

Michigan Part B FFY 2005 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE		
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Michigan’s FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 70.6%. This represents progress from FFY 2004 data of 69.7%. Michigan did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 80%.</p>	<p>Michigan revised the baseline, targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to Michigan’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Michigan’s FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 25.2%. This represents progress from FFY 2004 data of 25.5%. Michigan did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 13%.</p>	<p>Michigan revised the baseline and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to Michigan’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size meeting the State’s AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Michigan’s FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%. Michigan met its FFY 2005 target of 88%.</p>	<p>Michigan met its target and OSEP appreciates Michigan’s efforts to improve performance.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator for Grade 3 Math are 98.4%. Michigan met its FFY 2005 target of 95%.</p> <p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator for Grade 3 English Language Arts are 98.1%. Michigan met its FFY 2005 target of 95%.</p> <p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator for Grade 4 Math are 98.9%. Michigan met its FFY 2005 target of 95%.</p> <p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator for Grade 4 English Language Arts are 98.6%. Michigan met its FFY 2005 target of 95%.</p> <p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator for Grade 5 Math are 99.2%. Michigan met its FFY 2005 target of 95%.</p> <p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator for Grade 5 English Language Arts are 99.1%. Michigan met its FFY 2005 target of 95%.</p>	<p>Michigan revised the targets for Indicator 3B in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The FFY 2005 APR does not include the revised targets; it includes targets from the SPP submitted in December 2005. In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must include the revised targets.</p> <p>Michigan met its target and OSEP appreciates Michigan's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator for Grade 6 Math are 97.5%. Michigan met its FFY 2005 target of 95%.</p> <p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator for Grade 6 English Language Arts are 97%. Michigan met its FFY 2005 target of 95%.</p> <p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator for Grade 7 Math are 98.9%. Michigan met its FFY 2005 target of 95%.</p> <p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator for Grade 7 English Language Arts are 98.1%. Michigan met its FFY 2005 target of 95%.</p> <p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator for Grade 8 Math are 98.1%. Michigan met its FFY 2005 target of 95%.</p> <p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator for Grade 8 English Language Arts are 97.5%. Michigan met its FFY 2005 target of 95%.</p>	<p>Michigan revised the targets for Indicator 3B in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The FFY 2005 APR does not include the revised targets; it includes targets from the SPP submitted in December 2005. In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must include the revised targets.</p> <p>Michigan met its target and OSEP appreciates Michigan's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator for Grade 11 Math are 94.1%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 97.3%. Michigan did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 95%.</p> <p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator for Grade 11 English Language Arts are 91.3%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 97.3%. Michigan did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 95%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to Michigan's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</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 standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator for Grade 3 Math are 68.2%. Michigan met its FFY 2005 target of 59%.</p>	<p>Michigan revised the targets for Indicator 3C in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The FFY 2005 APR does not include the revised targets; it includes targets from the SPP submitted in December 2005. In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must include the revised targets.</p> <p>Michigan revised the baseline by adding additional grade assessments in math Grades 3,5,6 and 7; and in English Language Arts in Grades 3,6 and 8.</p> <p>The State met its target and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator for Grade 3 English Language Arts are 53.3%. Michigan met its FFY 2005 target of 50%.</p> <p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator for Grade 4 Math are 59%. Michigan met its FFY 2005 target of 56%.</p>	<p>Michigan revised the targets for Indicator 3C in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The FFY 2005 APR does not include the revised targets; it includes targets from the SPP submitted in December 2005. In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must include the revised targets.</p> <p>The State met its target and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
	<p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator for Grade 4 English Language Arts are 46.8%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 49.4% for Elementary School English Language Arts (ELA). Michigan did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 48%.</p> <p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator for Grade 5 Math are 48.5%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 51.7% for Elementary School Math. Michigan did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 53%.</p> <p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator for Grade 5 English Language Arts are 45%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 49.4% for Elementary School ELA. Michigan did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 46%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to Michigan's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator for Grade 6 Math are 35.3%. This represents progress from FFY 2004 data of 32.4% for Middle School Math. Michigan did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 50%.</p> <p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator for Grade 6 English Language Arts are 43.3%. This represents progress from FFY 2004 data of 38.7% for Middle School ELA. Michigan did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 45%.</p> <p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator for Grade 7 Math are 29.2%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 32.4% for Middle School Math. Michigan did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 46%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to Michigan's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator for Grade 7 English Language Arts are 38.4%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 38.7% for Middle School ELA. Michigan did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 43%.</p> <p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator for Grade 8 Math are 31.9%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 32.4% for Middle School Math. Michigan did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 43%.</p>	
	<p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator for Grade 8 English Language Arts are 35.3%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 38.7% for Middle School ELA. Michigan did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 41%.</p> <p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator for Grade 11 Math are 21.7%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 23.8% for High School Math. Michigan did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 44%.</p>	<p>Michigan revised the baseline by adding an additional grade level assessment for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to Michigan's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to Michigan's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator for Grade 11 English Language Arts are 25.1%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 33.7% for High School ELA. Michigan did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 52%.</p>	
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 3%. Michigan met its FFY 2005 target of less than 10%.</p>	<p>Michigan revised improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>In its improvement activities, Michigan indicated that it completed a review of LEAs that show significant discrepancy in the suspension/expulsion rate of students with IEPs for the 2005 data submission. Therefore, the State indicated that it reviewed, and if appropriate revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise) policies, procedures and practices, but did not indicate that the review, and if appropriate, revision covered policies, practices and procedures relating to development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. Michigan must demonstrate in the FFY 2006 APR that when it identified significant discrepancies, it has reviewed, and if appropriate revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise) policies, practices and procedures relating to each of the following topics: development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards for: 1) the 19 LEAs identified as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2005 APR; and 2) any LEAs identified as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2006 APR.</p> <p>Michigan met its target and OSEP appreciates Michigan's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>		<p>Based upon our preliminary review of all State submissions for Indicator 4B, it appears that the instructions for this indicator were not sufficiently clear and, as a result, confusion remains regarding the establishment of measurements and targets that are race-based and for which there is no finding that the significant discrepancy is based on inappropriate policies, procedures, or practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. As a result, use of these targets could raise Constitutional concerns. Therefore, OSEP has decided not to review this year's submissions for Indicator 4B for purposes of approval and will revise instructions for this indicator to clarify how this indicator will be used in the future. Based upon this, OSEP did not consider the submissions for Indicator 4B in making determinations under section 616(d). It is also important that States immediately cease using Indicator 4B measurements and targets, unless they are based on a finding of inappropriate policies, procedures, or practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p>
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 54.01%. Michigan met its FFY 2005 target of 46%.</p>	<p>Michigan revised the targets for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>Michigan met its target and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p>	<p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 17.87%. Michigan met its FFY 2005 target of 21.5%.</p>	<p>Michigan revised the targets for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>Michigan met its target and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p>	<p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 5.17%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 4%. Michigan did not meet its FFY 2005 target of less than 4%.</p>	<p>Michigan revised the targets for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to Michigan's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 53.4%. Michigan met its FFY 2005 target of 49%.</p>	<p>Michigan revised its improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>Michigan met its target and OSEP appreciates Michigan's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>Please note that, due to changes in the 618 State-reported data collection, this indicator will change for the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008. States will be required to describe how they will collect valid and reliable data to provide baseline and targets in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>7. Percent of preschool children 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; New]</p>	<p>Entry data provided.</p>	<p>Michigan reported the required entry data and activities. Michigan must provide progress data and improvement activities with the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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; New]</p>	<p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported baseline data for this indicator are 21%.</p>	<p>Michigan provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP's March 14, 2006 SPP response letter required that Michigan provide a revised sampling methodology with the State's FFY 2005 APR. Michigan submitted a revised sampling plan on September 22, 2006 and OSEP approved that plan.</p>
Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality		
<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; New]</p>	<p>Michigan identified 43 districts with disproportionate representation in special education and related services.</p>	<p>Michigan provided targets and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>Michigan identified 43 districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services but did not determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification, as required by 34 CFR §300.600(d)(3). Michigan must provide, in its FFY 2006 APR, baseline data from FFY 2005 on the percent of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification, and describe how Michigan made that determination (e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures, etc.). Michigan must also provide data, in its FFY 2006 APR, on the percent of districts identified in FFY 2006 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification, and describe how Michigan made that determination, even if the determination occurs in the fall of 2007.</p> <p>(Analysis Continued Next Page)</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>The State reported that “as a result of inappropriate identification” would be based on a review of additional data, including LEA policies, procedures, and practices.</p> <p>Under Michigan’s definition, <i>disproportionate representation</i> occurs when the number of students aged 6 to 21 in a particular racial/ethnic group identified for special education is disproportionate to the representation of that group in the state and district population and there are data that support that membership in a given group affects the probability of being placed in a specific special education category. Michigan defines <i>significant disproportionality</i> of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services as a weighted risk ratio or alternate risk ratio of greater than 2.5 for any racial/ethnic group. The State has a level system from 1-4, with level 4 being significant disproportionality. Under Indicator 9, the State must report on the percent of districts with <i>disproportionate representation</i> of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. It appears that Michigan has identified districts with <i>significant disproportionality</i>, but has not identified all districts it includes in its definition of <i>disproportionate representation</i>. In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, Michigan must clarify what levels it includes in its definition of <i>disproportionate representation</i> and provide FFY 2005 baseline data and FFY 2006 progress data on the percent of districts with <i>disproportionate representation</i> of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. (Italics added.)</p> <p>Michigan reported that it “will continue to examine policies, procedures and practices of districts with weighted risk ratios greater than 2.5 for African American Students: 1) in special education; and 2) those with cognitive impairments, as an initial target.” Michigan may target its</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>technical assistance to maximize the use of the State's resources. However, Michigan must determine if disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification for all districts identified with disproportionate representation of any racial and ethnic group in special education and related services. In addition, for those districts identified with significant disproportionality based on any race or ethnicity with respect to identification, placement, or discipline, the State must: 1) provide for the review (and, if appropriate) revision of policies, procedures, and practices; 2) require the LEA to reserve the maximum amount of funds to be used for early intervening services; and 3) require the LEA to publicly report of the revision of policies, procedures, and practices. In its FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must clarify that it is not limiting its review to only those districts with disproportionate representation or significant disproportionality of African Americans in special education and those with cognitive impairments.</p>
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator; New]</p>	<p>Michigan identified 122 districts with disproportionate representation in specific disability categories.</p>	<p>Michigan provided targets and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>Michigan identified 122 districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories but did not determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification, as required by 34 CFR §300.600(d)(3). Michigan must provide, in its FFY 2006 APR, baseline data from FFY 2005 on the percent of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification, and describe how Michigan made that determination (e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures, etc.). Michigan must also provide data, in its FFY 2006 APR, on the percent of districts identified in FFY 2006 with</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification, and describe how Michigan made that determination, even if the determination occurs in the fall of 2007.</p> <p>The State reported that “as a result of inappropriate identification” would be based on a review of additional data, including LEA policies, procedures, and practices.</p> <p>Under Michigan’s definition, <i>disproportionate representation</i> occurs when the number of students aged 6 to 21 in a particular racial/ethnic group identified for special education is disproportionate to the representation of that group in the State and district population and there are data that support that membership in a given group affects the probability of being placed in a specific special education category. Michigan defines <i>significant disproportionality</i> of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services as a weighted risk ratio or alternate risk ratio of greater than 2.5 for any racial/ethnic group. The State has a level system from 1-4, with level 4 being significant disproportionality. Under Indicator 10, the State must report on the percent of districts with <i>disproportionate representation</i> of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. It appears that Michigan has identified districts with <i>significant disproportionality</i>, but has not identified all districts it includes in its definition of <i>disproportionate representation</i>. In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, Michigan must clarify what levels it includes in its definition of <i>disproportionate representation</i> and provide FFY 2005 baseline data and FFY 2006 progress data on the percent of districts with <i>disproportionate representation</i> of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. (Italics added.)</p> <p>Michigan reported that it “will continue to examine policies,</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>procedures and practices of districts with weighted risk ratios greater than 2.5 for African American Students (1) in special education and (2) those with cognitive impairments, as an initial target.” Michigan may target its technical assistance to maximize the use of the State’s resources. However, Michigan must determine if disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification for all districts identified with disproportionate representation of any racial or ethnic group in any of the specific disability categories. In addition, for those districts identified with significant disproportionality based on any race or ethnicity with respect to identification, placement, or discipline, the State must: 1) provide for the review (and, if appropriate) revision of policies, procedures, and practices; 2) require the LEA to reserve the maximum amount of funds to be used for early intervening services; and 3) require the LEA to publicly report on the revision of policies, procedures, and practices. In its FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must clarify that it is not limiting its review to only those districts with disproportionate representation or significant disproportionality of African Americans in special education and those with cognitive impairments.</p>
Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision		
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline). [Compliance Indicator; New]</p>	<p>Michigan’s FFY 2005 reported baseline for this indicator are 80.51%.</p>	<p>Michigan provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator. Michigan reported data based on a State-established timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrates compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including data demonstrating correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 92.1%. Because Michigan was unable to provide FFY 2004 baseline data, OSEP cannot determine if there was progress or slippage. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>Michigan did not indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed and the reasons for the delays. Michigan must provide these data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.124, including correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator; New]</p>	<p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported baseline data for this indicator are 36%.</p>	<p>Michigan provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed a representative sample within each Intermediate School District (ISD) of all students with IEPs aged 14-21. Therefore, it appears that the FFY 2005 (2005-2006) baseline data included youth aged 14 and above, instead of youth aged 16 and above. If the State is providing data on youth aged 14 and above, we recommend that the State revise its targets to state, "100% of IEPs, for youth, aged 14 and above, will include coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals."</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.320(b), including data demonstrating correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of post-secondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>Michigan provided a plan that describes how data will be collected.</p>	<p>Michigan provided a plan that describes how data will be collected. The State must provide baseline data, targets, and improvement activities with the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>OSEP's March 14, 2006 SPP response letter required that Michigan provide a revised sampling methodology with the State's FFY 2005 APR. Michigan submitted a revised sampling plan on September 22, 2006 and OSEP approved that plan.</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>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State reported on correction of noncompliance "identified through complaints." The State must clarify, in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that this includes findings of noncompliance made through due process hearings.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600. In its response to Indicator 15 in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, Michigan must disaggregate by APR indicator the status of timely correction of the noncompliance findings identified by Michigan during FFY 2005. In addition, the State must, in reporting on Indicators 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13, specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates Michigan's efforts in achieving compliance.</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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 99%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, demonstrating compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.152.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%. Michigan met its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>Michigan revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates Michigan's efforts in achieving compliance and looks forward to data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that continue to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.515(a).</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported baseline data for this indicator are 36%.</p>	<p>Michigan provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Michigan's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 88%. Michigan met its FFY 2005 target of 74%.</p>	<p>Michigan revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State met its target and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</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 2005 reported data for this indicator are 90%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must provide data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in IDEA section 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p>