

**Michigan Part B FFY 2010 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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 57.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 57.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 80.0%.</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 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013.</p> <p>In reporting data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR, States must use the same data they used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.</p>														
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 6.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 7.2%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 9.0%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</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 2010 reported data for this indicator are 96.6%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 99.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 98.0%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 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 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1341 1583 1487"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Grade</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="3"><u>Reading</u></td> <td colspan="3"><u>Math</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Grade</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>		<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>			<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 2011 APR.</p>
<u>Grade</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>										
	<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>												

**Michigan Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues							OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																																															
	3	98.4%	98.6%	95%	98.3%	98.2%	95%																																																																
	4	98.5%	98.9%	95%	98.5%	98.8%	95%																																																																
	5	98.4%	98.9%	95%	98.4%	98.9%	95%																																																																
	6	98.2%	98.9%	95%	98.1%	98.8%	95%																																																																
	7	98.5%	98.7%	95%	98.2%	98.4%	95%																																																																
	8	97.5%	98.5%	95%	97.0%	98.1%	95%																																																																
	HS	93.0%	92.6%	95%	92.0%	91.9%	95%																																																																
	<p>These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State met part of its FFY 2010 targets.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 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's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 773 1583 1216"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Grade</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="3"><u>Reading</u></td> <td colspan="3"><u>Math</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>69.4%</td> <td>64.5%</td> <td>78.0%</td> <td>84.9%</td> <td>86.4%</td> <td>75.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>60.0%</td> <td>58.0%</td> <td>77.0%</td> <td>80.0%</td> <td>78.0%</td> <td>74.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>60.2%</td> <td>57.2%</td> <td>76.0%</td> <td>56.5%</td> <td>53.9%</td> <td>71.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>62.8%</td> <td>54.8%</td> <td>75.0%</td> <td>56.2%</td> <td>58.6%</td> <td>70.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>54.3%</td> <td>45.7%</td> <td>74.0%</td> <td>54.1%</td> <td>55.1%</td> <td>67.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>55.4%</td> <td>51.2%</td> <td>73.0%</td> <td>39.5%</td> <td>49.9%</td> <td>66.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS</td> <td>35.7%</td> <td>36.4%</td> <td>79.0%</td> <td>23.6%</td> <td>23.7%</td> <td>67.0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State met part of its FFY 2010 targets.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>							<u>Grade</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>		<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>			3	69.4%	64.5%	78.0%	84.9%	86.4%	75.0%	4	60.0%	58.0%	77.0%	80.0%	78.0%	74.0%	5	60.2%	57.2%	76.0%	56.5%	53.9%	71.0%	6	62.8%	54.8%	75.0%	56.2%	58.6%	70.0%	7	54.3%	45.7%	74.0%	54.1%	55.1%	67.0%	8	55.4%	51.2%	73.0%	39.5%	49.9%	66.0%	HS	35.7%	36.4%	79.0%	23.6%	23.7%	67.0%	<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 2011 APR.</p>
<u>Grade</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																																																																	
	<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>																																																																			
3	69.4%	64.5%	78.0%	84.9%	86.4%	75.0%																																																																	
4	60.0%	58.0%	77.0%	80.0%	78.0%	74.0%																																																																	
5	60.2%	57.2%	76.0%	56.5%	53.9%	71.0%																																																																	
6	62.8%	54.8%	75.0%	56.2%	58.6%	70.0%																																																																	
7	54.3%	45.7%	74.0%	54.1%	55.1%	67.0%																																																																	
8	55.4%	51.2%	73.0%	39.5%	49.9%	66.0%																																																																	
HS	35.7%	36.4%	79.0%	23.6%	23.7%	67.0%																																																																	
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 2.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 5.1%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of &lt;5.0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of "significant discrepancy."</p>							<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY</p>																																																															

**Michigan Part B FFY 2010 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>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 reported that 23 districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs.</p> <p>The State reported that 12 of 829 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of five or more students with IEPs suspended/expelled for greater than ten days.</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 in FFY 2010. 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 in FFY 2010.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2008 data through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was corrected.</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 corrected.</p>	<p>2011 APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2010 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 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 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</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</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 3.3%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State revised its calculation methodology. The State did not meet its target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that 131 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</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator and looks forward to data in the FFY 2011 APR demonstrating compliance.</p> <p>The State did not, until FFY</p>

**Michigan Part B FFY 2010 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>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>a school year for children with IEPs. 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 in FFY 2010. The State also reported that 27 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 that 117 of 829 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 30 students with IEPs.</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 in FFY 2010.</p> <p>The State reported that 75 of 76 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2008 data through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining finding subsequently was corrected by June 30, 2011.</p>	<p>2011, determine whether all of the districts with 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, based on FFY 2009 data, had 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, and therefore made findings of noncompliance in FFY 2010 and FFY 2011. Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 and FFY 2011 for this indicator for districts with a significant discrepancy based on FFY 2009 discipline data. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that these districts have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s)</p>

**Michigan Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
		<p>(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 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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;                      B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or                      C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="552 1068 1583 1490"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 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">61.1</td> <td align="center">61.6</td> <td align="center">≥ 63.0</td> <td align="center">0.60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">14.0</td> <td align="center">12.5</td> <td align="center">≤ 11.9</td> <td align="center">1.50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital</td> <td align="center">4.9</td> <td align="center">5.2</td> <td align="center">≤ 4.8</td> <td align="center">-0.30%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	61.1	61.6	≥ 63.0	0.60%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	14.0	12.5	≤ 11.9	1.50%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital	4.9	5.2	≤ 4.8	-0.30%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	61.1	61.6	≥ 63.0	0.60%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	14.0	12.5	≤ 11.9	1.50%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital	4.9	5.2	≤ 4.8	-0.30%																		

**Michigan Part B FFY 2010 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>																
	placements																				
<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 2010 APR.</p>				<p>The State must provide FFY 2011 baseline data, an FFY 2012 target, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 in the SPP that it submits with the FFY 2011 APR.</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's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 915 1583 1424"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 915 957 1019"><b><u>Summary Statement 1</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="957 915 1163 1019"><b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="1163 915 1373 1019"><b><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="1373 915 1583 1019"><b><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1019 957 1154"><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 1019 1163 1154">85.5</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1019 1373 1154">81.1</td> <td data-bbox="1373 1019 1583 1154">87.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1154 957 1321"><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 1154 1163 1321">86.8</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1154 1373 1321">82.2</td> <td data-bbox="1373 1154 1583 1321">87.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1321 957 1424"><b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 1321 1163 1424">87.7</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1321 1373 1424">80.6</td> <td data-bbox="1373 1321 1583 1424">89.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				<b><u>Summary Statement 1</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></b>	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	85.5	81.1	87.0	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	86.8	82.2	87.0	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	87.7	80.6	89.0	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p> <p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2011 with the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<b><u>Summary Statement 1</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></b>																		
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	85.5	81.1	87.0																		
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	86.8	82.2	87.0																		
<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	87.7	80.6	89.0																		

**Michigan Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<b><u>Summary Statement 2</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></b>	
	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	59.8	56.5	61.0	
	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	58.2	56.6	59.0	
	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	71.6	62.5	73.0	
	These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.				
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported preschool (3-5) data for this indicator are 58.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 47.8%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 35.5%.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported school-age (6-21) data for this indicator are 25.9%. The FFY 2009 data were 26.2%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 22.0%.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response groups were representative of the population.</p>				<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0.2%. The State’s FFY 2009 data for this indicator were 0.1%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 17 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that two districts were 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>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2011 APR, demonstrating compliance.</p> <p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of</p>

**Michigan Part B FFY 2010 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>The State reported that 167 of 812 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 30 students with disabilities enrolled.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator was corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the districts identified in FFY 2010 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 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.</p> <p>In the FFY 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review</p>

**Michigan Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.
<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 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 0.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 66 districts, including five districts that had been monitored the previous year and were in the year of correction, were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that six districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported that 167 of 812 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 30 students with disabilities enrolled.</p> <p>The State reported that all 13 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 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 2011 APR.</p> <p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the districts identified in FFY 2010 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</p>

**Michigan Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In the FFY 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 99.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 99.1%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 86 of 87 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining finding subsequently was corrected by November 3, 2011.</p> <p>The State reported that six findings of noncompliance identified in 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 2011 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 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is</p>

**Michigan Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 98.6%. The State's FFY 2009 reported data were 98.7 %. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 18 of 20 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2008 data were corrected in a timely manner and that both of the remaining findings subsequently were corrected by February 18, 2011.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 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 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this</p>

**Michigan Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 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 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 99.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 74.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 29 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the</p>

**Michigan Part B FFY 2010 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>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>for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 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 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure</p>

**Michigan Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<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's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 380 1583 922"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Enrolled in higher education</td> <td align="center">32.6</td> <td align="center">31.7</td> <td align="center">34.3</td> <td align="center">-0.90%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed</td> <td align="center">55.6</td> <td align="center">53.0</td> <td align="center">58.4</td> <td align="center">-2.50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed</td> <td align="center">68.0</td> <td align="center">67.1</td> <td align="center">71.4</td> <td align="center">-0.90%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent slippage for 14A and 14B. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets for 14A, 14B and 14C.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population. The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a response group that was not representative of the population.</p>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Enrolled in higher education	32.6	31.7	34.3	-0.90%	B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	55.6	53.0	58.4	-2.50%	C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed	68.0	67.1	71.4	-0.90%	<p>compliance.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p> <p>The State reported that the response group was not representative of the population. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2011 data are from a group representative of the population, and if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Enrolled in higher education	32.6	31.7	34.3	-0.90%																		
B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	55.6	53.0	58.4	-2.50%																		
C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed	68.0	67.1	71.4	-0.90%																		
<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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 88%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 93%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 469 of 533 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner and that seven findings were subsequently corrected by November 21, 2011. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>OSEP's March 19, 2012 Continuous Improvement Visit Letter required the State to exclude, during the clarification period, from measurement (b) of Indicator 15 the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009, where the State identified</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the remaining 57 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 and the remaining noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2008 that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2010 APR were corrected.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise</p>																				

**Michigan Part B FFY 2010 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>noncompliance in a small number of student records through focused monitoring, for which correction was not verified consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02. The State was also required to report whether any subsequent correction of noncompliance for these findings was verified consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State reported that ten of 11 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected. The State reported the one uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 was based on a due process decision that is being appealed to the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals and the order cannot be implemented until the Court renders its decision.</p>	<p>them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2011 APR, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2010 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>When reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 and each LEA with remaining 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 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>In addition, in reporting on</p>

**Michigan Part B FFY 2010 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>Indicator 15 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 4A, 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2011 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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 99.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 99.2%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing the State's FFY 2011 IDEA section 618 data, demonstrating that it is in 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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 50%. These data are based on four due process hearings. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's FFY 2011 IDEA section 618 data, demonstrating that it is in compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing</p>

**Michigan Part B FFY 2010 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>went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>64.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 46.3%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 42%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p> <p>OSEP’s March 19, 2012 Continuous Improvement Visit Letter required the State submit documentation that it has developed procedures that the State will implement to monitor whether LEAs hold resolution meetings in a timely manner in accordance with 34 CFR §300.510 and issue findings of noncompliance when LEAs do not meet the requirements of 34 CFR §300.510. On May 15, 2012, the State provided OSEP with the required documentation including: (1) revised procedures that describe how the State will track whether resolution sessions were conducted in a timely manner in accordance with 34 CFR §300.510; and (2) supporting documents that demonstrate the State will issue findings of noncompliance when LEAs are found not to have met the requirements in 34 CFR §300.510.</p>	<p>the State’s data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 77.4%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 84.5%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 80%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State’s data in the FFY 2011 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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 98.83%. However, OSEP’s calculation of the data for this indicator is 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 92.86%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in achieving compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>