

**Nebraska 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>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 71.63%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 66.92%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 74.9%.</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>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 3.83%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 3.89%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 2.36%.</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>The State revised the targets and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 53.03%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 72.13%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 53%.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, to either report on its revised targets that reflect its revised data calculation for this indicator or to report data based on the targets it established in its SPP. The State reported on the revised targets that reflect its revised data calculation for this indicator.</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 against alternate achievement</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 97.56% for reading and 96.59% for math. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 98.14% for reading and 97.22% for math.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 targets of 95%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																			
<p>standards.</p> <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>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="550 431 1419 717"> <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>Elementary</td> <td>71.14%</td> <td>76.31%</td> <td>81%</td> <td>75.45%</td> <td>80.25%</td> <td>83%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Middle</td> <td>68.86%</td> <td>72.76%</td> <td>81%</td> <td>64.85%</td> <td>70.63%</td> <td>79%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>High</td> <td>65.76%</td> <td>70.85%</td> <td>83%</td> <td>55.99%</td> <td>60.18%</td> <td>81%</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.</p>	Grade	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target		Reading			Math			Elementary	71.14%	76.31%	81%	75.45%	80.25%	83%	Middle	68.86%	72.76%	81%	64.85%	70.63%	79%	High	65.76%	70.85%	83%	55.99%	60.18%	81%	<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																																	
Elementary	71.14%	76.31%	81%	75.45%	80.25%	83%																															
Middle	68.86%	72.76%	81%	64.85%	70.63%	79%																															
High	65.76%	70.85%	83%	55.99%	60.18%	81%																															
<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>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 0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 0.4%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 4.75%.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, to either report on its revised targets that reflect its revised data calculation for this indicator or report data based on the targets it established in its SPP. The State reported data based on the revised targets established in its FFY 2005 SPP/APR.</p> <p>The State described how the State 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.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>As noted in the revised Part B 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).</p> <p>In addition, the State must again describe the review, and if appropriate, 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 LEAs identified with significant</p>																																			

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
	The State reported, as a result of its review of the one district in FFY 2006, no noncompliance was identified.	discrepancies in FFY 2007, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).																				
<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>	States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.	The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.																				
<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>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="550 816 1467 1295"> <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>69.91</td> <td>68.9</td> <td>58.7</td> <td>-1.01%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>7.24</td> <td>6.95</td> <td>12</td> <td>0.29%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>3.78</td> <td>2.52</td> <td>2.8</td> <td>1.26%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent slippage for 5A and progress for 5B and 5C from the FFY 2006 data.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 targets.</p>		FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	69.91	68.9	58.7	-1.01%	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	7.24	6.95	12	0.29%	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	3.78	2.52	2.8	1.26%	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.
	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress																		
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	69.91	68.9	58.7	-1.01%																		
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	7.24	6.95	12	0.29%																		
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	3.78	2.52	2.8	1.26%																		

**Nebraska 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>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>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 743 1480 1461"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 743 1050 917">07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1050 743 1192 917">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1192 743 1335 917">Knowledge &amp; Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1335 743 1480 917">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 917 1050 987">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1050 917 1192 987">2.1</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1192 917 1335 987">1.9</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1335 917 1480 987">1.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 987 1050 1122">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1050 987 1192 1122">5.2</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1192 987 1335 1122">5.1</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1335 987 1480 1122">4.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1122 1050 1224">c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1050 1122 1192 1224">3.7</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1192 1122 1335 1224">3.0</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1335 1122 1480 1224">2.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1224 1050 1326">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1050 1224 1192 1326">8.7</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1192 1224 1335 1326">9.8</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1335 1224 1480 1326">9.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1326 1050 1429">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1050 1326 1192 1429">80.3</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1192 1326 1335 1429">80.2</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1335 1326 1480 1429">81.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1429 1050 1461">Total (approx. 100%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1050 1429 1192 1461">100.00%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1192 1429 1335 1461">100.00%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1335 1429 1480 1461">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.	2.1	1.9	1.8	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	5.2	5.1	4.4	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	3.7	3.0	2.6	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	8.7	9.8	9.3	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	80.3	80.2	81.9	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.	2.1	1.9	1.8																											
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	5.2	5.1	4.4																											
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	3.7	3.0	2.6																											
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	8.7	9.8	9.3																											
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	80.3	80.2	81.9																											
Total (approx. 100%)	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%																											

**Nebraska 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>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.</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 77.6%.                      These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 79%.                      The State met its FFY 2007 target of 69.2%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</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>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 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 0%.                      The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%.                      OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to report, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, the results of the review it was conducting of the two districts identified in FFY 2006 as having disproportionate overrepresentation. The State was also required to report the percentage of districts in FFY 2007 that are identified as having disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification, including the results of any review it conducts to determine whether the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification.                      The State reported that it did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2006 for the two districts previously identified with disproportionate overrepresentation. The State reported that it conducted on-site visits and reviewed policies and procedures to make that determination.                      The State reported that no districts in FFY 2007 were identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services based on the State's calculation of the data.                      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</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>

**Nebraska 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>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>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>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 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to report, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, the results of the review it was conducting of the two districts identified in FFY 2006 as having disproportionate overrepresentation. The State was also required to report the percentage of districts in FFY 2007 that are identified as having disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification, including the results of any review it conducts to determine whether the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State reported that it did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2006 for the two districts previously identified with disproportionate overrepresentation. The State reported that it conducted on-site visits and reviewed policies and procedures to make that determination. The State reported that three districts were identified in FFY 2007 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories based on the State's calculation of the data.</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>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 and FFY 2005 with</p>

**Nebraska 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>were evaluated within 60 days (or State-established timeline).</p>	<p>accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 91%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 93.1%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 22 of 50 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner and that 28 findings subsequently were corrected prior to the submission of the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>OSEP’s June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to report, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, that the remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 has been corrected. The State reported that the remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 was subsequently 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>the timely initial evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was 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.</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 requirement(s); and (2) has completed the initial evaluation although late, 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 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.</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 remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in achieving compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b).</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance</p>

**Nebraska 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>above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.</p>	<p>accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 82.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 81.3%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 79 of 85 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner and that six findings subsequently were corrected prior to the submission of the FFY 2007 APR.</p>	<p>identified in 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.</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 requirement(s); and (2) has developed an IEP that includes the required transition content for each individual case of noncompliance, unless the youth is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</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>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 93.3%. The State's FFY 2006 reported data were 94.1%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 94.1%.</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>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 92.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 92.2%.</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 timely corrected noncompliance identified by the</p>

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>The State reported that 2,413 of 2,608 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining 195 findings subsequently were corrected three months after the one year timeline.</p> <p>In addition, the State reported that all 198 uncorrected findings identified in FFY 2005 were 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>State in FFY 2007, 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 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 11 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.</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 are based on two complaints. 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 complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>

**Nebraska 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>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>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 are based on one due process hearing.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving 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>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State reported that no resolution sessions were held during the FFY 2007 reporting period.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2007. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</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 62.5%. The State's reported data for FFY 2006 were 83%.</p> <p>The State reported that five of eight mediations held resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2007. The State is not required to meet its targets or provide improvement activities until any FFY in which ten or more mediations were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</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 86.4%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 92.8%.</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 timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p>

**Nebraska 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>
		In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.