

Nebraska Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table), baseline, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets. The revised targets are more rigorous than the previously-established targets.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 78.82%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 71.63%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 83.97%.</p> <p>The State provided a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet to graduate with a regular diploma. The State reported that the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular diploma may vary according to graduation requirements of their district, or by completing the program as described on the student's IEP.</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 2008 data for this indicator.</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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table), baseline, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets. The revised targets are more rigorous than the previously-established targets.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 1.87%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 3.83%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 2.24%.</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. The State reported dropout data used in the CSPR calculation. The State has</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Nebraska Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																					
	<p>not established ESEA targets for dropouts.</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 2008 data for this indicator.</p>																						
<p>3. Participation and performance of 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>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 53.03%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 53.25%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</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’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 97.82% for reading and 97.17% for math. The data source for this indicator has changed. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage from the State’s reported FFY 2007 data. The State met its FFY 2008 targets of 95%.</p> <p>The State provided a web link to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results: http://reportcard.nde.state.ne.us/Main/Home.aspx.</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>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language 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 1252 1419 1455"> <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>Elementary</td> <td>76.31%</td> <td>79.5 %</td> <td>81%</td> <td>80.28%</td> <td>82.37%</td> <td>83%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Grade	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target		Reading			Math			Elementary	76.31%	79.5 %	81%	80.28%	82.37%	83%	<p>OSEP 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																			
Elementary	76.31%	79.5 %	81%	80.28%	82.37%	83%																	

Nebraska Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues							OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	Middle	72.76%	70.63%	81%	70.63%	74.01%	79%	
	High	70.85%	77.81%	83%	60.18%	64.14%	81%	
<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 data source for this indicator has changed. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage from the State’s reported FFY 2007 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 targets.</p> <p>The State provided a web link to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results: http://reportcard.nde.state.ne.us/Main/Home.aspx.</p> <p>The State changed its definition of significant discrepancy and revised its target to match its new definition. The new definition is “any district that is suspending or expelling students for greater than ten days at a rate higher than 3.0 times the state rate,” which was 0.03192 for FFY 2008.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of less than 3.0 times the State rate.</p>							<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</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 IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</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>

Nebraska Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
[Compliance Indicator; New for FFY 2009]																						
<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) 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="550 503 1467 971"> <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>68.9</td> <td>71.8</td> <td>58.7</td> <td>2.90%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td>6.95</td> <td>6.72</td> <td>12</td> <td>0.23%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td>2.52</td> <td>2.83</td> <td>2.8</td> <td>-0.31%</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 targets for 5A and 5B, but did not meet its FFY 2008 target for 5C.</p>		FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	Progress	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	68.9	71.8	58.7	2.90%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	6.95	6.72	12	0.23%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	2.52	2.83	2.8	-0.31%	<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	68.9	71.8	58.7	2.90%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	6.95	6.72	12	0.23%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	2.52	2.83	2.8	-0.31%																		
<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>B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential</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>																				

Nebraska Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps												
facility. [Results Indicator; New]														
7. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 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 revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State provided FFY 2008 baseline data, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts the State's submission for this indicator. The State provided improvement activities for this indicator covering the remaining years of the SPP. The State's FFY 2008 reported baseline data for this indicator are: <table border="1" data-bbox="550 716 1444 1242"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="550 716 919 833">08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data</th> <th data-bbox="919 716 1192 833"><u>Summary Statement 1</u>¹</th> <th data-bbox="1192 716 1444 833"><u>Summary Statement 2</u>²</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="550 833 919 971">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="919 833 1192 971">45.6</td> <td data-bbox="1192 833 1444 971">81.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="550 971 919 1138">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="919 971 1192 1138">60.8</td> <td data-bbox="1192 971 1444 1138">84</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="550 1138 919 1242">Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td data-bbox="919 1138 1192 1242">53.5</td> <td data-bbox="1192 1138 1444 1242">84.6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> ¹	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> ²	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	45.6	81.9	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	60.8	84	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	53.5	84.6	The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2009 with the FFY 2009 APR.
08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> ¹	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> ²												
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	45.6	81.9												
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	60.8	84												
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	53.5	84.6												
8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services	The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 78.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 77.6%. The State met its FFY	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to												

¹ 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.

² 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.

Nebraska Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>2008 target of 69.8%.</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's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services.</p> <p>The State reported in its FFY 2008 APR its definition of disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</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's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</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 evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.</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. The State also revised its State-established timeline to determine initial eligibility from 60 calendar days to 45 school days, effective August 30, 2008.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 98.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 91%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 22 of 50 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining 28 findings</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 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</p>

Nebraska Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	subsequently were corrected by February 1, 2010.	<p>indicator.</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 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is 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) has 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 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>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>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 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 early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b).</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth with IEPs</p>	<p>The State is not required to provide actual target data for FFY 2008 for this</p>	<p>In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must</p>

Nebraska Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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>indicator.</p> <p>The State reported that all 70 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>provide a revised baseline using data from 2009-2010. Targets must remain 100%.</p>
<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</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, due February 1, 2011, the State must report a new baseline, targets, and, as needed, improvement activities.</p>

Nebraska Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</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 97.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 92.5%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 2,882 of 2,942 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining 60 findings subsequently were corrected two months after the one-year timeline.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2006 and 2007 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2008 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 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 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 responding to Indicator 11 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under that indicator.</p> <p>In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in</p>

Nebraska Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.
<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 for this indicator (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 100%. These data are based on three complaints. The State met its FFY 2008 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 adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing 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>The State revised the indicator language for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on one due process hearing. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the due 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 reported that no resolution sessions were held during the FFY 2008 reporting period.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2008. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>

Nebraska Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. The State reported that six of six mediations held resulted in mediation agreements. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 70%.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2008. The State is not required to meet its targets or provide improvement activities until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.</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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 97.61%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 86.4%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2006 and 2007 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2008 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 and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it 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). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</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>