00%	87.54%	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-12th 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, the results on M-Step, PSAT, and SAT allow for selection of students with an IEP among other subgroups, and this information can be totaled 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.

Visit MI School Data to generate an LEA level report for Indicator 3 at 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 2021 Public reporting was made available in May 2023. New FFY 2022 data will be publicly posted by June 1, 2024.

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

None

3A - OSEP Response

The State did not provide a Web link to FFY 2022 publicly-reported assessment results. OSEP notes that the State reported "New FFY 2022 data will be publicly posted by June 1, 2024." The failure to publicly report as required under 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) is noncompliance.

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 ED*Facts* file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3B - Indicator Data
Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	15.69%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	23.00%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	13.97%

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	13.53%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	8.02%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	5.09%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MDE OSE seeks stakeholder input through multiple means and mechanisms including in-person and virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys, and the use of virtual discussion rooms. MDE OSE uses Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) as the primary stakeholder group. Information about the SEAC can be found at the [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.

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 78 representatives with a race/ethnicity breakdown of 78%--White, 8%--African American, 3%--Native American,4%--Asian and 5%--Hispanic and 3%--Middle Eastern. 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 be more inclusive of diverse perspectives. 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. MDE OSE meets with SEAC and Michigan Alliance for Families (MAF) throughout the year bringing data and sharing information to determine whether targets are reasonable yet rigorous.

MDE OSE conducted presentations for input on Indicator methodologies and provided for stakeholders to breakout into groups to have a deeper discussion about the data and targets so attendees could provide informed feedback on proposed changes. Each breakout room had MDE OSE staff and content experts to facilitate the discussion. MDE OSE developed a schedule to systematically present 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 Indicator teams went through each indicator analyzing data, reviewing targets, improvement strategies and evaluated progress. The results of these analyses were presented to stakeholders.

Other stakeholder groups include the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board of Education, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD directors of special education, member district special education representatives, attendees of the ISD Collaborative Conference (special education personnel), and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts*

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

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	13,385	10,850	9,098
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,384	1,310	276
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	35	1,084	937

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

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	13,379	10,853	9,098

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,058	565	76
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	40	374	283

(1) The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	2,419	13,385	17.18%	16.00%	18.07%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	2,394	10,850	20.37%	23.00%	22.06%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	1,213	9,098	12.50%	14.00%	13.33%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	2,098	13,379	14.74%	14.75%	15.68%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	939	10,853	8.80%	8.02%	8.65%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	359	9,098	3.85%	5.80%	3.95%	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-12th 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, the results on M-Step, PSAT, and SAT allow for selection of students with an IEP among other subgroups, and this information can be totaled 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.

Visit MI School Data to generate an LEA level report for Indicator 3 at [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 2021 Public reporting was made available in May 2023. New FFY 2022 data will be publicly posted by June 1, 2024.

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
None

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 ED*Facts* file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3C - Indicator Data
Historical Data:

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

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MDE OSE seeks stakeholder input through multiple means and mechanisms including in-person and virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys, and the use of virtual discussion rooms. MDE OSE uses Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) as the primary stakeholder group. Information about the SEAC can be found at the 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.

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 78 representatives with a race/ethnicity breakdown of 78%--White, 8%--African American, 3%--Native American,4%--Asian and 5%--Hispanic and 3%--Middle Eastern. 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 be more inclusive of diverse perspectives. 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. MDE OSE meets with SEAC and Michigan Alliance for Families (MAF) throughout the year bringing data and sharing information to determine whether targets are reasonable yet rigorous.

MDE OSE conducted presentations for input on Indicator methodologies and provided for stakeholders to breakout into groups to have a deeper discussion about the data and targets so attendees could provide informed feedback on proposed changes. Each breakout room had MDE OSE staff and content experts to facilitate the discussion. MDE OSE developed a schedule to systematically present 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 Indicator teams went through each indicator analyzing data, reviewing targets, improvement strategies and evaluated progress. The results of these analyses were presented to stakeholders.

Other stakeholder groups include the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board of Education, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD directors of special education, member district special education representatives, attendees of the ISD Collaborative Conference (special education personnel), and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts*

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

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	1,752	1,672	1,710
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	1,068	1,058	1,165

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

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	1,800	1,755	1,808
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	879	809	1,040

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,068	1,752	62.37%	59.35%	60.96%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	1,058	1,672	66.50%	71.95%	63.28%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	1,165	1,710	67.91%	72.50%	68.13%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

Results from the spring 2023 Michigan summative alternate assessments showed scores did not meet targets and slipped compared to last year for 8th grade ELA, and in High School for both ELA and Math. The MDE OSE analysis indicates several factors likely contribute to this trend; First older students missed out on more years of in-person instruction during the pandemic, negatively impacting Math and ELA scores; Second, the high proficiency rates for alternate achievement standards observed in past years should continue to trend downward as the overall number of higher achieving students decreases due to the ESSA 1% cap requirements for alternate assessments.

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 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	879	1,800	47.35%	50.30%	48.83%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	809	1,755	47.71%	52.80%	46.10%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	1,040	1,808	61.08%	61.19%	57.52%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

Results from the spring 2023 Michigan summative alternate assessments showed scores did not meet targets and slipped compared to last year for 8th grade ELA, and in High School for both ELA and Math. The MDE OSE analysis indicates several factors likely contribute to this trend. First, older students missed out on more years of in-person instruction during the pandemic, negatively impacting Math and ELA scores. Second, the high proficiency rates for alternate achievement standards observed in past years should continue to trend downward as the overall number of higher achieving students decreases due to the ESSA 1% cap requirements for alternate assessments.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

Results from the spring 2023 Michigan summative alternate assessments showed scores did not meet targets and slipped compared to last year for 8th grade ELA, and in High School for both ELA and Math. The MDE OSE analysis indicates several factors likely contribute to this trend. First, older students missed out on more years of in-person instruction during the pandemic, negatively impacting Math and ELA scores. Second, the high proficiency rates for alternate achievement standards observed in past years should continue to trend downward as the overall number of higher achieving students decreases due to the ESSA 1% cap requirements for alternate assessments.

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-12th Grade Landing page at MI School Data. A specific grade is needed to request sub-group demographic results for the regular assessments. After selecting a specific grade, the results on M-Step, PSAT, and SAT allow for selection of students with an IEP among other subgroups, and this information can be totaled 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.

Visit MI School Data to generate an LEA level report for Indicator 3 at [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 2021 Public reporting was made available in May 2023. New FFY 2022 data will be publicly posted by June 1, 2024.

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)

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.

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions
None

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 ED*Facts* 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 2022-2023 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 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 2022-2023 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 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	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	23.80	22.60	21.40	20.25
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	33.00	31.75	30.50	29.20
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	40.50	39.00	37.60	36.00
Math	A <=	Grade 4	20.10	18.60	17.20	15.70
Math	B <=	Grade 8	21.60	19.90	18.20	16.40
Math	C <=	Grade HS	23.60	22.00	20.40	18.80

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MDE OSE seeks stakeholder input through multiple means and mechanisms including in-person and virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys, and the use of virtual discussion rooms. MDE OSE uses Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) as the primary stakeholder group. Information about the SEAC can be found at the 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.

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 78 representatives with a race/ethnicity breakdown of 78%--White, 8%--African American, 3%--Native American,4%--Asian and 5%--Hispanic and 3%--Middle Eastern. 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 be more inclusive of diverse perspectives. 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. MDE OSE meets with SEAC and Michigan Alliance for Families (MAF) throughout the year bringing data and sharing information to determine whether targets are reasonable yet rigorous.

MDE OSE conducted presentations for input on Indicator methodologies and provided for stakeholders to breakout into groups to have a deeper discussion about the data and targets so attendees could provide informed feedback on proposed changes. Each breakout room had MDE OSE staff and content experts to facilitate the discussion. MDE OSE developed a schedule to systematically present 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 Indicator teams went through each indicator analyzing data, reviewing targets, improvement strategies and evaluated progress. The results of these analyses were presented to stakeholders.

Other stakeholder groups include the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board of Education, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD directors of special education, member district special education representatives, attendees of the ISD Collaborative Conference (special education personnel), and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts*

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	97,571	98,509	98,716
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	13,385	10,850	9,098
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	43,311	56,947	48,039
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	40	1,991	3,082
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,384	1,310	276
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	35	1,084	937

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	97,861	98,620	98,752
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	13,379	10,853	9,098
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	37,782	35,041	27,742
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	45	842	1,438
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,058	565	76
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	40	374	283

(1) The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	18.07%	44.43%	26.28	23.80	26.36	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	22.06%	59.83%	39.44	33.00	37.77	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	13.33%	51.79%	39.36	40.50	38.45	Met target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	15.68%	38.65%	21.99	20.10	22.97	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	8.65%	36.39%	27.45	21.60	27.73	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	3.95%	29.55%	26.29	23.60	25.60	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs 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 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), 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 rates of suspensions and expulsions for 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 section 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 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 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 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon LEAs 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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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 QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	3.70%	3.50%	1.45%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	2.05%	2.41%	0.00%	0.00%	Not Valid and Reliable

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MDE OSE seeks stakeholder input through multiple means and mechanisms including in-person and virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys, and the use of virtual discussion rooms. MDE OSE uses Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) as the primary stakeholder group. Information about the SEAC can be found at the 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.

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 78 representatives with a race/ethnicity breakdown of 78%--White, 8%--African American, 3%--Native American,4%--Asian and 5%--Hispanic and 3%--Middle Eastern. 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 be more inclusive of diverse perspectives. 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. MDE OSE meets with SEAC and Michigan Alliance for Families (MAF) throughout the year bringing data and sharing information to determine whether targets are reasonable yet rigorous.

MDE OSE conducted presentations for input on Indicator methodologies and provided for stakeholders to breakout into groups to have a deeper discussion about the data and targets so attendees could provide informed feedback on proposed changes. Each breakout room had MDE OSE staff and content experts to facilitate the discussion. MDE OSE developed a schedule to systematically present 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 Indicator teams went through each indicator analyzing data, reviewing targets, improvement strategies and evaluated progress. The results of these analyses were presented to stakeholders.

Other stakeholder groups include the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board of Education, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD directors of special education, member district special education representatives, attendees of the ISD Collaborative Conference (special education personnel), and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP.

After OSEP's guidance on reasonably designed methodologies for examining suspension/expulsion data, Michigan sought additional stakeholder input which led to a change in the definition of significant discrepancy. After thoughtful review, data analysis, and stakeholder input, it was determined that Michigan will change from a comparison method where percentage points are added to the State-level suspension/expulsion rate to a comparison method where the State mean suspension/expulsion rate is multiplied by 2. Therefore, any LEA

that suspends and/or expels at least 5 students with an IEP at a rate of 2.6% (State-level suspension/expulsion rate for children with an IEP of 1.3 x 2) or more will be found to have significant discrepancy. The change will be reflected in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR reporting.

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
0	57	Not Valid and Reliable	0.00%	0.00%	Met target	N/A

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 defines significant discrepancy as any LEA with a rate of out-of-school suspensions/expulsions for greater than 10 days for children with IEPs that is greater than 5% of children with IEPs among LEAs in the State. Five percent as the suspension/expulsion-rate threshold can be derived from the State-level suspension/expulsion rate of 1.3% (thirteen-year historical average excluding COVID 2020-2021 school year). The 5% suspension/expulsion rate threshold is 3.5 percentage points higher than 1.3%, rounded up to the nearest whole percent. This method for setting the threshold is described as a "variation" to the example provided in Exhibit 8 of the IDEA Data Center's Indicator B4 Technical Assistance Guide. Michigan's methodology uses a minimum cell size of 5 (children with IEPs who were suspended in an LEA). No LEAs were excluded based on the cell size of less than 5 in school year 2021-22. Out of *57 LEAs, none had a rate greater than 5% (of the State rate of children with IEPs). Therefore, no LEAs were identified as having significant discrepancy for FFY 2022 (using school year 2021–22 data) for Indicator 4A.

Michigan, through previous stakeholder input, determined the State's methodology as described above are reasonable as the existing cell size and no minimum n size allow for all ISDs to be assessed for significant discrepancy.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

*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.

Michigan's LEAs are also known as ISDs. MDE OSE monitors the subrecipients of IDEA funds, which include ISDs and programs operated by other State agencies. The subrecipients (ISDs), in turn, are responsible for the general supervision of schools or programs within their jurisdiction. Monitoring and all reporting occur at the ISD level as member district data is aggregated to the ISD level. In FFY 2019, when Michigan began reporting 4A at the ISD level, a decision was made to reset baseline and set targets at 0% due to all data being aggregated to the ISD level.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 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 2021

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

4A - Prior FFY 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

See State's clarified definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology.

4A - OSEP Response

The State reported it is planning to revise its methodology for determining if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, to be reported in a future SPP/APR. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts, however, for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, OSEP notes that the State's chosen methodology results in a threshold for measuring significant discrepancy in the rate of long-term suspension and expulsion rates of children with IEPs that falls above the median of thresholds used by all States.

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), 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 the rates of suspensions and expulsions for 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 section 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 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 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 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 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, 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.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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 QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	5.07%	3.86%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
5	0	57	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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

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

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Michigan defines significant discrepancy as any LEA with a rate of out-of-school suspensions/expulsions by race/ethnicity for greater than 10 days for children with IEPs that is greater than 5% of children with IEPs among LEAs in the State. Five percent as the suspension/expulsion-rate threshold can be derived from the State-level suspension/expulsion rate of 1.3% (school year 2020-21). The 5% suspension/expulsion rate threshold is 3.5 percentage points higher than 1.3%, rounded up to the nearest whole percent. This method for setting the threshold is described as a "variation" to the example provided in Exhibit 8 of the IDEA Data Center's Indicator B4 Technical Assistance Guide. Michigan's methodology uses a minimum cell size of 5 (children with IEPs, by race or ethnicity, who were suspended in an LEA). No LEAs were excluded based on the cell size of less than 5 in school year 2021-22. Out of *57 LEAs, five LEAs had a rate greater than 5% (of the State rate of children with IEPs) and were identified with significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity.

Michigan, through previous stakeholder input, determined the State's methodology as described above are reasonable as the existing cell size and no minimum n size allow for all ISDs to be assessed for significant discrepancy.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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

After OSEP's guidance on reasonably designed methodologies for examining suspension/expulsion data, Michigan sought additional stakeholder input which led to a change in the definition of significant discrepancy. After thoughtful review, data analysis, and stakeholder input, it was determined that Michigan will change from a comparison method where percentage points are added to the State-level suspension/expulsion rate to a comparison method where the State mean suspension/expulsion rate is multiplied by 2. Therefore, any LEA that suspends and/or expels at least 5 students with an IEP at a rate of 2.6% (State-level suspension/expulsion rate for children with an IEP of 1.3 x 2) or more by race/ethnicity will be found to have significant discrepancy. The change will be reflected in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR reporting.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 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.

Five LEAs (ISDs) exceeded the established threshold for suspension/expulsion of students with an IEP by race/ethnicity. MDE OSE conducted monitoring activities using IDEA regulations and the Michigan Administrative Rules for Special Education (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 the significant discrepancy was not the result of inappropriate policies, procedures, and practices. Therefore, no corrective action plans were required at the ISD level.

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 2021

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

4B - Prior FFY 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

See State's clarified definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology.

4B - OSEP Response

The State reported it is planning to revise its methodology for determining if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, to be reported in a future SPP/APR. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts, however, for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, OSEP notes that the State's chosen methodology results in a threshold for measuring significant discrepancy in the rate of long-term suspension and expulsion rates of children with IEPs that falls above the median of thresholds used by all States.

4B- Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6.

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

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

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2020	Target >=	64.00%	64.25%	64.25%	69.92%	69.92%
A	69.92%	Data	67.19%	67.66%	68.58%	69.92%	71.71%

Part	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
B	2020	Target <=	11.50%	11.40%	11.40%	9.93%	9.93%
B	9.93%	Data	11.10%	10.97%	10.55%	9.93%	10.02%
C	2020	Target <=	5.24%	5.15%	5.15%	4.98%	4.98%
C	4.98%	Data	4.83%	4.79%	4.71%	4.98%	4.34%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MDE OSE seeks stakeholder input through multiple means and mechanisms including in-person and virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys, and the use of virtual discussion rooms. MDE OSE uses Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) as the primary stakeholder group. Information about the SEAC can be found at the 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.

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 78 representatives with a race/ethnicity breakdown of 78%--White, 8%--African American, 3%--Native American,4%--Asian and 5%--Hispanic and 3%--Middle Eastern. 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 be more inclusive of diverse perspectives. 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. MDE OSE meets with SEAC and Michigan Alliance for Families (MAF) throughout the year bringing data and sharing information to determine whether targets are reasonable yet rigorous.

MDE OSE conducted presentations for input on Indicator methodologies and provided for stakeholders to breakout into groups to have a deeper discussion about the data and targets so attendees could provide informed feedback on proposed changes. Each breakout room had MDE OSE staff and content experts to facilitate the discussion. MDE OSE developed a schedule to systematically present 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 Indicator teams went through each indicator analyzing data, reviewing targets,

improvement strategies and evaluated progress. The results of these analyses were presented to stakeholders.

Other stakeholder groups include the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board of Education, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD directors of special education, member district special education representatives, attendees of the ISD Collaborative Conference (special education personnel), and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	187,450
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	134,882
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	18,727
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	7,140
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	154
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	425

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

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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	134,882	187,450	71.71%	70.00%	71.96%	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	18,727	187,450	10.02%	9.75%	9.99%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	7,719	187,450	4.34%	4.98%	4.12%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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 ED*Facts* file specification FS089.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (*e.g.*, 75-85%).

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

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

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data (Inclusive) – 6A, 6B, 6C

Part	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	Target >=	28.50%	28.80%	28.80%	19.46%	19.50%
A	Data	28.68%	30.24%	28.24%	19.46%	18.52%
B	Target <=	41.50%	41.00%	41.00%	46.03%	46.00%
B	Data	38.51%	36.08%	37.31%	46.03%	47.49%
C	Target <=				2.82%	2.82%
C	Data				2.82%	2.86%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MDE OSE seeks stakeholder input through multiple means and mechanisms including in-person and virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys, and the use of virtual discussion rooms. MDE OSE uses Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) as the primary stakeholder group. Information about the SEAC can be found at the 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.

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 78 representatives with a race/ethnicity breakdown of 78%--White, 8%--African American, 3%--Native American,4%--Asian and 5%--Hispanic and 3%--Middle Eastern. 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 be more inclusive of diverse perspectives. 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. MDE OSE meets with SEAC and Michigan Alliance for Families (MAF) throughout the year bringing data and sharing information to determine whether targets are reasonable yet rigorous.

MDE OSE conducted presentations for input on Indicator methodologies and provided for stakeholders to breakout into groups to have a deeper discussion about the data and targets so attendees could provide informed feedback on proposed changes. Each breakout room had MDE OSE staff and content experts to

facilitate the discussion. MDE OSE developed a schedule to systematically present 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 Indicator teams went through each indicator analyzing data, reviewing targets, improvement strategies and evaluated progress. The results of these analyses were presented to stakeholders.

Other stakeholder groups include the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board of Education, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD directors of special education, member district special education representatives, attendees of the ISD Collaborative Conference (special education personnel), 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	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	19.50%	20.25%	21.00%	21.75%
Target B <=	46.00%	45.75%	45.50%	45.25%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

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

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

08/30/2023

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	5,565	6,004	837	12,406
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	778	1,631	189	2,598
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	2,691	2,279	426	5,396
b2. Number of children attending separate school	98	88	31	217
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	1	0	1
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	142	75	22	239

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 2022 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	2,598	12,406	18.52%	19.50%	20.94%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	5,614	12,406	47.49%	46.00%	45.25%	Met target	No Slippage

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
C. Home	239	12,406	2.86%	2.82%	1.93%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

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

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

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

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

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 5 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A1	2011	Target >=	87.50%	88.00%	88.00%	88.00%	88.00%
A1	81.10%	Data	88.31%	88.39%	88.61%	87.47%	86.03%
A2	2011	Target >=	55.20%	55.30%	55.30%	57.00%	57.00%
A2	54.00%	Data	58.08%	60.61%	54.02%	56.72%	55.49%

Part	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
B1	2011	Target >=	88.50%	89.00%	89.00%	86.00%	86.00%
B1	82.20%	Data	89.94%	88.23%	89.62%	89.78%	87.93%
B2	2011	Target >=	56.40%	56.50%	56.50%	56.00%	56.00%
B2	53.70%	Data	57.41%	57.65%	53.49%	55.11%	53.92%
C1	2011	Target >=	87.75%	88.25%	88.25%	86.00%	86.00%
C1	81.30%	Data	89.14%	87.71%	88.39%	88.33%	88.34%
C2	2011	Target >=	59.40%	59.50%	59.50%	59.00%	59.00%
C2	58.70%	Data	61.67%	61.55%	57.29%	58.58%	57.50%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MDE OSE seeks stakeholder input through multiple means and mechanisms including in-person and virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys, and the use of virtual discussion rooms. MDE OSE uses Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) as the primary stakeholder group. Information about the SEAC can be found at the 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.

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 78 representatives with a race/ethnicity breakdown of 78%--White, 8%--African American, 3%--Native American,4%--Asian and 5%--Hispanic and 3%--Middle Eastern. 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 be more inclusive of diverse perspectives. 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. MDE OSE meets with SEAC and Michigan Alliance for Families (MAF) throughout the year bringing data and sharing information to determine whether targets are reasonable yet rigorous.

MDE OSE conducted presentations for input on Indicator methodologies and provided for stakeholders to breakout into groups to have a deeper discussion about the data and targets so attendees could provide informed feedback on proposed changes. Each breakout room had MDE OSE staff and content experts to facilitate the discussion. MDE OSE developed a schedule to systematically present 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 Indicator teams went through each indicator analyzing data, reviewing targets, improvement strategies and evaluated progress. The results of these analyses were presented to stakeholders.

Other stakeholder groups include the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board of Education, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD directors of special education, member district special education representatives, attendees of the ISD Collaborative Conference (special education personnel), and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

2,416

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	15	0.62%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	260	10.76%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	845	34.98%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	780	32.28%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	516	21.36%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in	1,625	1,900	86.03%	88.00%	85.53%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*							
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*	1,296	2,416	55.49%	58.00%	53.64%	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	14	0.58%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	253	10.47%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	869	35.97%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	970	40.15%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	310	12.83%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the	1,839	2,106	87.93%	87.00%	87.32%	Met target	No Slippage

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*							
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*	1,280	2,416	53.92%	56.50%	52.98%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	10	0.41%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	253	10.47%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	821	33.98%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	850	35.18%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	482	19.95%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who	1,671	1,934	88.34%	87.00%	86.40%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*							
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*	1,332	2,416	57.50%	59.50%	55.13%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A2	Michigan met one of the six targets set for preschool outcomes (B1). For the five targets not met, no slippage occurred for A1 and B2. Upon further analysis, the total number of children assessed dropped significantly from the previous year which may be a causal factor for slippage and not meeting targets. Michigan is working to determine the cause for this drop with the understanding there may be multiple contributing factors. First, Michigan made a change in business rules eliminating the requirement for ISDs/LEAs to report the assessment tool used to determine the outcomes rating which may have contributed to overall lower reporting. In addition, a large education data vendor working with ISDs/LEAs underwent major infrastructure changes which may have created unintended negative impacts on ISDs/LEA data and implementation processes. Finally, COVID continues to impact data with late referrals and children entering the system with more complex needs. Michigan will continue to work closely with the ISDs/LEAs to determine the root cause(s) for slippage and not meeting targets.
C1	See A2 Comment
C2	See A2 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 (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 5 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 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

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

Include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States 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 input through multiple means and mechanisms including in-person and virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys, and the use of virtual discussion rooms. MDE OSE uses Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) as the primary stakeholder group. Information about the SEAC can be found at the [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.

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 78 representatives with a race/ethnicity breakdown of 78%--White, 8%--African American, 3%--Native American,4%--Asian and 5%--Hispanic and 3%--Middle Eastern. 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 be more inclusive of diverse perspectives. 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. MDE OSE meets with SEAC and Michigan Alliance for Families (MAF) throughout the year bringing data and sharing information to determine whether targets are reasonable yet rigorous.

MDE OSE conducted presentations for input on Indicator methodologies and provided for stakeholders to breakout into groups to have a deeper discussion about the data and targets so attendees could provide informed feedback on proposed changes. Each breakout room had MDE OSE staff and content experts to facilitate the discussion. MDE OSE developed a schedule to systematically present 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 Indicator teams went through each indicator analyzing data, reviewing targets,

improvement strategies and evaluated progress. The results of these analyses were presented to stakeholders.

Other stakeholder groups include the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board of Education, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD directors of special education, member district special education representatives, attendees of the ISD Collaborative Conference (special education personnel), and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP.

Historical Data

Group	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Preschool	2020	Target >=	47.00%	47.50%	47.50%	78.44%	78.44%
Preschool	78.44%	Data	50.48%	49.25%	54.77%	78.44%	74.89%
School age	2020	Target >=	26.40%	26.80%	26.80%	62.15%	62.15%
School age	62.15%	Data	28.14%	30.36%	31.45%	62.15%	62.44%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
Preschool	1,858	2,523	74.89%	78.44%	73.64%	Did not meet target	Slippage
School age	4,593	7,565	62.44%	62.15%	60.71%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for Preschool slippage, if applicable

Data analysis was conducted to determine possible slippage for Preschool and School Age categories. Each survey question about schools' efforts to partner with parents used a six-point agreement scale ranging from "very strongly disagree" to "very strongly agree". For every survey item, a percentage, ranging from 0% ("very strongly disagree") to 100% ("very strongly agree"), was calculated, and these percentages were averaged for each respondent. 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. The decline observed in the FFY 2022 data for preschool was determined to not be statistically significant, and there are no statistically significant differences when analyzing the survey results by child race/ethnicity, primary disability, ISD peer group, gender, age, or intermediate school district (ISD) ($p<0.05$). Of the 38 survey items from which the partnership effort score was calculated, 34 items had a lower average percentage of agreement compared to last year yet found not to be statistically significant. After further analysis, when the survey items were evaluated by calculating the percentage of overall agreement with each item (that is, the percentage of parents who at least "agree" with the item), two items declined significantly from last year ($p<0.05$). These two items are, "Providers give me strategies to deal with my child's behavior", and "Providers give me information about the research that supports the approaches they use to help my child learn." Both of these items involve parent education and support services and may suggest a dimension of parent involvement that contributed to the slippage observed in FFY 2022.

In contrast, the decline observed in the FFY 2022 data for school age is statistically significant. The results of the school age survey also reveal that, compared to last year, a statistically significantly smaller proportion of parents of students with cognitive impairment or traumatic brain injury met the statewide standard, as did a smaller proportion of parents of male students, and a smaller proportion of parents of students aged six. The school age survey results also show that a statistically significantly lower proportion of parents in the two smallest ISD peer groups (that is, the peer groups with the most sparsely populated ISDs) met the State standard, compared to last year. An item-level assessment of the school age survey results also reveals that the average level of parent agreement with five specific survey items was statistically significantly lower than last year. These survey items, grouped by their associated themes, are as follows:

- Communication and information sharing
    - The school gives me information regularly about my child's progress on IEP goals.
    - The school has a person on staff who is available to answer parents' questions.
- Soliciting parent input
    - Teachers and administrators seek out parent input.
    - Teachers treat me as a team member.
- Provider characteristics
    - Teachers and administrators show sensitivity to the needs of students with disabilities and their families.

These items may suggest some specific dimensions of parent involvement that contributed to the slippage observed in FFY 2022.

Provide reasons for School Age slippage, if applicable

See Above

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

71,335

Percentage of respondent parents

14.14%

Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	13.56%	14.14%

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.

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

Michigan conducted data analysis comparing survey results to State population in the areas of gender, race/ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location.

- **Gender**: No statistically significant differences between the survey population and the respondent sample with respect to child or student gender.
- **Race/Ethnicity Preschool Aged**: No statistically significant differences in the areas of race/ethnicity for the following categories: American Indian/Alaska Native, African American/Black, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, White, Hispanic, or Multi-race
- **Race/Ethnicity School Aged**: No statistically significant differences in the areas of race/ethnicity for the following categories: American Indian/Alaska Native, African American/Black, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
- **Disability Category Preschool Aged**: No statistically significant differences in the areas of disability category for the following: Cognitive Impairment, Emotional Impairment, Hearing Impairment, Visual Impairment, Developmental Delay, Specific Learning Disability, Severe Multiple Impairment, Autism Spectrum Disorder, Traumatic Brain Injury, Deaf-Blindness
- **Disability Category School Aged**: No statistically significant differences in the areas of disability category for the following: Cognitive Impairment, Visual Impairment, Developmental Delay, Traumatic Brain Injury, Deaf-Blindness

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. Specifically, in comparison to the eligible statewide population, the preschool survey sample had an over-representation of Asian American children (5.1% in the sample versus 3.7% in the statewide population). The school age survey sample had an under-representation of multiracial (4.7% sample versus 5.3% population) and White students

(58.4% sample versus 59.9% population), and an over-representation of Asian American (1.6% sample versus 1.2% population) and Hispanic/Latino students (12.2% sample versus 10.0% population).

In terms of disability category, children with speech and language impairment were under-represented in the preschool sample (51.1% sample versus 55.7% population), and children with a physical impairment (1.6% sample versus 0.9% population) or other health impairment (6.5% sample versus 4.9% population) were over-represented in the preschool sample. Students with emotional impairment (4.2% sample versus 5.2% population), speech and language impairment (23.6% sample versus 25.5% population), or specific learning disability (26.7% sample versus 30.0% population) were under-represented in the school age sample. Students with hearing impairment (1.6% sample versus 1.1% population), physical impairment (0.9% sample versus 0.6% population), severe multiple impairment (1.4% sample versus 0.9% population), autism (13.7% sample versus 11.2% population), or other health impairment (17.3% sample versus 15.2% population) were over-represented in the school age sample.

With respect to ISD peer group, students in 'medium small' ISDs (8.1% sample versus 10.3% population) were under-represented in the preschool sample, while students in 'smallest' (0.7% sample versus 1.0% population), 'medium small' (8.2% sample versus 10.0% population), or 'large' (20.3% sample versus 21.4% population) ISDs were under-represented in the school age sample. Students in the 'largest' ISDs were over-represented in both the preschool sample (49.2% sample versus 46.9% population) and the school age sample (54.5% sample versus 50.4% population).

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 weighted and unweighted 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. Wayne State University (WSU) has prepared a full technical report summarizing the data and findings from the survey results.

The demographics of the children for whom parents are 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 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).
- Using email as an additional way to contact parents about the survey, starting in 2024.
- 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;
    - Providing a toll-free number for questions about the survey and/or to take the survey over the phone if desired; and

o   Offering the survey in Arabic and Spanish.

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 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. For FFY 2023 reporting cycle, emails will also be attempted as a mode of contact. After additional mode of contact is implemented, the indicator team will analyze data to determine its effectiveness in increasing response rate and need for further development of strategies.

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

When comparing the survey sample to the eligible population, Michigan examines parent characteristics as well as child characteristics. Specifically, five demographic categories are assessed 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. Michigan 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 2022, this procedure indicated that the respondent group was representative of the population in terms of child/student gender, but revealed at least one statistically significant difference with respect to child/student race/ethnicity, parent race/ethnicity, disability category, and ISD peer group.

To further test for possible effects of nonresponse bias, Michigan conducts an additional assessment to determine if the results would be meaningfully impacted by statistical weighting. For each of the demographic categories in which the respondents were not fully representative of the population, the overall results are weighted and recalculated to assess how those weighted results might differ from the unweighted results. This procedure provides an estimate of the results that would be found if the distribution of a particular characteristic if 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 FFY 2022 data, no statistically significant differences were found between the weighted and unweighted 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).
- Using email as an additional way to contact parents about the survey, starting in 2024.

- 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;
  - Providing a toll-free number for questions about the survey and/or to take the survey over the phone if desired; and
  - Offering the survey in Arabic and Spanish.

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

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

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

There were 2,523 respondents to the preschool survey (18.83% response rate) and 7,565 respondents to the school age survey (13.06% response rate) for a total of 10,088 responses from 71,335 viable respondents (14.14% total response rate). Each survey question about schools' efforts to partner with parents used a six-point agreement scale ranging from "very strongly disagree" to "very strongly agree". For each survey item, a percentage, ranging from 0% ("very strongly disagree") to 100% ("very strongly agree"), was calculated, and these percentages were averaged for each respondent. An overall standard of 60% ("agree") was used to determine whether respondents reported that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with an IEP. Of the completed preschool surveys, all 2,523 respondents provided sufficient data to calculate an average score, and 1,858 respondents (73.64%) had scores that met or exceeded the State standard. Of the completed school age surveys, all 7,565 respondents provided sufficient data to calculate an average score, and 4,593 respondents (60.71%) 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.	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

See above.

8 - OSEP Response

8 - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures. 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 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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 2022 SPP/APR, the two school years examined were school year 2021-2022 and school year 2022-2023. 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 an ISD exceeds 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. However, there were no ISDs determined to have disproportionate representation.

When an ISD is determined to have disproportionate representation, MDE OSE conducts monitoring activities using IDEA regulations along with the Michigan Administrative Rules for Special Education (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 2021

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
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 = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

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

Based on its review of the section 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). 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 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	1.17%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

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

Part B

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
7	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 2022 SPP/APR, the two school years considered were school year 2021-2022 and school year 2022-2023. 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 seven ISDs 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 the seven ISDs determined to have disproportionate representation, MDE OSE conducted monitoring activities using IDEA regulations and the Michigan Administrative Rules for Special Education (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 disproportionate representation was not the result of inappropriate identification. Therefore, no corrective action plans were required by the ISD.

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 2021

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data
Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	80.51%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.77%	99.55%	99.35%	99.61%	99.70%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
37,550	37,398	99.70%	100%	99.60%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

152

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 - 20 (15.15%)
- Personnel not available for evaluation - 50 (37.88%)
- Personnel not available for IEP - 62 (46.97%)
- Total - 132 (86.84%)

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

- External reports not available - 2 (10.00%)
- Personnel not available for evaluation - 12 (60.00%)
- Personnel not available for IEP - 6 (30.00%)
- Total - 20 (13.16%)

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 30 (19.74%)
- 6-10 days 23 (15.13%)
- 11-15 days 16 (10.53%)
- 16-20 days 14 (9.21%)
- 21-25 days 10 (6.58%)
- 26-30 days 10 (6.58%)
- > 30 days 49 (32.24%)

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 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
44	42	N/A	2

FFY 2021 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 2021 to ensure compliance and updated as needed. The State also reviewed data through the MSDS system, the statewide database, to determine whether the entities were evaluating students within the required State timeline. The State reviewed data subsequent to the initial finding to determine that noncompliance has been corrected. Verification activities for each entity included: (1) a review of updated policies, procedures and/or practices and (2) a review of new data submitted through State data systems. Additional training and a review of more recent student records was conducted for the two entities that submitted data which demonstrated a continued noncompliance. Based on the additional review, the State established the identified noncompliance has been corrected and the LEA is correctly implementing the specific statutory or regulatory requirement(s) for forty-two of the forty-four entities 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. MDE OSE ensured each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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.

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

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 for each entity included: (1) a review of updated policies, procedures and/or practices and (2) a review of new data submitted through State data systems. Additional training and a review of more recent student records was conducted when the entity submitted data which demonstrated a continued noncompliance. Based on the additional 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 and virtually 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 guidance.

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

For the two member districts with ongoing noncompliance, MDE OSE is providing technical assistance and reviewing the cause of the ongoing noncompliance while mandating the use of TA, training, and other enforcement actions to ensure prompt compliance. MDE OSE has developed a plan to bring the district into

compliance which includes support from the ISD to conduct overdue evaluations. Monthly meetings are being held with the ISD and member district to review the progress of the district in completing evaluations and achieving 100% compliance as required by OSEP guidance. Compliance will be verified by MDE OSE.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2020	1	1	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*

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 worked 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% compliance, as verified by MDE OSE. The finding of noncompliance was verified, corrected and closed.

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

Each instance of student-level noncompliance was verified, corrected and subsequently closed unless the student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA and the LE/program was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100 percent compliance with the relevant IDEA requirements) based on a review of updated data and information based upon updated data collected through a data review. Each individual case of noncompliance was verified as corrected by a review of the student files conducted by the ISD and submitted to and reviewed by the State. After the subsequent reviews, the findings were verified as corrected, implementing the regulatory requirements per OSEP guidance assuring that each child received an evaluation.

11 - Prior FFY 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

See above.

11 - OSEP Response

The State did not demonstrate that each LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. Specifically, the State did not report that it verified that each LEA with 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.

11 - Required Actions

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

- # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- # 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.
- # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- # 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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	93.52%	93.04%	86.89%	97.35%	98.97%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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.	3,701
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	139
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	3,459
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.	17
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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.	3,459	3,492	98.97%	100%	99.05%	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

33

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

Reason for late IEPs of Eligible Children with Late IEPs:

- Late notification from Part C to Part B LEA (less than 90 days before third birthday) – 1
- Timeline began in previous district – 0
- Personnel not available for evaluation – 2
- Personnel not available for IEP – 5
- External reports not available – 0
- Unknown – 24
- Total – 32

Reason for late IEPs of Ineligible Children with Late IEPs:

- Late notification from Part C to Part B LEA (less than 90 days before third birthday) – 0
- Timeline began in previous district – 0
- Personnel not available for evaluation – 0
- Personnel not available for IEP – 1
- External reports not available – 0
- Unknown – 0
- Total – 1

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

- 1-10 days - 10 late IEPs (30.30%)
- 11-50 days - 11 (33.33%)
- 51-100 days – 3 (9.09%)
- >100 days – 3 (9.09%)
- Unknown days –6 (18.18%)
- 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 were 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 being issued a data CAP. In some instances, data indicated both B-12 noncompliance and data noncompliance for those particular 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 offerings of training and targeted TA to the districts where the focus was on B12. Files were found to be B12 compliant, and the children did have an IEP in place before their third birthday. However, because data entry and accuracy were 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 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
24	24	0	0

FFY 2021 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 2021 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. The State conducted reviews of policies and procedures for all entities with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 to ensure compliance and updated as needed. The State also reviewed data, using the statewide database. Based on the additional review, the State established the identified noncompliance has been corrected and the LEA is correctly implementing the specific statutory or regulatory requirement(s) for twenty-four of the twenty-four entities have compliant policies and procedures for evaluating and implementing a child's IEP by their third birthday.

The State reviewed data subsequent to the initial finding to determine 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. Additional training and a review of more recent student records were conducted when the entity submitted data which demonstrated continued noncompliance. 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 corrected, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, except for those entities whose findings are not yet verified as 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 whose findings were verified as corrected were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements per OSEP guidance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2020	2	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 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 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).

The State conducted reviews of policies and procedures for all entities with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and provided additional training to ensure compliance and updated as needed. The State also reviewed data, using the statewide database.

For the member districts with ongoing noncompliance, MDE OSE provided a technical assistant to review 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. Monthly meetings are held with the district and ISD to review the progress of the district in achieving 100% compliance as required by OSEP. Compliance has been verified by MDE OSE.

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

Each individual case of noncompliance was verified as corrected by a review of the student file conducted by the ISD and submitted to the statewide technical assistance system 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.

12 - Prior FFY 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

See above.

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	81.00%	92.34%	92.94%	90.66%	93.80%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
4,394	4,733	93.80%	100%	92.84%	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 684 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 4733 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 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
125	123	0	2

FFY 2021 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 123 LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 are now 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.

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. 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 corrected, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

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.

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

For the two districts with ongoing noncompliance, MDE OSE is providing increased technical assistance. This includes a review of policy and procedures as well as file reviews. Additional corrective actions are assigned which include revising policies and procedures and providing staff training. MDE OSE is providing a technical assistant and reviewing the cause of the ongoing noncompliance while mandating the use of TA, training, and other enforcement actions to ensure prompt compliance. MDE OSE developed a plan to bring the districts into compliance which includes support from the ISD and member districts. Monthly meetings are being held with the ISD and member districts to review the progress of the district in correcting noncompliance and improving transition practices to achieve 100% compliance as required by OSEP guidance. Compliance will be verified by MDE OSE.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

13 - Prior FFY 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

See above.

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

*Sampling **of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See General Instructions on page 5 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2023 on students who left school during 2021-2022, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2021-2022 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).

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 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

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

III. *Reporting on the Measures/Indicators*

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

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

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

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

Include the State's 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2018	Target >=	33.60%	33.90%	33.90%	28.21%	28.21%
A	28.21%	Data	29.18%	28.21%	27.10%	23.02%	28.08%
B	2018	Target >=	61.00%	61.50%	61.50%	42.82%	42.82%
B	42.82%	Data	64.85%	42.82%	40.72%	39.88%	43.35%
C	2018	Target >=	73.50%	74.00%	75.25%	75.19%	75.19%
C	75.19%	Data	77.43%	75.19%	78.09%	74.80%	77.01%

FFY 2021 Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MDE OSE seeks stakeholder input through multiple means and mechanisms including in-person and virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys, and the use of virtual discussion rooms. MDE OSE uses Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) as the primary stakeholder group. Information about the SEAC can be found at the 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.

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 78 representatives with a race/ethnicity breakdown of 78%--White, 8%--African American, 3%--Native American,4%--Asian and 5%--Hispanic and 3%--Middle Eastern. 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 be more inclusive of diverse perspectives. 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. MDE OSE meets with SEAC and Michigan Alliance for Families (MAF) throughout the year bringing data and sharing information to determine whether targets are reasonable yet rigorous.

MDE OSE conducted presentations for input on Indicator methodologies and provided for stakeholders to breakout into groups to have a deeper discussion about the data and targets so attendees could provide informed feedback on proposed changes. Each breakout room had MDE OSE staff and content experts to facilitate the discussion. MDE OSE developed a schedule to systematically present 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 Indicator teams went through each indicator analyzing data, reviewing targets, improvement strategies and evaluated progress. The results of these analyses were presented to stakeholders.

Other stakeholder groups include the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board of Education, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD directors of special education, member district special education representatives, attendees of the ISD Collaborative Conference (special education personnel), and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP.

Category	Response
Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	3,449
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	680
Response Rate	19.72%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	149
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	116
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)	84
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).	178

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	149	680	28.08%	28.21%	21.91%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	265	680	43.35%	42.82%	38.97%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher	527	680	77.01%	75.19%	77.50%	Met target	No Slippage

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)							

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Michigan's slippage on Indicator 14 measure A follows a similar pattern to the decreasing statewide higher education enrollment rates for high school graduates with an IEP who are enrolled in postsecondary education within six months. The rate for this group has been on a steady decline: 31.2% in 2017-18; 31.6% in 2018-19; 25.5% in 2019-20; 25.9% in 2020-21; and 22.9% in 2021-22. This declining trend is also evident in overall high school graduates (with and without IEPs) enrolling in postsecondary education within six months. The rate for this group is as follows: 62.5% in 2017-18; 62.2% in 2018-19; 58.0% in 2019-20; 56.8% in 2020-21; and 52.8% in 2021-22. These data can be found on MI School Data Postsecondary Reports by High School.
	Michigan's result on Indicator 14 measure A (i.e., 21.91%) is also similar to the most recently reported national median and mean percentage for indicator 14, which are 21.5% and 23.0%, respectively (ECTA Center: Improving Systems, Practices and Outcomes).
	Michigan's slippage on Indicator 14 measure A may be related to the COVID-19 pandemic - more precisely, the increase in high school dropout rates (Bryant et al., 2022) and a decrease in postsecondary education enrollment (Bryant et al., 2022; Selingo, 2022; and Smalley, 2021). The respondents to this year's B14 survey encountered COVID-19 in their second year of high school, likely effecting their high school education as a result. COVID-19 has had more adverse effects on students with disabilities, as documented by McMaughan et al. (2021) where they reported that students with disabilities were more likely to experience loneliness, increased anxiety, and depression. Zhang et al. (2020) found that students with disabilities were also more concerned about taking online classes compared to their peers without disabilities.

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	Studies on students in higher education found similar results in that students with disabilities felt less supported (Sutton 2020) and experienced greater barriers (Aquino & Scott, 2023). The online environment added further challenges faced by students with disabilities through a lack of social integration, isolation, and difficulty communicating with their instructors (Mullins & Mitchell, 2021). In addition, students with disabilities experienced greater distress, isolation, and difficulty in concentration compared to data collected in the past (Madaus et al., 2022). Given the challenges and barriers that have emerged during the COVID pandemic, it is possible that they act as a deterrent for students with disabilities to pursue postsecondary education.
B	Michigan's slippage on indicator 14 measure B is attributed to the drop in higher education (i.e., group 1 and Measure A), due to the aggregate nature of the measure (i.e., Measure B includes higher education and competitive employment). Competitive employment alone has increased from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022 (i.e., from 15.3% to 17.1%, respectively), but NOT statistically significant.

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	2021	2022
Response Rate	18.16%	19.72%

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.

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. Wayne State University (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 0.8070 and the proportion in the respondent group was 0.8632. Dividing 0.8070 by 0.8632 yields 0.9349. Therefore, the weight assigned to graduating former students was 0.9349.

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, email reminders, 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 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 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 LEAs, which have a high proportion of underrepresented groups to boost the response rate for this group along with the following strategies:

A) Offering the survey in three modes (online, paper, and telephone); mailing follow-up postcards, email reminders, 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 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. Hispanic/Latino students, students who dropped out of high school, and students with learning disabilities were less likely to respond to the survey and, therefore, underrepresented in the sample. African-American/Black 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, email reminders, 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.

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 1. 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 2022 (19.72%) is higher than FFY 2021 (18.16%). Telephone follow-up yielded higher completion rates in FFY 2022 than in FFY 2021. 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 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

See above.

14 - OSEP Response

14 - Required Actions

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 ED*Facts* Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

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

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

15 - Indicator Data
Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	61
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	41

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 input through multiple means and mechanisms including in-person and virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys, and the use of virtual discussion rooms. MDE OSE uses Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) as the primary stakeholder group. Information about the SEAC can be found at the [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.

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 78 representatives with a race/ethnicity breakdown of 78%--White, 8%--African American, 3%--Native American,4%--Asian and 5%--Hispanic and 3%--Middle Eastern. 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 be more inclusive of diverse perspectives. 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. MDE OSE meets with SEAC and Michigan Alliance for Families (MAF) throughout the year bringing data and sharing information to determine whether targets are reasonable yet rigorous.

MDE OSE conducted presentations for input on Indicator methodologies and provided for stakeholders to breakout into groups to have a deeper discussion about the data and targets so attendees could provide informed feedback on proposed changes. Each breakout room had MDE OSE staff and content experts to facilitate the discussion. MDE OSE developed a schedule to systematically present 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 Indicator teams went through each indicator analyzing data, reviewing targets, improvement strategies and evaluated progress. The results of these analyses were presented to stakeholders.

Other stakeholder groups include the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board of Education, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD directors of special education, member district special education representatives, attendees of the ISD Collaborative Conference (special education personnel), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	50.00%	52.00%	52.00%	45.00%-55.00%	45.00%-55.00%
Data	46.88%	54.55%	38.10%	38.89%	72.73%

Targets

FFY	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%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target (low)	FFY 2022 Target (high)	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
41	61	72.73%	45.00%	55.00%	67.21%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Michigan has an increase in overall due process complaints filed from 93 in 2021 to 135 in 2022. The MDE OSE created guidance in 2021, How to Complete the Resolution Session Summary Guide, and has distributed it to ISD directors of special education when a new due process complaint is filed. 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 ED*Facts* Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

Measurement

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1) times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of 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 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1 Mediations held	213
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	35
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	122

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 input through multiple means and mechanisms including in-person and virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys, and the use of virtual discussion rooms. MDE OSE uses Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) as the primary stakeholder group. Information about the SEAC can be found at the [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.

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 78 representatives with a race/ethnicity breakdown of 78%--White, 8%--African American, 3%--Native American,4%--Asian and 5%--Hispanic and 3%--Middle Eastern. 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 be more inclusive of diverse perspectives. 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. MDE OSE meets with SEAC and Michigan Alliance for Families (MAF) throughout the year bringing data and sharing information to determine whether targets are reasonable yet rigorous.

MDE OSE conducted presentations for input on Indicator methodologies and provided for stakeholders to breakout into groups to have a deeper discussion about the data and targets so attendees could provide informed feedback on proposed changes. Each breakout room had MDE OSE staff and content experts to facilitate the discussion. MDE OSE developed a schedule to systematically present 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 Indicator teams went through each indicator analyzing data, reviewing targets, improvement strategies and evaluated progress. The results of these analyses were presented to stakeholders.

Other stakeholder groups include the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board of Education, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD directors of special education, member district special education representatives, attendees of the ISD Collaborative Conference (special education personnel), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	75.00%-85.00%	75.00%-85.00%	75.00%-85.00%	75.00%-85.00%	75.00%-85.00%
Data	81.15%	82.47%	77.16%	75.63%	74.73%

Targets

FFY	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%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target (low)	FFY 2022 Target (high)	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
35	122	213	74.73%	75.00%	85.00%	73.71%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The slight decrease may be attributed to:

- Increased number of virtual mediations which are executed via electronic signature. In some instances when agreement is reached, parties do not sign the agreements before exiting the virtual session and will subsequently refuse to sign the circulated document, despite agreement at the "table". This scenario continues to account for several "no agreements".
- The changing landscape of attorneys in Michigan. Some of these attorneys are from out of state. Complaint proposed resolutions include demands for monetary compensation, residential placement, and attorney fees. This has impacted mediation agreement rates. In some cases, parties have come to an impasse specifically around dollar amounts and inclusion of attorney fees.
- Increased number of mediations with due process and state complaints overall.
- Impact of Perez vs Sturgis Public Schools. With the United States Supreme Court ruling in favor of Perez, districts are requesting more extensive waiver of rights language be included in mediation agreements. Parents are requesting monetary damages be included as part of the agreement. The higher stakes and increased demands from both schools and families have made reaching agreement at mediation more challenging.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Michigan's grant funded initiative, Special Education Mediation Services (SEMS) has instituted and continues to implement measures to counter the trends listed above through mediator training, case management

requirements, provision of electronic signature accounts and increased participant contact. SEMS has also enhanced mediator training to further strengthen the skills necessary to mediate the increasingly complex issues being raised.

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) (SiMR) for Children with Disabilities.

Targets*:* In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2022 through February 2027, 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) Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, is in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates)) outlined above):

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, is in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates)) outlined above):

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPPs/APRs, 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., February 1, 2023). 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 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024).

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 (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (e.g., 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 2022 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024) 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 (target students include first and second grade students who scored below the 21st percentile on screening measures), including students with disabilities. In 2022-2023, the SiMR was measured using Acadience Reading K- 6 universal screening 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 will also be measured using Aimsweb Plus, and potential additional 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 1.

The SiMR is calculated by examining the number of target students who made greater progress from fall to spring compared to other students who began the school year at a comparable reading level based on norm-referenced growth comparisons and dividing that number by the total number of students scoring well below benchmark and at or below the district 21st percentile on the Fall Acadience Reading Composite score each fall and winter.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

YES

Provide a description of the system analysis activities conducted to support changing the SiMR.

MDE has analyzed SiMR Part A and Part B data for two consecutive school years with five elementary schools that received intensive training and coaching supports to implement the the evidence-based practice, data-based individualization. All of this learning and data analysis has shown that what was originally conceptualized as SiMR Part B is not feasible to collect on a large scale in Michigan. See more details below regarding how we analyzed data.

Please list the data source(s) used to support the change of the SiMR.

2-year analysis of all available individualized intensive intervention plans and group intensification plans
Individual student progress monitoring graphs

Provide a description of how the State analyzed data to reach the decision to change the SiMR.

Removed: SIMR Part B

For the past two years, Michigan had the intention of reporting on a SIMR Part B focused on students' data after an intervention intensification. However, our two years of learning in the model demonstration revealed that nearly a full school year is required to support schools to implement their reading intervention platform with fidelity, collect progress monitoring data, and respond accordingly. When multidisciplinary teams identify a need to intensify intervention, that intensification process typically starts at the whole group level. This learning has resulted in the understanding that reporting on individual student responses to intervention intensifications is not feasible at the state level, especially as the number of schools and districts using the evidence-based practice of Data-Based Individualization is expanded. MDE OSE intends to continue reporting on SIMR Part A as more schools and districts access professional learning.

Please describe the role of stakeholders in the decision to change the SiMR.

Districts did not have data regularly available to submit for Part B. Removing this requirement lessened the burden on districts to expedite data collection beyond the scope of their implementation readiness.

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 five elementary schools that participated in the data-based individualization (DBI) model demonstration from 2021-2022 through 2022-2023. The first group of schools (n=3) began their professional learning and implementation with the MiMTSS TA Center in August 2021. A second group of schools (n=2) began their professional learning and implementation in August 2022. The 176 target students included 75 first grade, 66 second grade, and 35 third grade students with the most significant and persistent reading needs (scored Well Below Benchmark on the fall Acadience Reading screening and below the district's 21st percentile). The SSIP target student group includes 51 (29%) students with an individualized education program (IEP) but are not exclusively students with an IEP. Of the 51 students with an IEP, the majority were eligible based on a Speech and Language Impairment (27 students). Eleven students had a Specific Learning Disability, four students had a Developmental Delay, three had an Autism Spectrum Disorder, two had a Cognitive Impairment, two had an Other Health impairment, and two did not have a disability category specified. The SSIP target student group is 45% female and 55%, male. The racial/ethnic composition of the 176 SSIP target students is 86% White, 5% Hispanic/Latino, 5% Multi-racial, and 3% Native American.

Two additional schools within two separate districts, began participating in the DBI model demonstration in September 2023, and 66 students were identified to be part of a third cohort of SSIP target students. These are 1st and 2nd-grade students from the two new schools who scored below the 21st percentile on the fall 2023 reading universal screening assessment. SiMR data from this third cohort of target students will be reflected in the FFY 2023 report.

These first three cohorts of target students represent schools within Michigan school districts in rural and suburb locales with varying resources and needs, 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 in alignment with Michigan's State Personnel Development Grant. Michigan is also pursuing strategies to support more schools with implementation by working with their intermediate school district to develop local capacity, especially around reporting data for the SiMR.

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 Plan 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)

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

Targets

FFY	Current Relationship	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	22.00%	24.00%	26.00%	28.00%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of target students who made greater progress from fall to spring compared to other students who began the school year at a comparable reading level based on norm-referenced growth comparisons	Target students: Number of students scoring well below benchmark and at or below the district 21st percentile on the Fall Acadience Reading Composite score each fall and winter	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
79	176		22.00%	44.89%	Met target	N/A

Provide the data source for the FFY 2022 data.

Acadience Reading K-6 universal screening fall and spring composite scores, fall to spring pathways of progress based on the composite 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 made in the fall of 2022 and 2023. The SiMR is represented in the evaluation plan as a long-term outcome (improved reading outcomes) and Goal 1 (Each school year, we will increase the percent of target students with significant reading needs who make greater progress from fall to spring compared to other students who began the school year at a comparable reading level, as measured by universal screening scores). 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.

Acadience Reading K-6 screening data are collected for ALL students using paper/pencil or online/tablet administration methods. School assessment teams typically include 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 Learning Online. 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 provide 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.

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.

The 2022-2023 SIMR results demonstrated that 79 target students (44.88%) made above or well above typical progress compared to other students in 1st-3rd grade who started the school with the same reading performance. This is an extremely promising result. However, when students start the school year with very low skills and are performing well below grade-level expectations, it is also important to understand the extent to which instruction is helping them to get back on track. Michigan's work with the SSIP also demonstrates that some of our target students are making so much progress under the conditions of high quality, evidence-based reading intervention, that they are able to meet end-of-year grade-level expectations in reading. Thirteen 1st grade (17%) SSIP target students, ten 2nd grade students (15%), and seven 3rd grade students (20%) met the end-of-year benchmark goal. These students and teachers worked very hard to dramatically change their reading performance within a single school year. This amount of progress is life-changing and does not happen without intentional implementation of effective practices. An additional 32 students (18%) moved from well below benchmark at the beginning of the school year to just below benchmark by the end of the year. Progress for some students is also generalizing to their performance on the state assessment, M-STEP. Nine of the 35 third grade SSIP target students (26%) scored in the Advanced and Proficient categories on the English Language Arts Assessment. These students had access to evidence-based Tier 1 and Tier 2 reading instruction for two to three years prior to taking the M-STEP for the first time in the Spring of 2023.

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). Data were collected from 92 target students within the three schools that were actively engaged in DBI training during 2022-2023. When asked how they felt about school, 64% of target students felt positively about school (I love it, I like it), but only 46% felt positively about reading. More students reported loving and liking intervention time (66%) than reading and school in general. Most students thought they were great readers or getting better at reading (95%) at the end of the school year. Data were only collected at the end of the school year. Student perceptions are being gathered at both the beginning and end of the 2023-2024 school year in order to measure changes in perceptions.

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. Surveys were customized by each school and data were collected from 30 parents and caregivers at the end of the 2022-2023 school year. Nearly all parents (93%) reported being satisfied with their child's reading instruction and 92% felt that the school asked for their input about how to best support their child and felt a part of the decision-making process. During 2023-2024, family and caregiver perceptions are being gathered at both the beginning and end of the year in order to respond to input throughout the year and measure changes in perceptions.

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)
NO

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

Updated Evaluation Plan (November 2023)

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 evaluation plan has been consolidated to eight goal areas (from an original 15 in 2020) based on learning that has occurred over the past two years about what is both important and feasible to achieve and measure. This is a summary of each goal's focus. Goals continue to cover all parts of the logic model and evaluation questions. Please see the full evaluation plan for details.

1. Student reading progress (SiMR)
2. Student perceptions
3. Family and caregiver perceptions
4. Educator knowledge and skills
5. Educator perceptions
6. Reading MTSS fidelity
7. Reading Intervention fidelity
8. Reach of professional learning

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.

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:

The FFY 2022 infrastructure and improvement strategies reporting timeline is November 1, 2022, through October 31, 2023. 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. MDE is leveraging the MiMTSS TA Center to provide professional learning to districts on the EBP, data-based individualization. To date, the MiMTSS TA Center has worked with 5 school districts, and 7 elementary schools as part of model demonstration efforts and an aligned State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG). In addition, three new professional learning series have been offered to educators across Michigan as we work to expand access to learning based on the initial promising outcomes from the literacy DBI model demonstration efforts: Intensifying Literacy Instruction Overview Series (74

participants representing 30 districts and 16 intermediate school districts), Intensifying Literacy Instruction Summer Series (74 participants representing 12 districts and six intermediate school districts), Addressing the Advanced Tiers: Work of the Multi-disciplinary Team (12 participants representing 10 districts and 6 intermediate school districts).

General Supervision: Since 2016, when OSEP informed the MDE OSE that ISDs as sub-recipients of IDEA grant funds are functionally the local education agencies (LEAs), MDE OSE worked to broaden and enhance the system of general supervision. MDE OSE has engaged regularly since 2018 with a group of ISD and member district stakeholders, along with stakeholders representing other constituencies. MDE OSE supports the ISD work through grants – General Supervision System Grants – with required applications for funds and semi-annual and annual reporting of progress. MDE OSE has also been engaging with ISD directors of special education through a series of iterative documents that began with reviewing OSEP's Critical Elements (CrEAG), 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. MDE 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), the MDE OSE staff, and ISD directors of special education. MDE OSE has engaged and embraced a Data Use and Action Process to increase the MDE OSE capacity to report, analyze, and use data to improve both results and compliance. MDE OSE is building two teams for this capacity-building work. The Data Use and Action Process Team has provided TA to several ISD data action teams since 2018. TA will continue to be provided to additional ISDs and member districts. The Quadrant Data Use Team analyzes data used in annual ISD determinations based on the extent ISDs have met the purposes and requirements of IDEA and other more recent data to identify levels of TA. There is some overlap in the membership of these teams to ensure coordination. ISDs will be encouraged to identify staff to also participate in a future 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. Materials for supporting ISD staff will leverage previously offered universal TA sessions focused on reading acquisition and methods for intensifying intervention instruction, including the 5 steps of DBI.

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.

Short-term Outcomes in the evaluation plan are conceptualized as "Effective State-Level Infrastructures & Scale."

MDE Office of Special Education: Professional learning and network for ISD directors of special education and staff on how to develop regional infrastructures to support the literacy outcomes for students with disabilities.

MDE 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 the MDE OSE staff and ISD directors of special education 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.

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. Resources have been developed to address lessons learned during the second year of DBI Model Demonstration work with two new elementary schools during 2022-2023. New resources address the following topic areas: 1) Selection of a systems coach for a school multi-disciplinary team and instructional coach for interventions, 2) Helping district leaders to learn alongside school teams before attempting to scale the DBI districtwide, 3) Making a proactive plan for external coaches to exit and transition functions to internal coaches, 4) Expediting the start of reading intervention, 5) Tools for entering and summarizing intervention implementation records, 6) data analysis routines to help teams start analyzing data and making decisions earlier in the school year, 7) intervention-specific intensification checklists. In addition, ongoing efforts remain focused on providing greater statewide access to data-based individualization (DBI) professional learning through the aligned State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG), 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. To date, the MiMTSS TA Center has worked with 5 school districts, and 7 elementary schools as part of model demonstration efforts and an aligned State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG). In addition, three new professional learning series have been offered to educators across Michigan as we work to expand access to learning based on the initial promising outcomes from the literacy DBI model demonstration efforts: Intensifying Literacy Instruction Overview Series (74 participants representing 30 districts and 16 intermediate school districts), Intensifying Literacy Instruction Summer Series (74 participants representing 12 districts and six intermediate school districts), Addressing the Advanced Tiers: Work of the Multi-disciplinary Team (12 participants representing 10 districts and 6 intermediate school districts).

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 5-percentage points improvement in DBI knowledge and skills based on a 42-item assessment that was given before training the multidisciplinary teams (pre) and again at the end of the school year (post). At the end of the school year, staff were also asked about the impact of participating in the DBI model demonstration project. All (100%) of staff agreed with agreed with three statements affirming that they were glad their school participated in the project, they improved as reading teachers, and they believed their school's implementation of MTSS improved during the year.

Schools will implement the reading components of an MTSS framework and reading interventions with fidelity. The Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory 2.0 (R-TFI) was used to measure the implementation of the reading components of an MTSS framework. Tier 1 scores on the R-TFI remained high for three schools with scores above 80%; one school scored just below the 70% target; and one school with the lowest score demonstrated improvement from fall to spring. Advanced Tiers scores on the R-TFI exceeded the target of 70% for all five schools.

Nineteen interventionists were observed during Enhanced Core Reading Instruction (ECRI) intervention lessons during 2022-2023. The fewest number of observations per interventionist was one, and the most was four. All but two interventionists (17 of 19, 89%) were observed to be implementing the ECRI Tier 2 intervention with fidelity, as indicated by scores of 5 or 6 (scale 1-6) for overall fidelity.

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. One district (representing three schools) has sustained their district implementation infrastructure above 80% since September 2019. One district (representing one school) has sustained a score between 72-83% since September 2018. One district (representing one school) did not have data available for 2022-23 or previous years. The three new professional learning series described above have also increased access to learning about DBI. However, few ISDs and districts are currently prepared to run their own local training and coaching systems. MDE and the MiMTSS TA Center are planning to address local capacity and scale through additional professional learning offerings, connections with local special education leaders, and general supervision.

Did the State implement any <u>new</u> (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 (short-term outcomes) reported in FFY 23 will reflect work that is anticipated to occur between November 1, 2023, and October 31, 2024.

MiMTSS: MDE will continue to leverage the infrastructure developed for MiMTSS to communicate about and scale the supports for DBI. Some of the FFY 2022 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 local educators.

General Supervision: MDE OSE is connecting and leveraging the General Supervision and Data Use and Action Process with data-based individualization (DBI) technical assistance. For example, one of the Data Use and Action Process professional learning sessions and training of trainer sessions will be focused on selecting evidence-based practices, DBI and its application to intensifying literacy instruction will be discussed. The session will also share professional learning accessible to schools and ISD consultants in DBI. There are also focus groups being held with ISD special education directors and supervisors about LEA needs for supporting students with disabilities and DBI technical assistance available to ISD consultants and LEA staff.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

DBI implementation and the district-selected reading intervention curriculum resources (Enhanced Core Reading Instruction) chosen for DBI step 1 were the evidence-based practices implemented during the reporting period of 7/1/22-6/30/23.

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. Five of the seven schools participating in the DBI model demonstration (three schools' data are reported in the FFY 2022 report and the two schools' data to be reported in the FFY 2023 report) are using 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 two newest schools that started DBI professional learning are using Reading Mastery as the evidence-based, standard protocol intervention representing DBI step 1. Like ECRI, Reading Mastery incorporates 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, and when fidelity is established, 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 a Group or an Individualized Intensive Intervention Plan. The interventionists implement the contents of the Group or 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 and repeat of steps 3-5 as needed if the students are not making progress.

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.

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. Michigan's State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) features DBI professional learning for the district implementation team and elementary multidisciplinary teams in the first year of partnership. Future SPDG-supported district data will be included in subsequent annual performance 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 reading interventions with fidelity. Elementary school multidisciplinary teams are the second teaming structure receiving DBI professional learning. Sessions include introducing DBI, identifying students who need intensive 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 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 learning about the standard-treatment protocol intervention, developing an Individualized Intensive Intervention Plan and corresponding intervention supports to accelerate reading outcomes, and evaluating student progress.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

The following two measures of fidelity were used to assess practice change from July 2022 thru June 2023:

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 remained high for three schools with scores above 80%; one school scored just below the 70% target; and one school with the lowest score demonstrated improvement from fall to spring. Advanced Tiers scores on the R-TFI were above 70% for all five schools.

Tier 2 reading intervention fidelity: Step 1 of DBI uses a validated intervention program, and it is the foundation for intensifying instruction. The intervention used in the five elementary schools has a fidelity measure that the intervention program authors have developed. Nineteen interventionists were observed during Enhanced Core Reading Instruction (ECRI) intervention lessons during 2022-2023. The fewest number of observations per interventionist was one, and the most was four. All but two interventionists (17 of 19, 89%) were observed to be implementing the ECRI Tier 2 intervention with fidelity, as indicated by scores of 5 or 6 (scale 1-6) for overall fidelity.

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.

Progress was demonstrated across all eight areas in the evaluation plan. This indicates that the SSIP is making an impact and should continue to be refined, replicated, and scaled to impact even more learners in Michigan.

1. Student reading progress (SiMR)
2. Student perceptions
3. Family and caregiver perceptions
4. Educator knowledge and skills
5. Educator perceptions
6. Reading MTSS fidelity
7. Reading Intervention fidelity
8. Reach of professional learning

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

The DBI model demonstration is in its final year of implementation, as we transition to scaling up the work through the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG). Specifically, by the end of this reporting period (June 2024), the SiMR target (goal 1) will continue to be met for students accessing reading intervention supports and will demonstrate within-year reading progress as measured by universal screening 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. Intervention and DBI fidelity will continue to demonstrate progress (goal 6 and 7), setting the stage for sustainability.

The DBI model demonstration has expanded in FFY 2023 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. More districts will be invited to learn about and implement DBI through State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) funding.

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.

Although 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 input through multiple means and mechanisms including in-person and virtual meetings, summary information documents, surveys, and the use of virtual discussion rooms. MDE OSE uses Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) as the primary stakeholder group. Information about the SEAC can be found at the [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.

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 78 representatives with a race/ethnicity breakdown of 78%--White, 8%--African American, 3%--Native American,4%--Asian and 5%--Hispanic and 3%--Middle Eastern. 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 be more inclusive of diverse perspectives. 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. MDE OSE meets with SEAC and Michigan Alliance for Families (MAF) throughout the year bringing data and sharing information to determine whether targets are reasonable yet rigorous.

MDE OSE conducted presentations for input on Indicator methodologies and provided for stakeholders to breakout into groups to have a deeper discussion about the data and targets so attendees could provide informed feedback on proposed changes. Each breakout room had MDE OSE staff and content experts to facilitate the discussion. MDE OSE developed a schedule to systematically present 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 Indicator teams went through each indicator analyzing data, reviewing targets, improvement strategies and evaluated progress. The results of these analyses were presented to stakeholders.

Other stakeholder groups include the Part C Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC), the State Board of Education, the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, and the General Supervision Accountability Workgroup – comprised of ISD directors of special education, member district special education representatives, attendees of the ISD Collaborative Conference (special education personnel), and representatives of organizations with a stake in the education of students with an IEP.

District and school staff, families and caregivers, and students are additional critical stakeholders for the SSIP.

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.

Members of SSIP team presented to SEAC again in the Spring of 2023. Members of SEAC received overview of the Michigan Dyslexia Handbook. The DBI process is incorporated into the guidance as a method for supporting learners with characteristics of dyslexia. Per request, two follow-up presentations were provided to SEAC, focused on high quality Tier 1 instruction and how those relate to the taxonomy of intervention intensification.

The staff, students, and parents/caregivers are also critical partners who are informing the SSIP. During initial model demonstration partnership conversations, staff are made 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. 100% agreed that they were glad their school participated in the project, 100% of staff said their participation help them to improve as a reading teacher, and 100% of staff believed their school implementation of MTSS improved during the year.

Data were collected from 92 target students within the three schools that were actively engaged in DBI training during 2022-2023. When asked how they felt about school, 64% of target students felt positively about school (I love it, I like it), but only 46% felt positively about reading. More students reported loving and liking intervention time (66%) than reading and school in general. Most students thought they were great readers or getting better at reading (95%) at the end of the school year. Data were only collected at the end of the school year. During 2023-2024, student perceptions are being gathered at both the beginning and end of the year in order to measure changes in perceptions.

Surveys were customized by each school and data were collected from 30 parents and caregivers at the end of the 2022-2023 school year. Nearly all parents (93%) reported being satisfied with their child's reading instruction and 92% felt that the school asked for their input about how to best support their child and felt a part of the decision-making process. During 2023-2024, family and caregiver perceptions are being gathered at both the beginning and end of the year in order to respond to input throughout the year and measure changes in perceptions.

Description of previous activities with SEAC: 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."

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.

n/a

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).

n/a

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

Phone: 517-241-0497

Submitted on: 04/18/24 9:32:09 AM