

**Minnesota's Part B FFY 2006 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 compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 84.6%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 82.4%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 82.1%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</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 revised the targets for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 4.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 4.9%.</p> <p>The State met its revised FFY 2006 target of 4.5%.</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>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 targets 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 72.3%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 76.3%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 72.3%.</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</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 96%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 95.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

**Minnesota's Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																																															
standards. [Results Indicator]																																																																	
<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" data-bbox="548 532 1419 982"> <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>69.4%</td> <td>63.3%</td> <td>72.2%</td> <td>81.3%</td> <td>75.7%</td> <td>79.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>69.6%</td> <td>63.7%</td> <td>69.5%</td> <td>69.5%</td> <td>67.9%</td> <td>69.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>70.4%</td> <td>61.6%</td> <td>71.9%</td> <td>56.1%</td> <td>55.3%</td> <td>59.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>64.1%</td> <td>53.8%</td> <td>70.3%</td> <td>51.3%</td> <td>50.3%</td> <td>59.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>52.8%</td> <td>49.4%</td> <td>65.6%</td> <td>44.8%</td> <td>43.3%</td> <td>58.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>50.3%</td> <td>48.2%</td> <td>64.06%</td> <td>40.9%</td> <td>38.3%</td> <td>58.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS</td> <td>45.1%</td> <td>43.0%</td> <td>64.8%</td> <td>19.7%</td> <td>17.6%</td> <td>28.1%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data.</p> <p>The State did not meet 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	69.4%	63.3%	72.2%	81.3%	75.7%	79.0%	4	69.6%	63.7%	69.5%	69.5%	67.9%	69.6%	5	70.4%	61.6%	71.9%	56.1%	55.3%	59.8%	6	64.1%	53.8%	70.3%	51.3%	50.3%	59.9%	7	52.8%	49.4%	65.6%	44.8%	43.3%	58.8%	8	50.3%	48.2%	64.06%	40.9%	38.3%	58.4%	HS	45.1%	43.0%	64.8%	19.7%	17.6%	28.1%	<p>OSEP 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	69.4%	63.3%	72.2%	81.3%	75.7%	79.0%																																																											
4	69.6%	63.7%	69.5%	69.5%	67.9%	69.6%																																																											
5	70.4%	61.6%	71.9%	56.1%	55.3%	59.8%																																																											
6	64.1%	53.8%	70.3%	51.3%	50.3%	59.9%																																																											
7	52.8%	49.4%	65.6%	44.8%	43.3%	58.8%																																																											
8	50.3%	48.2%	64.06%	40.9%	38.3%	58.4%																																																											
HS	45.1%	43.0%	64.8%	19.7%	17.6%	28.1%																																																											
<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>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 .9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 1.3%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 1.7%.</p>	<p>As required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State provided a description of 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 supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the</p>																																																															

**Minnesota's Part B FFY 2006 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>[Results Indicator]</p>		<p>LEAs identified as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2005 APR.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b), was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected.</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 supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in 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 and ethnicity.</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 4B was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>	

**Minnesota's Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
[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="550 431 1419 812"> <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>60.4%</td> <td>60.3%</td> <td>61%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>9.9%</td> <td>10.0%</td> <td>9.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>4.7%</td> <td>4.5%</td> <td>5.2%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for Indicator 5C, and slippage for Indicators 5A and 5B.</p> <p>The State met its target for Indicator 5C, and did not meet its targets for Indicators 5A and 5B.</p>		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	60.4%	60.3%	61%	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	9.9%	10.0%	9.5%	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	4.7%	4.5%	5.2%	<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.	60.4%	60.3%	61%															
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	9.9%	10.0%	9.5%															
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	4.7%	4.5%	5.2%															
<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 improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills</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 provide progress data with the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, and</p>																

**Minnesota's Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																								
<p>(including social relationships);                      B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and                      C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.                      [Results Indicator; New]</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="533 228 1060 402">06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1060 228 1180 402">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1180 228 1299 402">Knowledge &amp; Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1299 228 1451 402">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="533 402 1060 472">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1060 402 1180 472">.8%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 402 1299 472">.5%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 402 1451 472">.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="533 472 1060 607">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1060 472 1180 607">18.2%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 472 1299 607">19.3%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 472 1451 607">14.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="533 607 1060 711">c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1060 607 1180 711">29.9%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 607 1299 711">28.8%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 607 1451 711">16.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="533 711 1060 815">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1060 711 1180 815">22.9%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 711 1299 815">23.6%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 711 1451 815">24.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="533 815 1060 919">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1060 815 1180 919">28.2%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 815 1299 919">27.8%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 815 1451 919">43.7%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The State provided improvement activities for this indicator covering the remaining years of the SPP.</p>				06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	.8%	.5%	.3%	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	18.2%	19.3%	14.7%	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	29.9%	28.8%	16.7%	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	22.9%	23.6%	24.4%	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	28.2%	27.8%	43.7%	<p>baseline data and targets with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																										
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	.8%	.5%	.3%																										
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	18.2%	19.3%	14.7%																										
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	29.9%	28.8%	16.7%																										
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	22.9%	23.6%	24.4%																										
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	28.2%	27.8%	43.7%																										
<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.                      [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 66%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 65.9%.                      The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 67%.</p>				<p>As required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 response table, the State submitted a revised sampling plan for this indicator in its FFY 2006 APR. An evaluation of the sampling plan indicated that it will yield valid and reliable data for this indicator.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2006 data, the State did not address whether the response group was representative of the population. In the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must address whether its FFY 2007 data are representative.</p>																								

**Minnesota's Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. [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 .8%. These data represent progress from the revised FFY 2005 data of 1.3%.</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>The State reported that four of six LEAs identified in FFY 2005 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. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that the two charter schools with findings of noncompliance are expected to complete the corrective action process in the Spring of 2008.</p>	<p>As required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State included, in the FFY 2006 APR:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Charter schools in its FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 calculation of the percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification;</li> <li>2. Data and information demonstrating that the State has in effect policies and procedures that prevent the inappropriate overidentification or disproportionate representation by race or ethnicity of children as children with disabilities, as required by 34 CFR §300.173;</li> <li>3. Data and information demonstrating that four of the six LEAs identified in the FFY 2005 APR as having disproportionate representation that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the child find, evaluation, and eligibility requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311;</li> <li>4. Information demonstrating that it makes an annual determination of whether significant disproportionality</li> </ol>

**Minnesota's Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>based on race and ethnicity is occurring in LEAs with respect to identification, placement, and disciplinary actions, as required in 34 CFR §300.646;</p> <p>5. The State's definition of disproportionate representation and clarification of whether the State has the same definition for significant disproportionality under 34 CFR §300.646 as it has for disproportionate representation; and</p> <p>6. Consistent with OSEP's recommendation, revised targets that read: "The State will have 0% districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is a result of inappropriate identification."</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.173, 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311 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 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 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or</p>

**Minnesota's Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</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]</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 1.9%. These data represent progress from the revised FFY 2005 data of 4.3%.</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 reported that 20 of 20 LEAs identified in FFY 2005 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 300.311.</p>	<p>As required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State included, in the FFY 2006 APR:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Data including charter schools for both FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 in the percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories;</li> <li>2. Data and information demonstrating that the State has in effect policies and procedures that prevent the inappropriate overidentification or disproportionate representation by race or ethnicity of children as children with disabilities, as required by 34 CFR §300.173;</li> <li>3. Data and information demonstrating that the LEAs identified in the FFY 2005 APR as having disproportionate representation that was the result of inappropriate identification corrected the noncompliance in a timely manner associated with the child find, evaluation, and eligibility requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311;</li> <li>4. The State's definition of disproportionate representation and</li> </ol>



**Minnesota's Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>clarification of whether the State has the same definition for significant disproportionality under 34 CFR §300.646 as it has for disproportionate representation;</p> <p>5. Consistent with OSEP's recommendation, revised targets that read: "The State will have 0% districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is a result of inappropriate identification;" and</p> <p>6. Confirmation, that it has reviewed the policies, procedures, and practices used in the identification and placement of children with disabilities for those districts identified in the State's FFY 2003 APR and described the results of that review.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311 was corrected in a timely manner.</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 in 34 CFR §300.173 and that the LEAs identified in FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of</p>

**Minnesota's Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline). [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 94.9%. These data represent slippage from the revised FFY 2005 data of 99.5%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State did not indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays for children who were not evaluated within the State established timeline.</p> <p>The State reported that 23 of 29 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that the identified noncompliance occurred in 16 student files. Three citations were found in one small metro district, two in a large metro district and the rest occurred in various districts throughout the State. The State reported that it notified the small metro district of the individual student records and systemic noncompliance and required the district to write a corrective action plan (CAP) to address the issue districtwide. The other districts were notified of the individual student record noncompliance, but were not required to develop CAPs. The State indicated that the individual noncompliance is considered to be individual errors or performance issues and not districtwide or statewide systemic concerns.</p>	<p>As required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State provided valid and reliable data that are consistent with the required measurement for this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to report data on the range of days of delay beyond the timeline and the reasons for the delays, and to include in its calculation the number of children determined not eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within the State established timeline in the FFY 2006 APR. The State provided data on the range of days of delay for only two students and reported that no other data regarding the length of delay was available. In addition, the State did not provide any reasons for the delays for children who were not evaluated within the State established timeline. The State must provide the required data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p> <p>The State also did not submit data for the number of children determined not eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within the State established timeline and the State must provide the required data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>

**Minnesota's Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>In response to OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State provided the monitoring data from the Care and Treatment facilities for this indicator for FFY 2005, and recalculated its statewide FFY 2005 reported data.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely evaluations 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 timely evaluation 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 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 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 aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services</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 71.4%. These</p>	<p>As required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State included monitoring data from the Care and Treatment facilities for this indicator</p>

**Minnesota's Part B FFY 2006 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>that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>data represent slippage from the revised FFY 2005 data of 89%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 209 of 234 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner. The State reported that the noncompliance was identified in 18 districts, ten of which corrected the noncompliance. Of the eight districts with continued noncompliance, only one had more than five citations related to this indicator. For this district, MDE has required them to submit a corrective action plan to address this area of noncompliance. For the other seven districts, the noncompliance was only found in a small number of files. For these districts, individual correction of each student record is required with documentation submitted to MDE for approval.</p>	<p>for FFY 2005, and recalculated its statewide FFY 2005 reported data.</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.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</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 78.9%.</p>	<p>In its description of its FFY 2006 data, the State did not address whether the response group was representative of the population. In the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must address whether its FFY 2007 data are representative.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</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</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 65.1%. These data represent slippage from the revised FFY 2005 data of 87.5%</p>	<p>In response to OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State clarified that the data reported in the FFY 2005 APR reflected findings of noncompliance identified prior to FFY</p>

**Minnesota's Part B FFY 2006 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>one year from identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that continued noncompliance was identified during the 2006-07 school year in 51 of the 61 districts with previously identified noncompliance. The continued noncompliance, as well as any new noncompliance identified in 2006-07, is currently being tracked through the Access Monitoring Database and 100% correction tracking system set up by MDE. All individual student record noncompliance must have correction submitted and verified by MDE. At present, 39 of the 51 districts have submitted documentation of correction and have met the target of completing the correction within one year. Ten districts are still within the one year timeframe within which to submit correction. Only two of the 51 districts did not correct all of their identified noncompliance within the one year. For those districts, correction of noncompliance is still required and the failure to meet the one year timeline will be a factor utilized by MDE when identifying the district's determination status.</p>	<p>2005 and corrected in FFY 2005.</p> <p>OSEP's March 13, 2006 SPP response letter also required the State to include in its FFY 2005 APR data that demonstrate correction of noncompliance related to the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.347(c) (now 34 CFR §300.320(c)) and 300.517 (now 34 CFR §300.520), regarding the transfer of rights at the age of majority. The State provided data indicating 100% correction of noncompliance related to FFY 2004 and 83% correction of noncompliance for FFY 2005 regarding the transfer of rights at the age of majority.</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 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, including data demonstrating correction of the remaining noncompliance from FFY 2005 related to 34 CFR §§300.320(c) and §300.520, regarding the transfer of rights at the age of majority.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 9, 10, 11, and 13, the State must specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY</p>

**Minnesota's Part B FFY 2006 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>were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 98.5%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>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 improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 66.7%. These data are based on three due process hearings. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 75%. 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's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 9.5%. However, based on the actual numbers provided in Table 7, OSEP recalculated the data to be 5.26%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 61%.</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>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 81%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 75% to 85%.</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%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</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 that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in IDEA section 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p>

**Minnesota's Part B FFY 2006 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>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely and accurate data requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p>