

Michigan Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																												
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 69.7%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 70.6%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 80%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</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>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 28.9%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 25.2%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 11.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</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>The State revised the activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 99.7%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 88%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>																												
<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>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1247 1419 1498"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="3">Reading</td> <td colspan="3">Math</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>98.1%</td> <td>99.3%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>98.4%</td> <td>99.2%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>98.6%</td> <td>99.7%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>98.9%</td> <td>99.6%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Grade	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target		Reading			Math			3	98.1%	99.3%	95%	98.4%	99.2%	95%	4	98.6%	99.7%	95%	98.9%	99.6%	95%	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the revised targets for Indicator 3B. The State provided this information.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
Grade	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target																								
	Reading			Math																										
3	98.1%	99.3%	95%	98.4%	99.2%	95%																								
4	98.6%	99.7%	95%	98.9%	99.6%	95%																								

Michigan Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues							OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																																									
<p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<table border="1"> <tr><td>5</td><td>99.1%</td><td>99.3%</td><td>95%</td><td>99.2%</td><td>99.3%</td><td>95%</td></tr> <tr><td>6</td><td>97%</td><td>99.3%</td><td>95%</td><td>97.5%</td><td>99.1%</td><td>95%</td></tr> <tr><td>7</td><td>98.1%</td><td>99.2%</td><td>95%</td><td>98.9%</td><td>99%</td><td>95%</td></tr> <tr><td>8</td><td>97.5%</td><td>98.9%</td><td>95%</td><td>98.1%</td><td>98.8%</td><td>95%</td></tr> <tr><td>HS</td><td>91.3%</td><td>96.6%</td><td>95%</td><td>94.1%</td><td>96.4%</td><td>95%</td></tr> </table>	5	99.1%	99.3%	95%	99.2%	99.3%	95%	6	97%	99.3%	95%	97.5%	99.1%	95%	7	98.1%	99.2%	95%	98.9%	99%	95%	8	97.5%	98.9%	95%	98.1%	98.8%	95%	HS	91.3%	96.6%	95%	94.1%	96.4%	95%																													
5	99.1%	99.3%	95%	99.2%	99.3%	95%																																																											
6	97%	99.3%	95%	97.5%	99.1%	95%																																																											
7	98.1%	99.2%	95%	98.9%	99%	95%																																																											
8	97.5%	98.9%	95%	98.1%	98.8%	95%																																																											
HS	91.3%	96.6%	95%	94.1%	96.4%	95%																																																											
<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>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="3">Reading</td> <td colspan="3">Math</td> </tr> <tr><td>3</td><td>53.3%</td><td>48%</td><td>50%</td><td>68.2%</td><td>67.2%</td><td>59%</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>46.8%</td><td>45%</td><td>48%</td><td>59%</td><td>61%</td><td>56%</td></tr> <tr><td>5</td><td>45%</td><td>41.4%</td><td>46%</td><td>48.5%</td><td>46.9%</td><td>53%</td></tr> <tr><td>6</td><td>43.3%</td><td>38%</td><td>45%</td><td>35.3%</td><td>36.1%</td><td>50%</td></tr> <tr><td>7</td><td>38.4%</td><td>32.8%</td><td>43%</td><td>29.2%</td><td>30.9%</td><td>46%</td></tr> <tr><td>8</td><td>35.3%</td><td>29.7%</td><td>41%</td><td>31.9%</td><td>34.9%</td><td>43%</td></tr> <tr><td>HS</td><td>25.1%</td><td>18.5%</td><td>52%</td><td>21.7%</td><td>22.8%</td><td>44%</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent slippage in reading and progress in part and slippage in part in math from the FFY 2005 data.</p> <p>The State met part of its FFY 2006 targets.</p>	Grade	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target		Reading			Math			3	53.3%	48%	50%	68.2%	67.2%	59%	4	46.8%	45%	48%	59%	61%	56%	5	45%	41.4%	46%	48.5%	46.9%	53%	6	43.3%	38%	45%	35.3%	36.1%	50%	7	38.4%	32.8%	43%	29.2%	30.9%	46%	8	35.3%	29.7%	41%	31.9%	34.9%	43%	HS	25.1%	18.5%	52%	21.7%	22.8%	44%	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the revised targets for Indicator 3C. The State provided this information.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
Grade	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target																																																											
	Reading			Math																																																													
3	53.3%	48%	50%	68.2%	67.2%	59%																																																											
4	46.8%	45%	48%	59%	61%	56%																																																											
5	45%	41.4%	46%	48.5%	46.9%	53%																																																											
6	43.3%	38%	45%	35.3%	36.1%	50%																																																											
7	38.4%	32.8%	43%	29.2%	30.9%	46%																																																											
8	35.3%	29.7%	41%	31.9%	34.9%	43%																																																											
HS	25.1%	18.5%	52%	21.7%	22.8%	44%																																																											
<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</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are <1%. These data represent progress from the revised FFY 2005 data of 2.3%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, information to demonstrate that the State has reviewed, and if appropriate, revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise) policies,</p>																																																															

Michigan Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of <10%.</p> <p>The State did not provide the information required by the FFY 2005 response table related to reviewing, and if appropriate revising (or requiring the affected LEA to revise) its 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 IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified as having a significant discrepancy in FFY 2005. The State reported that 15 districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy in FFY 2005. However, the State reported that only the six districts that were also identified as having a significant discrepancy in FFY 2006 were participating in a review of their 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 IDEA. The State reported that the remaining nine districts identified in FFY 2005 “have improved their practices to the point that they are no longer on the list.” The State also reported the status in 2006-2007 of seven of the nine districts that had a significant discrepancy in FFY 2005. One charter school closed, so no follow-up was possible. Among the six remaining districts, during 2006-2007, there were fewer than 10 students who received suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days.</p>	<p>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 to ensure compliance with IDEA for the LEAs identified as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2005 APR.</p> <p>The State did not provide the required information because it only reviewed, and if appropriate, required the affected LEAs to revise, policies, practices and procedures relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with IDEA for six of the 15 districts identified as having significant discrepancies in FFY 2005. One charter school closed, so no follow-up was possible. However, the State did not conduct this review for the remaining eight LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2005. This constitutes noncompliance with 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p> <p>The State must identify annually the percent of districts having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year. The State may examine more than one year’s data to make this determination but must make an annual determination. Once a district is identified as having a significant discrepancy, the State must review that district’s policies, procedures and practices, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b), even if the district “improved their practices to the point that they are no longer on the list” or in a</p>

Michigan Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>subsequent year had fewer than 10 students who received suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days. The State reported that beginning with FFY 2007, it would implement the annual review of 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) based on one year of data that reflects a significant discrepancy.</p> <p>In reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must describe the results of the State’s examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008). In addition, the State must describe the review, and if appropriate, revision, of policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and support, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
<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</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 4B was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>	

Michigan Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
and ethnicity. [Results Indicator]																		
<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>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 480 1419 862"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td>54%</td> <td>50.3%</td> <td>55%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>17.9%</td> <td>18.5%</td> <td>16.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>5.2%</td> <td>5%</td> <td>5.1%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress in 5C and slippage in 5A and 5B from the FFY 2005 data.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target for 5C and did not meet its targets for 5A and 5B.</p>		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	54%	50.3%	55%	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	17.9%	18.5%	16.9%	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	5.2%	5%	5.1%	<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 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target															
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	54%	50.3%	55%															
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	17.9%	18.5%	16.9%															
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	5.2%	5%	5.1%															
<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>Reporting on Indicator 6 was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>																	
<p>7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p>	<p>The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must</p>																

Michigan Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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>06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</p>	<p>Social Emotional</p>	<p>Knowledge & Skills</p>	<p>Appropriate Behavior</p>	<p>provide progress data with the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009 and baseline data and targets with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
	<p>a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</p>	<p>2.04%</p>	<p>4.08%</p>	<p>3.07%</p>	
	<p>b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</p>	<p>12.93%</p>	<p>10.20%</p>	<p>11.95%</p>	
	<p>c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</p>	<p>32.99%</p>	<p>39.80%</p>	<p>17.41%</p>	
	<p>d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</p>	<p>31.63%</p>	<p>31.97%</p>	<p>44.71%</p>	
	<p>e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</p>	<p>20.41%</p>	<p>13.95%</p>	<p>22.87%</p>	
	<p>The State provided improvement activities for this indicator covering the remaining years of the SPP.</p>				
<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 2006 reported data for this indicator are 23.59%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 21.14%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 21%.</p>				<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>9. Percent of districts with</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline and improvement activities for this indicator</p>				<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR</p>

Michigan Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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>in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are <1%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of <1%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2006 and FFY 2005 to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p>	<p>response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, baseline data from the FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 progress data 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 the State made that determination. The State provided FFY 2005 baseline data and FFY 2006 progress data.</p> <p>The State was also required to clarify its definition of disproportionate representation and 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. In addition, the State was required to provide information that demonstrates that for those districts identified with significant disproportionality based on any race or ethnicity with respect to identification, placement or discipline, the State provides for the review (and if appropriate) revision of policies, procedures, and practices, requires the LEA to reserve the maximum amount of funds to be used for early intervening services, and requires the LEA to publicly report the revision of policies, procedures, and practices. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that demonstrate that the State has in effect policies and procedures as required by 34 CFR §300.173 and that the LEAs identified in FFY 2005 and</p>

Michigan Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p>
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 2.4%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2006 and FFY 2005 to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State did not provide valid and reliable data because the State identified districts with disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006, but did not determine if disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification in all of the districts with disproportionate representation. In response to OSEP feedback, the State reported that it amended its disproportionality business rules and re-analyzed all LEA disproportionate representation data from FFY 2005 and FFY 2006. The State reported that it identified an additional 12 districts with disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories and would make a determination of whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification after these districts were notified.</p> <p>Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage or whether the State met its target.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, baseline data from FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 progress data 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 the State made that determination for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006. The State did not provide complete FFY 2005 baseline data and FFY 2006 progress data.</p> <p>The State was also required to clarify its definition of disproportionate representation and 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. In addition, the State was required to provide information that demonstrates that for those districts identified with significant disproportionality based on any race or ethnicity with respect to identification, placement or discipline, the State provides for the review (and if appropriate) revision of policies, procedures, and practices, requires the LEA to reserve the maximum amount of funds to be used for early intervening services, and requires the LEA to</p>

Michigan Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>publicly report the revision of policies, procedures, and practices. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>In the FFY 2006 APR, the State reported that it determined 13 districts in FFY 2005 and 18 districts in FFY 2006 to have disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification. The State did not provide valid and reliable data because the State identified 12 additional districts with disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories, but did not determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification. The State provided a plan to collect and report the required data beginning in FFY 2007. The State must provide, in its FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, valid and reliable baseline data from FFY 2005 and data from FFY 2006 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.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that demonstrate that the State has in effect policies and procedures as required by 34 CFR §300.173 and that the LEAs identified in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through</p>

Michigan Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		300.311.
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline).</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 96.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 80.5%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported under Indicator 15 that 36 of 38 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner and one finding was subsequently corrected. For the remaining one uncorrected finding of noncompliance, the State reported that it increased monitoring in the district through April 2008 and required the district to submit a report by June 15, 2008.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</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 revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 91.5%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 92.1%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported under Indicator 15 that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator was corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed and the reasons for the delays. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006</p>

Michigan Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps								
<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]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 40%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 35%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported under Indicator 15 that 12 of 20 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner and 5 findings were subsequently corrected. For the one uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 through focused monitoring, the State reported that it increased monitoring and provided technical assistance for three months. For the remaining two uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 through the SPSR process, the State has increased monitoring until April 2008 in the two districts and required each district to submit a final report to the State by June 15 of 2008.</p>	<p>APR.</p> <p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, data on youth aged 14 and above, if the State's (2005-2006) baseline data included youth age 14 and above, instead of 16 and above. The State clarified that it is reporting data on youth ages 16 through 21.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected. The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b), including reporting on the correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006.</p>								
<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 postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1252 1421 1511"> <tbody> <tr> <td>Percent of youth who are competitively employed.</td> <td align="right">19%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Percent of youth who were only enrolled in some type of postsecondary school or training.</td> <td align="right">29.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Percent of youth who had been competitively employed and enrolled in some type of postsecondary program.</td> <td align="right">27.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Percent of youth who had not been competitively employed or enrolled in some type of postsecondary program.</td> <td align="right">22.2%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Percent of youth who are competitively employed.	19%	Percent of youth who were only enrolled in some type of postsecondary school or training.	29.1%	Percent of youth who had been competitively employed and enrolled in some type of postsecondary program.	27.7%	Percent of youth who had not been competitively employed or enrolled in some type of postsecondary program.	22.2%	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
Percent of youth who are competitively employed.	19%									
Percent of youth who were only enrolled in some type of postsecondary school or training.	29.1%									
Percent of youth who had been competitively employed and enrolled in some type of postsecondary program.	27.7%									
Percent of youth who had not been competitively employed or enrolled in some type of postsecondary program.	22.2%									

Michigan Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 90.18%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 147 of 163 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported the program-specific follow-up activities it is carrying out to ensure correction of the remaining 16 findings of noncompliance. The activities include increased monitoring, the provision of technical assistance, and continued reporting by LEAs with uncorrected noncompliance.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, clarification that the State is reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance identified through due process hearings. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP's March 11, 2008 Michigan verification letter required the State to provide, within 60 days from the date of that letter, a method to ensure correction of noncompliance within a reasonable period of time, not to exceed one year from the date of identification in situations where districts or ISDs identify noncompliance in the SPSR, as required by IDEA sections 612(a)(11) and 616, 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600, and 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E). OSEP has reviewed the information submitted in the FFY 2006 APR and the documentation received from the State on May 12, 2008, and concluded that the State has provided the required information.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State has corrected the remaining noncompliance identified in Indicator 15 from 2005.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 (2006-2007) under this indicator in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 4A, 9,</p>

Michigan Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		10, 11, 12 and 13, the State must specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 99%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 99%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 11, 2008 Michigan verification letter required the State to provide, within 60 days from the date of that letter, a method to ensure that it is properly documenting that extensions are granted only if exceptional circumstances exist with respect to a particular complaint as required by 34 CFR §300.152(b)(1). OSEP has reviewed the documentation received from the State on May 12, 2008, and concluded that the State has provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 83%. These data are based on six hearings. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely due process hearing resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 45%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 36%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Michigan Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 80%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 75%.</p>	<p>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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100% for timeliness and 100% for accuracy. The State met its FFY 2006 targets of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p>