

**Nebraska 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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the FFY 2012 improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 75.23%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 71.25%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 83.97%.</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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the FFY 2012 improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 1.94%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 1.64%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 2.12%.</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 revised the targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and baseline for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets. The revised targets are more rigorous than the previously-established targets.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 revised baseline data for this indicator are 34.18%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage, or whether the State met its target because the State submitted a new baseline.</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: B. Participation rate for children</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 99.55% for reading and 99.53% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 99.53% for math. The FFY 2009 data for reading were 99.64%. The State met its FFY 2010 targets of 95%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																			
with IEPs. [Results Indicator]	The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.																																				
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline for math, and targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets.</p> <p>The State's reported data for reading and revised baseline data for math are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="552 548 1583 792"> <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></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td align="center" colspan="3"><u>Reading</u></td> <td></td> <td align="center" colspan="2"><u>Math</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Elementary</td> <td>42.77%</td> <td>48.02%</td> <td>67%</td> <td></td> <td>44.43%</td> <td>51%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Middle</td> <td>33.10%</td> <td>38.45%</td> <td>70%</td> <td></td> <td>28.62%</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>High</td> <td>29.44%</td> <td>27.92%</td> <td>68%</td> <td></td> <td>18.50%</td> <td>41%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for elementary and middle school reading, and slippage for high school reading from the FFY 2009 data. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage for math because the State changed its baseline. The State did not meet 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 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>		<u>Reading</u>				<u>Math</u>		Elementary	42.77%	48.02%	67%		44.43%	51%	Middle	33.10%	38.45%	70%		28.62%	50%	High	29.44%	27.92%	68%		18.50%	41%	<p>OSEP 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 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																															
	<u>Reading</u>				<u>Math</u>																																
Elementary	42.77%	48.02%	67%		44.43%	51%																															
Middle	33.10%	38.45%	70%		28.62%	50%																															
High	29.44%	27.92%	68%		18.50%	41%																															
<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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of "significant discrepancy."</p> <p>The State reported that no 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 55 of 253 districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement of 30 students with disabilities. The State did not report the number of districts that did not meet the additional State-established minimum "n" size, which the State included in its definition, of six or more students with disabilities suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>In its FFY 2011 APR, the State must report the number of districts that did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement of 30 students with disabilities <u>and</u> the number of districts that did not meet the additional State-established minimum "n" size of six or more students with disabilities suspended or expelled for greater</p>																																			

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<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’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that one district was 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 reported that it reviewed the district’s policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the district identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010.</p> <p>The State did not identify any noncompliance through this review.</p> <p>The State reported that 204 of 253 districts had no suspensions or expulsions by race/ethnic grouping greater than ten days, 45 districts met the State-established minimum “n” size of 30, and six districts met the minimum cell size of six students with disabilities suspended or expelled for greater than ten days.</p>	<p>than 10 days.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</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’s reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1029 1583 1503"> <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">72.06</td> <td align="center">74.21</td> <td align="center">58.9</td> <td align="center">2.15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">6.69</td> <td align="center">5.99</td> <td align="center">11.8</td> <td align="center">0.70%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td align="center">2.96</td> <td align="center">3.23</td> <td align="center">2.6</td> <td align="center">-0.27%</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	72.06	74.21	58.9	2.15%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	6.69	5.99	11.8	0.70%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	2.96	3.23	2.6	-0.27%	<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>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	72.06	74.21	58.9	2.15%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	6.69	5.99	11.8	0.70%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	2.96	3.23	2.6	-0.27%																		

**Nebraska 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>																				
	These data represent progress for 5A and 5B and slippage for 5C from the FFY 2009 data. The State met its FFY 2010 targets for 5A and 5B, but did not meet its FFY 2010 target for 5C.																					
<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>	The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR.	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>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 FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 894 1583 1503"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 894 957 997"><b><u>Summary Statement 1</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="957 894 1163 997"><b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="1163 894 1373 997"><b><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="1373 894 1583 997"><b><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 997 957 1133"><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 997 1163 1133">46.1</td> <td data-bbox="1163 997 1373 1133">76.3</td> <td data-bbox="1373 997 1583 1133">63.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1133 957 1304"><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 1133 1163 1304">61.3</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1133 1373 1304">70.8</td> <td data-bbox="1373 1133 1583 1304">60.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1304 957 1406"><b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 1304 1163 1406">54.0</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1304 1373 1406">80.4</td> <td data-bbox="1373 1304 1583 1406">63.7</td> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 1406 957 1503"><b><u>Summary Statement 2</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="957 1406 1163 1503"><b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="1163 1406 1373 1503"><b><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="1373 1406 1583 1503"><b><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></b></th> </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) (%)	46.1	76.3	63.1	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	61.3	70.8	60.9	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	54.0	80.4	63.7	<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>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</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) (%)	46.1	76.3	63.1																			
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	61.3	70.8	60.9																			
<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	54.0	80.4	63.7																			
<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>																			

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	66.7	77.1	72.9	
	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	72.0	67.4	61.3	
	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	82.9	81.3	74.5	
	These data for this indicator represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State met its FFY 2010 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 children with disabilities.  [Results Indicator]	The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 73%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 78.7%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 70.8%.  In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.				OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.
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]	The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.  The State reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services.  The State provided its definition of "disproportionate representation."  The State reported that 241 of 253 districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement of 30 or more students with disabilities in the group of interest and comparison group (based on child count data).				OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.
10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific	The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.				OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.

**Nebraska 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>disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported that 241 of 253 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 30 or more students with disabilities in the group of interest and comparison group (based on child count data).</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 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 99.38%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 30 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 in achieving compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1).</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 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in achieving compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b).</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 86.43%. The FFY 2009 data were 86.73%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 54 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, 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 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this</p>

**Nebraska 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>student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>		<p>indicator.</p> <p>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 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>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>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>The State’s reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1419 1583 1518"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 1419 938 1518"></th> <th data-bbox="938 1419 1100 1518"><u><b>FFY 2009 Data</b></u></th> <th data-bbox="1100 1419 1262 1518"><u><b>FFY 2010 Data</b></u></th> <th data-bbox="1262 1419 1423 1518"><u><b>FFY 2010 Target</b></u></th> <th data-bbox="1423 1419 1583 1518"><u><b>Progress</b></u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1419 938 1518"></td> <td data-bbox="938 1419 1100 1518"></td> <td data-bbox="1100 1419 1262 1518"></td> <td data-bbox="1262 1419 1423 1518"></td> <td data-bbox="1423 1419 1583 1518"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u><b>FFY 2009 Data</b></u>	<u><b>FFY 2010 Data</b></u>	<u><b>FFY 2010 Target</b></u>	<u><b>Progress</b></u>						<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
	<u><b>FFY 2009 Data</b></u>	<u><b>FFY 2010 Data</b></u>	<u><b>FFY 2010 Target</b></u>	<u><b>Progress</b></u>								

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;                      B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.                      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>	A. % Enrolled in higher education	39.4	39.1	39.9	-0.30%	
	B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	65.2	63.8	65.7	-1.40%	
	C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed	83.6	80.5	84.1	-3.10%	
	<p>These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p>					
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the FFY 2012 improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data 100%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 1,590 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner.</p>					<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in timely correcting findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009.</p> <p>When reporting in the FFY 2011 APR on the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010: (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;</p>

**Nebraska 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>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. In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicator 13 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under that indicator.</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 100%. These data are based on eight complaints. The State met 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 in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day</p>	<p>The State reported, as of January 31, 2012, that it did not have any fully adjudicated due process hearings during the reporting period.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's FFY 2011 IDEA section 618 data.</p>

**Nebraska 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>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>Resolution data until July 2012.</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 reported, as of January 13, 2012, that no resolution sessions resulted in settlement agreements.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2010. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.</p> <p>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>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported, as of January 31, 2012, that all four mediations resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2010. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.</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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 97.73 %. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</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 and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011</p>

**Nebraska 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>APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance. In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>