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Executive Summary

The Madison Metropolitan School District is committed to providing an exemplary educational experience for our students with disabilities. While students with disabilities have made recent gains in graduation rates and reading proficiency, if we eliminate barriers to learning and consistently provide excellent instruction in rich supportive environments our students will experience much higher outcomes.

The Special Education Plan outlines key actions to ensure that all students with disabilities are engaged in high quality curriculum and instruction within inclusive educational environments leading to deep learning which results in college, career, and community readiness.

Over the last year, the Student Services team analyzed multiple sources of data over several years, reviewed relevant literature with support from colleagues at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, consulted with special education and legal experts, reviewed state and federal guidelines and engaged stakeholders to identify the most critical actions for the next three years.

Obtaining key stakeholder feedback was an essential step in developing the Plan. We engaged over 250 stakeholders including parents, school staff, students, and community members throughout the 2015-2016 school-year. Input/feedback was solicited using several methods including an on-line form and 23 face to face sessions in schools and/or community locations. The feedback received covered a range of topics including staffing/hiring, desire to improve inclusive educational practices, special education services, instructional practices/interventions, professional development, data use, accountability and parent communication. The feedback gathered throughout the year provided valuable insights and recommendations which greatly shaped the Plan and associated actions.

The Plan is organized into six primary sections which collectively identify current barriers to student learning and strategic actions aligned to our vision, goals, and legal requirements. The six sections include: (1) Service Delivery for Students with Disabilities; (2) Curriculum, Instruction and Professional Development; (3) Data Use and Accountability Systems; (4) Disproportionality; (5) Recruiting, Hiring and Placement of High Quality Staff; and (6) Collaboration and Communication. Key actions for each section are listed below.
1. Service Delivery for Students with Disabilities
   - Implement a collaborative Service Delivery planning process as a component of comprehensive school instructional design to ensure all students with disabilities are provided with high quality instruction and effective special education/related services in the most inclusive educational environments
   - Implement improved processes to successfully transition students with disabilities from grade to grade, school to school and from high school to adulthood

2. Curriculum, Instruction and Professional Development
   - Expand Universal Design for Learning (UDL) as a strategy for curriculum and lesson design that ensures access for students with disabilities to rigorous standards-based content
   - Create a repository of modified or adapted curricula aligned with district scopes and instructional resources in core subjects
   - Increase professional learning opportunities for special education teachers and assistants on evidence-based interventions for reading, writing, math, and social emotional skills/behavior
   - Provide professional development for instructional staff, including all principals, district-wide, on the principles and practices of inclusive education

3. Data Use and Accountability Systems
   - Utilize accountability systems and data routines in schools to monitor student progress on learning goals and determine when additional supports, guidance, or immediate adjustments are needed
   - Implement improved accountability systems to monitor and immediately correct procedural compliance issues

4. Disproportionality
   - Apply improved monitoring systems and implement five actions to reduce/eliminate factors contributing to disproportionality within special education (improve access to timely evidence-based reading interventions, improve student support and intervention team practices, require re-evaluation for transfer students with certain disabilities, improve the quality of initial evaluations, and ensure appropriate educational environments with the service delivery process).

5. Recruiting, Hiring, Retention and Placement of High Quality Staff
   - Revise hiring processes for both special education teachers and assistants to ensure appropriate staffing levels and qualification/skills
   - Create a process to increase the number of high quality special education and bilingually certified teachers
   - Research, identify and implement a successful model for the equitable distribution of special education and related services staffing/resources
6. Collaboration and Communication

- Improve family partnerships and communication with stakeholders, including parents/families, administrators, teachers, and special education assistants
- Improve teaming and collaboration practices among both special education staff and with general education colleagues
- Revise the roles/responsibilities of assistant directors, program support teachers and other Student Services staff to improve communication and alignment with the Special Education Plan goals and priorities

The Plan concludes with an appendix which includes a Budget and Data Overview, Additional Data, Background Information/Input-Feedback Analysis, Literature Review of Special Education Research, Additional Information and Document Links, Acknowledgements, Results Driven Accountability (RDA) Metrics and Goals, and Plan Evaluation Measures.
Acknowledgements

Members of the Department of Student Service’s Special Education Plan Cross-Functional Team, which includes the Madison Metropolitan School District central office and school-based administrators and staff, worked collaboratively over the past twelve months to develop the Plan. We would like to thank this team for their work which supported the development of the Special Education Plan. In addition, we would like to thank parents, students, district staff members, and community members who provided feedback to inform the Plan. The team would also like to thank our University of Wisconsin-Madison partners who provided a review of research and guidance throughout this process (for a complete list of all contributors to the Special Education Plan, please refer to Appendix F).
Introduction

The Madison Metropolitan School District vision is that every school will be a thriving school that ensures every child graduates college, career, and community ready. Our theory of action, as captured in our district’s Strategic Framework, includes three major parts: (1) The School Improvement Plan, which establishes the disciplined way of working necessary for each school to meet the needs of all children; (2) A common approach to Professional Learning that ensures that every educator across all schools is knowledgeable about our district’s shared definition of great teaching that is culturally and linguistically responsive; and (3) Five Priority Areas for central office focused on providing schools with the high quality tools and resources they need to be successful and removing institutional barriers to student success. Every action we take is aimed at achieving three over-arching goals with associated metrics for raising student achievement and narrowing achievement gaps.

Goal 1: Every student is on-track to graduate as measured by student growth and achievement at key milestones.

Goal 2: Every student has access to a challenging and well-rounded education as measured by programmatic access and participation data.

Goal 3: Every student, family and employee experiences a positive school and district climate as measured by school climate survey data.

All results are disaggregated by race/ethnicity, English Language Learner status, advanced learner status, disability and poverty.

In alignment to the district’s Strategic Framework the mission of the Department of Student Services is to ensure appropriate services are provided to students with disabilities, empowering all to reach their fullest individual potential to meet, and work beyond, grade level academic and behavioral standards within an inclusive educational environment. Our mission has been refined through a review of research and best practice with input from key stakeholders (students, parents, staff, community members, and national special education experts).

In 2014, the Department of Student Services conducted an independent program review with the Futures Education group. The findings from that review informed the first draft of the Special Education Plan. In addition, new state and federal requirements called Results Driven Accountability (RDA) require districts to increase reading, writing, and math outcomes for students with disabilities. The program review, Results Driven Accountability requirements, and our own desire to improve the outcomes of our students with disabilities provide a foundation for the Special Education Plan.

In the following pages, you’ll see a description of the purpose of the Plan, its alignment with other priority action in the MMSD, a review of data that informed the Plan, a review of each element of the Plan, and finally a 3-year overview and budget.
Purpose

The purpose of the Special Education Plan is to provide a clear outline of changes needed to ensure that consistent, high quality services are provided to students with disabilities resulting in deep learning. Special education services are provided to ensure that all students with disabilities have a free and appropriate public education to meet their unique needs and prepare them for further education, employment, and independent living. The MMSD aims to move past compliance requirements and support each student with a disability within the most inclusive educational environments to reach their fullest individual potential.

Inclusive Schools: Our Vision for the Future

Inclusive schooling means that special education, English as a Second Language (ESL) and bilingual education are no longer described as placements but rather as systems of support. In successful inclusive schools, all students including those with disabilities lose neither services nor support, but gain the opportunity to have full membership and to grow in functional and meaningful ways in the social and learning contexts of their nondisabled peers. Inclusive schools are designed to meet the educational needs of all their members within common, yet fluid, environments and activities. For students learning in multiple languages, inclusive schooling enables students from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds to use their skills and abilities to move successfully between multiple environments in order to synthesize skills and knowledge in various settings.

A successful inclusive learning community fosters collaboration, problem solving, self-directed learning, and critical discourse. Inclusive schools allows (a) students with extraordinary gifts and talents to move at their natural learning rate, (b) students who progress at a slower rate move at the best of their ability (gaining learning strategies as well as remaining part of the exciting content of the themes and lessons) and (c) students with specific learning challenges to receive creative and effective supports to maximize their success. When teachers use what they know about students’ strengths, they can provide culturally responsive and meaningful lessons that use students’ prior knowledge as the building blocks for learning.
Context of the Special Education Plan

The Special Education Plan operationalizes the Madison Metropolitan School District (MMSD) Strategic Framework. Specifically, the Plan is a “key action” aligned to the first priority area of the Strategic Framework, Coherent Instruction. This priority area focuses on providing schools the tools and resources necessary to provide every student with a well-rounded, culturally responsive and coherent education leading to college, career and community readiness. The Special Education Plan is also aligned with and supported by other critical plans and actions outlined in this priority area of the Strategic Framework. What follows is a brief description of how the Special Education Plan aligns with each.

Great Teaching Matters Framework

Nested within the Strategic Framework, MMSD’s Great Teaching Matters Framework describes the district’s vision and goals for effective teaching that is responsive to the cultural and language assets of all students. This vision is grounded in a commitment to all students as we prepare them to be college, career, and community ready. Culturally and linguistically responsive practices are at the center and embedded throughout Great Teaching. The “plan, teach, reflect and adjust” cycle represents key teacher actions that advance students learning.

Multi-Tiered System of Supports

The Special Education Plan is realized within a Multi-tiered System of Supports (MTSS) in every school. In MTSS, the needs of all learners in the school are identified and supported early, with increasing levels of instructional time and intensity provided based on individual needs. Beginning with highly effective core instruction, MTSS facilitates students’ access to timely, evidence-based interventions to address areas of academic and/or behavioral need. A thriving MTSS is a key structure to increase academic outcomes for all, while simultaneously reducing gaps in achievement and disproportionality among some. In the 2014-2015 school-year, we strengthened schools’ capacity to provide MTSS by developing the MTSS summary guidance document, the Intervention Toolkit, and the Teacher Team Toolkit, all supported through strategic professional development and consultation with school leadership teams. These recent and ongoing efforts to promote high quality classroom teaching, followed up by targeted support, pave the way for maximizing effectiveness of our Special Education Plan.
Behavior Education Plan
The Behavior Education Plan defines the district’s restorative approach to behavior, providing clear expectations, giving students the opportunity to learn positive behavior skills and pairing consequences with opportunities to learn and restore relationships. In order to accomplish the best results for all students, we need to ensure that each of our schools is a place where all students are learning and thriving in safe and supportive environments. The BEP is a teaching and learning model rather than a rules and consequences model. This represents a philosophical shift in thinking as we support all students, including students with disabilities who may experience challenging behaviors that require specialized intervention.

English Language Learner Plan & Advanced Learner Plan
The Special Education Plan builds on and is in alignment with the English Language Learner Plan and Advanced Learner Plan. All three plans identify very similar needs. For example, all plans identify access to high quality curriculum and instruction as a critical need in increasing student outcomes. Furthermore, the plans all identify the school design process, hiring/retaining high quality staff, and accountability systems as key levers in accelerating student learning and ensuring all relevant statutes and regulations are met. Through intentional collaboration, coordinated systems of support will be provided to schools to ensure coherence.

Review of Data
The components of the Plan were informed by key sets of data, highlighted here. In the review of data, we begin with highlighting key enrollment and demographic information. This is followed by student outcome data such as academic achievement results, graduation and dropout rates. We conclude with data illustrating aspects of disproportionality. For a more comprehensive review of data, please see Appendix B.

Special Education Enrollment and Demographic Data
Madison has long been considered a highly inclusive school district. At rates significantly exceeding the national average, over 81% of students with disabilities are served primarily in general education settings, and are considered fully included.

At the beginning of 2015-16, our identification rate for students with disabilities was 13.7%. This compares to a state-wide identification rate of 13.5%. Other similar districts (e.g., Green Bay, 15.5%; Racine, 17.4%; Milwaukee, 19.7%), have higher rates of students in special education than MMSD. Overall, rates for students identified with disabilities fluctuate across the year, rising about one percentage point at the end of the year. This fluctuating enrollment across the year has implications for appropriate allocation of resources and staff.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Percent of District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>3834</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>3902</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End</td>
<td>4054</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>3700</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>3787</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End</td>
<td>3950</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>3673</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>3798</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End</td>
<td>4056</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>3707</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>3839</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End</td>
<td>3799</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In looking at disability types by race/ethnicity, different race/ethnic groups emerge as more common than others within certain disability categories. For example, the most common student groups to comprise Autism are White (23%) and Asian (25%) students. Specific Learning Disabilities is most common among African American (32%) students. Speech and Language impairments are most common among Hispanic/Latino (27%) students, and Emotional Behavioral Disabilities are most common among African-American (20%) and Multiracial (20%) subgroups.

**Educational Environment**

As mentioned previously, Madison is considered an inclusive school district. However, when disaggregating educational environments by race/ethnicity, we see striking differences. Specifically, African American and Native American students are fully included 73% of the time as compared to the district average of 81%. These data indicate African American and Native American students are educated in more restrictive or segregated environments when compared to all students with disabilities (October, 2015). While the levels of segregation in Madison are far less than national data, we find this inconsistent with our vision and values.
With few exceptions, there are great disparities on the district’s Strategic Framework proficiency milestones between students with disabilities and those without. However, there are much smaller gaps between students with and without disabilities regarding meeting growth targets. There are few differences between students with and without disabilities in access to arts education. Large gaps exist between students with and without disabilities in world language participation. It’s important to note that decisions related to world language participation are often determined by IEP teams.

**Focus on Strategic Framework Milestones 2015-16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal #1</th>
<th>Special Education</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PALS 2 Reading Meeting Benchmark</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP 3 Reading Proficiency</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP 5 Reading Proficiency</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP 5 Math Proficiency</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP 8 Reading Proficiency</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP 8 Reading Growth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal #2</th>
<th>Special Education</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts Education K-5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Education 6-8</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Language 7-8</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Coursework Profile</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-Rounded Profile</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While standardized academic assessments provide important information regarding evidence of student learning, each student with a disability has an individualized education program (IEP) with annual goals, which are often the most critical learning outcomes. The percentage of students who are meeting or exceeding their IEP goals have largely increased over the past 4 years. In 2014-15, 78% of students met or exceeded their annual IEP goal(s).

**Percent of IEP Goals Met Over Time.**

In MMSD 78% of annual individualized education Plan (IEP) goals are met or anticipated to be met by the end of the IEP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>49%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAP 8 Math Proficiency</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP 8 Math Growth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9 Fs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 11 GPA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT 11 Reading College Readiness</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT 11 Math College Readiness</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MAP and ACT Proficiency Results**

On the Measure of Academic Progress (MAP), students with disabilities in Madison are not meeting the same percentage of proficiency in reading and math when compared to students without disabilities. While some moderate growth is evident over the last two years, the gap between students with disabilities and those without is significant, especially at the secondary level. Further, on the American College Test (ACT), students with disabilities trail students without disabilities on reading/math and
have lower overall participation. The chart provides a disaggregation by disability areas. This provides staff with important insights regarding targeted areas of improvement. For example, about 2% of our students with learning disabilities meet proficiency standards. Over the last several years we have invested heavily in new intervention materials and professional development to improve student outcomes based on the type of disability.

### 2015-16 MAP Results by Disability Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability Type</th>
<th>MAP Spring Reading Tested Students</th>
<th>MAP Spring Reading Proficiency</th>
<th>Met MAP Fall Spring Reading Growth Target</th>
<th>MAP Spring Math Tested Students</th>
<th>MAP Spring Math Proficiency</th>
<th>Met MAP Fall Spring Math Growth Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Autism</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBD: Emotional Behavioral Disability</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H: Hearing Impairment</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID: Intellectual Disability</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD: Specific Learning Disability</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Spec Ed</td>
<td>9491</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>9286</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHI: Other Health Impairment</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OI: Orthopedic Impairment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL: Speech or Language Impairment</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2015-16 Grade 11 ACT Results by Disability Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability Type</th>
<th>Tested Students</th>
<th>Average ACT Composite</th>
<th>ACT Reading Met College Readiness Benchmark</th>
<th>ACT Math Met College Readiness Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LD: Specific Learning Disability</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHI: Other Health Impairment</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBD: Emotional Behavioral Disability</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Autism</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL: Speech or Language Impairment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graduation Rate**

Over the course of the last several years, students with disabilities have increased the four year graduation rate and decreased the number of dropouts. When disaggregating graduation data of students with disabilities by race/ethnicity, free/reduced lunch and English language proficiency, the greatest discrepancies are between our African American, students who qualify for F/R lunch and our English language learners. While measurable progress has been realized in reducing dropouts and increasing graduation rates, significant gaps still exist.
## High School Completion and Dropout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four-Year Completion</th>
<th>Disability Status</th>
<th>Class of 2012</th>
<th>Class of 2013</th>
<th>Class of 2014</th>
<th>Class of 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six-Year Completion</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>89.9%</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-Year Dropout</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six-Year Dropout</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With an increased focus on transition planning and post-secondary options our students with disabilities have experienced improvements in four year graduation rates and decreased dropouts.

### Four-Year High School Completion by Disability Status and Other Demographic Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th>Disability Status</th>
<th>Class of 2012</th>
<th>Class of 2013</th>
<th>Class of 2014</th>
<th>Class of 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Free/Reduced</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not ELL</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When disaggregating graduation data for students with disabilities by race/ethnicity, free/reduced lunch and English language proficiency, we see our greatest gaps for African American, students receiving F/R lunch and English Language Learners.

**Disproportionality**

There are multiple dimensions of disproportionality in special education. Madison is one of 29 other districts in the state identified by the Department of Public Instruction as having disproportionately high representation of African Americans and Native Americans identified with disabilities. Specific disability areas include: emotional behavioral disorder (EBD), intellectual disability (ID), other health impairments (OHI) and specific learning disability (SLD). As an example, African American students in Madison are 4 times more likely to be identified with an emotional behavioral disability compared to their peers. The charts and graphs below, particularly the risk ratio, provide disaggregated data to compare between race/ethnicity groups. Another aspect of disproportionality is access to general education classrooms or levels of segregation. As noted below, African American and Native American students are the least included in general education classrooms and experience the greatest amount of segregation (specialized programs or off-site locations). In the 2015-16 school-year, 12% of African American students with disabilities were educated in substantially separate environments compared to only 4% of White students with disabilities. Approximately 85% of students in offsite special education programs are non-White.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Ratio</th>
<th>2014-15 and 2015-16 Year (ages 6-21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk ratio compares the risk of one racial/ethnic group to the risk for all other racial/ethnic groups combined.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>EBD</th>
<th>SLD</th>
<th>OHI</th>
<th>SL</th>
<th>LI*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| African American |
| 2015-16 | 3.16 | 4.05 | 3.18 | 2.02 | 0.89 | 0.61 |
| 2014-15 | 3.27 | 3.88 | 3.21 | 2.22 | 1.08 | 0.62 |


DPI defines disproportionate representation as risk ratio of 2.0 or greater.

The numbers in red identify areas of disproportionality (as calculated by the Department of Public Instruction) as well as the degree of disproportionality. Interestingly, African American students are less likely to be identified with speech and language and all other low incidence disabilities. Annually, the district is required to take actions specifically designed to address factors contributing to disproportionality.
This graph demonstrates risk ratio over a 12 year period for African American students identified with emotional behavioral disabilities (blue) and intellectual disabilities (red). Little progress has been realized over time suggesting new and/or more coordinated systemic actions are required.
This graph represents the four primary areas of newly identified students with disabilities. District data on special education qualification has indicated that students who transfer to MMSD are more than twice as disproportionate compared to internally identified students. Students with disabilities transferring to Madison add to the disproportionality in special education for our district. The evaluation records of each transferring student are currently reviewed by student services or special education personnel for technical accuracy however, this has proven to be insufficient in identifying inappropriate disability determinations.

In summary, over the last two years, students with disabilities have experienced improvements in graduation rates, reading proficiency and a reduction in dropouts. However, as illustrated by the above data, students with disabilities lag far behind peers on nearly every Strategic Framework milestone or metric. Our challenge now is providing meaningful, engaging curriculum and instruction leading to deep learning. We believe that by reducing barriers that impede learning and improving instructional systems/practices, our students with disabilities can and will dramatically improve outcomes leading to college, career, and community readiness.
The Special Education Plan

The challenges related to fluctuating enrollment in special education, disproportionality in disability designation and placement, academic growth and achievement, and low and disproportionate graduation rates, provide the impetus for the Special Education Plan. The following section details our action plan for addressing our data. The six areas (delineated in the Executive Summary) include (1) Service Delivery for Students with Disabilities; (2) Curriculum and Instruction, Supports and Interventions; (3) Data Use and Accountability Systems (4) Disproportionality; (5) Recruiting, Hiring and Placement of High Quality Staff; and (6) Collaboration and Communication. For each area we describe the need, evidence of need, a description of proposed actions and resources when applicable.

1. Service Delivery for Students with Disabilities

Service Delivery
What is Needed?
In the past, service delivery planning processes in schools have lacked consistency and coherence, which negatively impacts student outcomes. There is a need for an intentional collaborative service delivery planning process which will align specially designed instruction with current schedule or location to ensure all students with disabilities are consistently provided the necessary instructional opportunities and rich supportive inclusive environments to realize their potential. The service delivery planning process will lead to service delivery practices which adhere to the Scheduling Guidance and Allocation Guidance each school receives. Desired outcomes of the process include:

- Comprehensive, current view of the school’s service delivery
- Reliable schedule based on student needs outlined in the IEP
- School identification of content for professional learning
- Central office leaders and schools in alignment regarding next steps to accelerate growth for students

Evidence of Need
In 2014, The Futures Education group observed inconsistent and ineffective service delivery planning across the district, leading to significant gaps in access to general education curriculum, special education services and or general education environments. They also noted an over reliance on certain co-teaching practices (particularly, one teaches/one assists and team teaching), limiting the ability of special educators to provide specially designed instruction to students with disabilities. Inconsistent with the district’s inclusive education values, the program review team observed significant levels of clustering across the district (students with disabilities), which creates disproportionate classroom environments. In some cases the density of students with disabilities is greater than 50%.

Additionally, evidence from both the Futures Report and the feedback sessions showed that far too many students with disabilities are not engaged in meaningful and/or standards-based curriculum and instruction. A second, related theme showed that...
included students were not consistently provided the necessary scaffolds or supports to engage with the curriculum and instead were observed working on disconnected activities. Finally, in a review of our formal and informal complaints or disputes, the root cause of many of these was a result of misalignment of specially designed instruction with schedules and staffing.

When conducting a root cause analysis to understand the factors and or barriers to academic and behavioral achievement, specifically for students with disabilities, multiple district-level teams identified school instructional design as most critical.

School Instructional Design is an annual school-level process, with support from central office and conducted in collaboration with staff, students and families, that ensures every child benefits from a holistic school experience that leads to deep learning.

It includes:

- The identification of students’ strengths and needs as they transition into a new grade or school
- The design of an instructional experience that builds on student strengths and addresses needs both within and beyond the school day
- The flexible use of resources (time, budget, staff, and programmatic supports) in alignment with a design that will bring that experience to life.

An effective school instructional design process is a coordinated and responsive approach that leads to collective responsibility for all students on their journey to become college, career and community ready.

**How Does the Special Education Plan Address this Need?**

The Service Delivery planning process will be implemented as an essential component of School Instructional Design. This process is developed to assist schools in equitably allocating their resources to ensure all students with disabilities are receiving the appropriate special education/related services in the correct educational environments. An aspect of the Service Delivery process is ensuring that students with disabilities are scheduled into classes as heterogeneously as possible to reduce the use of clustering. Ideally, classroom densities would reflect the school’s natural proportions. When a general education classroom approaches a density of 25 - 30% or higher students with disabilities, a service delivery analysis is triggered. The analysis will be conducted with the school principal, PST, and central office special education administrative staff to examine the context, circumstances, use of resources, and rationale. Ultimately, approval from special education administrative staff or key central office personnel is required for densities of 30% or higher. Service delivery for students with disabilities is an on-going process which evolves over the course of the year and changes to meet student learning needs. The service delivery process will also examine the scheduling of students who only receive speech and language services to ensure appropriate placement/balanced classrooms. Moreover, the service delivery analysis will also review and take into consideration dually identified students (English Language Learners and Advanced Learners) and those in highly restrictive placements. [Service Delivery Process](#).
Service Delivery Actions
- Beginning in 2016-17, Student Services administrators will work collaboratively with school principals to utilize the new process, beginning with the highest needs schools.

Budget Impact
- On-going professional development and orientation to the new Service Delivery Guidance document and process. Estimated cost of professional development for principals, site-based leaders and special education/related services staff is approximately $10,000, funded using IDEA flowthrough.

Student Transitions

What is needed?
There is a need to improve our processes and procedures to successfully transition students with disabilities from grade to grade, school to school and from high school to adulthood.

Evidence of Need
Our input/feedback sessions revealed a need to improve transitions. There are three distinct transitions we are targeting:
- In both grade to grade (within a school) and school to school transitions there is a lack of consistent information transfer between the sending team and the receiving team. Parents and staff reported it often took lengthy periods of time to finally understand the student’s need and provide the right supports, instruction and environments which negatively impacted student learning.
- Reports from parents, students, and post-secondary agencies confirm that high school to adulthood transition related activities are not consistently planned or communicated, and that connections were either not made or took place at the last moment which greatly reduced or eliminated authentic self-determination/family input.

How Does the Special Education Plan Address this Need?
The Special Education plan will expand and enhance guidance for transitions from grade to grade and school to school transitions. This guidance will provide staff with step by step procedures to ensure that students successfully navigate yearly transitions through clear information transfer. The current Secondary Transition Resource Guide will also be revised to assist staff, parents, and students with disabilities successfully transition from high school to adulthood. Successful and meaningful transition services result from collaborative and thoughtful planning, driven by a student’s dreams, desires, and abilities. This Secondary Transition Resource Guide will establish a year by year, step by step process for staff, adult-aged students (from 14 years old to 21, depending on pathway) and families as they navigate the many options and available opportunities. Our process, anchored in self-determination, places students in the driver’s seat regarding all aspects of planning and goal-setting (long and short), as well as participating in the ongoing development of IEPs and goal-monitoring. In addition to
keeping the team focused on the student’s needs and desires, this participation helps the student to develop decision-making and self-advocacy skills critical for college, career and community readiness.

**Student Transitions Actions**
- Create and implement a grade to grade and school to school transition process for students with disabilities
- Provide clarified guidance and expectations using the revised Secondary Transition Resource Guide
- Provide clarified guidance and expectations for students using the IEP process to meet graduation requirements

**Budget Impact**
- On-going professional development and orientation to the new Transition procedures. Estimated annual cost of professional development is approximately $10,000, funded using IDEA flow through.

**2. Curriculum, Instruction, and Professional Development**

**Universal Design for Learning: Access to Standards**

**What is needed?**
There is a need for students with disabilities to both access academic standards and meet their unique Individualized Education Program goals in the areas of reading, writing, math, and social emotional/behavior skills through our core and supplemental instruction and materials in inclusive environments.

**Evidence of Need**
Outcomes for students with disabilities are among the lowest of all disaggregated subgroups. The achievement of students with disabilities is not on pace with non-disabled peers. There is a need for general and special educators and Special Education Assistants to improve their collective capacity to provide rich, engaging curriculum and instruction leading to deep learning. There is also a need to increase our capacity to teach reading, writing, math, and social emotional/behavior skills through our core materials as well as specific highly effective interventions.

In addition to legal entitlements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA), strengthening our students’ access to grade level curriculum also has a recent policy imperative. Per a recent U.S. Department of Education Letter, students with disabilities should have access to the state’s academic content standards with individualized education programs (IEP) in alignment with academic content standards.

**How Does the Special Education Plan Address this Need?**
The following aspects of the Special Education Plan will specifically address how professional development meets the needs identified in the area of curriculum and instruction and tiered supports and interventions. Professional development offerings will
include integrated opportunities with general educators as well as those designed specifically for special educators.

Maximizing access for students with disabilities to the academic standards begins with general and special educators working together to make their expertise visible to one another, and thus available to students. As we promote teacher collaboration, we must also promote collaboration in leadership of professional learning. During the 2016-2017 school year, special education administrators and Curriculum & Instruction administrators will co-lead opportunities ranging from the Intensive Schools Professional Learning Series, Instructional Coach Professional Learning, the Beginning Educator Seminar, the K-5 Enhanced Report Card Professional Learning, Interventionist Professional Learning, and the Pathways design process. Throughout these experiences, explicit strategies for how to support teachers in developing connections to the academic standards for students with disabilities will be articulated. Specific structures that maximize teacher capacity to provide access to academic standards for students with disabilities include team-based instructional planning, cross-school collaboration, and school-based support.

To provide full access to the academic standards, the plan includes embedded opportunities for educators to learn how to plan for all learners through the Universal Design for Learning (UDL) process, an educational approach that facilitates meaningful access and authentic learning for all students, especially those with disabilities. UDL maximizes implementation efforts of inclusive schooling.

Currently, MMSD is participating in a state-wide Mini-Grant to develop internal capacity to provide high quality professional development and is supporting pilot schools’ implementation of universally accessible curriculum and instruction. As we deepen implementation of the district’s Technology Plan more of our students will have access to devices. This provides a natural opportunity for integrating the use of assistive and instructional technology devices into our UDL plans to meaningfully engage students in deep learning. Additionally, district and school leadership, as well as school improvement partners, will look for evidence of implementation of academic standards for all learners during walkthroughs and observations.

**Universal Design for Learning: Access to Standards Actions**
- Expand district capacity to design and deliver UDL professional development
- Expand UDL practices to support effective inclusive education
- Create an on-line repository of modified or adapted curricula

**Budget Impact**
- School-based and central office personnel will engage in multiple professional learning experiences, including conferences and after school meetings to develop our internal capacity to support and deliver UDL professional development. Estimated first year cost is approximately $13,000. On-going costs are projected to be approximately $12,000 annually, funded through IDEA flowthrough.
On-line Repository of Modified or Adapted Curricula
What is Needed?
There is a need to store/share modified or adapted curricula which is aligned to district scopes and instructional resources in core subjects.

Evidence of Need
Our special education staff reported that they spend far too much time re-creating modified/adapted materials. The time it takes to create instructional materials often comes at the expense of communication or collaborating with colleagues in lesson planning or family communication.

How Does the Special Education Plan Address this Need?
On-line Repository of Modified or Adapted Curricula Actions
- Create an on-line repository of modified or adapted curricula aligned with district scopes and instructional resources in core subjects is an essential action to support both access to rigorous culturally/linguistically responsive materials and implementing UDL. The repository will not only store curricular materials it will also function as a platform for sharing, collaborating, and deepening professional knowledge.

Budget Impact
- None expected

Professional Learning: Evidence-based Interventions
What is Needed?
There is a need to provide effective on-going professional learning for targeted instructional staff on the use of evidence-based interventions.

Evidence of Need
The review of data illustrates significant gaps in reading and math achievement between students with disabilities and those without. Over time, these gaps tend to grow which presents barriers to meaningfully engage in the curriculum. Ultimately, we feel this is a contributing factor in the substantial gaps in graduation rates between students with disabilities and those without.

How Does the Special Education Plan Address this Need?
Improving our capacity to deliver high quality instruction to students with disabilities is a key lever in improving academic and behavioral outcomes. Professional learning will be provided to special education teachers in collaboration with general education teachers on topics such as inclusive education and evidenced-based reading, writing, math, and social emotional/behavior strategies/interventions. In addition, professional learning will be designed to build educators’ capacity to support transfer of skills students learn in interventions to general education environments.

The plan recommends greatly accelerating our capacity to provide highly specialized reading interventions for emerging readers and/or students with dyslexia. MMSD has partnered with the Children’s Dyslexia Center to provide staff with extensive training in
the Orton-Gillingham (O-G) method of reading instruction. The O-G method focuses on multi-sensory reading and spelling instruction to support students to learn foundational literacy skills in an intensive instructional setting. Beginning in summer 2016, we have augmented our offerings for students with dyslexia with another O-G intervention which keeps intact O-G methods while improving usability for teachers. Our goal is to have at least two staff per school (a regular and special educator) licensed and capable of providing these highly effective reading interventions.

Finally, the Student Services professional development team will provide job-embedded coaching on the use of evidence-based reading and math interventions.

Professional Learning: Evidence-based Interventions Actions
- Train two staff per school (a regular and special educator) licensed and capable of providing these highly effective reading interventions.
- Provide job-embedded coaching on the use of evidence-based reading and math interventions.
- Provide on-going professional learning through a coaching model
- Increase the number of staff certified to deliver evidence-based reading and math interventions
- Conduct periodic teacher listening/feedback sessions regarding the implementation of the Special Education Plan and seek input into future professional development offerings

Budget Impact
- Expected annual costs funded by IDEA flowthrough professional development budget, $42,000 for Orton Gillingham and Sonday System-Orton Gillingham based intervention training (previously $23,750)

Professional Learning: Inclusive Education
What is Needed?
District-wide professional learning for all instructional staff on principles and practices of inclusive education

Evidence of Need
Improving the quality of inclusive education was a pervasive theme in every input and feedback session. While Madison has a rich history of inclusive education and possesses a desire to improve systems and practices, we are struggling to maintain consistent and effective practices across the district. During the initial transition from categorical-based pullout programs to inclusive service delivery designs, the district provided consistent professional learning on inclusive education. However, it has been over 10 years since any coordinated district professional learning has been offered to all staff. Moreover, with significant turnover in key leadership and teaching positions, professional learning on inclusive education is deemed critical to the success of the Special Education Plan.
How Does the Special Education Plan Address this Need?
The Plan calls for on-going professional learning to all staff on inclusive education and pedagogy specific to students with disabilities. This addresses a critical missing aspect of our professional learning system for staff to meaningfully engage students with disabilities in curriculum and instruction leading to deep learning.

Professional Learning: Inclusive Education Actions
- Provide professional learning for all instructional staff and principals on the principles and practices of inclusive education
- Embed professional learning opportunities into hiring, on-boarding, training and orientation plans for teachers and principals
- Use the 2017 Teaching and Learning Institute: Accelerating the Learning of Students with Disabilities as a venue to provide professional learning on inclusive education

Budget Impact:
- Professional development costs of the 2017 Teaching and Learning Institute: Accelerating the Learning of Students with Disabilities, $40,000 (reallocated, IDEA flowthrough professional development funds).

3. Data Use and Accountability Systems

Accountability Systems and Data Routines
What is Needed?
Regarding accountability systems there are two overarching areas of need: (1) evidence that students are benefiting from their educational programs through measurable academic and behavioral progress and (2) adherence to required procedural requirements per state/federal disability laws. Regarding the first point, district and school-based staff need consistent routines, protocols and practices for monitoring the outcomes of students with disabilities. At all levels, systems of accountability are required to ensure individual students with disabilities are experiencing academic/behavioral progress and if not, staff are making necessary adjustments in response to changing needs.

Evidence of Need
Accountability was a topic that emerged in all listening and feedback sessions. We heard numerous examples where our inconsistent accountability and monitoring systems let students and families down. Our diagnostic reviews, observations and formal complaints have also provided valuable insights into the need for strengthened accountability systems. Specifically, we lack disciplined data review practices to regularly monitor student progress and are not accurate enough regarding procedural compliance requirements. As a result, we do not feel students with disabilities have consistently been provided the necessary instructional opportunities or rich supportive environments to realize their true potential.

The US Department of Education’s Results Driven Accountability (RDA) goals only heighten the sense of urgency by establishing ambitious outcomes by which we are
measured and evaluated. To meet our Strategic Framework and RDA goals requires new ways of working with disciplined accountability systems and practices.

**How Does the Special Education Plan Address this Need?**

The Special Education STAT data dashboard will be used to collect, review, and monitor special education data across the district. On a quarterly basis, school-based and central office staff will review the extent to which our students with disabilities are meeting proficiency and growth benchmarks. The Special Education STAT data will be used by the Student Services administration to prioritize school needs and identify schools that may benefit from a diagnostic review. Reviews will be used to determine the root cause(s) and barrier(s) to student learning, required corrective actions and additional needed supports or resources.

To accomplish these routine and specialized data reviews and decision making processes, significant adjustments will be made to the structure for oversight of the Assistant Special Education Directors whose roles and responsibilities will significantly change. More detail related to these changes can be found in the Collaboration and Communication section of the plan.

While Student Services has restructured to prioritize implementation of the Strategic Framework and the Plan, our analysis suggests the need for two additional program support teachers. The addition of two PSTs allows for a consistent level of support at all school locations. The goal is to have one PST per comprehensive high school and all other PSTs serving two schools. Currently there are several PSTs who have 3 schools which limits their ability to impact compliance and instructional improvement.

Strong data protocols already exist and there is a need to institutionalize these practices. Support the use of the Data Use Toolkit with special education teams: This toolkit is designed to help staff at all levels (central office, school based leadership teams, principals, and teachers) locate and analyze data. The toolkit consists of data use guidelines, resources, and talks-tools to model conversations. This is a valuable resource for special education teams and teacher teams to reflect and use data for students with disabilities. For more details on the Data Use Toolkit, click here: https://accountability.madison.k12.wi.us/data-use-toolkit

*For a list of evaluation measures, please see Appendix H

**Accountability Systems and Data Routines Actions**

- Implement a revised accountability process to monitor student outcomes on a quarterly basis
- Implement a revised accountability process to monitor data use routines to improve student outcomes

**Budget Impact**

- Addition of (2.0) PST positions beginning in the 2017-18 school-year. Initial and on-going cost of $181,079 (newly allocated local funds).
Accountability Systems and Data Routines: Compliance
What is Needed?
The second overarching area of accountability is adherence to required procedural requirements per state/federal disability laws and district guidance. Given the complexity of disability laws and/or procedures, district staffs need clear guidance on all required procedures for students with disabilities.

Evidence of Need
Accountability from a compliance standpoint was a topic that emerged in all listening and feedback sessions. We heard numerous examples where our inconsistent practices negatively impacted student learning.

The US Department of Education’s Results Driven Accountability (RDA) goals require district implementation of the Individual’s with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and its implementing regulations.

Internal audits confirm our basic compliance related practices require immediate correction. For example, while the district’s percentage of annual IEPs completed within the anniversary date has improved over time, we are currently not meeting state/federal requirements, where the expectation is 100%. This is also true for the completion of quarterly progress updates on IEP goals (which are to be mailed home to families along with report cards) and student participation on state assessments.

How Does the Special Education Plan Address this Need?
The Special Education STAT data dashboard will be used to collect, review, and monitor special education compliance data across the district. The Student Services administrative team will regularly review school data to determine the level and type of support needed. More specifically, the Student Services administrative team will monitor the following five areas, in preparation for RDA: (1) high school graduation rates, (2) rate of participation of students with disabilities in statewide testing, (3) the percentage of students who score proficient or advanced on state reading and math assessment, (4) behavior and removal data and (5) several essential IDEA compliance indicators.

Additional Areas of Monitoring and Accountability:
- Use of seclusion and restraint data through the Special Education STAT system. Student Services administration and school staff will use the Special Education STAT to review seclusion and restraint data by school on a monthly basis. If a school is experiencing an unusual increase in restraint or seclusion, Student Services personnel (administrators or Intensive Support team) will engage the principal and relevant team in a problem solving session to identify corrective actions.
- School performance through diagnostic reviews. The Special Education STAT data will be used by the Student Services administration to prioritize school needs and identify schools that may benefit from a diagnostic review. Reviews will be used to determine the root cause(s) and barrier(s) to student learning, required corrective actions and additional needed supports or resources.
To accomplish these compliance data reviews, significant adjustments will be made to the structure for oversight of the Assistant Special Education Directors whose roles and responsibilities will significantly change. One example of the change is an expansion of decisional authority regarding procedural compliance matters. If/when there are situations where state/federal laws or district procedures have not been followed, the Assistant Director will issue guidance for immediate correction. More detail related to these changes can be found in the Collaboration and Communication section of the plan.

**Accountability Systems and Data Routines: Compliance Actions**
- Implement a revised accountability process to monitor both compliance with state/federal laws as well as student outcomes
- Enhance the Special Education STAT system to improve monitoring of our centrally operated alternative environment programs

**Budget Impact:**
- None expected

**4. Disproportionality**

**Practices to Reduce Disproportionality**

**What is Needed?**
The Madison Metropolitan School District has been identified by the Department of Public Instruction as disproportionately identifying African American and Native American students with disabilities. Overall, we have a need to address our educational system to improve classroom curriculum and instruction, reduce the impact of bias, and improve our use of data to reduce significant gaps in achievement. Specific to this plan we need to (1) improve practices related to student accessing timely evidence-based interventions and (2) improve evaluation procedures that accurately identify students with disabilities and differentiate between those who may be behind or are struggling but do not have an educational disability.

**Evidence of Need**
As noted in the data section, the Madison Metropolitan School District has been identified by the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction as disproportionately identifying African American and Native American students with disabilities. While significant efforts have been made to address this, the risk ratios which quantify the level of disproportionality have remained largely the same.

**How Does the Special Education Plan Address this Need?**
Disproportionality is best addressed through multiple means beginning at the systems level through the use of high quality culturally relevant curriculum and instruction, access to timely evidence-based interventions, and the elimination of institutional forms of bias. The Plan builds on the Great Teaching Matters Framework, our multi-tiered systems of support and deepening implementation of our race and equity work, led by the National Equity Project.
The Special Education Plan will focus on several high leverage strategies aimed at reducing disproportionality: (1) access to timely evidence-based reading interventions, (2) improved student support and intervention team practices, (3) required re-evaluation for transfer students, (4) improvements in the quality of initial evaluations, and (5) service delivery process. Each of these actions is described in more detail below.

**Practices to Reduce Disproportionality Actions**

- **Access to timely evidence-based reading interventions.** This area was addressed in the preceding section. As part of our multi-tiered system of support, we will improve our capacity of evidence reading interventions for emerging or struggling readers (those with and without disabilities).

- **Student Support and Intervention Teams (SSIT).** Student Service and Intervention Teams exist to identify barriers to student learning, identify potential intervention strategies and evaluate the impact of the intervention(s). There is great variability in practice and efficacy across the district leading to negative student outcomes. The Department of Student Services has created best practice guidelines and designed specific professional development for the 2016-17 school year.

- **Issue procedural guidelines for re-evaluations.** To address the transfer student situation, we will create and implement a required re-evaluation for students transferring into the MMSD. The re-evaluation would take place 3 – 6 months after the student transfers, which allows staff sufficient time to determine student needs and provide instruction/interventions.

- **Improve the quality of initial IEP evaluations.** The Student Services administrative team will audit initial evaluations to ensure the following: (1) current and best practices in assessment are utilized, (2) evaluation is completed according to state and federal regulations which include the impact of culture/race, (3) intervention data and the effects of the intervention are provided in the evaluation when appropriate, (4) additional assessments are conducted to support qualification, and (5) evidence and documentation to support a student’s qualification for special education is documented. Continued qualification for special education services is based on data, therefore it will be required that additional assessments are completed as a part of all individual education program re-evaluations. This practice would positively support the reduction of disproportionality in special education.

- **Issue procedural guidance for identifying other health impairments.** To address the high number of students identified with other health impairments (OHI), procedural guidelines will be issued and professional development provided for special education teachers and program support teachers. The training will provide greater clarity on these disability categories to ensure correct application of the state eligibility criteria and the process for completing individualized education program re-evaluation and initial evaluation procedures.

- **Service Delivery Process.** This action was addressed in the first section School Instructional Design. As part of the design process, IEPs are reviewed to ensure students are receiving appropriate special education and related services in the
correct educational environment(s). The review will also analyze the student’s individualized education program goals for alignment to standards, services, accommodations, and setting. Perhaps most important, systems and practices relative to monitoring student progress on goals will be implemented (this too was described in more detail above).

Budget Impact
- No additional costs are anticipated for these actions.

5. Recruiting, Hiring, Retention and Placement of High Quality Staff

Revise Recruitment, Hiring, and Retention Process of Special Education Teachers and Assistants
What is Needed?
Hiring high quality special education teachers, related service providers and special education assistants is a key lever in dramatically improving the outcomes of students with disabilities. More certified special education teachers are needed in the district, both as permanent employees and substitute teachers. Revising the recruitment and hiring process such that Madison is able to gain early employment commitments is essential to realizing our goals. Moreover, retaining our dedicated high quality staff is a critically important priority.

Once we recruit, hire and place special education staff, the issue of retention is another area of critical need. This is particularly true for our SEAs who often work with many of our highest need students and experience the greatest “burn out.” As we develop a culture of collective responsibility and shared ownership for all of our students with disabilities, it is essential to create systems of professional development and support for our special education assistants.

Evidence of Need
Madison, like many surrounding districts, has experienced a shortage in certified high quality special education teachers, especially those with bilingual certifications. In reviewing recent hiring data, it was noted Madison makes the majority of external hires in July and August. The concern is that by this time, many highly qualified applicants are seeking employment in neighboring districts. As a result, there were approximately 18 provisionally licensed special education teachers hired during the 2015-16 school year due to a lack of certified special education teachers. Principals, teachers and families expressed great frustration related to this lack of certified staff.

How Does the Special Education Plan Address this Need?
Lead by the Human Resources Department, the district has already begun making changes to the recruitment, hiring and on-boarding of new staff, including special educators. Student Services administrators will collaborate with Human Resources staff to eliminate any further barriers and streamline the regular and early hiring process.
Revised Recruitment, Hiring, and Retention Processes for Special Education Teachers, Assistants, and Principal Actions

- Collaborate with the Human Resources Department to identify current barriers and streamline the recruitment and hiring process of both permanent and substitute teachers and assistants
- Revise the early and/or expedited hiring process for special education teachers/related services providers, especially bilingual individuals to complete hiring prior to July
- Revise and improve the on-boarding, orientation, and mentoring of special education teachers, assistants, and principals
- Enhance the principal selection process to ensure alignment of District beliefs and values regarding inclusive education practices
- Create greater learning and leadership opportunities for special education assistants by creating a tiered system with recognition of a career track; creating lead special education assistant positions at each school, and providing stipends for special education assistants in our special education alternative learning programs
- Embed professional development time (25 hours annually) for all special education assistants

Budget Impact

- Immediate costs for Lead SEA stipend while exploring longer-term strategy: $500 stipend to lead special education assistant at 50 schools, $24,500
- Provide a $500 stipend to special education assistants who work in alternative special education programs located at sites in the community, $7,613

“Grow Our Own” Dual Licensure Program

What is Needed?
As noted above, increasing the number of highly qualified special education teachers is a critical need of the district. We feel it is imprudent to solely rely on teacher preparation programs to fulfill our staffing needs. Therefore, systems and strategies need to be developed to increase the number of high quality certified special education teachers in the district. A particularly effective strategy is to increase the number of dually licensed (e.g., bilingual and special education, regular education and special education) staff to better serve students with disabilities, especially English Language Learners.

Evidence of Need
Madison, like many surrounding districts, has experienced a serious shortage in certified high quality special education teachers. As noted above, during the 2015-16 school year, we filled approximately 18 special education positions with provisionally certified staff. While dedicated and hardworking, these individuals have yet to complete their preparation programs and generally lack discipline specific knowledge (characteristics of disabilities, instructional strategies, curricular adaptations/modifications, and the IEP process) necessary to advance student learning. In response, Student Services has had to hire retired special education teachers/PSTs to assist in mentoring or the completion
of IEP related documents. Furthermore, Student Services has had to design and deliver an entirely new training, orientation, and professional development program for provisionally certified staff.

**How Does the Special Education Plan Address this Need?**
The “Grow Our Own” program targets regular education teachers (both permanent and substitute staff) who are interested in earning special education licensure to become dually certified and special education teachers who are interested in becoming bilingually certified. The program offers staff tuition reimbursement to defer a portion of the costs. Increasing the number of dually licensed staff is an important long-term strategy as it provides the flexibility for more effective and efficient service delivery models.

**“Grow Our Own” Dual Licensure Program Actions**
- Create a “Grow Our Own” program for general education teachers to become dually licensed as special educators and special education teachers to become bilingually certified
- Utilize the “Grow Our Own” program for educational assistants, special education assistants, and behavior education assistants to increase the number of bilingual special education teachers

**Budget Impact**
- Reallocate $30,000 from existing special education budget for partial tuition reimbursement program

**Equity-Based Allocation Model**

**What is Needed?**
Distributing special education and related services in a responsive and equitable manner is critical to advancing the learning of students with disabilities. There is a need to research, identify and implement an equity-based allocation model for the distribution of resources.

**Evidence of Need**
In nearly every listening session questions and concerns were raised about the current allocation model. The consensus of stakeholders was that the current allocation model is reasonably calculated to provide the resources necessary to implement student IEPs but it could be better. Shortcomings of the current system include: the loose relationship between individualized education program services, the amount of staffing allocation, and the lack of a timely response process when additional resources are requested.

**How Does the Special Education Plan Address this Need?**
In collaboration with other central office departments, Student Services will research, identify and implement a successor allocation model to more accurately/equitably distribute special education resources.
Equity-Based Allocation Model Actions
- Research, identify and implement a highly effective equity-based model for allocating special education resources

Budget Impact
- None expected

6. Collaboration and Communication

Family Engagement and Communication with Schools
What is Needed?
To engage students with disabilities in deep learning leading to college, career and community readiness, stronger family partnerships are needed. Improved communication systems need to be developed between teachers and parents of students with disabilities to increase the quantity and quality of two way family communication and engagement.

Evidence of Need
A consistent theme at all feedback sessions was the need to improve district practices around communication with parents, particularly on student progress. Many parents requested more frequent contact with teachers to understand if their child is making expected progress. Often parents received no feedback for several months followed by poor grades on report cards. The overwhelming sentiment was “Had I known this, I could have done something about it.” A lack of timely feedback results in lower grades, grade point averages, and fewer credits earned which all leads to a negative impact on graduation rates.

Parents also reported they only intermittently received quarterly progress reports on IEP goals and when they did receive updates, it was so minimal, it didn’t convey enough information to know what to do. Parents reported feeling like they didn’t have access to critical information such as educational documents and had to request (often multiple times) copies of recently developed IEPs. Last, while families reported appreciation for having translators at IEP meetings, they reported experiencing long periods of time (3 – 7 weeks) waiting to receive Spanish translated documents.

How Does the Special Education Plan Address this Need?
Family Engagement and Communication with Stakeholders Actions
- Make individual education program-related documents available to parents and families electronically through Infinite Campus
- Make individual education program documents more accessible in Spanish (and reduce translation time)
- Improve communication practices with families regarding their child’s educational progress during IEP meetings as well as providing more comprehensive quarterly progress updates which use consistent objective measures for goals
• Provide three parent trainings per year (totaling at least 50 individuals) to help parents understand and participate in the individualized education program (IEP) process
• At least quarterly, utilize the MMSD Family Newsletter to provide information to families of students with disabilities on parent trainings, community resources, and Student Services staff directory to know who to call when families have questions
• At least annually, share post high school outcome (Indicator 14) data on the Student Services website and via email updates to parents
• Revise the Madison Metropolitan School District Parent Planner: A Guide for Individualized Education Program Team Participation and provide it in electronic format with informational links

Budget Impact
• Reallocate Bilingual Resource Specialist (BRS) resources to expedite the translation of individualized education programs in Spanish
• Estimated cost to develop an electronic system to make individual education programs (IEP) accessible for parents is approximately $10,000, funded using IDEA flowthrough.

Staff Collaboration
What is Needed?
To engage students with disabilities in deep learning leading to college, career and community readiness, stronger family partnerships are needed. Better communication systems need to be developed between teachers and parents of students with disabilities to both increase and improve two way family communication and engagement.

Evidence of Need
A consistent theme from input/feedback sessions was the need for greater collaborative teaming between special education teachers/assistants and general education teachers. This was seen as critical so all teachers “begin to see and practice their joint ownership of students with disabilities.” This idea of “ownership” permeated the responses gathered in the Fall/Spring feedback sessions, with respondents calling for all teachers to connect with students with disabilities and own their students’ outcomes.

How Does the Special Education Plan Address this Need?
Staff Communication and Collaboration Actions
• Utilize monthly special education team meetings to create professional learning communities focused on student needs, curriculum/instruction and data to increase outcomes
• Increase opportunities for special education assistants to attend individualized education program (IEP) meetings
• Improve special education team communication and collaboration through targeted professional development
• Improve general and special education communication and collaboration, especially for students with multiple support systems such as English Language
Learners and Advanced Learners through targeted professional development and coaching

Budget Impact
- Increase opportunities for special education assistants to attend individualized education program (IEP) meetings. Initial and on-going cost of $20,000 annually (newly allocated local funds).

Revised Role/Responsibilities for Student Services Personnel

What is Needed?
Revising the roles and responsibilities of key Student Services staff was seen as critical from an accountability standpoint but also for communication and collaboration. There is a need to develop improved collaboration and communication practices regarding student engagement in high quality curriculum and instruction leading to deep learning.

Evidence of Need
In multiple feedback sessions stakeholders reported limited communication and collaboration between key Student Services staff (primarily assistant directors and PSTs) and principals as well as other central office leaders. The limited opportunities to collaborate had an isolating or compartmentalizing effect which may have delayed awareness of issues, problem solving and strategic guidance/support. It was also noted that assistant directors were rarely included in district-wide professional development opportunities which further isolated their input or role.

How Does the Special Education Plan Address this Need?
Revised Role/Responsibilities for Student Services Personnel Actions
Significant adjustments will be made to the roles and responsibilities of the Assistant Special Education Director. Revisions include the following:
- Utilize STAT system to focus on instructional practices that lead to improved outcomes for students with disabilities
- Quarterly meetings with School Improvement Partners, PST and Principals to analyze STAT data and problem solve adjustments to instructional strategies
- Decisional authority and renewed focus on IDEA and Section 504 compliance and accountability at the school level
- All Assistant Directors will be Teachscape certified
- Engage in regular school visits and STAT diagnostic reviews, with a focus on intensive support schools
- Utilize Service Delivery review with all schools to analyze use of resources to support a continuum of services
- Regularly meet with PSTs to monitor compliance and deliver targeted professional development

This graphic illustrates two important new accountability related protocols (1) quarterly data reviews using the special education STAT system at district-wide school-based leadership team (SBLT) meetings and (2) quarterly meetings with the principal, assistant
director, school partner, instructional coach, PBS coach and PST to review compliance/achievement data and make any necessary adjustments in service delivery, professional development, or school improvement plan.

**School Support Refinements**

In addition to revising the role of Assistant Directors, the responsibilities of Special Education Program Support Teachers will also be updated:

- Utilize STAT system to focus on instructional practices that lead to improved outcomes for students with disabilities and/or fidelity to both core and intervention (e.g., Read 180/System 44)
- Communicate regularly with principals and assistant directors to ensure IDEA and Section 504 compliance at the building level
- Quarterly meetings with School Improvement Partners, PST and Principals to analyze STAT, adjust strategies and determine what school support is needed
- Engage in Special Education Teacher coaching cycles
- Collaborate with Instructional Coach and PBS Coach to integrate supports for both academics and behavior
- Provide or coordinate building-based professional development for special education staff

Assistant Directors and PSTs will support the use of the Data Use Toolkit with special education teams to analyze data and make necessary adjustments to ensure students are benefiting from their educational program.
Revised Role/Responsibilities for Student Services Personnel Actions

- In collaboration with school-based staff, develop enhancements to the Special Education STAT system to improve data use and accountability screens/reports used to monitor student, school, and district outcomes
- Successfully review STAT data monthly and complete at least 6 Diagnostic Reviews per year and provide the associated recommendations to the principal, chief of schools, and school partner
- Conduct quarterly meetings among the Assistant Director, Principal, School Partner, Instructional Coaches, and PST to discuss progress monitoring data and align strategies with school improvement plan
- Monitor school-based data reviews (monthly special education team meetings and quarterly reviews of progress)
- Monitor the use of seclusion and restraint data to provide targeted support for schools with emerging needs

Budget Impact

- None expected: Reorganization of existing administrative and department positions
Three Year Plan Overview and Timeline

The following is a summary of the Three Year Plan Overview/Timeline:

**Year One 2016-2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Delivery for Students with Disabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide guidance to schools regarding the service delivery planning process for students with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement improved processes to successfully transition students with disabilities from grade to grade, school to school and from high school to adulthood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum, Instruction, and Professional Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop district capacity of Universal Design for Learning by providing professional development and supporting pilot sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide professional development for staff on principles and practices of inclusive education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase professional learning for special education teachers and assistants in literacy and math interventions; increase staff certified in multi-sensory reading strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a curriculum sharing web site to share modified/adapted curricular materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Use and Accountability systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement accountability systems and data routines for schools to monitor student progress on learning goals and determine when additional supports, guidance, or immediate adjustments are needed;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement improved accountability systems to monitor and immediately correct procedural compliance issues; and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disproportionality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement improved monitoring systems to reduce factors contributing to disproportionality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruiting, Hiring, Retention and Placement of High Quality Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refine the recruitment, hiring and retention of high quality special education staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a teacher tuition reimbursement program to increase the number of certified staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research equity-based resource distribution models for special education and related services staffing/resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaboration and Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduce practices for improved family partnerships and communication with stakeholders, including parents/families, administrators, teachers, and special education assistants; update Parent Planner; increase accessibility of individual education program documents in Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce guidance on improved teaming and collaboration practices among special education staff and with general education colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise the roles/responsibilities of assistant directors, program support teachers and other Student Services staff to improve communication and accountability in alignment with the Special Education Plan goals and priorities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Year Two 2017-2018

### Service Delivery for Students with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support schools in the implementation of the service delivery planning</td>
<td>process; begin integration into the district’s School Instructional Design Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor requirement for special education staff to use Students Moving</td>
<td>Across Levels procedures as well as grade to grade/school to school procedures; continue to implement improved processes to successfully transition students with disabilities from high school to adulthood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Curriculum, Instruction, and Professional Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase professional learning opportunities for Universal Design for</td>
<td>Learning; expand pilot locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide on-going professional development for staff on principles and</td>
<td>practices of inclusive education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase professional learning for special education teachers and</td>
<td>assistants in literacy and math interventions; increase staff certified in multi-sensory reading strategies; increase the use of program support teachers coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update web-site for shared modified/adapted curricular materials web site</td>
<td>based on use/feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Use and Accountability systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilize the special education STAT system to implement and monitor</td>
<td>Results Driven Accountability requirements for compliance and student achievement/outcome data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand the use of evidence-based progress monitors (e.g., AIMsweb) as a</td>
<td>consistent measure of reading/math goals; implement coordinated diagnostic reviews with other departments; and deepen implementation of data use routines for special educators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Disproportionality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audit individual education program evaluations to evaluate quality</td>
<td>standards; monitor disproportionality data; and evaluate disproportionality related actions, make necessary adjustments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recruiting, Hiring, Retention and Placement of High Quality Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue to refine the recruitment, hiring and retention of high quality</td>
<td>special education staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase participants in our tuition reimbursement program to increase the</td>
<td>number of certified staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify possible equity-based resource distribution models for special</td>
<td>education and related services staffing/resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Collaboration and Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refine practices for improved family partnerships and communication with</td>
<td>stakeholders, including parents/families, administrators, teachers, and special education assistants; increase accessibility of individual education program documents in Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide on-going guidance, expectations, and professional learning</td>
<td>opportunities to improve teaming and collaboration practices among both special education staff and with general education colleagues with professional development and embedded coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate need for continued organizational/structural adjustments in</td>
<td>administrative and support staff to improve communication and accountability in alignment with the Special Education Plan goals and priorities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Year Three 2018-2019

#### Service Delivery for Students with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support schools in the implementation of the service delivery planning process through the district’s School Instructional Design process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitor requirement for special education staff to use Students Moving Across Levels procedures as well as grade to grade/school to school procedures; continue to implement improved processes to successfully transition students with disabilities from high school to adulthood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Curriculum, Instruction, and Professional Learning

| Increase professional learning opportunities for Universal Design for Learning to all staff; expand pilot locations |
| Provide on-going professional development for staff on principles and practices of inclusive education |
| Increase professional learning for special education teachers and assistants in literacy and math interventions; increase staff certified in multi-sensory reading strategies; increase the use of program support teachers coaching |
| Update web-site for shared modified/adapted curricular materials web site based on use/feedback |

#### Data Use and Accountability systems

| Institutionalize practices for using the special education STAT system to implement monitor Results Driven Accountability requirements for compliance and student achievement/outcome data |
| Expand the use of evidence-based progress monitors (e.g., AIMSweb) as a consistent measure of reading/math goals; implement coordinated diagnostic reviews with other departments; and deepen implementation of data use routines for special educators |

#### Disproportionality

| Audit individual education program evaluations to evaluate quality standards; monitor disproportionality data; and evaluate disproportionality related actions, make necessary adjustments |

#### Recruiting, Hiring, Retention and Placement of High Quality Staff

| Continue to refine the recruitment, hiring and retention of high quality special education staff |
| Increase participants in our tuition reimbursement program to increase the number of certified staff |
| Implement possible equity-based resource distribution models for special education and related services staffing/resources |

#### Collaboration and Communication

| Refine practices for improved family partnerships and communication with stakeholders, including parents/families, administrators, teachers, and special education assistants; increase accessibility of individual education program documents in Spanish |
| Provide on-going guidance, expectations, and professional learning opportunities to improve teaming and collaboration practices among both special education staff and with general education colleagues with professional development and embedded coaching |
| Evaluate need for continued organizational/structural adjustments in administrative and support staff to improve communication and accountability in alignment with the Special Education Plan goals and priorities |
Preliminary Special Education Plan Recommended Budget
Investments beginning in 2017-18

1. Service Delivery for Students with Disabilities
   Service Delivery
   - On-going professional development and orientation to the new Service Delivery Guidance document and process. Estimated cost of professional development for principals, site-based leaders and special education/related services staff is approximately $10,000, funded using IDEA flowthrough.
   Student Transitions
   - On-going professional development and orientation to the new Transition procedures. Estimated annual cost of professional development is approximately $10,000, funded using IDEA flow through.

2. Curriculum, Instruction, and Professional Development
   Universal Design for Learning: Access to Standards
   - School-based and central office personnel will engage in multiple professional learning experiences, including conferences and after school meetings to develop our internal capacity to support and deliver UDL professional development. Estimated first year cost is approximately $13,000. On-going costs are projected to be approximately $12,000 annually, funded through IDEA flowthrough.
   On-line Repository of Modified or Adapted Curricula
   - No anticipated budget impact
   Professional Learning: Evidence-based Interventions
   - Expected annual costs funded by IDEA flowthrough professional development budget, $42,000 for Orton Gillingham and Sonday System-Orton Gillingham based intervention training (previously $23,750)
   Professional Learning: Inclusive Education
   - Professional development costs of the 2017 Teaching and Learning Institute: Accelerating the Learning of Students with Disabilities, $40,000 (re prioritized funded through IDEA flowthrough)

3. Data Use and Accountability Systems
   Accountability Systems and Data Routines
   - Addition of (2.0) PST positions beginning in the 2017-18 school-year. Initial and on-going cost of $181,079 (newly allocated local funds).
   Accountability Systems and Data Routines: Compliance
   - No anticipated budget impact

4. Disproportionality
   Practices to Reduce Disproportionality
   - No anticipated budget impact

5. Recruitment, Hiring, Retention and Placement of High Quality Staff
   Revise Hiring Process for Special Education Teachers and Assistants
   - Immediate costs for Lead SEA stipend while exploring longer-term strategy $500 stipend to lead special education assistant at 50 schools: $24,500
   - Provide a (potential) $500 stipend to special education assistants who work in alternative special education programs located at sites in the community: $7,613
“Grow Our Own” Dual Licensure Program
- Reallocate $30,000 from existing special education budget for partial tuition reimbursement program

Equity-Based Allocation Model
- Research, identify and implement a highly effective equity-based model for allocating special education resources

6. Collaboration and Communication

Family Engagement and Communication with Schools
- Reallocate Bilingual Resource Specialist (BRS) resources to expedite the translation of individualized education programs in Spanish
- Estimated cost of to develop an electronic system to make individual education programs (IEP) accessible for parents is approximately $10,000, funded using IDEA flowthrough

Staff Collaboration
- Increase opportunities for special education assistants to attend individualized education program (IEP) meetings. Initial and on-going cost of $20,000 annually (newly allocated local funds).

Revised Role/Responsibilities for Student Services Personnel
- No anticipated budget impact: Reorganization of existing administrative and department positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Components</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Service Delivery for Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Reallocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Increase PD by reallocating fund within Special Education budget</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Reallocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Curriculum, Instruction, and Professional Development</td>
<td>$112,000</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* $8,000 from DPI (Grant)</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>Grant Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* $12,000 from IDEA Flow Thru (341)</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>Reallocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* T&amp;L Institute (Focus on Special Education)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Intervention materials and Prof Development</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Reallocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Reading Specific intervention materials and PD</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td>Reallocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Data Use and Accountability Systems</td>
<td>$181,079</td>
<td>New Funds Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Add 2,000 PST Positions to support schools</td>
<td>$181,079</td>
<td>New Funds Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Disproportionality</td>
<td>$82,000</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* No anticipated budget impact, reprioritize staff time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Recruiting, Hiring, Retention and Placement of High Quality Staff</td>
<td>$233,079</td>
<td>New Funds Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* SEA Lead Stipend</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>New Funds Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Alternatives Stipend</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>New Funds Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Attending after school IEP Meetings</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>New Funds Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Grow our Own (dual license Teachers)</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>Reprioritize PD funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 2.0 unallocated to meet unforeseen/emerging student needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Collaboration and Communication</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Reallocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Oasys program enhancements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>New funds request $233,079</td>
<td>Recurring request $233,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New funds request $181,079</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In conclusion, the Special Education Plan provides a clear outline of changes needed to ensure that consistent, high quality services are provided to students with disabilities in alignment with our vision and goals as well as state and federal mandates. The work initiated this year to engage students, families, staff and the community through feedback sessions and an online survey has made this plan comprehensive and complete. Student Services is committed to following this Plan to fulfill our vision to provide the supports and services necessary for each student with a disability to reach their fullest individual potential.
Appendix A: Budget and Data Overview

This next section contains data in four primary areas: (1) Overall special education budget and Special Education Plan budget, (2) demographics, (3) student achievement, and (4) general staffing information.

Special Education Budget (overall)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property taxes/Mobile Home/TIF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other local sources</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdistrict sources</td>
<td>48,181</td>
<td>82,636</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate sources</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State sources</td>
<td>18,635,747</td>
<td>18,761,914</td>
<td>18,911,297</td>
<td>18,951,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal sources</td>
<td>5,781,245</td>
<td>6,034,479</td>
<td>6,146,843</td>
<td>6,592,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other sources</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,465,974</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,879,029</strong></td>
<td><strong>25,108,140</strong></td>
<td><strong>25,543,338</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular instruction</td>
<td>470,537</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>278,469</td>
<td>278,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational instruction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special instruction</td>
<td>53,326,775</td>
<td>54,989,537</td>
<td>54,156,964</td>
<td>55,641,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other instruction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil services</td>
<td>12,493,394</td>
<td>12,517,637</td>
<td>11,604,751</td>
<td>11,580,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional staff services</td>
<td>2,782,471</td>
<td>2,743,078</td>
<td>3,176,570</td>
<td>3,210,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General administration services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building administration services</td>
<td>90,566</td>
<td>126,161</td>
<td>170,100</td>
<td>170,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil transportation</td>
<td>3,260,457</td>
<td>3,633,423</td>
<td>3,658,250</td>
<td>3,808,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal and Interest</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other support services</td>
<td>362,328</td>
<td>86,608</td>
<td>455,689</td>
<td>472,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-program</td>
<td>95,281</td>
<td>209,650</td>
<td>229,000</td>
<td>229,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>72,881,808</strong></td>
<td><strong>74,306,093</strong></td>
<td><strong>73,729,792</strong></td>
<td><strong>75,389,746</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Proceeds from Debt              | -                | -                | -                           | -                       |
| Transfers in                    | 48,530,444       | 49,651,498       | 48,788,208                  | 50,012,964              |
| Transfers out                   | (114,609)        | (224,434)        | (166,556)                   | (166,556)               |
| **Net change in fund balance**  | -                | -                | -                           | -                       |
| **Fund balance - beginning of year** | -     | -                | -                           | -                       |
| **Fund balance - end of year**  | -                | -                | -                           | -                       |
Appendix B: Additional Data

Demographics

The official prevalence rate or percentage of students with disabilities is calculated based on October 1, 2015 enrollment data. The charts and graphs below describe enrollment of students with disabilities at the beginning, middle, and end of recent school years. The increase in students with disabilities from the beginning to the end of a single school year is primarily due to new identifications, which is part of our Child Find obligation. Demographic data describes how common each disability type is by race/ethnicity, how common each disability type is overall, and special education identification among English language learners (ELL).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>beginning</td>
<td>3834</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>middle</td>
<td>3902</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>end</td>
<td>4054</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>beginning</td>
<td>3700</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>middle</td>
<td>3787</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>end</td>
<td>3950</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>beginning</td>
<td>3673</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>middle</td>
<td>3798</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>end</td>
<td>4056</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>beginning</td>
<td>3707</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>middle</td>
<td>3839</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>end</td>
<td>3799</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student enrollment data has important implications for staffing and student support. The table demonstrates the changes in identified students throughout the school year.

Disability Types by Race/Ethnicity

- **All Students**: 25% LD, 21% OEI, 17% SLI, 14% OHI, 13% CD, 6% EBD, 5% Other
- **White**: 18% LD, 22% OEI, 19% SLI, 10% OHI, 23% CD, 5% EBD, 4% Other
- **Multiracial**: 21% LD, 26% OEI, 13% SLI, 20% OHI, 10% CD, 5% EBD, 4% Other
- **Hispanic/Latino**: 27% LD, 17% OEI, 27% SLI, 9% OHI, 9% CD, 5% EBD, 7% Other
- **Black or African American**: 32% LD, 21% OEI, 9% SLI, 20% OHI, 5% CD, 9% EBD, 4% Other
- **Asian**: 17% LD, 13% OEI, 25% SLI, 4% OHI, 25% CD, 10% EBD, 5% Other
This graph provides a disaggregated view of major disability areas by race/ethnicity group. There are substantial differences by race/ethnicity group, especially for emotional behavioral disabilities, learning disabilities and autism. Native American students are not represented on this graph because the numbers were below 6, at which point we suppress the data to protect confidentiality.

Overall, Madison is considered an inclusive school district, as over 80% of our students with disabilities are considered “fully included,” receiving the majority of education in general education or integrated environments. However, when disaggregating educational environments by race/ethnicity, we see striking differences. Specifically, African American and Native American students are educated in more restrictive or segregated environments. A primary goal of the Plan is to ensure all students with disabilities are provided a high quality education within rich, engaging learning environments.
MMSD District and Special Education
PK-12 Enrollment
Comparison 2014-15 and 2015-16

* Data for groups of 6 or fewer students is suppressed to protect student privacy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Special Education Enrollment</th>
<th>Special Education Percentage</th>
<th>Enrollment Third Friday September</th>
<th>District Enrollment in Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Percent of Ethnic Group in SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>1,166</td>
<td>1,132</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,297</td>
<td>1278</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>11,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 1 Race</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,792</td>
<td>3,808</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>27,202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart represents two ways to review demographic data for students with disabilities. The blue section provides the actual number of students identified with disabilities, disaggregated by race within the special education population. For example, there are 1,132 African American students identified with disabilities out of the 3,080, which represents 30% of students with IEPs. The pink portion represents the number and percent of students with disabilities within a race/ethnicity group. White students represent 43% of our school population and have a prevalence rate of 11%. By contrast, 23% of all African American students are identified with disabilities.
### Academic and Behavior Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Special Education</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAP Reading Proficiency</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAP Reading Growth</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAP Math Proficiency</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAP Math Growth</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACT Participation</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade 11 Average ACT Composite</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 11 ACT Reading Met College Readiness Benchmark</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 11 ACT Math Met College Readiness Benchmark</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) is a standardized assessment used by the district to evaluate student progress (proficiency and growth) for grades 3 – 8. Significant differences exist between students with disabilities and those without across all measures.
Percent of IEP Goals Met Over Time
In MMSD 78% of annual individualized Education Plan (IEP) goals are met or anticipated to be met by the end of the IEP

Percent of IEP Goals Met by Level

While standardized academic assessments provide important information regarding evidence of student learning, each student with a disability has an individualized education program (IEP) with annual goals, often the most critical learning outcomes. Progress on IEP goals offers another key indicator of student learning. The graph above provides a year to year comparison of the percentage of students who met or exceeded their annual IEP goal(s).
Focus on Strategic Framework Milestones 2015-16

### Goal #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PALS 2 Reading Meeting Benchmark</th>
<th>Special Education</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP 3 Reading Proficiency</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP 3 Reading Growth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP 5 Reading Proficiency</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP 5 Math Proficiency</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP 5 Math Growth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP 8 Reading Proficiency</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP 8 Reading Growth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP 8 Math Proficiency</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP 8 Math Growth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9 Fs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 11 GPA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT 11 Reading College Readiness</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Goal #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts Education K-5</th>
<th>Special Education</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Education 6-8</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Language 7-8</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Coursework Profile</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-Rounded Profile</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With few exceptions, there are great disparities on the district’s Strategic Framework proficiency milestones between students with disabilities and those without. However, there are much smaller gaps between students with and without disabilities regarding meeting growth targets. There are few differences between students with and without disabilities in access to arts education. Large gaps exist between students with and without disabilities in world language participation. It’s important to note that decisions related to world language participation are often determined by IEP teams.
High School Completion and Dropout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Class of 2012</th>
<th>Class of 2013</th>
<th>Class of 2014</th>
<th>Class of 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Four-Year Completion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Six-Year Completion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Four-Year Dropout</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Six-Year Dropout</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With an increased focus on transition planning and post-secondary options our students with disabilities have experienced improvements in four year graduation rates and decreased dropouts.

### Four-Year High School Completion by Disability Status and Other Demographic Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th>Disability Status</th>
<th>Class of 2012</th>
<th>Class of 2013</th>
<th>Class of 2014</th>
<th>Class of 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Free/Reduced</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>79.9%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not ELL</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When disaggregating graduation data by race/ethnicity, free/reduced lunch and English language proficiency, we see our greatest gaps for African American students receiving F/R lunch and English Language Learners.

### Six-Year High School Completion by Disability Status and Other Demographic Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th>Disability Status</th>
<th>Class of 2014</th>
<th>Class of 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Free/Reduced</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not ELL</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Special Education</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While measurable progress has been realized in reducing dropouts and increasing graduation rates, significant gaps still exist.
### Demographics of Out-of-School Suspensions vs. District Overall

The graph above illustrates that students with disabilities receive a disproportionate share of out-of-school suspensions (52%) while constituting about 14% of the district.

### Staffing

#### Student Services Staffing Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th></th>
<th>SEA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Allocation FTE*</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Categorical</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>322.45</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>303.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impairment/Audiologist</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Therapy</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Therapy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech/Language</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>77.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision Impairment/O&amp;M</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>647</td>
<td>605.46</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>310.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Full time equivalent

The chart above describes the number and allocation of special education teachers and special education assistants (SEA) based on the October 1st, 2015 count. The total special education student enrollment in the district is 3,808 students.
Applying Results Driven Accountability Measures to Current Performance

RDA Indicators and MMSD Status

1 - 2

The blue bars represent where MMSD is currently performing. Our goal is to move into the green or yellow areas.

RDA Indicators and MMSD Status
3B Reading & 3B Math

The orange bars represent where MMSD is currently performing. Our goal is to move into the green area.
### RDA Indicators and MMSD Status

#### 3C Reading & 3C Math

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2 points</th>
<th>1 point</th>
<th>0 points</th>
<th>Most Recent MMSD Data</th>
<th>Estimated MMSD Value</th>
<th>Estimated MMSD Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3C Reading</td>
<td><strong>At least 17%</strong> students with IEPs scored proficient or advanced on the WSAS reading assessment.</td>
<td>10%-16% of students with IEPs scored proficient or advanced on the WSAS reading assessment.</td>
<td><strong>Less than 10%</strong> of students with IEPs scored proficient or advanced on the WSAS reading assessment.</td>
<td>2014-15 Badger and DLM</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C Math</td>
<td><strong>At least 25%</strong> of students with IEPs scored proficient or advanced on the WSAS math assessment.</td>
<td>18%-24% of students with IEPs scored proficient or advanced on the WSAS math assessment.</td>
<td><strong>Less than 18%</strong> of students with IEPs scored proficient or advanced on the WSAS math assessment.</td>
<td>2014-15 Badger and DLM</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bright green bars represent where MMSD is currently performing. Our goal is to move into the light green area.

This graph represents total student population (blue), students with disabilities (red), and the prevalence rate (solid line) which includes students in private and parochial settings.
Disability prevalence rates, state average, Madison, and surrounding districts.

Disability prevalence rates, state average, Madison, and the large districts.
This graph illustrates the changes in prevalence by categorical disability area over time. Of particular note is the substantial decrease in specific learning disability and the rise of Other Health Impairment.

Madison’s 2015-16 Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) data. This is used as a rough gauge to determine the level of inclusive education.
Madison’s Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) data compared to the state average and other large districts.
Madison’s Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) data compared to the state average and surrounding districts.

African American students transferring into Madison are more disproportionately identified with disabilities as compared to those internally identified.

Primary disabilities disaggregated by race (African American, Hispanic, and White).
Attendance rates over time by level (elementary, middle and high school). Elementary was nearly unchanged, high school students made slight progress and middle school experienced an unexpected decrease.

**MAP and ACT Proficiency Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability Type</th>
<th>MAP Spring Reading Tested Students</th>
<th>MAP Spring Reading Proficiency</th>
<th>Met MAP Fall-Spring Reading Growth Target</th>
<th>MAP Spring Math Tested Students</th>
<th>MAP Spring Math Proficiency</th>
<th>Met MAP Fall-Spring Math Growth Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Autism</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD: Cognitive Disability</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBD: Emotional Behavioral Disability</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H: Hearing Impairment</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD: Specific Learning Disability</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>9528</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>9386</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHI: Other Health Impairment</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OI: Orthopedic Impairment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL: Speech or Language Impairment</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V: Visual Impairment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2014-15 ACT Grade 11 Results by Disability Type
On the Measure of Academic Progress (MAP), students with disabilities in Madison are not meeting the same percentage of proficiency in reading and math when compared to students without disabilities. Students with disabilities and students without disabilities have somewhat similar reading and math growth target scores. However, on the American College Test (ACT), students with disabilities trail students without disabilities on reading/math and have lower overall participation.

Measures of Academic Progress (MAP): This graph provides a more detailed depiction of the different performance categories. Madison is moving students from minimal to higher proficiency levels.
Measures of Academic Progress (MAP): This graph provides a more detailed depiction of the different performance categories.
Measures of Academic Progress (MAP): This graph provides a more detailed depiction of the different performance categories. We’re moving students from minimal to higher proficiency levels.

![Fall MAP - 8th Grade Math](image)

Measures of Academic Progress (MAP): This graph provides a more detailed depiction of the different performance categories.

![Post High School Data Survey 2014](image)

Post High School Survey (Indicator 14): One year following graduation, the district invites every exiting student to participate in a standardized Department of Public Instruction survey. The survey has three domains – Post Secondary Education, Employment, and Independent Living. Madison consistently has a higher percentage of exiting students attending post-secondary education options as compared to state averages.
Post High School Survey (Indicator 14): One year following graduation, the district calls every exiting student and requests that they participate in a standardized Department of Public Instruction survey. The survey has three domains – Post Secondary Education, Employment, and Independent Living. Madison was lower than the state average in terms of student employed. Our theory is that with a higher percentage attending post-secondary education options fewer are employed.

Suspension trends for students with disabilities over time.
Suspension trends for students with disabilities over time (disaggregated by race/ethnicity).

This chart represents the percentage of students disaggregated by race/ethnicity by disability.
Appendix C: Background Information and Input/Feedback Analysis

Program Review
In the Spring of 2014, the district contracted with Futures Education group to conduct an independent review of all special education programs and services (see report here: Special Education/Alternatives Audit Report - May 2014 ). The purpose of the program review was to analyze strengths and identify areas of need and/or opportunity to improve the outcomes of students with disabilities. Three key areas were identified for improvement: (1) Organization and Systems to Support Learning, (2) Curriculum, Instruction, and Professional Learning, and (3) Improve Student Outcomes Through Data Use/Analysis.

Feedback Sessions
The Department of Student Services engaged key stakeholders to update the district’s Special Education Plan during the 2015-16 school year. Several methods were used to gather feedback, such as online surveys and community feedback sessions. A comprehensive communication plan was used to engage families, staff and the community. Communications included information in district newsletters, phone calls, texts, Tweets, district web articles, and emails to all families of students with disabilities. Flyers were posted and shared in schools, staff were notified through Infinite Campus, and voluntary informational meetings were led by program support teachers at schools. Both online resources and in-person translation for feedback sessions was available in Spanish and Hmong, as well as English. The results of the feedback were analyzed by the Department of Research and Program Evaluation. What follows is a summary of the Special Education Plan Feedback Reports from both the fall and spring sessions.

The first report indicates that the Department of Student Services in the fall of 2015 collected parent, staff, and community feedback on serving students with disabilities via nine in-person meetings with 100+ participants and a survey that yielded 145 responses. Feedback was organized around seven discussion questions which had minimal overlap, so drawing overarching themes from the data was challenging. This report summarizes the feedback based on the questions. During four of the six in-person sessions and on the online form, participants had the opportunity to answer a series of seven questions:

1. What do you believe is going well for students with disabilities in MMSD?
2. What do you see as the single most important priority when designing services for students with disabilities?
3. How should we improve our services for students with disabilities?
4. How can we help students with disabilities achieve access to a challenging and well-rounded education, including fine arts, world language, extracurricular, and advanced coursework?
5. How can we reduce the disproportionality of students of color in special education?
6. What information or data is important for measuring the success of our special education program?
7. How should we communicate with families of students with disabilities?

The findings from the feedback sessions and online survey are summarized and indicated for each question below:
Question 1: What is going well?
- Teachers and staff
- Access to services and support
- Specific programming/curriculum

Question 2: What do you see as the single most important priority when designing services for students with disabilities? and Question 3: How should we improve our services for students with disabilities?
- Staffing resources
- Equitable allocation to schools
- Continuum of services
- Professional Development
- Collaborative Team, understanding of general curriculum and instruction to make accommodations

Question 4: How can we help students with disabilities achieve access to a challenging and well-rounded education, including fine arts, world language, extra-curricular activities, and advanced coursework?
- Staffing and resources as a way to increase access
- Tailoring access to fit student needs

Question 5: How can we reduce the disproportionality of students of color in special education?
- Family and out of school factors
- Practices and interventions

Question 6: What information or data is important for measuring the success of our special education program?
- Suggestions for new types of data fell into three major categories: implementation data, parent/student/teacher feedback, and post-graduation data

Question 7: How should we communicate with families of students with disabilities?
- Many requested more frequent contact; others described themselves as overwhelmed by the amount of contact they receive
- Communicate with families of students with disabilities the "same as any other family"

For more detailed information about the feedback and on-line survey, please see the Additional Information section or the Special Education Plan Fall 2015 Feedback Report.

The second report, Special Education Plan Spring 2016 Feedback Report was completed based on the spring feedback sessions and on-line survey. Student Services staff collected feedback on the Special Education Plan with a focus on its three main components – Systems and Organizational Improvements to Support Student Learning, Curriculum, Instruction, and Professional Learning, or Improve Student
Outcomes through Data Use/Analysis, as well as the plan as a whole. These data were collected via two venues: (1) In-person feedback sessions, and (2) Online form. There were 12 in-person sessions led by Student Services staff involving a total of more than 130 respondents. The online feedback form consisted of 14 questions and asked respondents to identify their connection to MMSD, their participation in previous MMSD Special Education Plan feedback sessions, and their level of familiarity with the draft Special Education Plan.

A total of 21 responses were received from the online form. The majority of online form respondents (85%) believed that Systems and Organizational Improvements to Support Student Learning section of the plan was either somewhat strong or very strong. Of the respondents, 84% believed the Curriculum, Instruction, and Professional Learning section of the plan was either somewhat or very strong. Almost three quarters of respondents (74%) felt the Improve Student Outcomes through Data Use/Analysis section was somewhat or very strong.

Respondents were asked to rate the strength of the Special Education Plan overall in the online form and at the in-person sessions using one of three response options: Very Strong, Somewhat Strong, or Not Strong. Of 55 respondents, 38% believed that the plan was very strong as a whole. Almost half (45%) perceived the plan as being somewhat strong, and 16% felt that the plan was not strong.

The majority of respondents believed that sections of the Special Education Plan and the plan as a whole are somewhat or very strong. This suggests that the plan is on the right track in addressing the concerns of stakeholders, but that it could use further refining.
Appendix D: Literature Review of Special Education Research

A team of nine university of Wisconsin-Madison professors and a Minority Student Achievement Network (MSAN) Dean provided citations which were utilized by two doctorate students to develop the following review of the literature in Special Education.

Purpose and Goal
The MMSD Department of Student Services is engaged in a process to update its existing Special Education Plan. The purpose of this process is to provide a clear outline of the changes and infrastructure needed to ensure that consistent and coherent services are provided to all students with disabilities in alignment with MMSD’s vision and goals, as well as new State and Federal requirements.

A secondary goal is to introduce and engage district leaders in current research. This goal is important because the roots of a conceptual framework are hard to trace. Our hope is to spark innovative discussions around supporting students with disabilities in the district’s vision for 2030. As Farrell and Coburn (2016) wrote:

“The conceptual use of research is a potentially powerful way to inform policy. When used conceptually, research serves to introduce new ideas, help people identify problems and appropriate solutions in new ways, and provide new frameworks, to guide thinking and action.”

To meet these goals, a cross departmental team is utilizing recommendations from a recent program evaluation, gathering key input from families, staff, and community members, consulting with state and national experts, and using the latest research. Toward this aim, the Department of Student Services requested from the state and national experts at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, School of Education a literature review representing the latest research and best practices in the field of special education.

Accordingly, this literature review is derived from two primary sources:

1. An annotated bibliography, which graciously was provided by faculty from the Department of Rehabilitation Psychology and Special Education (RPSE) at the University of Wisconsin-Madison; and
2. Scholarly literature gained through independent research conducted by graduate students within the RPSE Department.

Focus Areas
In 2014, MMSD contracted for an independent program review of all special education programs and services in with Futures Education. (See report here: Special Education/Alternatives Audit Report - May 2014). The purpose of the program review was to analyze strengths and identify needs and/or opportunities to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. As a result, MMSD developed a Special Education Plan.
(See plan here: Special Education Plan 2015). This plan identifies three key areas for improvement, including:

1. Systems and Organizational Improvements to Support Student Learning;
2. Curriculum, Instruction and Professional Learning; and
3. Improve Student Outcomes Through Data with Analysis.

Accordingly, this literature review is aligned with MMSD's three key areas for improvement, and organized with relevant sub-topics, as follows:

**Introduction.** Looking Toward Inclusive Education

**Part One.** Systems and Organizational Improvements to Support Student Learning: Results Driven Accountability;

**Part Two.** Curriculum, Instruction and Professional Learning: Universal Design for Learning and Culture;

**Part Three.** Improve Student Outcomes Through Data Use Analysis: Culturally Responsive Practices.

**Part Four:** Games for Learning

**Part Five:** Additional Online Resources; and

**Part Six:** Annotated Bibliography: Topically and Alphabetically Organized

**Introduction: Looking Toward Inclusive Education**

Inclusion is a theme underscored throughout this report because it promotes academic opportunities for every student in the school system. Importantly, inclusive education is more than a child's placement in the classroom setting: it also relates to homework material, culturally responsive practices, language and instruction (Grisham-Brown & Pretti-Frontczak, 2011; Green, Terry & Gallagher, 2014; Rafferty, Piscitelli & Boettcher, 2003). The objective of inclusive education is to provide students of all abilities an equal way of engaging and accessing academic material. In this regard, inclusive education should be a practice visible in every classroom within the district.

**Cooperative Teaching**

One way to promote inclusion is through cooperative teaching. Similar to the definition of inclusive education, cooperative teaching applies to more than just established partnerships between special education and general education teachers. As the University of Kansas (2016) outlines, cooperative teaching comes in many forms, including but not limited to the following:

1. Special and general educators
2. Paraprofessional and a special or general educator
3. Two general education teachers
4. Speech/language pathologists and a special educator or general educator
5. Social worker and a special educator or general educator
6. Other support personnel (volunteers) and special educator or general educator
7. Elective teachers (P.E., music, art, computers, foreign languages, etc.) and a special educator or general educator
Cooperative teaching results in equal opportunity for success among every group member (Sapon-Shevin, Ayres & Duncan, 1994; Putnam, 1993) while simultaneously accommodating learner variability. Scholars often view cooperative teaching as a shared responsibility among two or more educators. Naturally, these partnerships are not established without proactive measures and ongoing conversations. Villa, Thousand & Nevin (2008) outline ways to make cooperative teaching effective for both parties involved:

1. Coordinate work to achieve at least one common, publicly agreed-on goal
2. Share a belief system that each of the co-teaching team members has unique and needed expertise
3. Demonstrate parity by alternatively engaging in the dual roles of teacher and learner, expert and novice, giver and recipient of knowledge or skills
4. Use a distributed functions theory of leadership in which the task and relationship functions of the traditional lone teacher are distributed among all co-teaching group members.
5. Use a cooperative process that includes face-to-face interaction, positive interdependence, performance, as well as monitoring and processing of interpersonal skills, and individual accountability.

Teacher roles are crucial in not only providing educational opportunities to students but engaging in community and family supports. Per the MMSD Special Education Plan for 2016-2019, focus group participants expressed the need for a stronger approach in collaborative teaching efforts between special education and general education teachers. By promoting more opportunities for collaborative engagement and leveraging teacher expertise in the classroom setting, students will come away with a stronger, more well-rounded education.

Learning and Diversity
Importantly, MMSD focus group sessions revealed a stronger need for family and community engagement. As Booth (2000) writes: “Inclusion is concerned with fostering a mutually sustaining relationship between schools and communities.” In this way, inclusive education is a practice that occurs both inside and outside the school system, taking into account community perspectives. Inclusive education also promotes diversity (Falvey, Givner, Kimm, 1995) and universal design (Udvari-Solner & Thousand, 1995; Villa & Thousand, 1992) through building authentic assessments—of which community members can help gauge.

Barriers to inclusive education are often the result of habits and ways of thinking (Ainscow, 2005), of which MMSD is now critically examining. By opening the door to additional community involvement and family voice, schools can work collaboratively to build inclusive practices for all.
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Part One: Systems and Organizational Improvements to Support Student Learning; Results Driven Accountability

Overview
Results Driven Accountability (RDA) was a new initiative rolled out by the Department of Education Office of Special Education Rehabilitation Services in 2014 (U.S. Dept of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services). RDA is a new way of evaluating states on The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B determinations. It now requires states to report compliance (meeting timelines, due process hearing information, transition information) and results data to the Department of Education (Klotz, 2014). While this is an additional procedural requirement at the state level, MMSD is required to forward data regarding its students to the state for compliance with this initiative. MMSD already has collected the data associated with this requirement and annually submits it to the Department of Public Instruction via the 3rd Friday Enrollment Reports. The Department of Public Instruction disseminates this information via its WiseDash portal (Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 2016).

Federal/State Policy Guidelines
RDA assesses the efficacy of programs and services offered to students with disabilities. RDA does not stop with procedural compliance of The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) at the state level. Instead, it focuses on State accountability for attaining measurable academic progress for students with disabilities (US Dept of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services). Measurable academic progress is reported as the percentage of students with disabilities taking the standardized tests and the proficiency gap between students with disabilities and grade level peers as well as the percentage of students with disabilities that graduate with a high school diploma (Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction; Klotz, 2014). The State of Wisconsin has the option of choosing an area of focus within this framework.

The focus in Wisconsin schools is heavily geared towards literacy (Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction). DPI supports this as the Reading Drives Achievement (RDA) initiative. The Department of Public Instruction recommends that districts focus on the following areas to ensure compliance and meaningful progress in attaining RDA goals: 1) Universal Design for Learning; 2) strong literacy instruction; 3) culturally responsive curriculum and instructional practices; 4) meaningful access to grade level, standards based education; 5) strategies for family engagement; 6) collaboration between special and general educators; and 7) multi-level systems of supports (Response to Intervention, Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction). Through engaging in meaningful collaboration with the University of Wisconsin - Madison, MMSD is poised to not only continue to meet expectations in the areas of evaluation but increase its performance as well.
Implementation: Compliance with RDA

MMSD can document its compliance with RDA through systematic progress monitoring and documentation of interventions associated with RtI and the services provided to students with disabilities as written into their Individual Education Plans (IEPs) (Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction). MMSD should provide adequate professional development to enable school leaders and staff to devise and implement procedures to increase the ability of all learners in the classroom to be successful (McLeskey, Waldron, & Redd, 2013; Sweeting & Yeomans, 2015). Professional development in this area should enable teachers to become proficient in using data generated by progress monitoring protocols (Parker, et al. 2012; Ball & Christ, 2012). Teachers should be proficient in identifying and accessing data, using data tools and technology (Bunk et al, 2013; Ball and Christ, 2012; Rodrigues & Oliveira, 2014). Special care should be given with using progress monitoring protocols with Non-native English Speaking students (Barrera & Liu, 2010; Deno, et al. 2009). Districts should compare similar data across learners of similar language proficiency and across both languages in an effort to make sure that they are assessing static content area skills and not English proficiency (Barrera & Liu, 2010; Sandberg & Reschly, 2011). One way progress monitoring is being implemented in schools is through the use of Curriculum Based Assessments (CBMs). Graney and Shinn (2005) recommend providing teachers substantial ongoing support to effectively implement such programs. Integral to this process is providing teachers with specific instructional recommendations to enhance student learning (Graney & Shinn, 2005).

Implementation: Management and Equitable Allocation of Resources

Site Based Management (SBM) within specified parameters is a process that MMSD can use to ensure the equitable allocation of resources to increase the achievement of all students within the district. This process empowers the principal to be responsible for decisions made at the school level. Teachers become similar to policymakers, and parents also play a crucial role. This type of methodology allows for equal input and is seen as innovative. It allows schools to address and resolve challenges in the building in a timely manner. However, school districts must also provide procedural guidance in order to maintain equitable allocation of resources for students with disabilities in the district (Marshall & Patterson, 2002; Hill & Bonan, 1991). Such resource equity includes each school having: (1) Routine maintenance of equipment, and (2) Updated and adequate textbooks, staff, technology and other learning material. Other decisions that should remain centralized within the district are tasks such as large scale monitoring data, staff development and establishing a broad mission and goals (Marshall & Patterson, 2002).

Implementation: Student Services Intervention Teams

Each school within MMSD should convene a Student Services Intervention Teams (SSIT) to make educational decisions for students in need of support within their school. The purpose of this team is to provide support to grade level teachers/teams in order to determine which interventions will have the most significant impact for students. This team should be comprised of various stakeholders within each building: administrators, teachers and other service providers. Student records and data are
part of this dialogue. It is also best to determine standard protocols for use (Stecker, Fuchs, & Fuchs, 2008) with attention focusing on culturally responsive practice. Care should be taken to ensure that this team does not function as the “referral” team for special educational services (Logan, Hansen & Nieminem, 2001). Ronfeldt, et al. (2015) Efficacious use of these teams is found to increase student achievement by promoting collaboration and instruction within teacher teams (Ronfeldt et al, 2015).

**Online Resources**

http://www.parentcenterhub.org/repository/rda-guide-for-parent-centers/

http://www.wisedash.dpi.wi.gov
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**Part Two: Curriculum, Instruction, and Professional Learning; Universal Design for Learning**

**Overview**

Universal Design for Learning (UDL) is an educational approach that facilitates access and learning for students (Coyne et. al, 2006; Dieker, 2006; Dymond et. al, 2006; CAST, 2013) of all abilities. UDL principles were developed during the 1997 reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Through extensive critique and discussion, UDL evolved into a validated, scientific practice, particularly for those with significant learning disabilities (Edyburn, 2010). The purpose of UDL is to provide access to all students (Embry et. al, 2005). In this framework, specific emphasis is placed on representation, expression and engagement (CAST, 2013; Pliner & Johnson, 2004).

**UDL Framework: CAST**

There are three core sections in the framework developed by CAST (2016): engagement, representation and expression. These sections are outlined in the CAST (2011) structure:
The expected outcome of UDL is that each student becomes a resourceful, goal-directed and motivated learner. CAST encourages the implementation of these three components while simultaneously using other resources (e.g., the UDL Curriculum Toolkit) to design curriculum practices.

**Universal Design for Learning (UDL) Practices**

The MMSD can implement UDL through presenting varied forms of the same instructional material (e.g., same paper, different reading levels). In addition, designing a community of leaders (Burgstahler, 2012; McGuire, Scott & Shaw, 2002; Black, Weinburg & Brodwin, 2015) that can mentor and learn from each other. The Department of Public Instruction (WI) also emphasizes the important relationship between UDL and culturally responsive practices. This State Education Agency (SEA) has outlined the following recommendations:

1. Fluid and equitable relationships at home and in the community
2. Draw on experiences to sustain engagement
3. Like UDL, culturally responsive education is meant to support all learners
Professional Development
Teacher preparation is also key to implementing UDL. Today, teacher uncertainty on how to best implement UDL practices (August & Shanahan, 2006) remains high. CAST (2016) recognizes that professional development opportunities are needed on a district and statewide level. As they explain, “CAST invites school leaders, teams and teachers to work together toward sustainable, system-wide improvements through UDL. As a partner, CAST works with its partners to craft customized solutions which may include a blend of services and materials.”

Thus, a further recommendation is to continue monitoring the research and publications that CAST offers in the coming year. Similarly, to participate in ongoing development opportunities sponsored by the Department of Public Instruction (DPI) office.

UDL Example
The following example illustrates how a teacher might seamlessly integrate principles of Universal Design for Learning into a lesson plan. The following case scenario is hypothetical (though based on teacher narrative from a surrounding school district:

Ms. Rudolph is a third grade teacher. She recently heard about Universal Design for Learning and decided to include these practices in her classroom. Today, she is teaching her students about geography. Normally, Ms. Rudolph would have the students read aloud from the textbook and look at maps online. However, she recognizes this may not support all learner needs. She therefore includes a video about geography, a slide presentation and a hands-on activity as well. In doing this, students are engaging in the same information in different ways. Other hypothetical practices include lessons that are accessible in different levels of English proficiency. Alternatively, providing study guides in both English and native languages (Klem & Connell, 2014). Classroom configuration and organization are also important to building social impact (Lopes-Murphy, 2012).

Online Resources
http://udl-toolkit.cast.org/p/about/
http://www.udlcenter.org/
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Part Three: Improved Student Outcomes Through Data Use Analysis; Culturally Responsive Practices

Background
Social and racial disparities continue to exist in special education services (Blanchett, 2009; Harry & Klinger, 2006; Hosp & Reschly, 2004). Today, the number of African American students placed in special education is proportionately higher compared to other groups (USDOE, 2008). In addition, immigrant students and those labeled as English Language Learners (Banks & Banks, 2009) risk being placed in special education due a misunderstanding in language development (Sears, 1998). Other factors, like a disconnect in cultural practices or beliefs, also impacts the way teachers are supporting student needs (Ladson-Billings, 1994).

What is Culturally Responsive Education?
“Often, cultural responsiveness is misconstrued as an additive pedagogy in which teachers incorporate units on how people celebrate holidays around the world or traditional foods and clothing from various cultures. Cultural responsiveness is actually a much deeper introspection of instructional practices in order to ensure that teachers are not simply teaching content but teaching students in ways that respect, promote, and incorporate diverse ways of thinking, learning, and communicating” (Toppel, 2015).

Parental Involvement in Culturally Responsive Education
For parents from culturally diverse backgrounds, there may be an increased perception of inadequacy, especially if their child is diagnosed with a disability (Sousa, 2015). Latina parents may feel isolated from the education and service delivery systems (Blacher, Neece & Paczkowski, 2005). Specifically, parents of students with disabilities feel largely disconnected from school communications (Fishman & Nickerson, 2014). These perceptions may contribute to a student’s overall performance (Carranza, et. al., 2009). It is therefore important to establish respectful and effective communication structure in order to empower parents to be engaged in their child’s education.

Establishing partnerships with multicultural community resource providers facilitates a needed dialogue between stakeholders (Ford, et. al., 2014). Creating accessible role models, planning a consistent process of learning, training staff and constructing an inclusive school ethos all are methods to assist parents in becoming more comfortable participants in their child’s education (Ford, et. al., 2014; Stalker, et. al. 2011). Other strategies to increase parental involvement include the use of buddy families and the parental volunteers within the school setting (Panferov, 2010).

By seeking out opportunities for parents to articulate their perceptions, schools are able to build and nurture personal relationships with the families in their communities (Cobb, 2014). Respecting and learning about these barriers to education (e.g. family responsibilities, language, illiteracy, immigrations status and mobility) will create a safe
environment for parents to feel like equal partners in their child’s education (Rivera-Singletary, 2009; Cobb, 2014).

**Characteristics of Culturally Responsive Teaching**

One popular paradigm of incorporating culturally responsive practices into schools on a daily basis has been explained by Gloria Ladson-Billings, in her book *The Dreamkeepers*. She lists the following characteristics as integral for establishing a culturally inclusive school (from Ladson-Billings, 1994):

1. Positive perspectives on parents and families
   a. Teachers must build and maintain a positive rapport with caregivers through newsletters, phone calls, emails or other mediums
   b. Teachers must seek to understand parent expectations
   c. Inform parents of services available

2. Communication of high expectations
   a. Let students know expectations ahead of time
   b. Create environment to foster student capabilities

3. Learning within the context of culture
   a. Teachers should vary instructional approaches
   b. Educators attend community sponsored events
   c. Teachers discuss and promote individual differences

4. Student-centered instruction
   a. Promote student interest / exploration
   b. Create projects based on individual and / or group interest

5. Culturally mediated instruction
   a. Vary teaching methods and goals
   b. Reshaping the curriculum Develop classroom tasks that go beyond textbook readings

6. Teacher as facilitator
   a. Students should lead their own discussion groups
   b. Teachers should learn about community and student cultural differences

**District Role**

Situated within the context of over identification and disparate achievement rates, MMSD has the opportunity to become a leader in the way special education uses culturally responsive education practices. The school district’s current makeup of students in special education includes a high number of children identified as Native American (24%), African American (23%) and Multiracial (16%). The district therefore has a diverse student profile that should be supported and celebrated.

**Implementation of Culturally Responsive Practices**

The following list includes techniques and activities that MMSD is able to integrate into current practices in order to sustain a more culturally responsive school for our students:
1. Student activities should include text, speech and models that highlight and address cultural diversity (Sanchez, 2007; Loewen, 1993; Gay, 2002).

2. Teachers should engage and encourage student voice, along with incorporating student funds of knowledge into the classroom setting (Bell & Clark, 1998; Ladson-Billings, 1992; Toppel, 2013; Howard, 2001).

3. Teachers use cooperative learning techniques that take into consideration how student culture impacts learning and communication style (Toppel, 2015).

4. Schools should use data to identify disproportionality (Moreno, & Gaytán, 2013; Skiba et. al., 2011, Zion, et. al 2011). This includes monitoring and accounting for social impact and academic trends (Harry & Anderson, 1994).

5. Schools should design and implement ongoing professional development opportunities for educators in order to remain updated on current inclusive practices (DeMatthews & Mawhinney, 2013).

6. Staff should reflect on their own cultures and beliefs (Weinstein, Tomlison-Clark, Curran, 2004). Similarly, teachers should build on student experiences and voice (Delpit, 2006).

7. The district should consider ways to incorporate parents and families into their vision for the future. Currently, 40 percent of participants in the Special Education Feedback report (2015) believed outside factors and family connections were important issues to address. Participation from parents and families is both valuable and necessary. All data collection with parents should be implemented by bilingual staff in person (Moreno, et. al, 2013).

8. Initiate cooperative learning groups (Padron, Waxman & Rivera, 2002) and student directed discussion groups (Brisk & Harrington, 2000)
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**Online Resources for Teachers Regarding Issues Pertaining to Culturally Responsive Practices:**

http://www.nea.org/home/16723.htm
NEA’s web page with information for teachers

http://sppsfoundation.org/sites/default/files/bp_2-_culturally_responsive_instruction.pdf
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction’s web page of many resources

(http://nichcy.org/families-community) NICHY serves the nation as a central source of information on disabilities in infants, toddlers, children and youth. You’ll find easy-to-read articles on IDEA, the law authorizing early intervention services and special education, as well as researched-based information on effective practices, programs and services.

Child Development Institute (http://childdevelopmentinfo.com/)

PACER (http://www.pacer.org/) The mission of PACER Center (Parent Advocacy Coalition for Educational Rights) is to expand opportunities and enhance the quality of life of children and young adults with disabilities and their families, based on the concept of parents helping parents. With assistance to individual families, workshops, materials for parents and professionals and leadership in securing a free and appropriate public education for all children, PACER’s work affects and encourages
families in Minnesota and across the nation.

Parents Helping Parents (http://www.php.com/) Parents Helping Parents (PHP) strives to improve the quality of life for any child with any special need of any age, through educating, supporting and training their primary caregivers.

E-Ready Special Education Information for Parents: http://www.pta.org/advocacy/content.cfm?ItemNumber=3713

TASH (http://tash.org) TASH is an international leader in disability advocacy for human rights and inclusion for people with significant disabilities and support needs. TASH works to advance inclusive communities through advocacy, research, professional development, policy and information and resources for parents, families and self-advocates.

The Federation for Children with Special Needs (http://fcsn.org/index.php) The Federation for Children with Special Needs provides information, support and assistance to parents of children with disabilities, their professional partners and their communities. We are committed to listening to and learning from families, and encouraging full participation in community life by all people, especially those with disabilities.

Family Voices (http://www.familyvoices.org) Family Voices aims to achieve family-centered care for all children and youth with special health care needs and/or disabilities. Through our national network, we provide families with tools to make informed decisions, advocate for improved public and private policies, build partnerships among professionals and families, and serve as a trusted resource on health care. For example, since 1982, Support for Families of Children with Disabilities has offered information, education, and parent-to-parent support free of charge to families of children with any kind of disability, concern, or special health care need in San Francisco. Support for Families is the coordinating office for Family Voices of California, a statewide collaborative of locally-based parent-run centers working to ensure quality health care for children and youth with special needs.

Stop Bullying Parent Guide (http://www.stopbullying.gov/what-you-can-do/parents/index.html) StopBullying.gov provides information from various government agencies on what bullying is, what cyberbullying is, who is at risk and how you can prevent and respond to bullying.

Part Four: Games for Learning

Educational games offer a unique opportunity for students with disabilities to collaborate with peers while simultaneously learning about core material. Through games, students can strengthen communication, increase literacy (Charlton, Williams, & McLaughlin, 2005), cultivate decision making skills (Standen, Rees & Brown, 2009) and reinforce mathematical concepts taught in school (Brown, Ley,
Evett & Standen, 2011; Bakker, 2005). Beyond this, educational games have innumerable benefits for building social skills (Koceski & Koceska, 2015), particularly for students with autism (Finke, Hickerson & McLaughlin, 2015). In fact, games are an ideal alternative for demonstrating knowledge gained to teachers and peers, particularly with regards to participatory cultures (Gee, 2009). Through participatory cultures, students share ideas and become each other’s mentors (Steinkuehler, 2004). This type of learning experience is not only authentic but provides interactions typically unavailable in traditional classrooms.

Games also provide a way for teachers to engage in formal or informal assessments. For example, a science teacher may use a game as a conversation starter for environmental science or virology. After each student begins playing an assigned game, the teacher may walk around and observe individual interactions (Marino, Basham & Beecher, 2011). What level(s) are students struggling with? Are they using terminology from the game to formulate scientific arguments? These are example questions that a teacher might pose and reflect upon during a lesson. In observing student engagement during gameplay, teachers can assess what material is making sense and what areas need further improvement.

Importantly, games should not be seen as a substitute for lesson plans. As described in the above scenario, games in school should accompany a larger curriculum structure. It is through a combination of games-based learning and traditional work that students are exposed to multiple means of representation and engagement. In embedding this UDL approach, (Bull & Bell, 2008; Simpson, 2009), students can enhance their understanding of science or other core subject matters in ways that accommodate their learning style.

Educational games for impact is a growing topic in universities across the country. MMSD is located in a city featuring many different game designers and developers. This provides special education teachers and students a unique opportunity to engage in games-based learning in ways not open to neighboring districts. Already, partnerships between MMSD and UW-Madison are being developed in order to cultivate games-based learning opportunities for students with significant learning needs.
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**Part Five: Additional Online Resources**

**Assistive Technology**

Alliance for Technology Access (ATA). (http://www.ataccess.org/)
The mission of the ATA is to increase the use of technology by children and adults with disabilities and functional limitations. ATA encourages and facilitates the empowerment of people with disabilities to participate fully in their communities. Through public education, information and referral, capacity building in community organizations and advocacy/policy efforts, the ATA enables millions of people to live, learn, work, define their futures and achieve their dreams.

The Trace Center (http://trace.wisc.edu).
The Trace Research & Development Center is a part of the College of Engineering, University of Wisconsin-Madison. Founded in 1971, Trace has been a pioneer in the field of technology and disability. The Resources and Tools section of their website has a variety of informational products, kits, videos, databases and online tools intended for consumers, advocates, industry and educators.
Learning Disabilities
The National Center for Learning Disabilities (http://www.NCLD.ORG/).
Committed to ensuring that all students with learning disabilities graduate from high
school with a standard diploma—prepared for college and the workplace.

The Resource Room (http://www.resourceroom.net/).
Provides tools, strategies and structured explorations for interesting learners, including
lessons, ideas, articles and links for multisensory learning for people of all ages. The
site also offers resources for people who learn differently, or have learning difficulties
or learning disabilities such as dyslexia, dysgraphia or dyscalculia.

LD OnLine (http://www.ldanatl.org/)
The world’s leading website on learning disabilities and ADHD, serving more than
200,000 parents, teachers and other professionals each month.
(http://www.ldonline.org/)

Learning Disabilities Association of America. Since 1964, the Learning Disabilities
Association of America (LDA) has provided support to people with learning
disabilities, their parents, teachers and other professionals. Today, the LDA is the
largest non-profit volunteer organization advocating for individuals with disabilities,
and provides cutting-edge information on learning disabilities, practical solutions and
a comprehensive network of resources.

The International Dyslexia Association (http://www.interdys.org)
The purpose of IDA is to pursue and provide the most comprehensive range of
information and services that address the full scope of dyslexia and related difficulties
in learning to read and write … in a way that creates hope, possibility and
partnership.

Attention Deficit Disorder/Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder

CHADD (http://www.chadd.org/)

Children and Adults with Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (CHADD), is a
national non-profit, tax-exempt organization providing education, advocacy and
support for individuals with ADHD. In addition to our informative website, CHADD
also publishes a variety of printed materials to keep members and professionals
current on research advances, medications and treatments affecting individuals
with ADHD.

KidSource Online (http://www.kidsource.com/kidsource/pages/dis.add.html)
KidSource Online is a group of parents who want to make a positive and lasting
difference in the lives of parents and children. We’ve brought together our best
articles in the Disabilities: Attention Deficit Disorder section of our website. Information
on learning disabilities and physical disabilities can be found in other sections.
The Attention Deficit Disorder Association (http://www.add.org/)
The Association provides information, resources and networking opportunities to help adults with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder lead better lives.

One Add Place (http://www.oneaddplace.com/)
At the ADD and ADHD resource place you will find information on both child and adult attention deficit disorder and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. Learn the symptoms of ADD and ADHD and how to test for them, and discover the latest natural treatments, pharmaceutical medications and brain science.

**Emotional and Behavioral Disorders**
National Federation of Families for Children’s Mental Health (FFCMH) (http://www.ffcmh.org) The National Federation of Families for Children’s Mental Health is a national family-run organization linking more than 120 chapters and state organizations focused on the issues of children and youth with emotional, behavioral or mental health needs and their families.

American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry (AACAP) (http://www.aacap.org/aacap/Families_and_Youth/Facts_for_Families/Home.aspx) The AACAP developed Facts for Families to provide concise and up-to-date information on psychiatric issues that affect children, teenagers and their families. The AACAP provides this important information as a public service.

National Alliance on Mental Illness (NAMI) (http://www.nami.org) NAMI is the National Alliance on Mental Illness, the nation’s largest grassroots mental health organization dedicated to building better lives for the millions of Americans affected by mental illness. NAMI advocates for access to services, treatment, supports and research and is steadfast in its commitment to raise awareness and build a community for hope for all of those in need.

**Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities**
The Arc (http://www.thearc.org) The largest national community-based organization advocating for and serving people with intellectual and developmental disabilities and their families. Encompasses all ages and all spectrums from autism, Down syndrome, Fragile X and various other developmental disabilities.

National Down Syndrome Society (NDSS) (http://www.ndss.org/) The mission of the National Down Syndrome Society is to be the national advocate for the value, acceptance and inclusion of people with Down syndrome.


National Down Syndrome Congress (http://ndssccenter.org/)
Founded in 1973, the National Down Syndrome Congress is the country’s oldest national organization for people with Down syndrome, their families and the professionals who work with them. We provide information, advocacy and support concerning all aspects of life for individuals with Down syndrome, and work to create a national climate in which all people will recognize and embrace the value and dignity of people with Down syndrome.

**Autism Spectrum Disorder/Pervasive Development Disorder**

Autism Community (http://www.autism-community.com)

Autism Community provides information on Autism, education issues, communication, and other resources for parents, teachers and more. It is also a great place to connect with individuals with autism, family members, teachers and other professionals.

The Autism Society (http://www.autism-society.org/)

The Autism Society has a simple goal: To improve the lives of all living with autism. In order to improve lives, we focus on ensuring that all individuals with autism and their families have access to the help they need.

The Autism National Committee (AUTCOM) (http://www.autcom.org/)

Autism National Committee is the only autism advocacy organization dedicated to “Social Justice for All Citizens with Autism” through a shared vision and a commitment to positive approaches. Our organization was founded in 1990 to protect and advance the human rights and civil rights of all persons with autism, pervasive developmental disorder and related differences of communication and behavior.

TEACCH Autism Program (http://teacch.com/)

TEACH is a University-based system of community regional centers that offers a set of core services along with unique demonstration programs meeting the clinical, training and research needs of individuals with ASD, their families and professionals across the state of North Carolina. TEACCH conducts training nationally and internationally and provides consultation for teachers, residential care providers and other professionals from a variety of disciplines.

Autism Treatment Center of America (http://www.autismtreatmentcenter.org/)

Since 1983, the Autism Treatment Center of America™ has provided innovative training programs for parents and professionals caring for children challenged by autism, autism spectrum disorders, pervasive developmental disorder (PDD) and other developmental difficulties.

**Communication Disabilities**

American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) (http://www.asha.org/public/)
The American Speech-Language-Hearing Association is committed to ensuring that all people with speech, language and hearing disorders receive services to help them communicate effectively. Here you will find resources to help you understand communication and communication disorders.

The National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders (NIDCD) (http://www.nidcd.nih.gov)  
NIDCD is one of the Institutes that comprise the National Institutes of Health (NIH). NIH’s mission is to uncover new knowledge that will lead to better health for everyone. Simply described, the goal of NIH research is to acquire new knowledge to help prevent, detect, diagnose and treat disease and disability.

The Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing (AG Bell) (http://www.agbell.org)  
AG Bell helps families, health care providers and education professionals understand childhood hearing loss and the importance of early diagnosis and intervention. Through advocacy, education, research and financial aid, AG Bell helps to ensure that every child and adult with hearing loss has the opportunity to listen, talk and thrive in mainstream society.

American Society for Deaf Children (ASDC) (http://www.deafchildren.org/)  
ASCD supports and educates families of deaf and hard-of-hearing children and advocates for high-quality programs and services. We believe that these children are entitled to full communication access in their home school and community; there should be access to identification and intervention by qualified providers, family involvement and educational opportunities equal to those provided for hearing children.

National Association of the Deaf (NAD) (http://www.nad.org/issues/education)  
The NAD is actively involved in providing information about opportunities available for educating deaf and hard of hearing children, challenges that deaf and hard of hearing people encounter with high-stakes testing and the legal obligations of public and private schools, post-secondary programs, colleges and universities.

Visual Impairments  
FamilyConnect (http://www.familyconnect.org/parentsitehome.asp)  
FamilyConnect is designed for parents of children with visual impairments, and brought to you by American Foundation for the Blind and National Association for Parents of Children with Visual Impairments. On FamilyConnect you’ll find videos, personal stories, events, news and an online community that can offer tips and support from other parents of children who are blind or visually impaired.

The National Association for Parents of Children with Visual Impairments (NAPVI) (http://www.napvi.org/)
NAPVI is a non-profit organization of, by and for parents committed to providing support to the parents of children who have visual impairments. NAPVI is a national organization that enables parents to find information and resources for their children who are blind or visually impaired, including those with additional disabilities.

National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped (NLS) [http://www.loc.gov/nls/] Through a national network of cooperating libraries, NLS administers a free library program of braille and audio materials circulated to eligible borrowers in the United States by postage-free mail.

National Federation of the Blind (NFB) [https://nfb.org] The NFB improves blind people’s lives through advocacy, education, research, technology and programs encouraging independence and self-confidence. It is the leading force in the blindness field today and the voice of the nation’s blind.

SPARKLE [http://www.sparkle.usu.edu/] Project SPARKLE is a program of individualized learning that enhances the ability of parents of children who are deaf and blind to fulfill their roles in the development and education of their children. Through Project SPARKLE, parents will have access to information, training and resources in their homes via DVDs and the Internet.

Brain/Spinal Cord Injury
Brain Injury Association of America (BIAA) [http://www.biausa.org/] The mission of the Brain Injury Association of America (BIAA) is to advance brain injury prevention, research, treatment and education and to improve the quality of life for all people affected by brain injury. We are dedicated to increasing access to quality health care and raising awareness and understanding of brain injury. With a network of state affiliates, local chapters and support groups, we are the voice of brain injury.

The National Spinal Cord Injury Association (NSCIA) [http://www.spinalcord.org/] Our mission is to improve the quality of life of all people living with spinal cord injuries and disorders (SCI/D). We provide active-lifestyle information, peer support and advocacy that empower individuals to achieve their highest potential in all facets of life.

Epilepsy Foundation [http://www.epilepsyfoundation.org/] The mission of the Epilepsy Foundation is to stop seizures and SUDEP (Sudden Unexpected Death in Epilepsy), find a cure and overcome the challenges created by epilepsy through efforts including education, advocacy and research to accelerate ideas into therapies.

Teacher Resources
National Association of Special Education Teachers [http://www.nasct.org/] NASET is the premier membership organization for special education teachers and offers a wealth of resources, including professional development courses, job postings, and more.
U.S. Department of Education Strengthening Teaching (http://www.ed.gov/teaching)

Articles and resources for educators.

What Works Clearinghouse (http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/)

The Institute of Education Sciences’ reviews of the research on the different programs, products, practices, and policies in education to provide educators with the information they need to make evidence-based decisions.

The Teacher’s Guide (http://www.theteachersguide.com)
A list of primarily free online teaching resources for teachers, including lesson plans and printouts. Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) (http://www.cec.sped.org/)
The Council for Exceptional Children is the largest international professional organization dedicated to improving the educational success of individuals with disabilities and/or gifts and talents.

E-Ready Special Education Information for Teachers (http://www.pta.org/advocacy/content.cfm?ItemNumber=3713)
This website provides teachers and other education professionals, as well as parents, with information and resources about teaching students with disabilities.

Internet Special Education Resources (ISER) (http://www.iser.com)
ISER is a directory of special education-related professionals, organizations and schools. We help parents find local special education professionals for learning disabilities and attention deficit disorder assessment, therapy, advocacy, critical teen issues and other special needs.

CARS+ (http://www.carsplus.org)
CARS+ is a non-profit organization representing the needs of resource specialists and other special education teachers.

Association of University Centers on Disabilities (AUCD) (http://www.aucd.org/template/index.cfm)
A network of interdisciplinary centers advancing policy and practice for and with individuals with developmental and other disabilities, their families and communities.

DREAMMS for Kid (http://www.dreamms.org/)
An Assistive Technology information clearinghouse and search facility. Founded in 1988 by the parents of a child with Down syndrome, DREAMMS (an acronym for Developmental Research for the Effective Advancement of Memory and Motor Skills), is committed to increasing the use of computers, high-quality instructional technology and assistive technologies for children with special needs in schools, homes and the workplace.

NICHCY (http://nichcy.org/schools-administrators)
NICHCY serves the nation as a central source of information on disabilities in infants,
toddlers, children and youth. You’ll find easy-to-read information on IDEA, the law authorizing early intervention services and special education, as well as research-based information on effective practices, programs and services. We’ll also help you connect with disability agencies and organizations in your state.

Stop Bullying Teacher Guide (http://www.stopbullying.gov/what-you-can-do/educators/index.html) Helping to establish a supportive and safe school climate where all students are accepted and knowing how to respond when bullying happens are key to making sure all students are able to learn and grow. There are many tools on StopBullying.gov specific for teachers, administrators and other school staff.

The Council for Learning Disabilities (CLD) (http://www.cldinternational.org) An international organization that promotes evidence-based teaching, collaboration, research, leadership and advocacy. CLD is comprised of professionals who represent diverse disciplines and are committed to enhancing the education and quality of life for individuals with learning disabilities and others who experience challenges in learning.

Teaching LD (http://teachingld.org/) Information and resources for teaching students with learning disabilities. The Division for Learning Disabilities (DLD) is one of 17 special interest groups of the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), the largest international professional organization dedicated to improving educational outcomes for individuals with exceptionalities, including both students with disabilities and the gifted.

American Association of Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (http://www.aaidd.org/). AAIDD is an organization of professionals and citizens working to support individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities; they promote progressive policies, sound research, effective practices and universal human rights for people with these disabilities. AAIDD offers cutting-edge educational opportunities to members; events focus on deep exploration of best practices, new policy directions and the latest research findings.

Alliance for Technology Access (ATA) (http://www.ataccess.org/) The mission of the ATA is to increase the use of technology by children and adults with disabilities and functional limitations. ATA encourages and facilitates the empowerment of people with disabilities to participate fully in their communities. Through public education, information and referral, capacity building in community organizations and advocacy/policy efforts, the ATA enables millions of people to live, learn, work, define their futures and achieve their dreams.

Legal/Advocacy Information and Resources
National Disability Rights Network (http://www.ndrn.org/index.php) Every single day, our Network protects and advocates for the rights of people with disabilities across the United States and the territories. We fight to end abuse and neglect where we find it. We assist people in finding and keeping their jobs and work
with kids, parents and schools to combat bullying and ensure educational opportunities for students with disabilities.

Education Law Resource Center (http://www.edlawrc.com/)
The Education Law Resource Center provides information to help parents, educators and other professionals understand legal requirements and meet student needs. This site contains information and resources about a variety of education law topics including physical restraints in schools, special education and No Child Left Behind.

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (http://idea.ed.gov/)
The official website of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), Part B (ages 3 to 21) and Part C (birth to 2 years).

National Center on Disability and Journalism (NCDJ) (http://ncdj.org/)
The National Center on Disability and Journalism is located in the Walter Cronkite School of Journalism and Mass Communication at Arizona State University. The center provides support and guidance for journalists as they cover people with disabilities.

Special Education Law Blog (http://specialedlaw.blogs.com/)
A special education legal resource discussing case law, news, practical advocacy advice and developments in state and federal laws, statutes and regulations.

Wrightslaw (http://www.wrightslaw.com/)
Parents, educators, advocates and attorneys come to Wrightslaw for accurate, reliable information about special education law, education law and advocacy for children with disabilities.
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### Appendix E: Additional Information Document Links

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At Risk Plan</td>
<td>(Pending Board of Education Approval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Core State Standards -3 Year Plan</td>
<td><a href="https://www.madison.k12.wi.us/files/CCSS%20%20year%20plan%20final_0.pdf">https://www.madison.k12.wi.us/files/CCSS%20%20year%20plan%20final_0.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Use Tool Kit</td>
<td><a href="https://accountability.madison.k12.wi.us/data-use-toolkit">https://accountability.madison.k12.wi.us/data-use-toolkit</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining Special Education Placement in Multi-Tiered Systems of Support</td>
<td><a href="https://specialed.madison.k12.wi.us/files/specialed/ContinuumServices_0.pdf">https://specialed.madison.k12.wi.us/files/specialed/ContinuumServices_0.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envisioning the Future of Special Education</td>
<td>Summary Report Envisioning the Future of Special Education NetworkED Summit Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Service Delivery Review</td>
<td>The link below is to the Special Education Service Delivery Review Process. This document supports schools in planning, implementing and reviewing their school service delivery model to ensure it meets the needs of all students. <a href="https://docs.google.com/a/madison.k12.wi.us/document/d/1OOTxmEOIGkO3Pyhrh9P9YEViwUYzfAxSR7Jeh8H3DhYo/edit?usp=sharing">https://docs.google.com/a/madison.k12.wi.us/document/d/1OOTxmEOIGkO3Pyhrh9P9YEViwUYzfAxSR7Jeh8H3DhYo/edit?usp=sharing</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing Survey</td>
<td>This is a <a href="https://accountability.madison.k12.wi.us/teacher-team-toolkit">Staffing Survey</a> of comparing MMSD staffing levels to other national urban school districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Team Tool Kit</td>
<td><a href="https://accountability.madison.k12.wi.us/teacher-team-toolkit">https://accountability.madison.k12.wi.us/teacher-team-toolkit</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Resource Guide</td>
<td>The guide contains general information, resources and checklists that teachers, parents and students can use to assist IEP teams to a successful outcome to the specific path chosen. The guide can be used each year of high school based on four particular paths a student may follow. The four paths include Supported Employment, Competitive Employment, Military, and Post Secondary Education. <a href="https://specialed.madison.k12.wi.us/files/specialed/TransitionPlanningResourceGuide.2014_0.pdf">https://specialed.madison.k12.wi.us/files/specialed/TransitionPlanningResourceGuide.2014_0.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix G: Results Driven Accountability (RDA) Metrics and Goals

Results Driven Accountability (RDA)

The U.S. Department of Education has issued new accountability expectations and revised monitoring requirements called Results Driven Accountability (RDA). This requires school districts to increase outcomes for students with disabilities in reading, writing, and math. The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI) recommends the following best practices to advance Results Driven Accountability goals: (1) Universal Design for Learning, (2) strong literacy instruction, (3) culturally responsive curriculum and instructional practices; (4) meaningful access to grade-level, standards-based education, (5) strategies for family engagement, (6) collaboration between special and general educators, and (7) multi-level systems of supports (Response to Intervention; Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports). The Madison Metropolitan School District is either implementing or introducing each of these best practices.

For detailed information on the Results Driven Accountability criteria see Criteria for Local Educational Agency IDEA Determinations. For more information on Results Driven Accountability please see the DPI RDA website. The main reason for the development of the Special Education Plan is to improve programs to meet these ambitious learning outcomes for students with disabilities.

Metrics and Goals

Criteria for districts to meet the RDA requirements will be phased in over the next 3 years. The following RDA criteria are based on districts’ compliance with IDEA indicators and student performance (indicators 1, 2, 3B reading, 3B math, 3C reading and 3C math) on the following:

2015 LEA Determinations

The total score for 2015 determinations is the total compliance points earned divided by the total compliance points possible.

- Meets Requirements – Total score is greater than or equal to 80%.
- Needs Assistance – Total score is between 60% and 80%.
- Needs Intervention – Total score is less than 60%.
- Needs Substantial Intervention – The department determines, at any time, a LEA needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of IDEA Part B or that there is a substantial failure to comply with any condition of eligibility under this part.
2016-2018 Determinations

In 2016 the department will begin including results indicators in its determinations. The weight given to results indicators will increase each year during the period from 2016 to 2018, until 50% of the score comes from compliance and 50% comes from results. The table below shows the compliance and results weights that will be used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016 Determination</th>
<th>2017 Determination</th>
<th>2018 Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% Compliance</td>
<td>75% Compliance</td>
<td>50% Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% Results</td>
<td>25% Results</td>
<td>50% Results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scoring of the Results Indicators (in 2016 and later)

- LEAs with students in the 4-year cohort receive scores for Indicator 1.
- LEAs with students in grades 7-12 receive a score for Indicator 2.
- All LEAs with students in tested grades (3-8 and 10) receive scores for 3B and 3C in reading and math

The score for the Results Indicators is the total points received divided by the possible points earned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2 points</th>
<th>1 point</th>
<th>0 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>At least 90% of students with disabilities in a 4 year cohort graduated from high school with a regular diploma.</td>
<td>70-89% of students with disabilities in a 4 year cohort graduated from high school with a regular diploma.</td>
<td>Less than 70% of students with disabilities in a 4-year cohort graduated from high school with a regular diploma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Less than 0.2% of students with disabilities in grades 7-12 (when adjusted for exclusionary conditions**) dropped out of school.</td>
<td>0.2% - 1% of students with disabilities in grades 7-12 (when adjusted for exclusionary conditions**) dropped out of school.</td>
<td>Greater than 1% of students with disabilities in grades 7-12 (when adjusted for exclusionary conditions**) dropped out of school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B Reading</td>
<td>At least 90% of students with IEPs participated in WKCE*.</td>
<td>81%-89% of students with IEPs participated in WKCE*.</td>
<td>Less than 80% of students with IEPs participated in WKCE*.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B Math</td>
<td>At least 90% of students with IEPs participated in WKCE*.</td>
<td>81%-89% of students with IEPs participated in WKCE*.</td>
<td>Less than 80% of students with IEPs participated in WKCE*.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C Reading</td>
<td>At least 17% of students with IEPs scored proficient or advanced on the WSAS reading assessment.</td>
<td>10%-16% of students with IEPs scored proficient or advanced on the WSAS reading assessment.</td>
<td>Less than 10% of students with IEPs scored proficient or advanced on the WSAS reading assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C Math</td>
<td>At least 25% of students with IEPs scored proficient or advanced on the WSAS math assessment.</td>
<td>18%-24% of students with IEPs scored proficient or advanced on the WSAS math assessment.</td>
<td>Less than 18% of students with IEPs scored proficient or advanced on the WSAS math assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examination (WKCE) **Indicator 2 Exclusionary Conditions: transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district-approved educational program; temporary absence due to expulsion, suspension or school-approved illness; death.
Appendix H: Plan Evaluation Measures

The following Evaluation Measures will be used to evaluate both the implementation of the Special Education Plan and impact on student outcomes:

Meet Results Driven Accountability (RDA) Measures

- **Indicator 1:** At least 90% of students with disabilities in a 4 year cohort graduated from high school with a regular diploma.
- **Indicator 2:** Less than 0.2% of students with disabilities in grades 7-12 (when adjusted for exclusionary conditions**) dropped out of school.
- **Indicator 3B Reading:** At least 90% of students with IEPs participated in WKCE.
- **Indicator 3B Math:** At least 90% of students with IEPs participated in WCKE.
- **Indicator 3C Reading:** At least 17% of students with IEPs scored proficient or advanced on the WSAS reading assessment.
- **Indicator 3C Math:** At least 25% of students with IEPs scored proficient or advanced on the WSAS math assessment.

Increase academic achievement, access to a challenging and well-rounded education, and positive school climate to meet Strategic Framework Milestones based on the percentage of students with disabilities meeting goals on:

- Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening (PALS) 2 Reading
- Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) 5 and 8 Reading Proficiency and Reading Growth
- Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) 5 and 8 Math Proficiency and Math Growth
- Grade 9 two or more course failures
- Grade 11, 3.0+ GPA
- American College Test (ACT) II Reading and Math College Readiness
- Fine Arts Participation grades K-5 and 6-8
- World Language Participation grades 7-8
- Fine Arts and World Language Profile grades 9-12
- Student Climate Survey Data

Additional Department Level Student Achievement and Other Measures

- Increase the number and percent of students with specific learning disabilities who are proficient on MAP Reading over the next 3 years
- Reduce the number and percent of students with disabilities in minimal and basic
- Increase the number and percent of students who score at or above the 25th percentile on MAP Reading and Math
- Reduce the number of restraint and seclusion incidents from 2015-16 baseline

Decrease clustering of students with disabilities using the Service Delivery Planning Process
• Students with disabilities will be scheduled into general education classes at natural proportions with no more than 30% of students with disabilities in a class (excluding students with only speech/language services)

Reduce African-American Student Disproportionality
• Reduce the percent of African-American students identified with disabilities in special education over the next 3 years
• Reduce the percent of African-American students served in the most restrictive settings (less than 40% of the day) over the next 3 years
• Reduce the risk ratio for African-American students in emotional behavioral disorders over the next 3 years
• Reduce the percentage of African-American and Native American students in the most restrictive placements

Improve the Hiring Process
• Increase participation in the dual certification program, starting with 2 participants and growing over the next 3 years
• Improve the annual fill rate of special education teachers