

**Michigan Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>																																			
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data are 69.3%. The revised FFY 2006 data were 69%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 80%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>																																			
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 28.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 28.9%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 10%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>																																			
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 98.5%. These data represent progress from the revised FFY 2006 data of 92.7%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 91%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>																																			
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are :</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1198 1419 1484"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Target</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="3">Reading</td> <td colspan="3">Math</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>99.3%</td> <td>99.1%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>99.2%</td> <td>99.4%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>99.7%</td> <td>98.8%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>99.6%</td> <td>99.1%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>99.3%</td> <td>99.2%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>99.3%</td> <td>99.8%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Grade	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target		Reading			Math			3	99.3%	99.1%	95%	99.2%	99.4%	95%	4	99.7%	98.8%	95%	99.6%	99.1%	95%	5	99.3%	99.2%	95%	99.3%	99.8%	95%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
Grade	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target																															
	Reading			Math																																	
3	99.3%	99.1%	95%	99.2%	99.4%	95%																															
4	99.7%	98.8%	95%	99.6%	99.1%	95%																															
5	99.3%	99.2%	95%	99.3%	99.8%	95%																															

**Michigan Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues							OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																																									
<p>against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="548 233 1419 399"> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>99.3%</td> <td>99.7%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>99.1%</td> <td>98.7%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>99.2%</td> <td>98.3%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>99%</td> <td>98.7%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>98.9%</td> <td>98.3%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>98.8%</td> <td>98.8%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS</td> <td>85.1%</td> <td>90.5%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>91.1%</td> <td>91.8%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data. The State provided revised FFY 2006 data for HS reading and math.</p> <p>The State met part of its FFY 2007 targets.</p>	6	99.3%	99.7%	95%	99.1%	98.7%	95%	7	99.2%	98.3%	95%	99%	98.7%	95%	8	98.9%	98.3%	95%	98.8%	98.8%	95%	HS	85.1%	90.5%	95%	91.1%	91.8%	95%																																				
6	99.3%	99.7%	95%	99.1%	98.7%	95%																																																											
7	99.2%	98.3%	95%	99%	98.7%	95%																																																											
8	98.9%	98.3%	95%	98.8%	98.8%	95%																																																											
HS	85.1%	90.5%	95%	91.1%	91.8%	95%																																																											
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are :</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 613 1419 1065"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Target</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="3">Reading</td> <td colspan="3">Math</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>56.1%</td> <td>57.9%</td> <td>60%</td> <td>74.1%</td> <td>77.1%</td> <td>67%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>51.3%</td> <td>50.5%</td> <td>59%</td> <td>66.9%</td> <td>67.7%</td> <td>65%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>49%</td> <td>48.9%</td> <td>57%</td> <td>50.9%</td> <td>49.5%</td> <td>62%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>48.4%</td> <td>49%</td> <td>56%</td> <td>42.1%</td> <td>42.9%</td> <td>60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>43.2%</td> <td>42.1%</td> <td>54%</td> <td>35.2%</td> <td>39.1%</td> <td>57%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>39.1%</td> <td>43.6%</td> <td>53%</td> <td>39.5%</td> <td>40.4%</td> <td>54%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS</td> <td>25.5%</td> <td>24.5%</td> <td>61%</td> <td>22.1%</td> <td>20.3%</td> <td>55%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress in part and slippage in part from the revised FFY 2006 data.</p> <p>The State met part of its FFY 2007 targets.</p>	Grade	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target		Reading			Math			3	56.1%	57.9%	60%	74.1%	77.1%	67%	4	51.3%	50.5%	59%	66.9%	67.7%	65%	5	49%	48.9%	57%	50.9%	49.5%	62%	6	48.4%	49%	56%	42.1%	42.9%	60%	7	43.2%	42.1%	54%	35.2%	39.1%	57%	8	39.1%	43.6%	53%	39.5%	40.4%	54%	HS	25.5%	24.5%	61%	22.1%	20.3%	55%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
Grade	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target																																																											
	Reading			Math																																																													
3	56.1%	57.9%	60%	74.1%	77.1%	67%																																																											
4	51.3%	50.5%	59%	66.9%	67.7%	65%																																																											
5	49%	48.9%	57%	50.9%	49.5%	62%																																																											
6	48.4%	49%	56%	42.1%	42.9%	60%																																																											
7	43.2%	42.1%	54%	35.2%	39.1%	57%																																																											
8	39.1%	43.6%	53%	39.5%	40.4%	54%																																																											
HS	25.5%	24.5%	61%	22.1%	20.3%	55%																																																											
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 1.4%. These data represent progress from the revised FFY 2006 data of 1.5%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 9%.</p> <p>The State described how the State was in the process of reviewing, and if</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State reported that it identified noncompliance in the fall and spring of 2008 based on the review of policies, procedures, and practices of districts identified with a significant discrepancy</p>																																																															

**Michigan Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>than 10 days in a school year; and [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>appropriate, revising the LEA’s policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2007. The State reported that five districts newly identified as having a significant discrepancy based on FFY 2007 data were scheduled for a review of their policies, procedures, and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards in spring of 2009. The State reported that the remaining six districts, which had previously been identified as having a significant discrepancy based on FFY 2006 data, received on-site focused monitoring visits, which included a review of their policies, procedures, and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. The State identified findings of noncompliance in all six districts and the districts were implementing their one-year corrective action plans.</p> <p>OSEP’s June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009 a description of the review, and if appropriate, revision, of policies, procedures, and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with IDEA for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006. The State reported that it conducted on-site focused monitoring and reviewed the policies, procedures, and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with IDEA for the districts identified as having a significant discrepancy in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006.</p> <p>As a result of its review of policies, procedures, and practices, the State identified noncompliance in five districts identified with a significant discrepancy based on FFY 2005 data and eleven districts identified with a significant discrepancy based on FFY 2006 data. Because the State conducted monitoring visits and issued monitoring findings in the spring and fall of 2008, the one-year timeline for correction of findings of noncompliance identified through review of the policies, procedures, and practices of LEAs identified with a significant discrepancy based on data from FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 has</p>	<p>using data from FFY 2005 and FFY 2006. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the noncompliance was corrected, by reporting that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in the fall and spring of 2008 based on the FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 data is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance</p> <p>As noted in the revised Part B Indicator Measurement Table, in reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must again describe the results of the State’s examination of data from FFY 2007. In addition, the State must describe the review, and if appropriate, revision of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of the IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2007, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p>

**Michigan Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
	not ended.																					
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>																				
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p> <p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 829 1467 1312"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Target</th> <th>Progress</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td>50.3</td> <td>53.5</td> <td>57</td> <td>3.20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>18.5</td> <td>16.8</td> <td>15.4</td> <td>1.70%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>5</td> <td>4.8</td> <td>5.1</td> <td>0.20%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 targets for Indicator 5C and did not meet its targets for Indicator 5A and 5B.</p>		FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress	A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	50.3	53.5	57	3.20%	B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	18.5	16.8	15.4	1.70%	C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	5	4.8	5.1	0.20%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress																		
A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	50.3	53.5	57	3.20%																		
B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	18.5	16.8	15.4	1.70%																		
C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	5	4.8	5.1	0.20%																		

**Michigan Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																												
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>																												
<p>7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 651 1419 1401"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 651 1062 821">07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1062 651 1182 821">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1182 651 1302 821">Knowledge &amp; Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1302 651 1419 821">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 821 1062 889">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 821 1182 889">2.6</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 821 1302 889">2</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 821 1419 889">2.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 889 1062 1027">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 889 1182 1027">8.9</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 889 1302 1027">11.7</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 889 1419 1027">8.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1027 1062 1128">c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1027 1182 1128">28.7</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 1027 1302 1128">30.7</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 1027 1419 1128">18.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1128 1062 1229">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1128 1182 1229">41.2</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 1128 1302 1229">40.2</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 1128 1419 1229">44.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1229 1062 1331">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1229 1182 1331">18.6</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 1229 1302 1331">15.4</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 1229 1419 1331">26.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1331 1062 1401">Total (approx. 100%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1331 1182 1401">100.00 %</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 1331 1302 1401">100.00 %</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 1331 1419 1401">100.00 %</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	2.6	2	2.6	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	8.9	11.7	8.5	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	28.7	30.7	18.3	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	41.2	40.2	44.3	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	18.6	15.4	26.3	Total (approx. 100%)	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	<p>The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide baseline data, targets, and improvement activities with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																											
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	2.6	2	2.6																											
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	8.9	11.7	8.5																											
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	28.7	30.7	18.3																											
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	41.2	40.2	44.3																											
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	18.6	15.4	26.3																											
Total (approx. 100%)	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %																											
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in</p>																												

**Michigan Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 22%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 23.6%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 23%.</p>	<p>performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are .3%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of .3%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2007 to have disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, data demonstrating that the LEAs identified in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311.</p> <p>The State reported that the one LEA identified in FFY 2005 and the two LEAs identified in FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.173, 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311 was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that demonstrate that the State has in effect the policies and procedures required by 34 CFR §300.173 and that the LEAs identified in FFY 2007 as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the noncompliance was corrected, by reporting that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no</p>

**Michigan Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State provided FFY 2005 baseline data but requested permission to use the FFY 2006 data as baseline data because the analysis of two consecutive years of data would provide a more accurate portrait of each district. OSEP accepts this revision.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 1.7%. These data represent progress from the revised FFY 2006 data of 3.2%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009 baseline data from FFY 2005 and data from FFY 2006 on the percent of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification. The State reported the baseline data from FFY 2005 and the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 to have disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include data demonstrating that the LEAs identified in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311.</p> <p>The State reported that 13 of 13 LEAs identified in FFY 2005 as having</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.173, 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311 was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.173, 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311 was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that demonstrate that the State has in effect the policies and procedures required by 34 CFR §300.173 and that the LEAs identified in FFY 2007 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in</p>

**Michigan Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
	<p>disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311.</p> <p>The State reported that 17 of 25 LEAs identified in FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that the remaining eight LEAs are still within the one-year timeline for correction.</p>	<p>compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010 that the noncompliance was corrected by reporting that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 and each of the eight LEAs with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2006: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State-established timeline). [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 87.1%. These data represent slippage from the revised FFY 2006 data of 96.2%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 15 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2008 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009 data demonstrating correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005. The State reported that the one remaining uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely initial evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was corrected.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the timely initial evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that the State is in compliance with the</p>

**Michigan Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
	<p>2005 subsequently was corrected by May 15, 2008.</p>	<p>requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has completed the initial evaluation although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 93.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 91.5%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all five findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that it has</p>

**Michigan Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 87.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 39.5%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that two of three findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining finding subsequently was corrected by June 17, 2008.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2008 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, data demonstrating correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005. The State reported that all three of its uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator subsequently were corrected by June 15, 2008.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected.</p> <p>Although the State is not required to report data for this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must report on the timely correction of the noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR. The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed an IEP that includes the required transition content for each youth although late, unless the youth is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA,</p>

**Michigan Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 73.9%. These data represent slippage from the revised FFY 2006 data of 77.8%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 70%.</p>	<p>consistent with OSEP's 09-02 Memo.</p> <p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 94.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 90.2%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 202 of 213 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining findings were subsequently corrected by July 7, 2008.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009 data demonstrating correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005. The State reported that all nine of its findings of uncorrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 subsequently were corrected by January 20, 2009.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in the FFY 2007 APR in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e).</p> <p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance, the State must report that it has: (1) corrected all instances of noncompliance (including noncompliance identified through the State's monitoring system, through the State's data system and by the Department); and (2) verified that each LEA program with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 4A, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those</p>

**Michigan Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		<p>indicators.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 99.2%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 75%. These data are based on four due process hearings. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 83.3%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the due process hearing timelines requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 64.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 45.3%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 37%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 80.4%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 80.4%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 76%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100% for timeliness</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in</p>

**Michigan Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>and 100% for accuracy. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100% for timeliness and 100% for accuracy.</p>	<p>achieving compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA section 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>