

**Michigan Part B FFY 2008 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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 58%. Because the State's actual target data for this indicator are from the same year as the data reported in the State's FFY 2007 APR and the State changed the way the data were reported for this indicator, OSEP cannot comment on whether there is progress or slippage. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 80%.</p> <p>The State reported the required graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This means that the State submitted the most recent graduation data that the State reported to the Department as part of its Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). In its APR submitted February 1, 2010, the State reported FFY 2007 data for this indicator.</p> <p>The State provided a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet to graduate with a regular diploma.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 7.6%. Because the State's actual target data for this indicator are from the same year as the data reported in the State's FFY 2007 APR and the State changed the way the data were reported for this indicator, OSEP cannot comment on whether there is progress or slippage. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 10%.</p> <p>The State reported the required dropout rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the ESEA. This means that the State submitted the most recent dropout data that the State reported to the Department as part of its CSPR. In its APR submitted February 1, 2010, the State reported FFY 2007 data for this indicator.</p> <p>The State provided a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to</p>

**Michigan Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																																															
<p>children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP targets for the disability subgroup.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 99.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 98.5%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 94%.</p>	<p>improve performance.</p>																																																															
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 732 1419 1182"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Target</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="3">Reading</td> <td colspan="3">Math</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>99.1%</td> <td>98.5%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>99.4%</td> <td>99%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>98.8%</td> <td>98.5%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>99.1%</td> <td>98.9%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>99.2%</td> <td>98.9%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>99.8%</td> <td>99.4%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>99.7%</td> <td>98.5%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>98.7%</td> <td>99.1%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>98.3%</td> <td>98.3%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>98.7%</td> <td>99%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>98.3%</td> <td>97.6%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>98.8%</td> <td>98.4%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS</td> <td>90.5%</td> <td>92.7%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>91.8%</td> <td>92.5%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The data source for this indicator has changed. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage from FFY 2007 data. The State met part of its FFY 2008 targets.</p> <p>The State provided a web link to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results.</p> <p><a href="http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-22709_25058---,00.html">http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-22709_25058---,00.html</a></p>	Grade	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target		Reading			Math			3	99.1%	98.5%	95%	99.4%	99%	95%	4	98.8%	98.5%	95%	99.1%	98.9%	95%	5	99.2%	98.9%	95%	99.8%	99.4%	95%	6	99.7%	98.5%	95%	98.7%	99.1%	95%	7	98.3%	98.3%	95%	98.7%	99%	95%	8	98.3%	97.6%	95%	98.8%	98.4%	95%	HS	90.5%	92.7%	95%	91.8%	92.5%	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 2009 APR.</p>
Grade	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target																																																											
	Reading			Math																																																													
3	99.1%	98.5%	95%	99.4%	99%	95%																																																											
4	98.8%	98.5%	95%	99.1%	98.9%	95%																																																											
5	99.2%	98.9%	95%	99.8%	99.4%	95%																																																											
6	99.7%	98.5%	95%	98.7%	99.1%	95%																																																											
7	98.3%	98.3%	95%	98.7%	99%	95%																																																											
8	98.3%	97.6%	95%	98.8%	98.4%	95%																																																											
HS	90.5%	92.7%	95%	91.8%	92.5%	95%																																																											
<p>3. Participation and performance of</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to</p>																																																															

**Michigan Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																																															
<p>children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 367 1419 816"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Target</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Target</th> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="2">Reading</td> <td></td> <td colspan="2">Math</td> <td></td> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>57.9%</td> <td>60%</td> <td>60%</td> <td>77.1%</td> <td>79.3%</td> <td>67%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>50.5%</td> <td>50.6%</td> <td>59%</td> <td>67.7%</td> <td>70.6%</td> <td>65%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>48.9%</td> <td>48.8%</td> <td>57%</td> <td>49.5%</td> <td>51.5%</td> <td>62%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>49%</td> <td>49%</td> <td>56%</td> <td>42.9%</td> <td>51.5%</td> <td>60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>42.1%</td> <td>48.8%</td> <td>54%</td> <td>39.1%</td> <td>50.6%</td> <td>57%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>43.6%</td> <td>43.6%</td> <td>53%</td> <td>40.4%</td> <td>46.6%</td> <td>54%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS</td> <td>24.5%</td> <td>28%</td> <td>61%</td> <td>20.3%</td> <td>22.1%</td> <td>55%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The data source for this indicator has changed. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage from FFY 2007 data. The State met part of its FFY 2008 targets.</p> <p>The State provided a web link to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results.  <a href="http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-22709_25058---.00.html">http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-22709_25058---.00.html</a></p>	Grade	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target		Reading			Math			3	57.9%	60%	60%	77.1%	79.3%	67%	4	50.5%	50.6%	59%	67.7%	70.6%	65%	5	48.9%	48.8%	57%	49.5%	51.5%	62%	6	49%	49%	56%	42.9%	51.5%	60%	7	42.1%	48.8%	54%	39.1%	50.6%	57%	8	43.6%	43.6%	53%	40.4%	46.6%	54%	HS	24.5%	28%	61%	20.3%	22.1%	55%	<p>improve performance and looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
Grade	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target																																																											
	Reading			Math																																																													
3	57.9%	60%	60%	77.1%	79.3%	67%																																																											
4	50.5%	50.6%	59%	67.7%	70.6%	65%																																																											
5	48.9%	48.8%	57%	49.5%	51.5%	62%																																																											
6	49%	49%	56%	42.9%	51.5%	60%																																																											
7	42.1%	48.8%	54%	39.1%	50.6%	57%																																																											
8	43.6%	43.6%	53%	40.4%	46.6%	54%																																																											
HS	24.5%	28%	61%	20.3%	22.1%	55%																																																											
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; 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 1.4%. Because the State’s actual target data for this indicator are from the same year as the data reported for this indicator in the State’s FFY 2007 APR, OSEP cannot comment on whether there is progress or slippage. The State met its FFY 2007 target of ≤9%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed 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</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 and FFY 2007 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) was partially corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 and FFY 2007 is correctly</p>																																																															

**Michigan Part B FFY 2008 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>ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2007.</p> <p>The State reported that it 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, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2007.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) of LEAs identified as having a significant discrepancy based on FFY 2005 data was corrected.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 and FFY 2008 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), of LEAs identified as having a significant discrepancy based on FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 data was partially corrected.</p> <p>The State reported that it identified four findings of noncompliance in FFY 2008 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), of LEAs identified as having a significant discrepancy based on FFY 2007 data. The State reported that the one-year timeline for correction has not ended.</p>	<p>implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s).</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR.</p>	<p>Indicator 4B is new for FFY 2009. Baseline data from 2008-2009, targets (0%), and improvement activities must be submitted with the FFY 2009 APR.</p>

**Michigan Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator; New for FFY 2009]</p>																						
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:</p> <p>A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;</p> <p>B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or</p> <p>C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and 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="548 613 1467 1084"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Target</th> <th>Progress</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td>53.5</td> <td>57.6</td> <td>59</td> <td>4.10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td>16.8</td> <td>15</td> <td>13.9</td> <td>1.80%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td>4.8</td> <td>4.9</td> <td>5.0</td> <td>-0.10%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 5A and 5B and slippage for 5C from the FFY 2007 data. The State met its FFY 2008 target for 5C, but did not meet its FFY 2008 targets for 5A and 5B.</p>		FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	Progress	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	53.5	57.6	59	4.10%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	16.8	15	13.9	1.80%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	4.8	4.9	5.0	-0.10%	<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 2009 APR.</p>
	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	Progress																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	53.5	57.6	59	4.10%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	16.8	15	13.9	1.80%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	4.8	4.9	5.0	-0.10%																		
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:</p> <p>A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR.</p>	<p>The instruction package for the FFY 2009 APR/SPP will provide guidance regarding the information that States must report for this indicator in their FFY 2009 APRs.</p>																				

**Michigan Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps												
<p>B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>														
<p>7. Percent of preschool children age 3 through 5 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 revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State provided FFY 2008 baseline data, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 699 1444 1256"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 699 919 813">08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data</th> <th data-bbox="919 699 1192 813"><u>Summary Statement 1</u><sup>1</sup></th> <th data-bbox="1192 699 1444 813"><u>Summary Statement 2</u><sup>2</sup></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 813 919 951"><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="919 813 1192 951">86.8</td> <td data-bbox="1192 813 1444 951">60.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 951 919 1122"><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="919 951 1192 1122">86.5</td> <td data-bbox="1192 951 1444 1122">58</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1122 919 1256"><b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td data-bbox="919 1122 1192 1256">88.2</td> <td data-bbox="1192 1122 1444 1256">72.3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> <sup>2</sup>	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	86.8	60.7	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	86.5	58	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	88.2	72.3	<p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2009 with the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> <sup>2</sup>												
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	86.8	60.7												
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	86.5	58												
<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	88.2	72.3												
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline and improvement activities for this indicator</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to</p>												

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

<sup>2</sup> Summary Statement 2: The percentage of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.

**Michigan Part B FFY 2008 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>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>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported preschool (3-5) data for this indicator are 36.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 34%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 34.5%.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported school-age (6-21) data for this indicator are 25.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 20.5%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 21%.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2008 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p>	<p>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>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 0.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 0.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that ten districts were newly identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that one district was identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services.</p> <p>The State reported that both findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2009 APR demonstrating compliance. Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the district identified in FFY 2008 with 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 §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance,</p>

**Michigan Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report the total number of districts identified in FFY 2009 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services, including those districts that had been previously identified during FFY 2008.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State's definition of disproportionate representation and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</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.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 1.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 1.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 76 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that 11 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2009 APR demonstrating compliance.</p> <p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. The State</p>

**Michigan Part B FFY 2008 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>was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories.</p> <p>The State reported that all findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 for this indicator were corrected.</p> <p>The State reported that all 17 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the districts identified in FFY 2008 with disproportionate representation of racial and 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, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State's definition of disproportionate representation and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial</p>	<p>The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 95.3%. These data</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR, the State's data demonstrating</p>

**Michigan Part B FFY 2008 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>evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 87.1%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that ten of 11 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining finding subsequently was corrected by October 28, 2009.</p> <p>The State reported that 338 of 388 findings of noncompliance identified in April 2009 based on FFY 2007 data were corrected in a timely manner. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p>	<p>that it is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR that the remaining 50 uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2008 based on FFY 2007 data were corrected.</p> <p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2008 data the State reported for this indicator and the LEAs with the remaining 50 uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2008 based on FFY 2007 data: (1) are correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) have completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the</p>

**Michigan Part B FFY 2008 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>FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify correction.</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>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 97.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 93.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 102 of 105 findings of noncompliance identified in April 2009 based on FFY 2007 data were corrected in a timely manner. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR that the remaining three uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2008 based on FFY 2007 data were corrected.</p> <p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2008 data the State reported for this indicator and the LEAs with the remaining three uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2008 based on FFY 2007 data: (1) are correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated</p>

**Michigan Part B FFY 2008 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>data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) have developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State is not required to provide actual target data for FFY 2008 for this indicator.</p> <p>The State reported that all 16 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must provide a revised baseline using data from 2009-2010. Targets must remain 100%.</p>

**Michigan Part B FFY 2008 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>14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:</p> <p>A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State is not required to provide actual target data, targets or improvement activities for FFY 2008 for this indicator.</p>	<p>In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report a new baseline, targets, and, as needed, improvement activities.</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 2008 reported data for this indicator are 98.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 94.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 322 of 326 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner, three findings subsequently were corrected by October 28, 2009 and one finding subsequently was corrected by July 1, 2009.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR, the State's data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance, identified in FFY 2008, 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 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2008: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site</p>

**Michigan Part B FFY 2008 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>monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 worksheet.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 4A, 9, 10, 11, and 12 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</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, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 96.7%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>
<p>17. Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 83.3%. These data</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2009 APR, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the due</p>

**Michigan Part B FFY 2008 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>officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>are based on six due process hearings. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p>	<p>process hearing timeline 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 revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 46.6%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 64.3%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 38%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 78.8%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 80.4%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 77%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2008 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).</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>