

Nebraska 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's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 66.92%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 73.83%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 74.8%.</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 3.89%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 3.17%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 2.48%.</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's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 72.13%. These data represent progress from the revised FFY 2005 data of 50.00%.</p> <p>OSEP could not determine whether the State met its FFY 2006 targets because the State set separate targets for this indicator by school type and subject, but did not report actual data based on those targets.</p>	<p>The State must, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, either revise its targets to reflect its revised data calculation for this indicator or report data based on the targets it established in its SPP.</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>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's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 98.14% for reading and 97.22% for math.</p> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 88% for both math and reading.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 95.0% for reading and met its FFY 2006 target of 95.0% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Nebraska 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>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's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 313 1421 677"> <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>Elementary</td> <td>64.3%</td> <td>71.14%</td> <td>72%</td> <td>67.9%</td> <td>75.45%</td> <td>74%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Middle School</td> <td>61.3%</td> <td>68.86%</td> <td>71%</td> <td>57.4%</td> <td>64.85%</td> <td>69%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>High School</td> <td>60.1%</td> <td>65.76%</td> <td>75%</td> <td>48.2%</td> <td>55.99%</td> <td>72%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress 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			Elementary	64.3%	71.14%	72%	67.9%	75.45%	74%	Middle School	61.3%	68.86%	71%	57.4%	64.85%	69%	High School	60.1%	65.76%	75%	48.2%	55.99%	72%	<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																																	
Elementary	64.3%	71.14%	72%	67.9%	75.45%	74%																															
Middle School	61.3%	68.86%	71%	57.4%	64.85%	69%																															
High School	60.1%	65.76%	75%	48.2%	55.99%	72%																															
<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>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0.4%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 0.4%.</p> <p>OSEP was unable to determine if the State met its target because the target is not expressed as 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; rather the target is related to the State's definition of significant discrepancy and indicates that the suspension/expulsion rate in each LEA will decrease to 5% or less. The State reported that it planned to meet with stakeholders to review and revise the targets for this indicator, as appropriate, for the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>	<p>The State must, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, either report on its revised targets that reflect its revised data calculation for this indicator or report data based on the targets it established in its SPP.</p> <p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to 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 school districts identified as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 APRs. On pages 30-31 of the APR, the State described the review.</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</p>																																			

Nebraska Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
		of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008). OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.																
<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]</p>	Reporting on Indicator 4B was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.																	
<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's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 829 1421 1235"> <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>70.95%</td> <td>69.91%</td> <td>58.5% or more</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>2.5%</td> <td>7.24%</td> <td>12.2% or less</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>5.43%</td> <td>3.78%</td> <td>3% or less</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for Indicator 5C and slippage for Indicators 5A and 5B from the FFY 2005 data.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 targets for Indicators 5A and 5B but did not meet its FFY 2006 target for Indicator 5C.</p>		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	70.95%	69.91%	58.5% or more	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	2.5%	7.24%	12.2% or less	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	5.43%	3.78%	3% or less	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.
	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target															
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	70.95%	69.91%	58.5% or more															
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	2.5%	7.24%	12.2% or less															
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	5.43%	3.78%	3% or less															

Nebraska Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																								
<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). [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: A. Positive social-emotional skills (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>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 613 1419 1295"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 613 1060 784">06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1060 613 1180 784">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1180 613 1299 784">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1299 613 1419 784">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 784 1060 854">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1060 784 1180 854">2%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 784 1299 854">2%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 784 1419 854">2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 854 1060 987">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same age peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1060 854 1180 987">17%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 854 1299 987">7%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 854 1419 987">10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 987 1060 1089">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 987 1180 1089">7%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 987 1299 1089">7%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 987 1419 1089">7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1089 1060 1192">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1060 1089 1180 1192">17%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 1089 1299 1192">17%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 1089 1419 1192">15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1192 1060 1295">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1060 1192 1180 1295">56%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 1192 1299 1295">66%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 1192 1419 1295">66%</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.	2%	2%	2%	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same age peers.	17%	7%	10%	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	7%	7%	7%	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same aged peers.	17%	17%	15%	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	56%	66%	66%	<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 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.	2%	2%	2%																							
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same age peers.	17%	7%	10%																							
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	7%	7%	7%																							
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same aged peers.	17%	17%	15%																							
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	56%	66%	66%																							
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 79%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 68.2%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>																								

Nebraska Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 68.8%.</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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State established the baseline and 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 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in 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 did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2006 because it reported that it was currently conducting a review for the two LEAs identified in FFY 2006 that were at or above the cut-score of 2.0 for overrepresentation to determine whether disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification (e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures) but had not yet made that determination.</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 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in its FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, revised targets and baseline data from FFY 2005. This requirement is satisfied.</p> <p>The State did not submit valid and reliable data for FFY 2006 and must, in its FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, report on the results of the review it was conducting of the two districts identified in FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation. It also must report the percentage of districts in FFY 2007 that are identified as having disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification, including the results of any review it conducts to determine whether the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification.</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 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 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>

Nebraska Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 established baseline data and revised the targets for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 data for this indicator are 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in 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 for FFY 2006 because it reported that it was currently conducting a review for the two LEAs identified in FFY 2006 that were at or above the cut-score of 2.0 for overrepresentation to determine whether disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification (e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures) but had not yet made that determination.</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 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in its FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, revised targets and baseline data from FFY 2005. This requirement is satisfied.</p> <p>The State did not submit valid and reliable data for FFY 2006 and must, in its FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, report on the results of the review it was conducting of the two districts identified in FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation. It also must report the percentage of districts in FFY 2007 that are identified as having disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification, including the results of any review it conducts to determine whether the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification.</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 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 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>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 93.1%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the data were based on a different measure than the FFY 2005 data. In its FFY 2005 APR, the State did not report on the number of children determined not eligible for whom parental consent to evaluate was received and whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were</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</p>

Nebraska Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>completed within 60 days.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 26 of 27 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that it gathered focused data from the LEA to determine the cause of the continuing noncompliance and required the LEA to submit a new corrective action plan outlining the plan for correction, timelines for activities, and the methods by which the LEA will demonstrate compliance. The State reported that it worked in partnership with the LEA to conduct a review of a representative sample of files to verify correction.</p>	<p>uncorrected noncompliance was corrected.</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 evaluations 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'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's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to provide in the February 1, 2008 APR data for all required measurements. The State provided the required data.</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 that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts that revision.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 81.3%. These data represent slippage from the revised FFY 2005 data of 87.8%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 18 of 18 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 response table required the State to provide in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, a composite baseline that reflects the required measurement for Indicator 13. The State reported the required data.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(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,</p>

Nebraska Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		2009, demonstrating 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>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 94.1%.</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 one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 92.6%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100% for this indicator.</p> <p>For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that it completed program-specific follow-up activities as described in Indicators 11 and 15. For the four districts that have not completed their Corrective Action Plans and corrected the outstanding noncompliance identified in 2005-2006, the State provided, on page 97 of the APR, a chart of activities it intends to conduct during the 2007-2008 school year to be reported in the FFY 2007 APR. These activities include onsite visits to determine the need for additional activities to assist the districts in correcting the remaining noncompliance, file reviews, and submission of a new CAP.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 SPP/APR response table required the State to provide documentation of correction in FFY 2006 of individual file noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 in its FFY 2006 APR submission and to ensure that its FFY 2006 APR included data for Indicator 15 that reflect findings of noncompliance identified through complaint decisions and due process hearing decisions issued in FFY 2005 that are corrected within one year of identification. The State provided the required information for FFYs 2005 and 2006 in its APR.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise, 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.</p>

Nebraska Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		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>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>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on five complaints. 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 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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported there were no fully adjudicated due process hearing requests during the reporting period.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported no resolution sessions were held during the reporting period.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that five of six mediations held resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2006. The State is not required to meet its targets or provide improvement activities until any FFY in which ten or more mediations were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>

Nebraska Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 2006 reported data for this indicator are 91%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 92.8%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 targets of 100%.</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 timely and accurate data requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p>