

**Minnesota's 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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 84.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 84.6%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 82.2%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 4.5%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 4.2%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 4.4%.</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: 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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 63%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 72.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 72.3%.</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: 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 against alternate achievement</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 98%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 96%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 96%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

**Minnesota's 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>																																																															
standards. [Results Indicator]																																																																	
<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 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:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 483 1419 938"> <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>63.3%</td> <td>65.0%</td> <td>76.2%</td> <td>75.7%</td> <td>79.5%</td> <td>82.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>63.7%</td> <td>62.8%</td> <td>73.8%</td> <td>67.9%</td> <td>69.2%</td> <td>74.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>61.6%</td> <td>63.4%</td> <td>75.9%</td> <td>55.3%</td> <td>57.1%</td> <td>65.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>53.8%</td> <td>55.3%</td> <td>74.5%</td> <td>50.3%</td> <td>54.5%</td> <td>65.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>49.4%</td> <td>51.3%</td> <td>70.5%</td> <td>43.3%</td> <td>48.2%</td> <td>64.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>48.2%</td> <td>51.8%</td> <td>69.2%</td> <td>38.3%</td> <td>38.9%</td> <td>64.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS</td> <td>43.0%</td> <td>58.4%</td> <td>69.8%</td> <td>17.6%</td> <td>18.7%</td> <td>38.4%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 targets for Reading and did not meet its targets for Math.</p>	Grade	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target		Reading			Math			3	63.3%	65.0%	76.2%	75.7%	79.5%	82.0%	4	63.7%	62.8%	73.8%	67.9%	69.2%	74.0%	5	61.6%	63.4%	75.9%	55.3%	57.1%	65.5%	6	53.8%	55.3%	74.5%	50.3%	54.5%	65.6%	7	49.4%	51.3%	70.5%	43.3%	48.2%	64.7%	8	48.2%	51.8%	69.2%	38.3%	38.9%	64.3%	HS	43.0%	58.4%	69.8%	17.6%	18.7%	38.4%	<p>OSEP 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	63.3%	65.0%	76.2%	75.7%	79.5%	82.0%																																																											
4	63.7%	62.8%	73.8%	67.9%	69.2%	74.0%																																																											
5	61.6%	63.4%	75.9%	55.3%	57.1%	65.5%																																																											
6	53.8%	55.3%	74.5%	50.3%	54.5%	65.6%																																																											
7	49.4%	51.3%	70.5%	43.3%	48.2%	64.7%																																																											
8	48.2%	51.8%	69.2%	38.3%	38.9%	64.3%																																																											
HS	43.0%	58.4%	69.8%	17.6%	18.7%	38.4%																																																											
<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 than 10 days in a school year; and</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 1.0%. The FFY 2006 data were .9%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 1.6%.</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: (1) data demonstrating correction of the noncompliance identified in FFY 2005; (2) a description of the results of the State's examination of the FFY 2007 data; and (3) a</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</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 (2007-2008). In addition, the State must again describe the review, and if appropriate, the</p>																																																															

**Minnesota's 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>description of the review and if appropriate, revision of (or required the affected LEAs to revise), 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 the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2006.</p> <p>The State described the results of its examination of the FFY 2007 data and reported how it reviewed, and if appropriate, revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise), 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 the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2006 and 2007.</p> <p>The State reported that the one remaining finding of previously identified noncompliance for FFY 2005 was corrected. Although the State reported on the review and revision of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards for LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2006 and 2007, the State did not report that it had identified any noncompliance in these districts.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>revision of 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 the IDEA for the LEAs identified in FFY 2007 with significant discrepancies in FFY 2007, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p>
<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</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>

**Minnesota's 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>greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</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="550 553 1467 1032"> <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 align="center">60.3</td> <td align="center">60.8</td> <td align="center">61.5</td> <td align="center">0.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td align="center">10.0</td> <td align="center">10.1</td> <td align="center">9.3</td> <td align="center">-.10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td align="center">4.5</td> <td align="center">4.2</td> <td align="center">5.0</td> <td align="center">0.30</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 5A and 5C from the FFY 2006 data.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target for 5C and did not meet its targets for 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.	60.3	60.8	61.5	0.50	B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	10.0	10.1	9.3	-.10	C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	4.5	4.2	5.0	0.30	<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.	60.3	60.8	61.5	0.50																		
B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	10.0	10.1	9.3	-.10																		
C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	4.5	4.2	5.0	0.30																		
<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</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>																				

**Minnesota's 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>																												
special education settings). [Results Indicator]																														
7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]	The State's FFY 2007 reported progress data for this indicator are: <table border="1" data-bbox="548 402 1419 1157"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 402 1062 578">07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1062 402 1182 578">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1182 402 1302 578">Knowledge &amp; Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1302 402 1419 578">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 578 1062 646">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 578 1182 646">.9</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 578 1302 646">.7</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 578 1419 646">.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 646 1062 781">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 646 1182 781">13.7</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 646 1302 781">14.4</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 646 1419 781">11.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 781 1062 883">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 781 1182 883">33.6</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 781 1302 883">31.0</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 781 1419 883">19.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 883 1062 985">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 883 1182 985">28.9</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 883 1302 985">30.6</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 883 1419 985">30.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 985 1062 1088">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 985 1182 1088">22.9</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 985 1302 1088">23.3</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 985 1419 1088">37.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1088 1062 1157">Total (approx. 100%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1088 1182 1157">100.00 %</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 1088 1302 1157">100.00 %</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 1088 1419 1157">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.	.9	.7	.8	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	13.7	14.4	11.1	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	33.6	31.0	19.9	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	28.9	30.6	30.4	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	22.9	23.3	37.8	Total (approx. 100%)	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	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.
07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																											
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	.9	.7	.8																											
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	13.7	14.4	11.1																											
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	33.6	31.0	19.9																											
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	28.9	30.6	30.4																											
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	22.9	23.3	37.8																											
Total (approx. 100%)	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %																											
8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. [Results Indicator]	The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 71.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 66%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 68%. 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 indicating whether the response group was representative of the State's population. The State provided the required information.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.																												

**Minnesota's 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>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 .2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of .8%.</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 and 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 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 in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311. The State reported that four of four 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 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 policies and procedures as required by 34 CFR §300.173 and that the LEA identified in FFY 2007 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification is 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 uncorrected noncompliance was corrected, by reporting that it has verified that each LEA with remaining noncompliance from FFY 2007: (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 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</p>

**Minnesota's 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>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.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 1.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 1.9%.</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 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 in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, data demonstrating compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311. The State reported that nine of nine 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.</p>	<p>ensure compliance.</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 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 policies and procedures as 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 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 uncorrected noncompliance was corrected, by reporting that it has verified that each LEA with remaining noncompliance from FFY 2007: (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</p>

**Minnesota's 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>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's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 89.4%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 94.9%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 36 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 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009 data on the range of days of delay beyond the timeline and the reasons for the delays for children who were not evaluated within the State-established timeline. In addition, the State was required to submit data for the number of children determined not eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within the State-established timeline. The State was also required to report on correction of the noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006.</p> <p>The State provided data on the range of days of delay, the reasons for the delays, and data on the number of children determined not eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within the State-established timeline.</p> <p>The State reported that all of the remaining findings of previously identified noncompliance for FFY 2005 have been corrected.</p>	<p>ensure compliance.</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 and noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 was subsequently corrected.</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 §300.301(c)(1), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported 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 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</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 99.9%. The FFY 2006 data were 100%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</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 it is in compliance with the requirements in 34</p>

**Minnesota's 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>birthdays. [Compliance Indicator]</p>		<p>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 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. [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 80.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 71.4%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State also reported that all 60 of its 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 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, data demonstrating correction of the noncompliance identified in FFY 2005. The State reported that all remaining findings of previously identified noncompliance for FFY 2005 have been corrected.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected in a timely manner and that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 was subsequently 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</p>

**Minnesota's 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>years based on the State's FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>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, unless the youth 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>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 82.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 78.9%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 78.9%.</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, information indicating whether the response group was representative of the State's population. The State provided the required information.</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 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 99.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 65.1%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 1180 of 1184 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner. Two districts did not meet the timeline to submit correction within one year, but the remaining four findings that were in those two districts subsequently were corrected.</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. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e) and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of</p>

**Minnesota's 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>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 the remaining noncompliance for FFY 2005 regarding the transfer of rights at the age of majority related to 34 CFR §§300.320(c) and 300.520 and the timely correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600. The State reported that all remaining findings of previously identified noncompliance for FFY 2005 related to 34 CFR §§300.320(c) and 300.520 (transfer of rights) have been corrected.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>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 with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, 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>In addition, in responding to Indicators 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 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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 98.5%.</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</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the due process</p>

**Minnesota's 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>fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on one due process hearing. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 66.7%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 11.1%. These data represent progress from the recalculated FFY 2006 data of 5.26%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 62%.</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>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 89.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 81%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 75% to 85%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). In reporting on Indicator 14 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>