

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 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 provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 57.3%. The State's FFY 2008 data for this indicator were 58%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 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).</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 7.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 7.6%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 9.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: 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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 99.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 99.4%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 97%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data are:</p>	<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 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues							OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<u>Grade</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	
		<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>			
	3	98.5%	98.4%	95%	99.0%	98.3%	95%	
	4	98.5%	98.5%	95%	98.9%	98.5%	95%	
	5	98.9%	98.4%	95%	99.4%	98.4%	95%	
	6	98.5%	98.2%	95%	99.1%	98.1%	95%	
	7	98.3%	98.5%	95%	99.0%	98.2%	95%	
	8	97.6%	97.5%	95%	98.4%	97.0%	95%	
	HS	92.7%	93.0%	95%	92.5%	92.0%	95%	
	<p>These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2008 data. The State met part of its FFY 2009 targets.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results.</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 provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data are:</p>							<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 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
	<u>Grade</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues							OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>			
	3	60.0%	69.4%	70.0%	79.3%	84.9%	67.0%	
	4	50.6%	60.0%	69.0%	70.6%	80.0%	65.0%	
	5	48.8%	60.2%	68.0%	51.5%	56.5%	62.0%	
	6	49.0%	62.8%	67.0%	51.5%	56.2%	60.0%	
	7	48.8%	54.3%	66.0%	50.6%	54.1%	57.0%	
	8	43.6%	55.4%	65.0%	46.4%	39.5%	54.0%	
	HS	28.0%	35.7%	71.0%	22.1%	23.6%	55.0%	
	<p>These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2008 data. The State met part of its FFY 2009 targets.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>							
<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 provided a revised FFY 2009 baseline, using FFY 2008 data, targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, revised the targets for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 revised baseline data for this indicator are 5.1%. The State changed its method for determining what constitutes a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs. Therefore, OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage. The State met its FFY 2009 revised target of <5.5%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that 22 of 821 districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement of more than five students with IEPs suspended/expelled for more than ten days, and were excluded from the calculation.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the districts’ policies, procedures, and practices</p>							<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2008 data as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each LEA with</p>

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>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 39 of the 42 districts identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2008 data. The State identified noncompliance through this review.</p> <p>The State reported that it revised (or required the affected districts to revise), the districts' 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 districts identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2008 data.</p> <p>For districts identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2008 data whose policies, procedures and practices were reviewed, consistent with 34 CFR §300.170(b) in the prior year, the State reported on whether there were changes to the policies, procedures and practices since the last review; if so, whether those changes comply with requirements regarding 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); and whether practices in this area continue to comply with applicable requirements.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 based on FFY 2007 data through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was partially corrected.</p>	<p>noncompliance identified by the State: (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 Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 based on FFY 2007 data 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 2010 APR, that it has verified that each district with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 based on FFY 2007 data is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s). If the State is</p>

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary, to ensure compliance.
<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>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline, using FFY 2008 data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are 6.5%.</p> <p>The State reported that 67 districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs. The State also reported that 53 districts were identified as having 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 reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that 22 of 821 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of having more than five students suspended/expelled for greater than ten days, and were excluded from the calculation.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the districts’ 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 districts identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2008 data. The State identified noncompliance through this review.</p> <p>The State reported that it revised (or required the affected districts to revise), the districts’ 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 districts identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY</p>	<p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009 (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 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the districts identified with noncompliance based on FFY 2008 data have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (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 2010 APR, the State must describe the</p>

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
	2008 data.	<p>specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2010 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 methodology for identifying “significant discrepancy” and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="552 1027 1583 1500"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td align="center">57.6</td> <td align="center">61.1</td> <td align="center">> 61.0</td> <td align="center">3.50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">15.0</td> <td align="center">14.0</td> <td align="center">< 12.4</td> <td align="center">-1.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td align="center">4.9</td> <td align="center">4.9</td> <td align="center">< 4.9</td> <td align="center">0.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	57.6	61.1	> 61.0	3.50%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	15.0	14.0	< 12.4	-1.00%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	4.9	4.9	< 4.9	0.00%	<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 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	57.6	61.1	> 61.0	3.50%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	15.0	14.0	< 12.4	-1.00%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	4.9	4.9	< 4.9	0.00%																		

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps												
	<p>These data represent progress for 5A and 5B and remain unchanged for 5C from the FFY 2008 data.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2009 target for 5A but did not meet its FFY 2009 targets for 5B and 5C.</p>													
<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 facility.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1122 1583 1505"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 1122 957 1224"><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th data-bbox="957 1122 1163 1224"><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 1122 1373 1224"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1373 1122 1583 1224"><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1224 957 1409">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 1224 1163 1409">86.8</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1224 1373 1409">85.5</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1224 1583 1409">86.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1409 957 1505">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 1409 1163 1505">86.5</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1409 1373 1505">86.8</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1409 1583 1505">86.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	86.8	85.5	86.0	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of	86.5	86.8	86.0	<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 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> <p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR.</p>
<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>											
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	86.8	85.5	86.0											
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of	86.5	86.8	86.0											

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)				
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	88.2	87.7	88.0	
	<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	
	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	60.7	59.8	60.0	
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	58.0	58.2	58.0	
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	72.3	71.6	72.0	
	The State's FFY 2009 data for this indicator represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2008 data. The State met part of its FFY 2009 targets for this indicator.				
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	The State provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State's FFY 2009 reported preschool (3-5) data for this indicator are 47.8%. These				OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>children with disabilities. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 36%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 35%.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported school-age (6-21) data for this indicator are 26.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 25.1%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 21.5%.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2009 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 0.1%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 0.1%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 15 districts, including one district that had been monitored during the previous year and was implementing a corrective action plan, were 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.”</p> <p>The State reported that 144 of 755 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 30 children with disabilities enrolled, and were excluded from the calculation.</p> <p>The State reported that both of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP’s FFY 2008 SPP/APR response table, dated June 3, 2010, required the State to report in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011, 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 in FFY 2008. The State provided the required information.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012 demonstrating compliance.</p> <p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the district identified in FFY 2009 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is</p>

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (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 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 0.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 1.4%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 62 districts, including 6 districts that had been monitored in the previous year and were in their year of correction, were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that seven districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, demonstrating compliance.</p> <p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009 (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</p>

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of disproportionate representation.</p> <p>The State reported that 144 of 755 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 30 children with disabilities enrolled, and were excluded from the calculation.</p> <p>The State reported that 20 of 21 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining finding subsequently was corrected by May 12, 2010.</p>	<p>reported for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the districts identified in FFY 2009 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 in 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 requirement(s) (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 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure</p>

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		compliance.
<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 provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 99.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 95.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 467 of 533 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 based on FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 data were corrected in a timely manner and that 60 findings were subsequently corrected by November 17, 2010. 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 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, 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 2009, 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 2010 APR, that the remaining six uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2008 based on FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 data were corrected. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 based on</p>

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 data: (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 Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the 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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 98.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 97.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 104 of 109 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 based on FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 data were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining five findings subsequently were corrected by September 15, 2010.</p> <p>The State reported that three findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 based on FFY 2007 data for this indicator were corrected.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, 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 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise</p>

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>them, if necessary.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 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 §300.124(b) (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 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 2010 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</p>	<p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported baseline data for this indicator are 74.3%.</p>	<p>Although OSEP did not consider data for Indicator 13 in its determinations for FFY 2009, OSEP is concerned about the State’s very low FFY 2009 data (below 75%) for this indicator. In 2012, OSEP will consider the State’s FFY 2010 data for Indicator 13 in determinations.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in</p>

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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 FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the State is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) (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 2010</p>

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.
<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 provided FFY 2009 baseline data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s reported FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <p>A. 32.6% enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;</p> <p>B. 55.6% enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school; and</p> <p>C. 68.0% 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>The State must report actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</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 provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 93%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 98.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 1,127 of 1,212 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner and that 74 findings were subsequently corrected by January 18, 2011. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the remaining 11 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2009 APR were corrected.</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 2010</p>

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>APR, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2009 in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e), and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (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 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>In responding to Indicators 4A, 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 in the</p>

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		FFY 2010 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.
<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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 99.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 96.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, 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 2010 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 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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on five due process hearings. The State met its FFY 2009 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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 46.3%. The State's FFY 2008</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012</p>

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	data for this indicator were 46.6%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 40%.	
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 84.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 78.8%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 78.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100% for timeliness and 92.86% for accuracy. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 92.86%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</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 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, 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 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>