

**Table B Chart – Michigan Part B
Previously-Identified Issues**

Issue	State Submission	OSEP Analysis	Required Action
<p>Indicator 4:</p> <p>OSEP’s September 23, 2005 response to Michigan’s FFY 2004 APR required Michigan to submit, in the SPP, due December 2, 2005, a plan including strategies, proposed evidence of change, targets and timelines, designed to ensure correction of the noncompliance with 34 CFR §300.146.</p> <p>OSEP also required the State to submit a Progress Report, including data and analysis demonstrating progress toward compliance, no later than March 23, 2006.</p>	<p>In the SPP, Michigan reported that 9.24% of school districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy in suspension/expulsion among students with IEPs. On pages 38 through 40 of the SPP, Michigan outlined a plan, along with improvement activities to support the plan.</p> <p>The plan included the following elements: (1) review of LEAs that show significant discrepancies; (2) obtaining assurance statements from districts regarding data validity; (3) development and implementation of a process/rubric for reviewing policies, procedures and practices in LEAs that demonstrate significant discrepancies; and (4) application of appropriate levels of intervention including compliance agreements or sanctions.</p>	<p>OSEP accepts Michigan’s plan to ensure that it meets the requirements of 34 CFR §300.146.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the APR, due February 1, 2007, that demonstrate full compliance with this requirement.</p>
<p>Indicator 9:</p> <p>OSEP’s September 23, 2005 response to Michigan’s FFY 2004 APR required Michigan to submit, in the SPP, due December 2, 2005, a plan, including strategies, proposed evidence of change, targets and timelines designed to ensure correction of noncompliance</p>	<p>On pages 69 through 72 of the SPP, Michigan outlined a plan with improvement activities to support implementation the plan.</p> <p>The plan includes the following elements: (1) convene the disproportionality team; (2) finalize the</p>	<p>OSEP accepts Michigan’s plan to ensure correction in meeting the requirements with 34 CFR §300.755.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the APR, due February 1, 2007, that demonstrate full compliance with this requirement.</p>

Issue	State Submission	OSEP Analysis	Required Action
<p>in meeting the requirements of 34 CFR §300.755 by determining what constitutes a significant discrepancy, reviewing the State's data against that standard, and providing for the review and, if appropriate, revision of policies, procedures and practices in identification and/or placement, when it identifies significant disproportionality, as soon as possible but not more than one year after OSEP accepts the plan.</p> <p>OSEP also required the State to submit a Progress Report, including data and analysis demonstrating progress toward compliance, no later than March 23, 2006.</p>	<p>rubric that will be used to review LEA policies, procedures and practices; (3) identify LEA data that show significant disproportionate representation and trigger a review of policies, procedures and practices; (4) apply appropriate levels of intervention, including compliance agreements and/or sanctions; (5) systematically review policies, procedures and practices; (6) develop guidance/ best practice information; and (7) provide documentation of revised policies, procedures and practices, when appropriate, to the SEA.</p>	<p>The State-reported data demonstrated full correction of the previously-identified noncompliance with the requirement at (34 CFR §300.600 and 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)). OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in ensuring compliance with this requirement.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the APR, due February 1, 2007, demonstrating continued compliance with this requirement.</p>
<p>Indicator 15:</p> <p>OSEP's September 23, 2005 response to Michigan's FFY 2004 APR required Michigan to report updated data and analysis demonstrating compliance in ensuring that LEAs implemented required corrective actions (34 CFR §300.600 and 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)), including the specific steps it has taken to ensure compliance in all intermediate school districts (ISDs) that are still identified in the FFY 2003 as "not closed out" in Cycles 1 through 5, and evidence that it is ensuring timely correction of noncompliance</p>	<p>On pages 105-106 of the SPP, Michigan provided data indicating that all corrective actions identified were corrected within one year of identification.</p>		

Issue	State Submission	OSEP Analysis	Required Action
<p>identified through complaint investigations, no later than February 4, 2006.</p> <p>Indicator 17:</p>	<p>Attachment 1, along with data and information on page 115 of the SPP, indicated 100% compliance with due process hearing timelines.</p>	<p>The State reported data showing correction of the previously-identified noncompliance with the requirements at 34 CFR §300.511(a). OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in ensuring compliance with this requirement.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the APR, due February 1, 2007, demonstrating continued compliance with these requirements.</p>
<p>OSEP's September 23, 2005 response to Michigan's FFY 2004 APR required Michigan to report, in the SPP, due December 2, 2005, data demonstrating compliance with due process hearing timelines required by 34 CFR §300.511(a). The letter indicated that failure to do so might affect the State's FFY 2006 grant award.</p>			